

Shaver, Timothy S., XXXX  
 Shaw, Worth D., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Shelden, David A., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Shires, Scott L., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Shortal, John F., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Siegel, David E., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Sihelnik, Stephen A., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Sills, Paul N., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Silva, Robert S., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Sinclair, Christopher B., III, XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Sitero, Charles M., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Skaggs, Alvah L., III, XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Sladky, John F., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Smith, Bryan E., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Smith, Jeffery B., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Smith, Maurice R., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Smith, Stephan G., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Snyder, Thomas L., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Sole, William R., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Sommerville, Jeffrey R., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Soncrant, James T., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Sorensen, Clark B., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Spaulding, Milton C., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Speakes, Stephen M., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Spencer, William J., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Spinelli, James L., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 St Cyr, Kenneth L., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Stamilio, Anthony J., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Stavridis, Thomas J., III, XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Stellar, Frederick W., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Stengel, Mark E., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Stevens, David S., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Stevenson, Steven W., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Stinnett, Gary R., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Stinson, David R., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Stone, Steve E., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Stratton, James R., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Strickland, Tracy L., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Stuart, Peter J., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Studer, Randal W., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Sullivan, Harold H., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Svoboda, Martin J., II, XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Sweeney, John G., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Swinson, Mark L., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Tafone, Paul J., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Tanner, Timothy T., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Tart, Randal G., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Taylor, Franklin R., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Taylor, Glenn A., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Taylor, Theodore R., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Thebaud, Charles C., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Thielke, Frederick L., XXX-XX-XXXX

Thomas, Carter S., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Thomas, Laurence E., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Thomas, Patrick A., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Thompson, David W., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Thompson, James E., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Thorsen Robert H., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Tixier, Michael L., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Tobin, Charles K., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Toomy Robert S., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Toothman, Edward J., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Topping, Gerald W., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Toth, John E., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Trauth, Stephen R., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Trompak, George S., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Troxell, John F., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Troxell, Robert T., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Tulay, Michael P., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Turner, Albert F., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Turner, Duncan C., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Turner, Thomas R., II, XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Twohig, John J., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Tyler, Timothy J., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Tyson, Timothy C., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Ulrich, John W., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Van Arsdale, Lee A., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Van Fleet, John A., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Velt, Rudy T., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Vestermark, James A., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Vidmar, Stephen M., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Vincent, Mark S., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Vincent, Richard L., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Visnovsky, Robert G., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Vollmer, Jeffrey R., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Vonderscheer, Eric A., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Vozzo, Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wahlgren, Van E., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Walker, Alan J., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Walker, John S., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wallace, Michael D., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wallace, Richard T., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wallinger, David T., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Walls, John D., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Ward, James W., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Ward, Joseph M., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Warner, Karl K., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Webber, Kenneth E., III, XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Webber, Paul M., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Weber, Robert J., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Weber, Thomas J., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Webster, Dwight S., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Webster, William G., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Weidner, Michael L., XXX-XX-XXXX

Weisz, John, XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wells, Herbert W., III, XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wells, Steven E., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Welt, John D., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wentz, Walter E., III, XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Westenhoff, Charles M., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wheeler, Clayton R., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 White, Charles E., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 White, Christopher B., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 White, French R., III, XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Whitman, Courtenay S., IV, XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Whitman, Mark H., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wiacek, Stephen J., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wilcox, Christopher J., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wildemann, Eric R., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wilkinson, Glenn F., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Williams, Gerald W., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Williams, Harry L., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Williams, Robert J., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Williams, Robert S., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Williamson, David R., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Willis, Colen K., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Willis, Thomas G., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wimberley, James W., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Withers, Benjamin G., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wittman, Craig P., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wolf, William A., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wolfe, Russell S., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wright, Alan K., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Wright, James A., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Yeterian, Edward M., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Yezak, Herman R., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Youngbluth, Terry R., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Zacherl, Donald H., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Zeigler, Peter H., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Zieske, Larry A., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Zwack, Daniel A., XXX-XX-XXXX

The following-named cadets, graduating class of 1974, U.S. Air Force Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283 through 4353:

Council, William C., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX  
 Monaghan, Joseph P., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Hicks, Ancil L., XXX-XX-XXXX

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### SOMETHING RIGHT

#### HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the April 24 edition of the Richmond Times-Dispatch included a balanced and fair-minded editorial praising President Nixon for refusing to impose coupon rationing of gasoline when the shortage was most critical.

The editorial points out that if rationing had been implemented as urged by many in February, a large bureaucracy would now be administering a cumbersome and unnecessary program.

The newspaper comments that—

As long as President Nixon is being blamed for everything from the defeat of local candidates to sunspots, it is only fair that he be credited when he does something right.

I agree.

I ask unanimous consent that the article "Something Right" from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of April 24, 1974,

be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

### SOMETHING RIGHT

As long as President Nixon is being blamed for everything from the defeat of local candidates to sunspots, it is only fair that he be credited when he does something right. And sometimes when the 10 thumbs of the federal government are concerned, doing something right means doing nothing at all.

On the question of initiating federal rationing of gasoline to American drivers, Mr. Nixon acted correctly. By doing nothing.

Four to six months ago, the President was under considerable pressure to start rationing as the Arab oil embargo began to take effect and Americans began to experience some inconvenience. Many citizens and politicians felt that rationing would be a fairer way for persons of meager or modest means to get their share of gasoline, although experience with rationing teaches that it is about as fair as life.

But now that the nation has survived a rough February in line at the service station and the oil embargo has been lifted, consider how fortunate we are that Mr. Nixon did not take a panicky leap into the rationing business. Overnight, states like Virginia

are able to lift the simple expedients, such as odd-even purchasing of gasoline, that they had imposed to deal with the temporary problem. If the central government had gotten into coupon-book rationing, a large and costly bureaucracy would have been set up to run a system that, once established, would have been difficult to disestablish.

Judging from the extreme difficulty the administration has had in extricating itself from the jungle of wage-price controls, the government could have been in the rationing business for years. Certainly the system would not have been ended overnight.

In this case, Mr. Nixon acted on his conservative instinct and it paid off for him and the nation.

### DOREEN GRANT SPEAKS ABOUT ENTHUSIASM, THE GOD WITHIN

#### HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the attention of my colleagues the following column by Doreen Grant entitled: "Enthusiasm, the God

Within" which appeared recently in western New York's Photo News.

With the quiet eloquence that marks all her columns, Doreen Grant outlines those characteristics which constitute mature adult enthusiasm. I am certain many Americans will find her remarks incisive and personally edifying. As she says, enthusiasm is "somewhere between wanting to make the world over, and wanting to hide from it." The article follows:

#### ENTHUSIASM, THE GOD WITHIN

Nobody is born bored. All of us can learn to foster that precious faculty which gives joy to our lives and purpose to our days.

In the morning of our lives a caterpillar is an astonishment, and a pink iced cake a marvel. But somewhere en route to adulthood we lose our enthusiasm, not because we have grown wise and sad, but because we misconceive it to be callow.

True adult enthusiasm is not puppy-dog eagerness for every new smell and sound and blade of grass, but rather the original endowment grown up—tempered and shaped by experience, judgment, humor.

The word enthusiasm comes from *enthus*—the god within—and means basically to be inspired or possessed by the god, or if you will, by God. It is an open secret, as commonplace and tireless as sunlight, that gives joy and purpose to all our days, if only we don't despise it.

The taproot of enthusiasm is learning. Learning makes us a child again in relation to the new thing, but it also means admitting that we don't already know. When I was in school there was a country lad who was an expert square dancer, but he wished to learn what he called "round dancing". The other boys laughed at him, but the girls didn't. He would say, "I'd ask you to dance, but I don't know how. Will you teach me? I like music. I like pretty girls, too." We taught him, and we scrambled for the privilege.

A woman who had always been afraid of flying took her first plane trip, and was miserably uneasy as the plane took off for its transatlantic trip. "I finally realized," she said afterward, "that I wasn't afraid of flying. I was afraid of not knowing how to act in a plane. I was wildly eager to ask questions, but first I had to admit my greenhorn standing. Once over that hurdle, I got along fine. And I learned some fascinating things about planes. You see, the air resembles a fluid, like water . . ." And she was off, the quintessence of enthusiasm.

Enthusiasm is sustained by the free play of our faculties. Too often, for example, our vision is exercised as a tool, too rarely as a joy. When crossing the street, we see a car coming and we go back to the curb. We need such practical information to survive, but its usefulness ought not to eclipse awareness of that world beyond, where a yellow taxi on a rain-black pavement is transportation, yes, but also a streak of color on a gray day, and a reason to have eyes.

Early one evening in spring, I walked along a busy London street, with a man who had been working fiercely hard. Suddenly he stopped and said, "I hear a cricket". Horns blew, feet hurried by, and that man's mind was groggy with problems—yet he heard a cricket. We hunted until we found him, scraping his legs at the edge of a grating, and we smiled and went on oddly comforted, reminded of our own ability to perceive and receive a world. I learned then that enthusiasm is partly willing attention, a turning aside to see, instead of hunching up inside like the affronted snail. Without enthusiasm, we are blind and deaf and only half know our world.

A little girl I know is a fledgling marine biologist who spends her allowance on specimens. One day I asked her if this passion wasn't depriving her of other important

things like after-school treats and movies. "I suppose so," she said. "But if I can't have both, I'll take biology."

She had already learned that without purpose, there is no lasting delight. It's hard to be enthusiastic and aimless. I have learned again and again that when I travel to a new city as a tourist, I often enjoy it without any real desire to go back. But if I take time to meet and get to know the people in those cities, I touch some deeper pulse of that city and am aroused to know it better.

There comes a time in nearly every life when purpose fails and fundamental enthusiasm quits, taking with it, to some extent, our very will to live. This dulling of the radiance can come about abruptly, because of a crisis, or gradually, from the abrasion of daily living. It can happen when a long-held job is snatched away; or on that morning when you find yourself so-and-so many years old without having done one tenth of the things you'd planned to do.

The temptation to give up is strong. But this is the one moment above all others, to hang on. The human mind is lazy and loves not to be disturbed, but some tough sinew of it—that very portion that is capable of enthusiasm—doesn't run to fat; it stretches thin and snaps us back.

One of the most exhilarating women I know was hit by a series of blows, culminating in the loss of a young son. For two or three years she was indifferent to everything. After a gap of some time, we met, and I was much comforted to find her lustre restored. "Day after day", she said, "I had to make myself go about my daily work. Everything was flat. Then one day I saw a couple quarreling on the street, so young, and obviously so much in love. I found myself understanding—I can't tell you how much. I talked with a refugee woman who told me about her lost family in Europe, and I understood, truly understood. I found myself with a new heart, and a new enthusiasm. I feel that understanding is the one thing that can save the world. If it took grief to teach me, at least I've learned that."

I couldn't agree with her more.

There is no magic formula that can cloak us with the gladness in living—indeed enthusiasm is that willingness. At times that involves acceptance of things as they are, at others it means DARING to change things.

Somewhere between wanting to make the world over, and wanting to hide from it, is a balance that permits intelligent adult enthusiasm.

#### MADE IN WASHINGTON

#### HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, each month the Foundation of Economic Education at Irvington on The Hudson, N.Y., publishes the Freeman.

Enclosed are the following articles from this month's Freeman which I commend for my colleagues:

#### MADE IN WASHINGTON

(By Paul L. Poirot)

The fact that the nation's crises are made in Washington leads many citizens of the United States to the false conclusion that solutions are to be found there, too. Opinion polls may reveal that the popularity of the President, or of the Congress, or both, has fallen below zero; yet an overwhelming preponderance of these same supposedly disillusioned citizens will demand that the Federal government "do something" to solve whichever crisis happens to be most aggravating at the moment.

Let there be no doubt that crises are made in Washington—whether it be a matter of meat, grain, energy, transportation, education, health care, or even inflation. The reason why shortages invariably are caused in Washington is because that's where all the raw material is concentrated.

The raw material concentrated in Washington? The meat? The grain? The fuel? No, of course not these things. But meat is not the raw material of a meat shortage, nor fuel the raw material of an energy shortage. The only raw material of any shortage of goods or services is *coercive intervention*. And only when that coercive intervention is concentrated in Washington can there be the kind of shortage that amounts to anything like a crisis.

Let's stick to the "energy crisis" for a moment. What is meant by *coercive intervention*? It is the use of violence to disrupt or interfere with the peaceful voluntary actions and transactions of willing buyers and sellers. For example, someone steals a gallon of gas, or a whole truckload, or bombs a refinery, or even an entire oil field.

Those are forms of coercive intervention, and they are destructive and disruptive of production and trade. But does the theft of a gallon of gas or the shutdown of a particular oil field result in a shortage or crisis of national or international proportions? No, it doesn't. The market, if left open and free to function, can readily cope with and adjust to such changes. If supplies are diminished to some extent, higher prices will discourage consumption and stimulate production until a new balance is achieved, with no crisis whatsoever.

#### MAJOR VIOLENCE

Suppose there is more extensive violence—such as an Israeli-Arab war that closes canals, cuts pipelines, destroys producing wells and shipping facilities. Wouldn't that bring an energy crisis? Indeed it could, but not necessarily, and not directly. Any crisis that comes of such warfare will come only in those countries where the war is used as an excuse to close the market and coercively prevent prices from adjusting to the new conditions of supply and demand. If the citizens of the United States, for instance, allow themselves to be stampeded by war in the Middle East to either demand or allow ceiling prices on oil and gas and other fuels, only then would there be concentrated in Washington the raw material of an energy crisis. And, to repeat, that raw material is coercive intervention: not the war in the Middle East, but the coercion turned against the people of the United States by the government in Washington to which they had surrendered their freedom of choice and freedom to trade.

#### MARKET INTERFERENCE

The process of closing the market against citizens is called *price control*, but a more realistic name would be *people control* or *prohibition*. Citizens are coercively prohibited from buying or selling precious fuels at market prices. If the legal price is lower than the free market rate, the consequence is a shortage—a demand that will not voluntarily be satisfied at that arbitrary price—a crisis of coercive intervention that must persist as long as the Federal government chooses to exercise the power of choice citizens have relinquished.

What motivates individuals to allow government to close the market may be of interest, but it doesn't have anything to do with the consequent shortage or crisis. Perhaps it was sympathy for Israelites or hatred of Arabs, a desire to befriend the poor, a concern over pollution, an objective of national self-sufficiency, an attempt to curb profit margins, or any one of the other reasons that might have entered 200 million different minds.

The fact is that the power to close the market was concentrated in Washington and was exercised; and no other consequence was



possible except a shortage and a crisis, at the prices and under the rules coercively prescribed. To then demand that Washington exercise further power, impose additional prohibitions, can only aggravate the crisis. All that is necessary to effect an instantaneous and miraculous end to the shortage is to lift all controls over the production and marketing of fuels; leave the matter to the voluntary actions of willing buyers and sellers in an open market.

So, how does one go about lifting these controls? Write his Congressman to do something? Perhaps that might be helpful. But an alternative is to stop writing Congressmen to do things for us, do what we can for ourselves and accept the responsibility for such risk decisions and actions. Washington would soon get the message if we wanted to try freedom.

#### A BETTER IDEA

The use of force to battle an idea tends to generate it rather than to kill it. I doubt if an idea has ever been killed by means of force. The enemy of the free market is an idea—the belief that controls can serve the freedom of man. . . .

Any law or regulation will be nullified whenever enough persons judge it to be unwise and improper, and not until then. Not every person needs to become convinced that it is unwise. Not even 51 per cent of them need to become convinced. All that is necessary is for a few thought leaders in all walks of life to become convinced because they are the ones to whom many others turn for guidance and advice. It is this understanding among the thought leaders that we now lack and that we must have for success in regaining freedom to trade.

#### DANGERS OF CONTINUED DEFICIT SPENDING

**HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, on April 18 and 19, WRAL-TV of Raleigh, N.C., telecast an excellent editorial warning of the dangers of continued, large-scale deficit spending by the Federal Government.

I am convinced that the inflation which is eating into the paycheck of every working man and woman is chiefly caused by the huge deficits which the Federal Government has been running.

The Federal funds budget has not been balanced since 1960, and deficits are increasing. For the 6-year period ending June 30, 1975, the accumulated deficit will total \$133 billion—and that is one-fourth of the entire debt piled up throughout our history.

As WRAL-TV put it:

In Washington . . . the name of the game is spend, spend, spend.

It is high time that we called a halt to that game.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the WRAL-TV editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

#### DANGERS OF CONTINUED DEFICIT SPENDING

If the trend continues, many upcoming election campaigns may be fought on an issue unrelated to Watergate, the energy crisis,

or any of the glamor subjects. The campaigns may be fought on the sobering issue of inflation.

Already the rise in wholesale prices has jumped to an annual rate of more than 15 percent, and in the past three months the government's wholesale price index has risen at an annual rate of nearly 25 percent.

As every housewife knows, food costs have risen alarmingly. Interest payments are climbing, with the prime rate now nudging 10.5 percent. The prices of steel, construction, clothing, health care—all are expected to hit new peaks in the coming months, and no end in sight.

That's what has economists worried. Inflation may become permanent, bringing eventual panic and collapse. The government has tried to rig the market by means of wage-price controls. That hasn't worked. The money supply has been jiggled. That hasn't worked either.

Reducing federal spending would work, but neither Congress nor the Administration has the stomach for it. There's too much boondoggling, too much barrel politics. Instead of trying to sit on expenses, the Administration wants Congress to approve a new budget amounting to \$304 billion. Congress seems more than willing.

There's no question about the effect that this massive spending would have on the economy. It would send the economy rocketing through the roof, with terrifying consequences for all of us.

The President's budget calls for an increase of \$29 billion in federal spending for the year beginning July 1st. Eighteen billion dollars of that is new debt. In this Administration alone, government spending has gone up by \$100 billion, which is an increase of 50 percent in only six years.

As Sen. Harry F. Byrd of Virginia put it recently, with great restraint, "I submit that federal spending is out of control."

The Senator's words make a small impression in Washington, where the name of the game is spend, spend, spend. Cutting expenses, balancing the budget—these things require momentary sacrifices for the sake of long-term benefits. Sales would dip. Some workers would be laid off until the economy could readjust. Such sorrows most politicians prefer not to inflict on their constituents, and certainly not at election time.

And so the nation continues to lurch forward toward its rendezvous with disaster—the kind of disaster that invariably strikes a nation too soft for self-denial and thus a prey to grinning goliwogs willing to trade the general good for votes. What will you do when your money will no longer buy anything?

#### MRS. BEATRICE PERRY—WOMAN OF THE YEAR

**HON. JAMES G. O'HARA**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday evening, May 4, the Eta Lambda Zeta Chapter of metropolitan Mount Clemens, Mich., will be presenting its annual "Woman of the Year" award at their dinner-soiree. Eta Lambda Zeta is a chapter of Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, which was organized in 1920 on the campus of Howard University, as a sister organization to the Phi Beta Sigma fraternity.

Each year the more than 300 chapters of this sorority in the United States and Africa celebrate Finer Womanhood Week, which culminates with the presentation of the "Woman of the Year" award.

This year the Eta Lambda Zeta Chap-

ter's award is being given to one of the truly outstanding women in Michigan—Mrs. Beatrice Perry of New Haven.

So much can be said about "Mama Bea," as she is affectionately known to her legion of friends, that it is hard to know where to begin. For as long as anyone can remember, she has been a tireless friend to anyone in need—in need of anything that she could possibly provide. It is said that "Mama Bea's refrigerator is a poor man's restaurant; her pocketbook, a poor man's bank; and her home, a poor man's hotel."

She is forever giving of herself to someone else's benefit. She has been known to stay up, or get up, to drive a worker to his place of employment so that he will not be late to work and lose his job. The homeless and the jobless have found acceptance and assistance in settling in the community, no matter who they are.

Mrs. Perry has toiled for years to provide for the education of young people, and to make their educations the best there is. In this effort, she has provided all young people of the area with a shining example of what it is to be a good citizen and a true friend. It is a gift that is beyond measure.

My wife and I have been privileged to know Mrs. Beatrice Perry as a friend for many years. We value her friendship greatly. Her thoughtfulness and her untiring efforts for her community have been an inspiration to us. It is in knowing and working with people like "Mama Bea" Perry that makes the work of a Congressman rewarding.

I cannot think of a better choice as "Woman of the Year." Mrs. Perry is a "woman of all years."

#### LOW-INCOME HOUSING

**HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, when I was first in the automobile business, those who worked for our company were able to buy brandnew homes for their families. The employees—mechanics, salesmen, clerks, and even maintenance people—were able to meet modest down payments and mortgage payments that were in line with take-home pay.

We are still in the automobile business, but today, rarely can the salesmen and mechanics, and certainly not the lower-income employees, buy a home, despite much higher salaries and commissions. New dwelling costs are far out of reach.

Ironically, it was in those times, a quarter of a century ago, that the Congress, in the Housing Act of 1949, committed itself to the goal of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family." But for millions of low-income American families, that goal has been nothing but a hollow joke. Despite a series of housing bills, our citizens, from young married couples to the elderly, cannot buy decent homes or a suitable living apartment.

Today, the housing situation is difficult for the middle-income family. The situation for low-income families is a disaster. According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development's own estimates, there are over 13 million households with incomes below \$5,000 annually, who are eligible for housing subsidies, but for whom there is no subsidized housing available. Almost all of these families living in housing which is either unsafe or unsanitary.

Housing subsidies in the form of tax deductions go to those who do not need relief as desperately as the low-income families. In fact, subsidies which go to well-to-do homeowners in the form of tax deductions amount to four times as much as all other housing subsidies combined.

The only program which has been developed to meet the housing needs of families with incomes below \$5,000 in any significant way has been low-rent public housing.

We need to deal with our housing problems from the bottom up through middle-income families.

The Housing Act of 1949, which set our national housing goal, set low-income housing at an estimated 10 percent of housing production. In 1972, housing starts for the poor amounted to less than 1 percent of total starts.

To convert some of the billions of our annual defense budget to underwrite, support, and assist buyers and renters of low- and middle-income housing will provide individual Americans a home to defend, as well as a homeland.

#### LEADERS IN THE FIGHT AGAINST MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY

**HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, it has recently been brought to my attention by the executive director of the Muscular Dystrophy Association of America, Mr. Robert Ross, that television personalities all across the country are leading the fight against muscular dystrophy.

The broadcast media are today subject to a great deal of criticism from people and organizations claiming radio and television stations focus too much attention on the negative aspects of our society.

I think it only fair now to highlight this contribution the media are making to fight this dread disease.

Mr. Ross has written to me to single out the work of two television stations and two individuals and I would like to share that letter with my colleagues:

Congressman WILLIAM WALSH,  
Syracuse, N.Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALSH: I believe you'll be interested to know that a signal contribution to the welfare of citizens in your area and elsewhere throughout the country—especially children and adults afflicted by neuromuscular disease—has been made by WHEN-TV, Syracuse, New York through the efforts of Jean Daugherty, and by WSYR-TV, Syracuse, New York through the efforts of Bill Everett.

In very large measure, it's thanks to individuals like Jean and Bill and stations like WHEN-TV and WSYR-TV throughout the United States that Muscular Dystrophy Associations of America has been able to make such gratifying progress toward increasing public awareness of the life-and-death problems represented by muscular dystrophy and related disorders—and toward enlisting constructive support from concerned citizens in your district and elsewhere.

WHEN-TV and Jean Daugherty and WSYR-TV and Bill Everett have furthered the educational thrust of this Association in many ways, but I'd like to pay special tribute to their aid in promoting our Carnivals Against Dystrophy project. The enlightenment and inspiration they've provided their youthful viewers through this project have led directly to a significant enhancement of our ability to serve patients in your constituency and throughout the nation.

Inspired by TV personalities at stations all over the country, young people held more than 40,000 backyard carnivals in 1973. Their efforts led to the realization of MDAA's programs of research and patient and community services.

As you may know, the Carnivals project functions primarily through promotion by popular children's TV personalities like Jean Daugherty and Bill Everett. These broadcasters invite their young viewers to write for a free kit, which contains all elements essential to the production of a fun-filled Carnival—which youngsters organize and run in their own backyards. Through the project, participants learn how to organize and set up a complex event, how to cope with responsibility, and how to meet the challenge of operating a business enterprise of their own. But perhaps the greatest benefit they derive from Carnivals is the "education in compassion" which it gives them—their increased awareness of the plight of the less fortunate.

In furthering this project in your area, Bill Everett and WSYR-TV and Jean Daugherty and WHEN-TV have done even more than help provide desperately-needed assistance to the victims of neuromuscular disease whom this Association seeks to serve. They've helped enrich the very spirit which has inspired this nation's greatest achievements.

Sincerely,

ROBERT ROSS,  
Executive Director.

#### FEO PREDICTS ALASKAN OIL WILL BE EXPORTED

**HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, virtually hidden in last Monday's New York Times was a statement by the Northwest Regional Administrator of the Federal Energy Office that in the first years of operation of the trans-Alaskan oil pipeline significant quantities of crude oil would be exported probably to Japan. These exports will occur because U.S. west coast markets will be unable to absorb the total throughput of TAPS. Although I am fully aware that such exports must be sanctioned by the President and Congress, it is indeed intriguing that similar predictions of such exports were greeted rather derisively when the Alyeska system was approved last summer.

As my colleagues will recall, the debate over a transmission system to bring Alaska's crude oil to market focused on the merits and disadvantages of the finally authorized Alaskan project and a MacKenzie Valley route across Canada. A central aspect of the debate concerned the ability of different regional markets to absorb the oil that system would transport. Myself and a number of other Members, after intensive study of petroleum supply and demand patterns, concluded that in the early years of operation the west coast markets could not absorb the full throughput of the Alaskan pipeline/tanker system. Partly as a result of this finding, we argued that the national interest would be better served by a pipeline system across Canada to deliver oil to U.S. Midwestern markets.

In spite of these findings, Congress was continually assured by TAPS proponents that such exports were thoroughly unforseeable. The Interior Department personally assured me that "District V—the west coast—demand would absorb all domestic lower 48 production, all North Slope production, all Canadian imports, and all Western Hemisphere imports." The State of Alaska commissioned a lengthy study that concluded that the "west coast demand will be sufficient to account for all of Alaska's Prudhoe Bay production. As the member companies of the trans-Alaskan pipeline group assured Governor Egan more than a year ago, no oil will be sold to Japan." Finally, then Deputy Secretary of the Treasury William E. Simon testified:

The earliest we can expect an Alaskan pipeline is in the mid-1977 or early 1978. By then, demand in District V will most likely exceed supply from California and southern Alaska by more than the capacity of the Alaska pipeline.

It now appears to the Federal Energy Office that all of these predictions are rather inaccurate.

Mr. Speaker, I do not raise this point to beat a dead horse. Rather, these developments occur just when another dispute involving Alaskan energy is beginning. Instead of crude oil, natural gas is at stake. Two competitive entities are seeking to bring the vast North Slope gas reserves to market: The Arctic gas consortium via a trans-Canadian pipeline that will service the Midwest and the west coast, and the El Paso Gas Co. which is promoting a trans-Alaskan pipeline/tanker system to feed west coast ports, and, potentially, overseas markets. As the decision date comes closer, a wide range of issues will surely be raised. I suggest to my colleagues that during the course of the debate they carefully examine the evidence and look askance at any project that may allow our precious fossil fuel reserves to flow overseas. One mistake is more than enough.

A news article follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 22, 1974]

#### OIL EXPORTS FORESEEN

SPokane, Wash.—A large portion of oil transported through the trans-Alaska pipeline will be exported, probably to Japan, during the line's early years of operation,



Jack B. Robertson, regional administrator of the Federal Energy Office, said yesterday, West Coast markets originally earmarked for as many as 2 million barrels of Alaskan crude oil daily would not be able to absorb that quantity until 1985.

# THERE'S NO SUCH THING AS A FREE LUNCH

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz is one of the most outspoken men in Government. Recently there appeared in the *Herald*, a newspaper in Bonners Ferry, Idaho, an article by Mr. Butz which supports his reputation for being outspoken. What the Secretary has to say in the article entitled "There's No Such Thing as a Free Lunch" deserves the attention of everyone—in Government and out of Government. As is usual for Mr. Butz, he is right to the point, using a minimum of words to say a great deal.

The article follows:

[From the Bonners Ferry (Idaho) *Herald*, Apr. 18, 1974]

## THERE'S NO SUCH THING AS A FREE LUNCH (By Earl L. Butz)

In the old days the king called in his three wise men to tell them he'd become interested in economics. "But," he said, "it sounds confusing and complicated. I want you to go out and boil it down for me in a way that I can understand."

Nine months later they came back and reported they had completed the job. They said they had condensed all of economics into a single book of 200 pages. The king said, "That's too long. I don't have time to read that much."

He had the chairman beheaded, and told the other two: "Now I want it boiled down."

They came back in 30 days and said they had economics boiled down into a single chapter of 20 pages. The king said, "That's too long. I don't have time for it."

He had the chairman beheaded, and turned to the remaining wise man: "You know your job. Now, boil it down."

"Yes sir, Mr. King!"

This wise man came back in three days: "Mr. King, I think I have it. I have boiled down the entire subject of economics into a single sentence of eight words."

The king said, "That's fine. I have time for that. What is it?"

"There's no such thing as a free lunch."

I tell that story because I think those eight words sum it up pretty well. Economics is a description of what you and I, and others like us, do in order to get our share of the things that are in the real life around us.

Unfortunately, there are a lot of people around—you know them and I know them—who think that there is such a thing as a free lunch.

Take the role of the Federal government—Uncle Sam, if you will. Some people look on him as a kind, benevolent old gentleman who hands out free gifts. They look on him as a child might look at a grandfather.

Take most any state or local project. If there's work or money involved, it's easy to say: "Let's have the Federal government do it." You see this happening all the time. Maybe it's a new courthouse in the county seat, or a sewage plant, or just one of many things: "Let Washington do it."

"There's only one way the government can do anything—that's with your money. The government is not a form of voluntary giving; it is a form of compulsory giving. You lose your home or your land if you don't pay your taxes. There's nothing benevolent about old Uncle Sam when it comes to you paying the tax bill. There's no such thing as a free lunch."

The next time you see a headline saying that the Congress has voted a \$1 billion project, just figure that on the average this is about \$5 out of your pocket and out of the pocket of every other member of your family.

"But," somebody says, "we're just talking about our own little community project. If we don't get that Federal money, somebody else will use the money. This project costs only a few thousands dollars. That's a drop in the bucket compared with what the Federal government spends on other things."

You've heard that, or something like that, many times, I'm sure.

Fact is, most everything the government does is, of itself, a drop in the bucket. However, when you add up all the little drops, it makes quite a bucketful. And the bucket is spilling over.

We're already spending about 34% of our gross national product for government—Federal, state or local. That means that we have given to the government one-third of the decisionmaking power over how our money is spent.

There are many things that we want and need to have the government do. The problem develops when it seems so painless and easy to add "just one more." That's how we got the 34%—by adding "just one more." We have direct control over the dollars that we spend individually; however, we lose direct control over our dollars when we pay them out as taxes. The control then becomes diffused and political and hard for any one of us as an individual to do very much about.

If you don't think so, pick up the newspaper almost any day. Chances are you can read one to several stories about this or that proposal to launch a government project of some kind. Each one is a proposal to spend more of your money. Some are worthy causes, but how much "say" do you have in deciding whether you want to pay more for each of these projects?

The farther away from your local government the decision gets, the harder it is for you to exercise control. That's why the Federal budget has been balanced only 4 of the past 20 years. That's why inflation is eating us up. That's why we ought to reverse the trend in this country and return more government to local decision-making. That's why we should ask about every public project, "Is it worth what it costs if we had to pay for it directly?"

Even then there are problems. If your local government is making a capital improvement of some kind, you'll probably find you can't save tax dollars in the budget ahead of time and pay cash. You'll probably have to borrow, float bonds, build up a debt and pay for the project twice through interest payments. There's no such thing as a free lunch.

All right, but we run out of the rich pretty quick. The great bulk of the tax load comes out of the pockets of ordinary people. There's no other way. If we held every rich guy by his heels and shook out all his money, it would still be a drop in the bucket.

Tax the corporations? When you tax them, they have to get the money somewhere, since it is strictly illegal for them to manufacture money. When the corporation is taxed, the corporation tacks the cost onto the price of the article you buy. When you buy Corporation X.Y.Z.'s handy dandy little gizmo, you pay the corporation's tax.

A corporation, then, is a tax collection agent for Uncle Sam. That kind, benevolent

old gentleman is a wily old cuss who has his hand in your pocket in a way and at times when you don't suspect it. *There's no such thing as a free lunch.*

Take ceilings on prices. We've heard a lot about them in the last few months. Inflation has been chasing prices of many things up the trees. It happened on food last summer. Housewives not only complained; some of them became activists and picketed. They demanded that "something be done."

Well, the government is also a listening post. When somebody in political office hears the chant loud and clear from back home, he figures he'd better do something or he won't be around to hear the chant the next time. The urge for personal survival in Washington is a powerful instinct. It's the primary political instinct, you might say.

Last summer, in response to the cry from back home, controls were put on food. All of a sudden, the market was telling farmers not to produce as much. The market after all is nothing more than a sounding board for the desires of people. You might call it an echo chamber. Each day people all around the country, by spending their money, say, "I want more of that." The price goes up. Or they say, "I want less of that." The price comes down.

Each person, including you and me, whispers something to the market each time we make even a little decision about how we spend our money. Those little whispers, billions of them a day, echo back from the market echo chamber. It shouts back that nationally we want more of this, or more of that, or less of it.

Stock markets reverberate. Corporations shake. The little store down at the corner quivers. All before the loud echo of those billions of little decisions that we make everyday.

Let's say the market thunders that it wants more of something—the price goes up. But the housewife fusses that "It's already too high priced." So the government puts on a ceiling. Well, that doesn't make any more of the product. We go right on making all those little decisions, each of us, that put the price up in the first place. Now that the price isn't going up anymore, as a result of the ceiling, we buy even more of it.

Pretty soon, there's not enough to go around. We keep right on buying—but the fellow who makes it is getting a wrong signal. The market is telling him not to produce as much. The price isn't attractive anymore. His costs keep climbing, but the price for what he makes doesn't. So he quits. Or his banker makes him quit. There is less of the product around.

There's only one thing you can do then—ration the product with ration stamps. If you don't, there won't be any of it down at the store when you get there. People don't like that. What good is a controlled price if the product isn't there to buy?

What controls do is substitute government ration stamps for our dollar bill ration stamps. Instead of you and me setting the price by our own decisions with the way we spend our dollar bills, we let the government make the decisions by parceling out ration stamps to us—so many for each one of us. The same for each. That's the bureaucratic way of being fair.

So controls, then, which set out to do us a favor, end up discouraging production, instead of encouraging it. The ration stamp cure for the disease of low supply makes more of the disease by discouraging production. *There's no such thing as a free lunch.*

Another common principle is that most everything has a cost-benefit ratio to it. The item has a benefit, or we don't want it. And it has a cost, or we can't get it. That's the way it is with anything where there isn't enough to go around.

You can walk out and look at the moon. It's pretty on a clear, crisp night, and you can

take in all of the scene you want to; it doesn't cost you a cent. Unless maybe you wear glasses, which I do. Then even looking at the moon isn't free.

The point is, if something is scarce, and practically everything is, it has a cost. Whether you pay that cost or not depends on how you look at the benefit and whether you have the money to pay.

Most everything has a cost-benefit ratio. You can't escape it. Are we going to have completely clear air and not enough energy? Are we going to poison coyotes—and maybe some birds while we're at it—and have enough wool and lamb; or are we going to listen to the howl of more coyotes at the cost of less lamb?

Are we going to feed DES to cattle and perhaps have a residue in some beef livers in an infinitesimal amount which has never been known to harm anyone's health; or are we going to avoid even one particle of DES per trillion in beef liver and pay more for beef, since it costs more to raise it without DES?

Are we going to disrupt a narrow strip of tundra and disturb some wildlife in remote parts of Alaska, while tapping the rich oil supplies there, or are we going to have gas rationing? Are we going to have well-planned forest harvests and reforestation, or are we going to look at the undisturbed wilderness and hoard resources? For every benefit there is an offsetting cost.

*There's no such thing as a free lunch!*

#### SOCIAL SECURITY NEEDS AIRING

#### HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I filed an additional five names as cosponsors of my social security bill calling for a reduction in the social security taxes from 50 percent on the employer and 50 percent on the employee too, or a 5.85 percent on both to a reduced amount of 3.9 percent on the employer and 3.9 percent on the employee with the balance being financed out of general revenue.

The regressive burden now being carried by the small business and low- and middle-income worker is outrageous and must be changed.

I include for the information of the Members of the U.S. Congress an editorial dealing with social security that appeared in today's Boston Globe:

#### SOCIAL SECURITY NEEDS AIRING

It is nearly two years since The Globe first advocated a serious review by Congress of the payments structure of the Social Security system. Its basic inequity, weighing more heavily on the low end of the income scale, has become even more onerous in the interim as inflation has hit the poor hardest.

For this reason we welcome the work being done by Rep. James A. Burke (D-Mass.) in collecting signatures from his colleagues in support of his proposal to halve the rate of collections while nearly doubling the amount of income susceptible to the payroll tax. It is the detail of his bill that deserves particular attention because it breaks new ground in congressional attempts to deal with this tricky problem.

The heart of the issue is the broad and unforgiving nature of the taxes paid into the system. No allowance is made for the fact that the total income of the taxpayer may be very low—5.85 percent of each dollar

up to the maximum of \$13,200 a year is collected from all employed persons, matched by equal amounts from their employers. All employees with income above \$13,200 a year are paying a lower proportion of their incomes than those with less than \$13,200.

Earlier attempts to tackle the problem have had prestigious sponsorship from at least four Democratic senators—Muskie of Maine, Mondale of Minnesota, Williams of New Jersey and Hartke of Indiana.

The important changes proposed included shifting a proportion of Social Security collections to the general tax system. They also suggested personal exemptions, low income allowances and elimination of ceilings on collections.

Outside Congress, others are looking at the question. Alicia Munnell, an economist with the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, has just published a paper in the bank's Economic Review advocating a series of slowly vanishing exceptions based on the number of dependents that would have its largest effect on families with incomes below about \$5,000. The Munnell work shows that raising the portion of income subject to taxation to \$18,000 would just compensate for revenue lost through the system of dependency deductions.

The Burke proposal would cut the rate of payment in half for all contributors but would raise to \$25,000 the maximum amount subject to Social Security taxes.

While Mr. Burke's has some obvious advantages in terms of reducing the burden on persons with low incomes, we harbor some reservations over at least one obvious defect: persons with incomes between \$20,000 and \$25,000 as well as those with less, would pay less than the full \$704 annual obligation under the current payment structure. That relief does not shout for enactment. We don't suggest an immediate choice between these two alternatives or others that may surface. But we agree emphatically with Alicia Munnell that "payroll tax reform should be given the highest priority" and hope that Congress, which is just rediscovering some of its oats, will take the job up quickly.

#### INDIAN AGENCY TAPS OKLAHOMA FOR AWARD

#### HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of her sincere dedication and compassionate volunteer service, one of my constituents, Mrs. Marie Cox of Midwest City, Okla., has been awarded a national leadership citation from the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I am most happy to add my commendation to the many accolades she so rightly deserves.

The following article from the Oklahoma Journal newspaper provides the highlights of her distinguished service:

AN OKLAHOMA INDIAN WOMAN has been singled out by the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs to receive a leadership award Tuesday in Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Marie Cox, a Comanche and a resident of Midwest City, will be presented the national award by Morris Thompson, commissioner of Indian Affairs, for her work with foster children.

Mrs. Cox has worked on state and national levels to find solutions to problems of Indian children who are orphans, delinquent, retarded or abandoned.

As chairman of the National Action for Foster Children Committee, she worked to develop a bill of rights for foster children which was ratified by Gov. David Hall last week.

Mr. Cox also organized North American Indian Women's Association.

Under her leadership, this group made a national survey of the special needs of the Indian child to use in proposing programs for those who receive care away from home.

Mrs. Cox now serves as national adviser to the association and is adviser on women for the U.S. Secretary of Labor National Committee Eighteen.

She has been a longtime volunteer worker to promote an understanding of Indian heritage and culture.

In 1969, Mrs. Cox wrote the Historical Indian Dress Review which was later presented at the Smithsonian Institute's Fourth Annual Folk Life Festival in Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Cox was also asked by the Fashion Group Inc. of America to include her modern adaptation of her tribal dress in a collection of "How America Dresses," which toured Europe.

She is a member of Oklahoma Historical Society and served on Oklahoma City Community Relations Commission's Indian Committee.

Mrs. Cox is a member of National Congress of American Indians and serves as secretary for the executive board of National Hall of Fame for Famous American Indians.

She has conducted seminars on American Indians for the YMCA, YWCA, Campfire Girls and Boy Scouts and has been a guest speaker at several public schools.

Mrs. Cox was recently asked to submit her biography for the Encyclopedia of American Women.

A native of Lawton, Mrs. Cox attended Fort Sill Indian Boarding School and graduated from Walters High School. She attended Pacific Union College in Angwin, Calif., and Central State University.

Mrs. Cox and her husband, James, a councilman of the Comanche Tribe, live at 3201 Shady Brook Drive.

#### MAJORITY LEADER THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., SAYS CONGRESS SHOULD DEAL WITH THE REPUBLICAN ECONOMIC MESS

#### HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the Republican administration is putting the Nation through another economic barrel roll.

Interest rates are up past 10 percent and still climbing. Yet, Dr. Burns says the Federal Reserve is not going to do anything about it.

The gross national product drops in recession proportions during the first 3 months of 1974. Yet, the cost of living shoots up 14½ percent, highest since the Korean war.

The administration says it will slow down inflation by letting unemployment go up even higher. Then, privately, the administration slips \$1.5 billion into the Defense budget, just to prime the economy.

It is time for Congress to deal forthrightly with this Republican economic mess. We need to find ways to put peo-



ple back to work, to boost production, to reduce interest rates, and to stimulate the economy.

We need public services employment and a release of impounded funds for such programs as the antipollution sewer construction program which Congress voted in 1972. We should begin a program of public works that will provide long-term benefits to communities and to great masses of people. And we should dampen the inflationary effect of these actions by eliminating that pump-priming \$1.5 billion from the Defense budget.

That is the kind of economic remedy this Nation needs, not the sit-on-your-hands attitude of the administration.

**NIX SUMS UP ASIAN AND PACIFIC SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS AS LEADING TO CONCLUSION THAT WE MUST BRING AT LEAST 100,000 MEN HOME FROM ASIA**

**HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee of which I am chairman has held 19 days of hearings since April 1974.

We have covered many vital matters including the Cambodian crisis in which American forces were engaged in bombing without any action by Congress, or treaty obligation; a pure case of Presidential war.

From last fall until now, we have engaged in hearings on our remaining involvement in South Vietnam, where there is now no peace, nor any prospect for peace. In addition, we have examined the strained relations between the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China which could explode into nuclear war. At the same time we see growing ties between the Soviet Union and Japan because of the oil crisis, because of Japan's utter dependence on oil to keep the world's third greatest industrial economy functioning and her people free from starvation.

In short, the old order is changing. The rivalries of the distant past have caught up with the present. The world, even in Asia, is not necessarily divided into Communist and anti-Communist camps. There is still great tension between the Communist world and our own, but other problems now demand attention as well.

For all of these reasons, it is now apparent that it is time to withdraw our ground forces from forward bases in Asia.

We have about 36,000 men in South Korea, 33,000 in Thailand, about 36,000 in Okinawa, and 19,000 in Japan, as well as 7,000 or so troops in Taiwan, and 19,000 in the Philippines.

The greatest danger to our own peace and safety is the presence of our airmen in Thailand, who number 33,000 and whose mission is the protection of the Thieu government in South Vietnam in

the event of an attack by the North Vietnamese. Yet bombing missions from these bases is forbidden by statute. The bases themselves do nothing for Thailand, they are only there to involve us once again in the Vietnam war. That is their only purpose.

We have 36,000 men in South Korea. The South Korean Armed Forces number well over 600,000 men and they have a reserve force of approximately the same number. Our forces serve only a symbolic purpose. What is their real value? It appears from Defense Department testimony that they serve an unspecified political purpose. We have not been able to learn what is the need for our men in Okinawa. They are in training units. They could train elsewhere.

Our forces were in Asia to serve our policy of containment of the Peoples Republic of China. Now we are improving our relations with the Peoples Republic of China, which has as its major concern a million Soviet troops on its Siberian border. This is the major fact in Asia, the rivalry between the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China. It is a dangerous rivalry and much of the trouble in Southeast Asia comes from the fact that the Soviet Union is now trying to contain the Peoples Republic of China.

What are our interests in Asia? They are limited. They are limited to maintaining our few viable commitments. In short the nations of Asia do not need us in the way they did before.

Most of those outside of Southeast Asia do not need our military help. Those in Southeast Asia, an area where we have no security interests, have to prove that they can defend themselves and that they do not totally rely on us.

Whatever we need to accomplish in Asia militarily can be done from mid-Pacific bases under our control and for the most part American territory.

Has the administration recognized any of these problems? They are taking some action but not enough. For instance, they are buying up two-thirds of the island of Tinian for air force and naval bases. Our base in Guam is being expanded for air and naval purposes.

What is more, we are now taking men out of Asia. But in a very small way: 4,000 men out of South Korea, a few thousand out of Thailand.

We are not an Asian power, yet we recognize that fact only grudgingly.

Our treaties and Executive agreements which were signed to contain China are now being used to maintain a stance of being the peacemaker for the entire area, including by indirection the Peoples Republic of China.

We have the following treaty commitments in Asia:

First, Republic of China—Taiwan, Mutual Defense Treaty, December 2, 1954.

Second, Japan, Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security, January 19, 1960—replaces earlier treaty signed on September 8, 1951.

Third, Korea, Republic of South, Mutual Defense Treaty, October 1, 1953.

Fourth, New Zealand, Australia, ANZUS, SEATO, September 8, 1954.

Fifth, Thailand, Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, including nations

which have disassociated themselves with the treaty. September 8, 1954.

Sixth, Philippines, Mutual Defense Treaty, and SEATO, August 30, 1951, and September 8, 1954.

South Vietnam was a protected state under the SEATO treaty and the Tonkin Gulf Resolution were basis for our action in South Vietnam which cost 50,000 lives and a cost exceeding \$100 billion.

We are supposed to be at peace in Asia and yet our present forces there on the ground in Asia will cost at least in personnel costs alone a billion dollars a year. If we kept those forces under arms in American bases we would at least reduce our balance-of-payments problems by a billion dollars a year. If we reduced our total forces since these very same troops would not have a ground mission in Asia and we emphasized our naval forces we would save more than a billion dollars a year.

The time has come for the United States to rely on its naval forces, for the sake of protecting our allies while controlling our own budget here at home. Naval forces being missile armed can accomplish whatever military mission we should undertake. They can be controlled by our own foreign policy since they can avoid unnecessary difficulties.

But the most important thing to remember about our old bases is that new missions will be found for them if we do not close them down. Our forces and bases serve no other than a political purpose. We must prevent our involvement in a Sino-Soviet dispute by withdrawing our forces from forward garrisons. They no longer serve our allies, even those allies which have been reluctant to rearm in their own defense.

Our men are in a position in Asia of having a mission found for them. The balance-of-power politics of the Secretary of State should not be allowed to supply our men as a counterweight to Sino-Soviet designs.

It is time to bring our men home. It is time for us to accept the role of a Pacific power rather than an Asian power.

**AMENDMENT TO H.R. 14434**

**HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will offer the following amendment:

Page 8, before the period in Line 2, insert the following: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be obligated, expended, or used for research, development, or other activities relating to the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor until the Commission has submitted to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate and to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a detailed breakdown of the total planned costs for the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor program research operations and construction and (1) a period of thirty days has passed (after the submission of such breakdown), or (2) such committees (before the expiration of such period) have transmitted to the Commission written notice to the ef-

fect that they have no objection to any such obligation, expenditure, or use".

## TROUBLED AND TROUBLESOME KIDS

**HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we live in a complex society characterized by change. As a result, many young people often find themselves confused, with problems, and with nowhere to turn for advice. Juvenile delinquency in some shape or form has at one time or another plagued virtually every community in America.

In an effort to combat the problems of juvenile delinquency, the New Jersey State Legislature passed the municipal youth guidance act of 1947. This legislation enabled municipalities to set up local youth guidance councils, designed to use community resources to help young people with their problems. Over the years, as a result of this legislation, many communities have established local youth guidance councils.

Recently however a drive has been launched to establish a youth guidance council in each municipality. Five Bergen County residents, I am proud to say, have founded the association of municipal youth guidance councils to foster and encourage the program in each municipality in the State. These five are: Arthur J. Davis of Upper Saddle River, Louis J. D'Arminio of Hackensack, Police Chief George Hecker of Montvale, Roderick Thorp of Upper Saddle River, and James J. Craffey of River Vale.

Mr. Speaker, an article concerning the youth guidance council program appeared recently in New Jersey Municipalities, a monthly magazine. Written by Mr. Craffey and entitled "Troubled and Troublesome Kids," the article offers further insight into this program. In view of the fact that juvenile delinquency is a problem with which we are all concerned, I would like to share this article with my colleagues. The article follows:

### TROUBLED AND TROUBLESOME KIDS

(By James J. Craffey)

Kids in trouble have problems that deserve far more attention than the present juvenile justice system offers. Most of the inequities in the juvenile justice system can be traced right back to the community, which has always been considered the front-line barricade in the fight against juvenile delinquency.

Many towns lack concern and know-how in tackling the problems of their youth effectively. Full-time juvenile officers are scarce. Many police departments rely solely on the Juvenile Court to handle their "problem" kids.

The inequities show up in municipalities everywhere. The "incurable" from your town who is in a correctional institution may have been the sacrificial lamb for an easy-living mother who decided her torrid love affair was more important than her parental duties. You may find a child sent to Juvenile Court for stealing a bag of candy while an adjoining town referred the same problem to its Youth Guidance Council.

You should know why a 16-year old from your town was charged with "auto theft" for taking a car without his parent's permission while youngsters in an adjoining town are charged with "joyriding" for the same offense. You find kids from your town on probation for offenses that a juvenile judge in another county treats as a youthful transgression that deserves a community solution rather than a court disposition.

Juvenile delinquency will never be stopped in any community by the seemingly punitive measure of "passing the buck" to the juvenile court. Only when a municipality has the machinery to help youngsters at the first sign of a problem will it make a dent in the juvenile problems threatening the peace and welfare of the community.

Almost half—49 per cent—of the juvenile cases referred to the juvenile courts in New Jersey in 1972 were "adjusted at in-take." This means that the offenses were not serious enough to warrant the intervention of the judge in the first place. Yet, few communities offer complainants an alternative to the satisfactory resolution of the problem for themselves and for the young perpetrators.

The seemingly "soft" disposition of cases by the juvenile courts have local police annoyed and disgusted. The fault, however, does not lie with the Juvenile Court, which is overburdened, not with the Probation Departments, which already work far beyond their physical capacity. The fault lies within the community. Local police, the juvenile courts and the Probation Departments cry out for a community-based alternative which will handle youth problems effectively.

### CHANGES

Changes are in the wind, fortunately. The State Legislature recently changed the 53-year old Juvenile Code to reflect society's attitude that incarceration is not the solution in the making of a law-abiding citizen. Under the new Juvenile Code, no longer will youngsters in New Jersey wind up "behind bars" for being truant, incorrigible, growing up in idleness etc.

The new Juvenile Code distinguishes between the criminal and non-criminal nature of a youth's transgressions. It distinguishes between a "delinquent" and a JINS (Juvenile In Need of Supervision). The acronym JINS officially permits us to recognize the unmet social, psychological, medical or educational needs of youngsters brought into the juvenile justice system.

A youngster becomes a "delinquent" for committing a misdemeanor, violating a municipal penal ordinance or is adjudged a "disorderly person." In these cases the young offenders expose themselves to Skillman, Jamesburg or one of the other youth correctional facilities maintained by the state. However, the odds are pretty good that the child will never make it to any one of these places.

The state youth correction facilities have room for only about 700 youngsters. This is about 1½ places for each of the state's 567 municipalities. At a cost of about \$12,000 per year to keep a youngster in one of these institutions, it makes sense to launch an all-out effort to find alternatives to help the youth of the state become law-abiding citizens.

Youngsters charged with "incorrigibility," "truancy," "growing up in idleness," etc., may not be labeled a "delinquent" and may not be subjected to the severe restrictions and ignominies of incarceration. Under the new Code, the Juvenile Judge is expected to come up with specific recommendations for the care and welfare of these JINS youngsters. The judge cannot succeed without the involvement of the community.

While the new Juvenile Code has paved the way for diverting more and more youngsters from the formal juvenile justice system, few towns have plans or programs underway to meet their new responsibilities in handling

the problems and needs of their troubled and troublesome youngsters. Neither the police nor the courts can do the job alone. The community must respond with the resources to help youngsters with incipient behaviour problems.

A milestone in juvenile justice occurred unceremoniously in the state over 25 years ago that offers municipalities an effective answer. Led by far-sighted legislators like State Senator David Van Alstyne Jr. of Bergen and top penologists like Sanford Bates, then head of the Department of Correction and Parole, the State legislature introduced a landmark approach for communities to fight juvenile delinquency.

The Municipal Youth Guidance Council Act of 1947 permits municipalities to set up local Youth Guidance Councils to mobilize a community's resources to help youths with problems. In the intervening years over 400 municipalities have taken advantage of the enabling legislation and have benefitted from local Youth Guidance Councils. Today, 26 years later, the Youth Guidance Council approach is relevant and valid. The President's Crime Commission in 1967 endorsed and encouraged the concept of community-based organizations like Youth Guidance Councils as the most effective way to coordinate the services that youths in a community need to win the struggle toward adulthood.

A Youth Guidance Council activates your community's expressions of concern and interest in resolving the problems of its younger citizens. It serves as the community eyes for the welfare of its young, ever watchful to straighten out anything that might go wrong.

The Youth Guidance Council calls for the active involvement of three local governmental departments to make the program effective. A member of the governing body, a representative of the police department and a representative of the school system are mandatory appointees by the Mayor and Council to the Youth Guidance Council. Four other citizens such as a psychologist, minister, lawyer, physician or other professional also are appointed to the seven-member body.

Many towns have had problems obtaining the services of professional people in the community. The citizen appointments now are being filled by residents who work with youth such as leaders in the Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, Little League, Junior Football and recreational departments. Possessing extraordinary common sense and an intense interest in the development of youngsters, these people are performing admirably after a brief training period.

### ADJUSTMENT COMMITTEE

The local Youth Guidance Council is empowered to appoint members of an Adjustment Committee which takes referrals from the police, schools and parents, looks into the problem, and assembles the resources of the community to deal effectively with the problem. The Adjustment Committee may recommend treatment for the youth and his family at a community mental health center, act as intermediary in a family dispute or intercede for the youngster in personal or family situations.

Juvenile and other police officers find the Adjustment Committee a welcome alternative in resolving behavior problems locally. Police maintain the Adjustment Committee referral is an added asset to station-house adjustment, and juvenile Court. Appearances before the Adjustment Committee occur in a matter of days rather than weeks as is the case with juvenile court. By the time the youngster gets to court, the police tell you, the youngster often has forgotten why he's there. With an Adjustment Committee, the problem is handled expeditiously and the youngster understands completely what is expected from him in the



future. Quick resolution of problems often stop youths from continuing a "devel-may-care" attitude that brings them into further contact with the police.

Parents find the Adjustment Committee helpful when they sense a problem of alienation in the child. Conferences are arranged at which the nature of the problem is uncovered or at which a determination is made that the help of a professional is needed. Problems develop when a 14-year old resorts to stealing because a strict parent doesn't believe in allowances; a parent may impart higher goals than the child has in mind or is able to achieve. Many potential drop-outs have been re-routed back into the school system after the communications gap was bridged by the Adjustment Committee. Many other youngsters have embarked on rewarding pursuits after personal or family problems were settled at Adjustment Committee sessions.

A Youth Guidance Council offers even more to a community. Charged with the responsibility for overlooking all services to youth, the YGC stands as a protective barrier against delinquency-breeding conditions. The local movie that shows pornographic films or an older group that buys beer for minors or a school policy that causes inordinate suspensions or truancy comes under the intensive study of a well-organized Youth Guidance Council.

Youngsters may need mental health services, a VD clinic, a drug abuse program, or answers to numerous questions that plague energetic, growing youths. An alert Youth Guidance Council will make positive referrals to the proper agency to eliminate or alleviate the problem.

#### COSTS ARE LOW

If the Youth Guidance Council offers so much, must it not cost a town quite a bit? Not so. Most Youth Guidance Councils operate on budgets of less than \$500 a year, many on less than \$200 and some on just pennies. It's a strictly volunteer activity. It harnesses the energies of capable people who want to help. The funds that are spent generally go for booklets that inform residents about drugs, alcohol and relations with the police. Some Youth Guidance Councils have developed extensive drug programs and special vocationally-oriented projects that the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency (SLEPA) felt worthy of funding.

Starting a local Youth Guidance Council requires good planning like any other worthwhile community project. It is important the community understand and support the concept of the Youth Guidance Council before the governing body introduces an ordinance establishing one.

The police chief, his juvenile officer, members of the governing body and representatives of the school system generally provide the impetus by getting together to discuss the Council and its relationships to the needs of the town and its younger citizens. A small group at this stage accomplishes much more than a larger, unwieldy group.

When the needs and objectives have been defined, the organizing group should be enlarged to include representatives from all youth-serving organizations such as the Scouts, recreational groups, PTA, Boy's Club, etc. The community's young leaders also should be invited. During these meetings you should be looking at and sizing up top candidates for appointment to the Youth Guidance Council. Look for people who know and understand kids of all ages, who can keep a secret, and who will earn respect from others.

Reflect the composition of your community in the make-up of your Youth Guidance Council membership. Statistics show that twice as many black kids as white end up in institutions so it is important to bring in leaders from the black community. It's

also known that the language barrier prevents many Spanish-speaking kids from getting a fair break. Involvement from representative sections of the community will help to establish acceptable standards of behaviour throughout the entire community as well as help those kids who perhaps are not being helped now.

Each year the Youth Guidance Council submits a report to the Mayor and Council and elects a chairman, vice chairman and secretary. The procedures for handling youngsters attending sessions with the Adjustment Committee are filed with the juvenile court in the appropriate county. The juvenile court judge has an interest in a community's steps towards preventing juvenile delinquency and should be kept informed.

Some communities have Juvenile Conference Committees that resulted from a New Jersey Supreme Court directive to juvenile judges in 1953 to help relieve the bench of the explosive increase in juvenile court referrals. Under this system, the juvenile judge appoints representatives in various towns to hear cases and to adjudicate problems that the judge does not feel serious enough to become directly involved in.

While approximately 173 Juvenile Conference Committees operating in the state bring some relief to the court's case-handling problems, this system responds to a youth and his problems *after* the youngster has been sent to juvenile court. On the other hand, the Youth Guidance Council steps into action when the youngster's behaviour first comes to the attention of the community; it offers services to overcome the problems *before* they become serious. Youngsters sent to the Adjustment Committees of Youth Guidance Councils generally never become involved with the formal juvenile justice system.

Another approach that you should know about is the Youth Service Bureau which has been adopted by some municipalities. It results from a specific recommendation of the President's Crime Commission. The Youth Service Bureau and the Youth Guidance Council have the same objectives, and function in a similar way. There is one slight difference. A Youth Service Bureau requires a paid director and budgeted services while a Youth Guidance Council is entirely voluntary.

Funds are available for a Youth Service Bureau by application to the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency. Funding is for three years after which the community is expected to continue the program at its own cost. Some Youth Guidance Councils are starting Youth Service Bureaus to obtain funding to provide needed services that their communities cannot now afford. In the long run, the interests of your younger citizens must dictate which route you take: Are you willing to pick up the tab after three years or are you committed to a voluntary program that offers continuity at little or no cost.

Juvenile justice in New Jersey and elsewhere still has a long way to go, even with a Youth Guidance Council. If a JINS (Juvenile in need of Supervision) does not commit a criminal act in the eyes of the law, one questions why the youngster comes under the jurisdiction of the court instead of a social agency equipped to take care of the problems. These are the youngsters who require help from the community; it's a duty of the community to respond, to fill the gap so that non-criminal problems receive non-criminal solutions.

By helping a youngster to steer a correct path at the age of 10 or 11, by the time the child is 16 he'll have a positive attitude and respect for the law. Catch a child early enough and your chances of preventing further harm to him and the community are many; let his problems mount up and everyone can expect a lot more trouble.

Albert C. Wagner, recently retired head of Corrections and Parole for the state, responded to a question about the best way to reduce the prison population, in this way: "Help the kids, now!" This noted penologist signals a warning for all communities to get involved now or face the consequences later. The Municipal Youth Guidance Council is the first step toward helping the kids in your town to stay out of trouble.

#### THE CASE FOR A FEDERAL OIL AND GAS CORPORATION NO. 23

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the editors of the New Republic recently called for the creation of a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation. An editorial appeared in the New Republic on February 2, stating that the proposed corporation would give the Government direct, dependable data on all aspects of oil and gas development, and would provide the petroleum industry with desperately needed competition. The New Republic's endorsement of the Federal Oil and Gas Corporation is yet another indication of the widespread support for a publicly owned oil company, and I would like to insert the article into the *RECORD* at this time for the information of my colleagues:

#### PUBLIC OIL AND GAS

Not since the scandals of Teapot Dome have America's oilmen been so roughly handled as they were by the Senate Interior Committee last week. It was not a routine interrogation, not the kind of polite questioning oilmen are used to when they appear before the Senate Antitrust or Joint Economic Committees. The mood was angrier. Senator Jackson, chairman of the committee and an early publicist of the energy crisis himself, opened by saying, "the facts are we do not have the facts." He chastised Shell Oil for its ad attacking the proposal for an excess profits tax without mentioning how much money Shell made last year. Senator Ribicoff said the industry is "reaping the whirlwind of 30 years of arrogance," and Senator Javits asked each executive to submit a written explanation reconciling each company's claims of shortage with the high level of fuel in stock.

While attention focused on the oilmen and their inability to explain the sudden crisis to the Interior Committee, other senators were on a more promising track. The Senate Commerce Committee was hearing testimony on the best suggestion to come out of the crisis. It is a plan, sponsored as an amendment to a natural gas deregulation bill (S2506), to create a real and permanent competitor in the oilfields in the form of a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation. Headed by five presidential appointees, the corporation would function outside the civil service, exploiting oil and gas on federal lands. Adlai Stevenson III introduced it, with co-sponsors Kennedy, Hart, McGovern, Mondale and others, and Rep. John Moss has a duplicate bill in the House. The Federal Oil and Gas Corporation (FOGC) isn't put forward as an instant remedy, but as a corrective to some of the follies that brought us where we are. If the fuel shortage is going to last for 10 or 15 years as the oilmen claim, and if prices continue to rise swiftly as the company executives say (hope?) they will, the government must find a better basis for regulation than it has to-

day. So little is known about energy production that Congress isn't even sure there is a crisis; it has no reliable data from which it can form a judgment. When the natural gas producers said they were running out of gas because the government had kept prices too low, Congress was inclined to believe them and get ready to endorse a price increase. Yet it still doesn't know whether or not the gas producers are telling the truth. When the oilmen asked for price increases, Congress was inclined to disbelieve. Again there was a lack of evidence, and it was the independent oil refiners who spoke up, pointing out that at least part of the shortage was due to the major companies' refusal to sell crude oil to them.

Noncompetition in the fuel industry is a very old story, and Senator Stevenson's answer itself is not original. As Melville Ulmer reported recently in these pages, the idea of a federal yardstick corporation in energy was first outlined in a *New Republic* article of 1926. This was the concept behind the Tennessee Valley Authority, the successful federal venture in the field of multi-purpose public power. But as old and proven as it is, the idea has never been tested in the oil industry, for the reason that the oil lobbyists have a great many friends in the right places.

The government has from time to time taken shots at the anti-competitive structure of big oil, and it continues to process lawsuits and restraint-of-trade inquiries. Last summer the Justice Department filed its first important antitrust suit against the major oil companies in years, and the case is now moving toward a consent decree. Also last year the Federal Trade Commission issued a report that concluded, "The major oil companies . . . have engaged in conduct which exemplifies their market power and has served to squeeze independents at both the refining and marketing levels." It recommended a partial break-up of the majors. But these suits move slowly; the antitrust laws do not come to grips with the immense modern fact of domination of the energy industry by big oil. Congress could pass new antitrust legislation, or it could simply order a divestiture by big oil of pipelines and refineries. That would help. But Congress has shown no enthusiasm for such drastic action. Nor is there any guarantee that oil corporations wouldn't find new ways to work their will within the literal restrictions of the law while ignoring its intent, as they do today. Congress, therefore, ought to be responsive to Stevenson's plan. It proposes no seizure of property, no interference with private business. It would merely introduce a new competitor to the market.

More than 50 percent of America's fuel is said to lie on federal land, most of it unexploited. What can this be but a public resource? Unlike private companies, the only incentive the government needs to exploit that resource is public need and demand. The Arab oil embargo has made the oil giants hungrier than ever for federal property, and last week the President gave them a hint of the feast to come by ordering the Interior Department to triple the number of acres leased for offshore drilling in 1975. The FOGC is an alternative approach to the disposal of the country's resources that would provide a built-in regulation of industry appetites.

Las December 18 two representatives of the oil industry came to Stevenson's hearings to say that he'd stumbled into a danger zone. Frank Ikard, president of the American Petroleum Institute, and Charles Spahr, chairman of Sohio and the API, testified against the FOGC on the grounds that it would be too competitive.

They said that the American oil industry, though naturally the best in the world, could collapse in a moment if the government were to barge in. The "deep and unanimous conviction among oil companies of all sizes with all ranges of activity," Ikard said,

was that FOGC, or even debate on FOGC, would raise the terrible specter of nationalization. And fear of nationalization, he said, would scare investors. They in turn would stop buying oil stocks, companies would lose the massive capital income they need to explore and to build plants, profits would drop, free enterprise in oil would die.

And that wasn't all. Even if investors weren't scared off, Ikard maintained, the Stevenson bill would give such great advantages to the FOGC that others wouldn't be able to compete. In the first place, he said, the new company would get first choice of the best federal land and wouldn't have to pay royalties for its use. (The bill gives the federal corporation first pick of 20 percent of any federal land put up for lease.) At first glance this does not seem to be a devastating blow, since the major oil companies would continue to control the rich fields they hold today and would continue to get 80 percent of all new lands. Ikard also protested that the federal corporation would be siphoning off experts, drills and pipe material from private industry—all of which he said are already in short supply.

Though the oil industry may suffer some shortages today, finding men to do the job has never been as difficult as finding jobs for the men. Moreover the development of FOGC would be gradual; it is inconceivable that a corporation starting from scratch in 1974 could drain the market of men and equipment faster than the country could supply them. Furthermore we are unpersuaded that a federal company running on a budget of \$50 million a year, even with its free land, could threaten the survival of Exxon (profit in the first nine months of 1973: \$1.6 billion), Texaco (nine months' profit: \$838 million) or Gulf (nine months' profit: \$570 million).

Ikard did make a good point that's worth repeating: he said the FOGC will not alleviate the present oil shortage. A corporation launched this year would contribute very little to oil production in this decade. FOGC would, however, give the government direct and dependable data on the drilling, pumping, refining and marketing of oil and gas. It would do extensive research on fuel that lies on government property, filling in some of the gaps in the government's knowledge of its own reserves. It would encourage competition not just by trying to undersell the majors, but by seeking out independent markets for its crude oil. Though the FOGC would not make fuel available at 1973 prices, it would provide an independent standard by which to judge the majors' performance. Congress ought to get behind it.

#### AWARENESS DAY

#### HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Thomas Meskill has proclaimed Wednesday, May 1, 1974, to be Awareness Day in the State of Connecticut. Awareness Day is sponsored by the Consumer Advocacy Council of the United Cerebral Palsy Association. The council is comprised of people who are physically disabled and are concerned with the elimination of the many architectural and attitudinal barriers which hinder the handicapped in their day-to-day activities.

Physically disabled people are willing to work and have proven their ability as employees.

Awareness Day, used successfully in 35 States to date, is one ingenious method of bringing the problems of the handicapped to the attention of the public.

I commend the Consumer Advocacy Council, and especially its energetic Chairwoman Phyllis Zlotnick, for its worthy efforts on behalf of Connecticut's handicapped citizens. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the objectives of Awareness Day.

#### MEMORIAL TO U.S. CONGRESS ON POLITICAL ASYLUM

#### HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of State Representative Gwen Cherry, and out of respect for humanity, as well as respect for the Florida House of Representatives, I am inserting into the RECORD for my colleagues' attention a memorial to the U.S. Congress regarding the granting of political asylum: [From the Journal of the Florida House of Representatives, proceedings at Tallahassee of the Third Legislature, [under the Constitution as Revised in 1968], second regular session, Friday, April 12, 1974]

#### A MEMORIAL TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES REQUESTING THE INSTITUTION OF A UNIFORM POLICY WITH REGARD TO THE GRANTING OF POLITICAL ASYLUM

Whereas, the United States of America has long been a home for persons of all nations, of all colors, of all creeds, and of all political persuasions, and

Whereas, this fact has for generations applied particularly to those persons suffering persecution in their homeland for their beliefs, both philosophical and political, and

Whereas, the "Golden Door" of America has liberally granted a protective political asylum to those persons who are, in words carved into our own Statute of Liberty, "yearning to breathe free", and

Whereas, the granting of political asylum, however, has often suffered from arbitrary standards applied in an irrational and discriminatory manner, and

Whereas, this fact has caused concern and frustration, both on the part of friends of our nation in other lands and on the part of residents and citizens of the United States who have loved ones and friends remaining in foreign lands, and

Whereas, a uniform policy establishing standard criteria for the granting of political asylum would significantly ease this problem and help America retain its reputation as a home for the persecuted of the world, now, therefore, be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to institute a uniform policy and to establish uniform standards with regard to the granting of political asylum.

Be it further resolved that copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Florida delegation to the United States Congress.



COMMUNITY CHALLENGE: BARRIERS TO THE HANDICAPPED

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the people of Hawaii are very proud of one of our young people, Miss Judy Yoshida, of Honolulu, Hawaii, who has won first place in the national "Ability Counts" writing contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped and participating Governors' Committees on Employment of the Handicapped.

For her outstanding research and report on the problems confronting handicapped individuals, how they tried to solve these problems, and how others might help them, Miss Yoshida will receive \$1,000 and a certificate at the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Thursday, May 2, at the Washington Hilton Hotel.

In her report, Miss Yoshida quotes Thomas Jefferson "that all men are created equal," in proving that handicapped people are deserving of an equal place in our society.

Because of the nationally recognized excellence of this Hawaii young woman's essay, I am pleased to spread it today on the pages of the RECORD for the edification and inspiration of all Americans:

COMMUNITY CHALLENGE: BARRIERS TO THE HANDICAPPED

(By Judy Yoshida)

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."<sup>1</sup> Quoted from the brilliant work of Thomas Jefferson, these words express the desire of the handicapped—Equality. Jeff Lambrecht, a member of the Hawaii Athletic Club for the Deaf, expressed his opinion of the handicapped very tragically by saying, "I believe that equality is something that we will never receive, but I honestly feel that our mental ability is just as adequate as any other 'normal' human being."<sup>2</sup>

The tragedy is that a great majority of handicapped people feel the same way. They must constantly wage a campaign in their own behalf to try to convince Mr. & Mrs. Normal that their disabilities have not all but left them useless vegetables. Training and rehabilitation for many could turn them into useful people. It isn't often that people beg for the right to help themselves.

In a recent survey conducted at several large shopping centers on Oahu, I discovered that sixty-three per cent (63%) of the employers claimed that they definitely would not hire handicapped people. Of the sixty-three per cent (63%), forty-seven per cent (47%) of the employers that possessed negative attitudes did not even have an explanation of why they did not hire handicapped people, while the remaining sixteen per cent (16%) gave ingenious answers such as "It's bad for the business" or "The other employees might feel as though anyone could get the job." Twenty-six per cent (26%)

of the employers were willing to hire handicapped people, provided that they were qualified for the job. Only nine per cent (9%) of the positive thinkers already have handicapped employees. Eleven per cent (11%) of all respondents refused to make statements.

The survey reveals that the most difficult barrier the handicapped have to overcome is the indifference and the apathy of people in our communities. I feel that the architectural barriers can fall more readily if negative attitudes are eliminated. Our people will be willing to change their facilities to make their places of business or work accessible to the handicapped instead of waiting to be mandated by law to act. We will have the desire to help the disabled succeed in their endeavors. However, the task of tearing down these attitudinal barriers will require the efforts of everyone in the community.

Mass media could be a very effective way of informing the public that handicapped persons "seek the opportunity to be self-sufficient and independent like their neighbors."<sup>3</sup> Nationwide publicity can spotlight their activities and abilities, and communicate the feelings of truly courageous citizens. Through this type of exposure, our people can be encouraged into the realization that the handicapped could be any of them in the community who were unfortunate victims of a crippling disease, an accident, a birth defect, and even war. We would no longer look down at these people as "hopeless freaks," but as individuals who have pride in themselves and who strive for equal opportunity that we deny them.

Early education programs for handicapped children would allow them to go to school with "normal" children. Acceptance is as important for the handicapped child as it is for the adult. Taught early, acceptance can be the key to the elimination of the attitudinal barriers.

Students could also participate through a volunteer program permitting them to work with handicapped children once a week. This experience could provide an opportunity for youth to redefine the terms "handicap" and "disabled" and in the process, start rewriting the stereotypes we have guarded for too long. Students can also help plan exhibits of work done by handicapped children displayed at main shopping centers.

Libraries and schools should add to their now sparse collection of resource books on the handicapped. Presently, the Hawaii State Library System has approximately seventy-nine (79) books about the handicapped. By comparison, the Library has eight times more books about sex (650) and three times more on drugs (243) than they do on the subject of the handicapped.

Most of all, to help change our present situation, we should wage an "all-out campaign to eliminate the barriers which impair the safety, comfort, and mobility of the handicapped."<sup>4</sup> Our goal is to make the public more sensitive, alert, and aware of the discrimination that handicapped people face.

The community changes needed to break the barriers, both attitudinal and architectural, are not expensive. They will not serve only a few, but rather, be of benefit to everyone. One out of every ten people in the United States has temporary or permanent disabilities. This includes unexpected disabilities such as pregnancy, broken legs or arms, or a weak heart that requires confinement to a wheelchair. The number of people

<sup>1</sup> Community Challenge: Barriers to the Handicapped, The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped and participating Governors' Committees on EH, pamphlet.

<sup>2</sup> "From Welfare to Productive Employ," Honolulu Star-Bulletin, March 4, 1969, p. F-1.

who will benefit from accessible facilities and more important, an accessible transportation system, will amount to millions by the year nationwide. Make no mistake, my proposals do not call for a society adjusted for "freaks," but rather a society built to exclude no one. As it is man's exclusive ability to reason, let it also be man's exclusive capacity to be compassionate. As George Bernard Shaw once said . . .

"The worst sin towards our fellow creatures is not to hate them, but to be indifferent to them; that's the essence of inhumanity."<sup>5</sup>

SURVEY

1. How many handicapped applicants have you encountered?
2. If you have hired handicapped people, what types of problems have you encountered?
3. How many handicapped workers do you have on staff?
4. Given a situation: There are two applicants; one handicapped with a college education (Master's Degree) and job experience. The other person is not physically handicapped, has a college degree (BS) and no job experience. Which would you hire? Why?
5. When hiring handicapped persons, does your firm have preferences as to the type of handicapped person it would allow working for you? Yes No
6. Would you be willing to open a position for a handicapped person?
7. What facilities are available for the handicapped workers and/or handicapped in the general public?
  - a. Does your building have hallways that are 3 feet wide?
  - b. Do you have ramps for wheelchairs?
  - c. Do you have low-reaching drinking fountains?
  - d. Do you have low-reaching telephone booths?
  - e. Do you have hand rails in your restrooms?
  - f. Do you have wide doorways?
  8. Would your company be willing to remodel your facilities to suit the handicapped?

Comments

The purpose of this survey was to try to evaluate employer attitudes towards handicapped persons in order to see the extent to which attitudes have changed or not changed in recent years.

ON THE SUPREME COURT'S DECISION IN THE WAYNE KENNEDY CASE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, in the Wayne Kennedy case, the Supreme Court decided that a Federal employee can be fired, without prior hearing, in order "to promote the efficiency of the service." I wholeheartedly disagree with every aspect of this decision.

Who knows what will promote the efficiency of the service? I can safely say that my view of what will promote efficiency is altogether different than that of President Nixon and the administration.

But these differences of opinion aside, I am greatly concerned that Government agencies will now use this case as an excuse to get rid of civil servants whose

<sup>5</sup> The New Book of Unusual Quotations, Rudolf Flesh, Feb. 1968, p. 178.

<sup>1</sup> "Declaration of Independence," World Book Encyclopedia, Vol. 5, (1964, U.S.A.), p. 66.

<sup>2</sup> Interview, Jeff Lambrecht, December 18, 1973.

views and statements may not agree with the political persuasion of the administration in power.

In these days, when the President and OMB Director Roy Ash are pursuing policies that will lead to the contracting out of a tremendous number of jobs now performed by Federal employees, we need to encourage Government employees to speak independently, without fear of retribution, where it is believed that the administration's contracting out policy will ultimately result in high profits for large corporations and cost the taxpayers a great amount of money.

In conclusion, the Government must recognize that Federal employees do not surrender their constitutional rights as citizens upon entering the civil service, and that further "the efficiency of the service" is perhaps most ill-served by efforts to silence criticism and to make "yes men and women" of all Government employees.

#### DEAN ROWE RETIRES

#### HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of Tennessee's truly outstanding educators has recently announced her retirement. Dean Marie Penn Rowe has served Lane College in Jackson, Tenn., as dean of women for the past 26 years and has given freely of her time and energy to the community.

I recently had the pleasure of attending a gathering at Lane College at which she was honored by the City Federation of Women's Clubs, which she had served as president for the past 13 years. We will truly miss her in west Tennessee as she retires to California with her husband, Mr. Rowe.

The Jackson, Tenn., Sun recently featured a story on Dean Marie Penn Rowe which I commend to everyone who has known and appreciated her over the years as it has been my pleasure to do. That article follows:

[From The Jackson (Tenn.) Sun, Apr. 21, 1974]

#### FEDERATION PAYS TRIBUTE TO LONG-TIME PRESIDENT

(By Dee Cain)

Her face begins to crinkle and she breaks out into a hearty laugh, sometimes laughing until the tears run down her cheeks.

That's the way it is when Dean Marie Penn Rowe is with a group of people she likes—and her friends say she just plain loves people.

A special group of those friends is gathering this afternoon to honor Mrs. Rowe, who has been Dean of Women at Lane College for the past 26 years.

The City Federation of Women's Clubs will pay tribute to her years of service at a dedication tea from 4-6 p.m. at the C. A. Kirkendoll Building at Lane College.

The federation will name its recently acquired clubhouse the Marie Penn Federation Clubhouse in honor of her 13 years service as federation president.

She is moving to California in early June.

Mrs. Rowe's years in Jackson have been busy and fruitful, to the point that most friends constantly ask her how she does it all.

"I have my own formula for that," she says. "And it's the reason I can do all I do. I appreciate the opportunity to be a good citizen. I'm not afraid of work, I'm not afraid of criticism and I'm not afraid to be involved."

"I wanted to be involved," she emphasizes, "I wanted to work with people—not just a segment of people, but all kinds of people. They're a part of my life."

In her years as a representative liaison between Lane College and the community and state, Mrs. Rowe's life touched many people.

She has been an active participant in the Democratic Women's Club, both locally and nationally, and was one of two Tennessee women named to Hubert Humphrey's campaign committee in 1968.

"I've been interested in politics for years, ever since I studied at UCLA," she says with a smile. "I was there when Jack Kennedy was elected and heard his speech, and was involved in the campaign for both Jack and Bobby."

She credits her years of travel and experiences to the opportunity given her by C. A. Kirkendoll when he was president of Lane College.

"He asked me to be the liaison person for Lane, and it was through his influence that I became involved in all my activities. I've met people I never thought I'd meet, and I've cherished every minute of it."

She had been a member of the board of directors for more organizations than she can remember—YMCA, United Fund, Church Women United, Friends of the Library, Mental Health Association, Jackson Arts Council and Mayor's Advisory Committee, to name a few.

She also is a member of the executive board of NAACP and the advisory committee for the Board of Education, and is treasurer of C.M.E. Minister's Wives and Interdenominational Minister's Wives.

In thinking back over her years of service, she remembers a time in Monroe, La., when her husband was pastor of a church there. They were involved in community welfare work and initiated a Christmas fund for the poor.

"I still remember handing out food slips of only \$1.50 per family," she says. "That was a long time ago."

Two projects in which she is especially interested are those of the City Federation, and her work with Western State Hospital.

"Those two are close to my heart," she says with a smile.

Although substantial payment has been made toward the cost of the clubhouse to be named after Mrs. Rowe, more than \$3,000 remains to be paid on the house.

At this afternoon's tea, contributions for the fund will be taken in Mrs. Rowe's name.

"We hope to clear all indebtedness on the clubhouse as a tribute to Dean Penn before she leaves," says Mrs. Emma Ross, a fellow Federation member who has known Mrs. Rowe for more than 20 years.

"Anyone who donates will sign a memory book to be presented to Dean Penn as she leaves," she says. "The public is welcome."

Mrs. Rowe, a lively, happy woman who says she has been too busy to grow old, has taken a lot of kidding about marrying and moving to California to become a "normal housewife." Her friends say she'll never be able to settle down without getting involved in new activities.

"Her mind is like a squirrel in a cage—it's forever running," laughs a friend.

As she looks forward to her new home and experiences, she pauses a moment to express her feelings about Jackson.

"I don't know anyone I've ever had such deep admiration for as the people in the city of Jackson—they're fine, fine people—and I'll miss them."

#### BAN THE HANDGUN—XLV

#### HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, important handgun hearings are being held this week in New York by the State commission of investigation. In New York, where the State legislature has enacted the Nation's stiffest gun control laws, the proportion of homicides committed by handguns has jumped 27 percent in 4 years. Evidently this crisis can not be controlled by one State alone. Federal legislation controlling manufacture and possession of handguns must be enacted. I append herewith an article that appeared in the April 23 edition of the New York Post and an editorial that appeared in that same newspaper on April 24.

SCI OPENING HEARINGS ON ILLICIT HANDGUN USE

(By Carl J. Pelleck)

The State Commission of Investigation today begins a series of public hearings to show what part illegal handguns play in forcing people here to "live under a constant and pervasive fear."

The hearings, scheduled to run through Thursday and longer if necessary, stem from an 18-month study by the SCI of the city's criminal justice system.

"In the course of gathering information and statistics," commission chairman Howard Shapiro noted in his statement prepared for the opening session, "the commission has become aware of, and concerned with, the high crime rate and particularly, its relation to the increasing availability and use of handguns in the commission of crimes."

Because of the seriousness of the situation, Shapiro said the commission made a statewide inquiry to see if current laws are adequate to cope with the problem.

Shapiro's statement listed a series of "criminal incidents, involving the illegal use of handguns," which were recently reported as "regular occurrences" in daily newspapers.

"These daily crimes, committed with the illegal use of handguns, illegally obtained and possessed, explain vividly why so many people in this city, and elsewhere in the United States live in constant and pervasive fear in going about their everyday tasks and why, when they return home, literally barricade themselves with reinforced locks and iron bars.

"This is a shocking condition for a civilized society."

In announcing the hearings yesterday, the commission said it was going to look at the handgun problem on a statewide basis. However, the bulk of the problem is apparently centered in the city, Shapiro indicated in his statement.

#### "FRIGHTENING FIGURE"

Citing statistics for 1969 through and including 1972, Shapiro said 2,744,469 crimes of all types were reported in the state for the three year period. Of that number, he said, 1,959,823 crimes or 71 per cent of the state total were reported here in the city.

"On the average, almost 500,000 crimes of all types have been reported in New York City each year during that period. Even for a population of eight million people, this is a frightening figure," he said.

Comparing 1969 city crime statistics to 1973 figures, Shapiro noted that reported homicides increased here by 58 per cent; assaults by 33 per cent; and robberies by 25 per cent.



He said handguns were used in 42 per cent of homicides here last year compared to 33 per cent in 1969. Similarly, guns were used in 28 per cent of robberies last year compared to 23 per cent of the time in 1969.

Numerous city, state and federal officials will testify at the hearings to be held in the commission's 25th floor hearing room at 270 Broadway. The sessions will begin daily at 10 a.m.

#### NO SHORTAGE OF GUNS

Early yesterday morning, only hours before the State Commission of Investigation began public hearings on the handgun plague, a mugging suspect was arrested in the Bronx after spraying shots around a street and wounding two persons—including himself; he was carrying not one but two guns.

The incident added a few more numbers to the commission's pile of statistics. As reported by SIC Chairman Shapiro, guns were used in 28 per cent of the robberies committed in the city last year, as compared with 23 per cent in 1969. The comparison on handgun homicides was 42 per cent in 1973, up from 33 per cent in 1969.

More data will be forthcoming daily during the hearings. They will corroborate the arguments of gun-control advocates and contribute further to the "constant and pervasive fear" that haunts many New Yorkers. The commission's proposals on realistic regulation of guns, particularly hand weapons, are urgently awaited. But there is no reason why the Albany Legislature cannot initiate new action on its own.

#### OMAR BURLESON DAY

#### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in everyone's lifetime he is privileged to meet and know an individual who is something special. This privilege was accorded to me when I first met OMAR BURLESON in 1947 and I am proud to say that we have been friends ever since. I was also privileged to attend the ceremony in Anson, Tex., when OMAR BURLESON's friends honored him by erecting a bronze cast of their favorite son in the town square.

I include an article which appeared in the Big Spring Herald for Sunday, April 21 in the RECORD.

The article follows:

OMAR BURLESON DAY: HUMBLE, HIGH PAY RESPECTS TO FAMOUS SON  
(By Joe Pickle)

ANSON.—They came here Saturday from the sprawling reaches of the 17th Congressional District by plane, bus and in pickups, the humble and the high, some 2,500 strong, to pay respects to a distinguished congressman and unveil the bronze cast of a favorite son.

"This is very humbling and touching," said Congressman Omar Burleson whom the district first sent away to Congress after he had filled several positions of trust in his native Jones County.

His wife, Ruth, compared it to that "wonderful, wonderful day 28 years ago when we stood on the east steps of this courthouse and saw the signs you had hung and scrawled on the sidewalk for our first time back home."

The unveiling of the likeness of Rep. Burleson, cast in bronze by Juan Dell of Lubbock was the capstone of an Omar Burleson Day

There were receptions for the congressman at the high school cafeteria, for Ruth Burleson and Miss Dell at the First Methodist Church. There was a big barbecue with heaped up plates. Then music by the famous Hardin-Simmons Cowboy Band, and then a duet by Gene and Bobbie Moore, singing at the request of the congressman. "Glory, Glory, Hallelujah" rang out against a backdrop of towering thunderheads in the east, the budding elms on the square and the tender silence of a friendly crowd.

#### EXTRA FLAVOR

For extra flavor the Albany troupe gave a sampler of its renowned "Fort Griffin Fandangle." "Friends and neighbors," said Burleson, when presented by his friend, B. J. Gist, "We are deeply touched by this remembrance from those of you among whom we have known for a long time. I get the feeling I would like to do something with each of you."

Reflecting the esteem of his colleagues were Olin (Tiger) Teague, College Station, chairman of the House Veterans Affairs committee, W. R. (Bob) Poage, Waco, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, and Rep. Bob Casey, veteran congressman from Houston, along with Mrs. Casey and Mrs. Teague. There were letters from President Richard M. Nixon, congratulating the district on its judgment in repeatedly choosing Burleson, regrets from vice president Gerald Ford and from Gov. Dolph Briscoe, and letters from all 23 members of the Texas delegation and Sens. John Tower and Lloyd Bentsen, and hosts of others for a momento.

#### BOOTS SUITS

People were there from everywhere it seemed, people in broad brimmed hats, boots, bright plaid business suits, Levis, peg-leg pants, alligator shoes and sneakers; people with skin leathery and wizened by the sun and wind, people bleached by the shade of offices; brown people, black people, white people; babies in baskets, toddlers, and old men tottering on canes.

It was their day as well as the congressman's. When the wrapping came off the bronze likeness of Burleson, a great cheer went up, and when Mrs. Burleson, recalled how "you have wept in our sorrows, and shared in our joys," they listened quietly. And when she paraphrased a current ballad of "tying a yellow ribbon on every mesquite tree," they clapped and laughed.

#### RAIN DROPS

"When this is over and you're home, I hope heaven pours out a blessing on you" she said, "and I mean rain." And she meant it; and they meant it, too, as they flocked up the north steps of the 1910 courthouse to embrace them, show off grandchildren, and welcome back once more a now famous son.

#### WFL INTRODUCES WORKERS TO JOYS OF CAPITALISM

#### HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, the free enterprise system has come under heavy assault by the news media. From reading the reports of the opinionmakers, one is led to believe that the system is the cause of our problems, rather than the panacea it really is. At any rate, I was very glad to learn in reading the Washington Post, of April 28, 1974, that Adam Smith is alive and well, albeit buried in the sports section for now. I would like to share the astute observations of Writer

William Barry Furlong with fellow free enterprisers and with those who should become more aware of the workings and the merits of the free enterprise system.

The article follows:

#### WFL INTRODUCES WORKERS TO JOYS OF CAPITALISM

(By William Barry Furlong)

Ordinarily, competition is celebrated in American life the way Spiro Agnew celebrated Law and Order; more in rhetoric than in fact. In the time and place where I grew up it did not take much in the way of cynicism to observe that most businessmen loved talking about competition more than they loved engaging in it.

In no place was this truer than in sports. In big league baseball, football, basketball, the magnates talked about competition triumphantly, while they carefully arranged to murder it.

The competition they talked about, of course, was on the playing field and it was fierce, genuine and remorseless. But in the front office—in matters of money—everything was done to avoid competition: pro leagues depend for their very survival on arrangements between magnates that spell the very denial of competition in the classic economic sense.

This is not a harsh judgment or a particularly moral one. It is a simple, palpable, practical fact. If the money men in sports engaged in competition—in the classic capitalist sense—they would be trying to put out of business the very people they relied on to play the on-the-field games with them. They perceived that it would be very awkward for the American League to have to get along with seven or 11 teams, or for the NFL with 25 or 23, simply because of some manic devotion to the capitalist system and to its theories of competition. So they became practical men: They—and Congress and the courts—found ways to adjust to this awkwardness in the capitalistic system by working out noncompetitive ways for sports to survive.

All this is by way of prelude to a portentous point:

In the last week, we've seen competition work—in sports—in so classic a manner as to make Adam Smith smirk. It is almost enough to renew one's faith in the creed and creed of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. And to cast glances of righteous hauteur at the ghost of Karl Marx (who was known, in the farthest reaches of the British Museum, as a wrong guy—he neglected to pay his overdue book fines).

For the events in pro football this last week were clearly of benefit to the customer of pro football and the laborer within it.

And they came about for no other reason than the growing competition between the NFL and the nascent World Football League. These guys have not worked out a deal between them as yet and so they are frantically almost capitalistically, plunging into a genuine competition. For scholars, it may be the last—indeed, the only—case history of how competition works beneficially within the structure of a capitalistic society.

For it is my conviction that the rule changes adopted by the NFL this week will improve the product for the buyer. They will make the NFL game more exciting, more wide open, more visceral in its compulsions for the fan. It is my further conviction that they would not have been adopted this year if the WFL had not got position on the NFL by scheduling summertime games on TV and on the field, when the greatest excitement the NFL might generate is whether it will have players, or a season, at all. To be sure, there may be nay-sayers: it is always dangerous to explore the minds of NFL magnates, dodging the stalactites and stalagmites all the way, but for the most part they are as transparent as a scoundrel's scowl.

As far as the laborers are concerned, the example of Charley Harraway of the Washington Redskins—far more than that of Larry Csonka, Jim Kilick and Paul Warfield of Miami—is illuminating. For Harraway was faced with the choices facing every working man; He might be discarded—despite his skills—at any time.

In these precincts Harraway is known with respect and affection, as an intelligent, articulate and concerned man. At one time, he was the premier blocking back in the NFL. He performed well enough as a blocker for Larry Brown to help Brown win the rushing title and to help the Redskins go to the Super Bowl in the 1972-73 season. In that year he got a salary—let's guess at \$45,000—and incentive pay. The latter might be worth, let's say, \$15,000. Total income: \$60,000. Next year, the salary goes up a notch, the incentives go down a lot. The net: a smaller net income for Charley. He balks. He won't sign a new contract. He decides to play out his option at 90 per cent of his base pay, \$45,000, meaning that he makes \$40,500. That's about a one-third cut—almost \$20,000—from his previous pay.

More than that, the Redskins move in a guy to take over his job. His name is Duane Thomas and whatever else he may be known for, he worked as a blocking back in college for a runner named Mercury Morris. It takes Thomas a year to learn the ropes but then the Redskins have got Charley Harraway by the you-know-what. In 1974 he either plays at this price or he doesn't play at all.

Except for the World Football League: It introduces a note of competition and suddenly a laborer named Charley Harraway has got a job at five times the salary with hope, and security, for the future.

So I am happy for Charley Harraway, for the fans of pro football, and most of all for the system. Rhetoric aside, isn't it nice to know, Pete Rozelle, that the system works? In however classic, and unexpected, a manner.

#### GURNEE IS ILLINOIS' 13TH DISTRICT FIRST BICENTENNIAL COMMUNITY

#### HON. ROBERT McCLODY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to participate in the impressive ceremonies held Sunday afternoon, April 28, in Gurnee, Ill., at which time the village of Gurnee received its American Revolution Bicentennial designation.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged on that occasion to present an American flag flown over the Capitol to the village of Gurnee, and to receive from Pam Powell, assistant to Anne Armstrong, counselor to the President, an American Revolution Bicentennial flag, which in turn, I presented to Gurnee's young and dynamic president, Richard Welton.

Mr. Speaker, eloquent remarks were delivered by Pam Powell; the regional director, Delbert Black; the State of Illinois Bicentennial Commission director, Dr. Samuel Lilly; State Senator Karl Berning; Circuit Judge La Verne Dixon, and the Reverend Julius Koch of the Bethel Lutheran Church of Gurnee. An inspiring narration was given by Fred Kattner of the prose work, "Duty, Honor, and Country," by Douglas MacArthur.

Gurnee Grade School Superintendent Milton J. Davis, the Gurnee Community Church Minister, Richard Hunt, and Bishop Allen Willey of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints also contributed to the successful program.

Mr. Speaker, the Warren Township High School Symphonic Band, under the direction of Sam J. Licocci, and the Viking School Singers, under the direction of Mrs. Marilyn Walters, as well as the Viking School Band Brass Ensemble, directed by Tom Erlenborn, provided musical renditions which were inspiring and appropriate for the occasion. The wife of Gurnee's mayor, Mrs. Joanne Welton, performed beautifully with her soprano rendition of the "Star Spangled Banner," and "America the Beautiful."

The entire program was under the able direction of the Bicentennial committee chairman, Mrs. Paulette White of Gurnee.

Mr. Speaker, the keynote address was clearly that of Gurnee's Mayor Richard Welton. Dick Welton's succinct and eloquent remarks would seem to me to establish a pattern for city officials throughout the country who seek to have their municipalities designated as Bicentennial communities, in order to participate actively in our Nation's 200th birthday celebration.

I am pleased to conclude this statement by attaching the remarks of Village President Richard Welton, as follows:

#### REMARKS BY VILLAGE PRESIDENT RICHARD WELTON

Good afternoon. I would like to take this opportunity to thank each of you for joining us today. We are particularly honored by those who have taken the time to visit Gurnee to participate in this occasion. On behalf of the village board and the Gurnee Bicentennial Commission, I would like to say we are honored to receive this certification. We will proudly fly the bicentennial flag at our municipal facility. This Federal community designation represents a challenge as well as an opportunity to us in the village of Gurnee.

Why did Gurnee get this recognition or special attention? We are not a bastion of revolutionary history! None of our Gurnee fore-fathers signed the Declaration of Independence. We don't have a Boston Tea Party Festival. We don't have the Liberty Bell to enshrine as Philadelphia is doing. We don't have a famous battlefield to dedicate. We don't have millions of dollars to build a new civic center. So why were we chosen to be a National Bicentennial Community, if we don't have any of these unique or special characteristics? The only thing that makes Gurnee special, is because we want to be special.

We were able to do this because first of all we are a community encompassing enthusiastic citizens, viable organizations, and optimistic businessmen. Therefore, our village board chose to establish a committee that would be representative of these various elements. We formed a citizens advisory Committee which became a reality by early summer of last year. Its forty members represent fraternal, social and philanthropic organizations geographical interests, commercial and industrial businessmen, school and church affiliated groups, as well as many interested citizens.

Upon receiving the original application for Federal designation, I turned it over to this committee. Because of this, the Gurnee Bi-

centennial Commission was established by village ordinance to carry out the necessary planning to receive certification. This commission provided the forum through which these pluralistic groups were able to communicate, and from this came the ideas, suggestions, and priorities. Most importantly it channeled the energies it takes to institute specific goals. These objectives though not unprecedented on a national scale are special to Gurnee. These aims were submitted through formal application. And because we cared enough to fulfill the requirements, we received the honor of Federal designation. These requirements confocalized the three Federal thematic areas, which are heritage, festival and horizons.

The areas that the Gurnee Bicentennial Commission selected to emphasize under heritage, will create a special awareness of Gurnee's past through educational programs which will allow our citizenry to better understand the nature of our community. How it originated, where it is today, and how we can better it tomorrow.

The purpose of festival that the commission wishes to accomplish have already been manifested last year, in "Gurnee Days". This event, which is special to Gurnee, will continue to explore the diversity and variety of the many interests and talents of the individuals that make our country a vigorous one. The main ingredient of this success is our spirit of participation.

The third and last category is horizons. Which is probably the most special. Its purpose is to establish priorities for the future. We hope to create an atmosphere that allows our many pluralistic elements to continue to participate in the shaping of our future mores and traditions. We shall achieve this by encouraging healthy discussions of ideas and suggestions. Only then can we identify those values we wish to preserve, those we wish to create anew, and those which we wish to perpetuate. Thus establishing the necessary priorities needed to sustain them.

These are the basic guidelines we have met to achieve Federal designation. We shall accomplish these goals with enthusiasm. We are optimistic because of an abiding belief in our basic democratic institutions that were established 200 years ago. The bicentennial is not an ending, but it marks for Gurnee the beginning. The beginning of our third century. This is why we in Gurnee feel we are special.

#### FOOD EXPORTS

#### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the statement I made before the International Trade Subcommittee of Banking and Currency on the matter of unrestrained food exports. I believe it is important for the House to recognize the dangers inherent in our present lack of control over food exports. Our response to the problem of irresponsible and misdirected export agreements will carry tremendous significance, not only for the American consumer, but for our traditional customers and for those underdeveloped nations overseas who rely upon U.S. food production.

The complete text of my testimony follows:



STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE LESTER L. WOLFF BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY APRIL 25, 1974

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have the opportunity to testify today on the subject of export controls. As the sponsor of H.R. 10844, one of the principal measures being considered by the Subcommittee, I feel it is extremely important that this attention be given to the impact which excessive export demands have had on the domestic economy, in terms of inflationary costs and shortage of supplies. Our response to the problem of irresponsible and misdirected export agreements will carry tremendous significance, not only for the American consumer, but for our traditional customers overseas and for those underdeveloped nations which depend upon the U.S. for their basic needs.

H.R. 10844, the Export Priorities Act, which I introduced on October 10, addresses itself specifically to the problem of uncontrolled exports of agricultural commodities. Close to 30 Members of the House have cosponsored this legislation, and an identical bill, S. 2411, introduced by Senators Javits and Stevenson, is pending before the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

This legislation arose from my concern over unconscionably high food prices facing the American consumer and the possibility of severe shortages of certain essential commodities, in particular wheat and feed grains. The Council of Economic Advisers recently reported that "perhaps half of the acceleration in food prices could be attributed to . . . the boom in export demand." Our total food bill jumped \$14 billion in 1973; we have experienced the most rapid escalation in food prices since the Korean War. Not only is the American consumer finding himself "priced out" of the supermarket, but he faces the greatest shortages of staple food products ever experienced in peacetime America. This scarcity not only has an obvious effect upon the American consumer, but will ultimately hinder the responsibility we owe to our neighbors overseas. At the time I introduced H.R. 10844, it was predicted that the United States would find itself so short of certain commodities, like wheat, that it would reach a point where we would either have to shortchange our own people or turn a cold shoulder to needy nations abroad. In a recent statement issued jointly by Dr. George E. Brandow, professor of agricultural economics at Penn State, and Dr. Norman E. Borlaug, who won the Nobel prize for developing a new strain of wheat, the comment was made that "it is already evident that the possibility of scarcity is a real one and that the mishandling of food under such conditions would cost as many lives as some nuclear wars."

We are and have been mishandling the allocation and distribution of our food supplies, and the wheat situation is a case in point. You are all undoubtedly familiar with the running battle between the Department of Agriculture and the baking industry, the Chicago Board of Trade and others concerned over the possibility of a wheat shortage before the 1974 crop is available. It is predicted that between now and sometime in July when the '74 crop is harvested, the U.S. will find itself over 100 million bushels short of wheat. This prediction is reached using USDA figures, although the Department of Agriculture actively denies the possibility of a shortage occurring. I would like to briefly run down the controversy for you. Our total domestic need is 800 million bushels of wheat. Our supply is 2.1 billion bushels, which sounds like more than enough to feed this Nation and cover any emergencies that may arise. However, the Administration has per-

mitted export commitments totaling 1.4 billion bushels, which leaves only 700 million bushels, 100 million less than we actually need. The Department of Agriculture, however, claims that we will not be able to meet present demand but actually have a 178 million bushel carryover. This is due to the fact, or I might say hope, that many announced export sales may be "phony," that is, not take place, be cancelled or deferred. Whether this contention is based on hard evidence or wishful thinking is impossible to tell, as neither the Congress nor the public has been privy to the reasoning behind Secretary Butz' thinking. The real point, however, is that even if we do find ourselves with a carryover of 178 million bushels, the Department has neglected to add that this carryover represents a 60% reduction from last year's carryover of 438 million bushels, and that a reasonable and necessary carryover should be about 300 million bushels. I might just add that this carryover which we refer to as a "surplus" is in reality the bulk of the world's grain reserves. It is as essential to domestic needs as it is to global requirements.

If anything, the controversy over the possibility of a wheat shortage points to the highly significant role which exports play in dictating food prices and supplies. There exists and will continue to exist a precarious balance between food production and global (including U.S.) needs. Any massive, mismanaged or irresponsible export agreement carries the potential of being extremely dangerous and catastrophic. Again, to refer to a case in point, we look back to the U.S.-Soviet wheat deal in the summer of '72, which was the largest private grain sale in U.S. history. The General Accounting Office has already detailed the Administration's utter negligence and lack of responsibility in negotiating this agreement. The fact is that we sold the Soviet Union over 400 million bushels of wheat, approximately 20% of our supply, at about \$1.64 a bushel, and we helped them finance the deal on generous credit terms. In addition, the agreement cost us about \$300 million in export subsidies. It jacked up the price of bread in the States by about 2 cents a loaf, cost the U.S. taxpayer millions, and created a very real dent in our wheat supply. Now rumor has it that the Soviet Union is willing to sell back to us our own wheat, to help us stave off scarcity, not at \$1.65 a bushel, but at the market price of over \$4 a bushel. The GAO report concluded that as a direct result of the Russian grain agreement, "domestic wheat prices rose from about \$1.68 a bushel in July 1972 to \$3 in May 1973. Consumer costs attributed to the sales included higher prices for bread and flour-based products, increased prices for beef, pork, poultry, eggs and dairy products resulting from higher costs for feedgrains, and a severe disruption of transportation facilities with attendant higher costs and shortages or delays in delivering certain supplies." The GAO also commented that since "(the Department of) Agriculture had no way of assessing the implications of such large sales on the domestic economy . . . (the Department) was an involuntary participant to the disruptive effects of Russia's large purchases made in a short time frame."

The Soviet wheat deal and the current wheat situation are perhaps the most blatant indicators of the need for an intelligent approach to allocating our food supplies. We might look back as well to the shortages of soybeans, cotton-seed oil and meal which has plagued us in '73. The severity of these shortages led finally to export controls, but the controls were hastily contrived and poorly managed. As a result, we alienated traditional trading partners like Japan. Even while denying the possibility of a wheat shortage, the Administration has been running helter-

skelter to try to get deferrals on announced export sales, and just recently, decided it was necessary to lift the quota system on wheat imports. We might well ask how this happened when we harvested the biggest crop in history last year. The very concept of continuing to export a commodity that is in short supply at home and then encouraging imports of the same product is economic folly.

We need to introduce some measure of order into what is now a chaotic handling of our food export policy. That policy is run now on a philosophy that tries to reconcile two opposing points of view. The Department of Agriculture says in one breath that "no government should undertake lightly to abrogate contracts that were made in good faith", and in the other that "almost every agreement to sell is in fact a conditional sale, subject to cancellation."

I do not advocate export controls lightly; since first coming to Congress, I have sought to broaden our free enterprise system and broaden the free market. However, I think we are kidding ourselves in maintaining that a free market situation as regards agricultural exports actually exists when our largest sales have gone to non-market states, like the Soviet Union, where unified states monopolies are set up against individual U.S. traders. We do not have a free market situation when massive export agreements benefit few at the expense of many; and we do not have a free market when traditional trading partners are denied access to exports because of scarcity, or because other nations are building up their own stock of food reserves at our expense.

The Export Priorities Act, which I introduced last fall, has actually a two-fold purpose. It attempts to provide a more orderly marketing system of our agricultural products and to widen participation in the international sale of food commodities by providing for an export licensing and allocation system. It also seeks to insure American consumers an adequate supply of food at reasonable prices. The bill requires the Secretary of Agriculture to pinpoint exactly what can be exported through a public forecast of domestic needs. The amount available for export would be the total number of bushels available, less the domestic need, a reasonable carryover, and a reserve for international natural disaster needs. I might also point out that the bill defines a reasonable carryover as 40% of domestic needs, which represents a level necessary both for the security of the American consumer and world needs. The provision which establishes an export licensing and allocation system, besides protecting supplies needed for domestic consumption, would protect traditional markets for U.S. exports and leave room for new markets that might emerge as a result of hardship. The Secretary of Commerce would be authorized to lift this export licensing system in the case of any agricultural commodity which he determines is produced in sufficient quantities to meet both U.S. demands and world requirements from the U.S.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that the U.S. is almost alone among the major food producers of the world in not restraining food exports. Canada, Argentina and Australia have created wheat boards, and these countries plus the Common Market countries have moved to control exports. There are so many unpredictable or difficult to control factors influencing food supplies and prices like the weather, the availability of fuel supplies and inflation, surely we should introduce some measure of restraint over those factors, like exports, which we can control.

In conclusion, I might just say that in the wake of the energy crisis, I doubt very

seriously whether the American people will stand for further rapid price hikes and shortages in another basic commodity, food. Having muddled through the problem of gas lines, we cannot allow bread lines to be next. We have a responsibility both to the American consumer and to our old friends and needy neighbors overseas to tackle the problem of uncontrolled exports before the situation controls us.

**CHICAGO ITALICS CLUB HONORS  
JUDGE PHILIP ROMITI**

**HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1974, at the Chateau Royale in Chicago, the Italics Club honored a most distinguished Chicagoan—Hon. Philip Romiti, judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County, as the "Man of the Year 1974," for his leadership and active interest in civic and community affairs.

Over 500 people, including Presiding Judge Joseph A. Powers and Illinois State Representative William J. Laurino, attended the Italics Club Annual Award Dinner Dance. Club President Mary M. Mento presented a plaque to Judge Romiti in recognition of his outstanding leadership and example of excellence, and also an album containing letters of tribute from Mayor Daley, Senator STEVENSON, Senator PERCY, Governor Walker, and Judge Romiti's many, many other friends and admirers. He was also presented with a gold honorary lifetime membership in the Italics Club by General Dance Chairman and first Vice President Carmello A. Blacconeri.

The Italics Club gave donations in the name of Judge Romiti to the Villa Scalabrini Home for the Aged and Miss Joan Marie Mostardi of Oak Park, Ill., a senior at Trinity High School, received the Victor A. Arrigo scholarship and will attend Notre Dame University.

The Victor A. Arrigo scholarship was created by Dr. Mary Ellen "Mancina" Batinich, Chicago educator and civic leader, shortly after Representative Arrigo's death in October 1973. Victor Arrigo was a former Illinois State legislator and leader in veterans' affairs.

I extend my warmest congratulations to Judge Philip Romiti for meriting the Italics Club's "1974 Man of the Year Award," and at this point in the RECORD include his biography. The biography follows:

**PHILIP ROMITI, JUDGE OF THE CIRCUIT COURT  
OF COOK COUNTY**

Judge Philip Romiti was born in Hurley, Wisconsin, where he received his early education. The son of immigrant parents born in Rome and Piemonte, he was graduated from Superior State College, Superior, Wisconsin, and then attended De Paul University College of Law where he was awarded the J.D. degree. In the same year he was admitted to the bar and remained at De Paul University Law School as a member of the faculty. In 1960 Judge Romiti became the dean of De Paul's College of Law and retained that position until 1968 when he was

elected Judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County-Criminal Division.

For 12 years Judge Romiti served as Magistrate in the Village of Hillside. He has devoted much time to public service including being the Mayor of the Village of Hillside from 1965-1968.

His civic and community activities have included the following: President and organizer of Hillside Little League, Chairman of the Hillside Community Chest, President of the Hillside Lion's Club, member of the Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus, President of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine of Saint Domitilla Parish, Board of Managers of Proviso YMCA, member Citizen's Committee Chicago Police Sergeants' Association, Vice President of the Hillside Public Library, member of the Lay Advisory Board of Villa Scalabrini and member of the Board of Trustees of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans.

Judge Romiti and his wife, Grace, have six children and three grandchildren.

**VOTE**

**HON. ED JONES**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity today, to include two speeches that were given by David Camp, and Margaret Ronk at a Democratic rally in Alamo, Tenn., on April 1, 1974.

I am proud of these two young people as I know their parents are. Their feeling of patriotism and citizenship as exemplified in their speeches is gratifying. The text of the speeches follow:

**VOTE**

This speech was given April 1, 1974 by David Camp at a Democratic Rally. Age 11.

Yes, 4 letters v-o-t-e. Such a short word to have such a great meaning. According to the Webster this means a choice between candidates for an office. It is unfortunate that far too many people do not realize the importance of this word—but to us, as Americans, the results of this word can be the decision to determine the way of life for all of us—white people, black people, red people, and yellow people. Yes, decisions that are made as a result of voting decides our way of life. Then why do so many people remark; "I'm not going to vote this time, my vote won't make any difference anyway." I'm afraid that these people have never really stopped to think about what it means to be able to choose our way of life through voting to elect our governmental officials which decide for us our form of government.

Now, let's take a look at these 4 letters. First let's look at the V. V which brings to my mind the word valuable; which you are to the United States, your state of Tennessee, your local county and city. Every person should consider the privilege to vote as being valuable. Everyone needs to have his say about "who" governs our country, on higher level or on a local level. By voting to elect officials to represent us, we indirectly govern ourselves. All states have certain requirements for voters. A few years ago Tennessee passed a law which gave 18 year olds the right to vote. A registered voter cast his ballot secretly, either by writing on a paper ballot or by using a voting machine.

The O stands for Opportunity. Voting gives one the opportunity to cast his feelings by voting for the man, or as some do, the party

of his choice. If one does not take advantage of this opportunity, he should never criticize the one who holds our government offices. If you don't like the way they are operating our government, then run for an office. Who knows, you just might have the opportunity to vote for yourself.

And then T is for Teach. Teach others to be good citizens by going to the polls and casting your vote. One cannot tell others to vote if he doesn't vote himself. We are also teaching patriotism through voting.

E which stands for Effort is a valuable letter in this word. Put forth the effort to make your country what it should be. Who knows, your vote might be the deciding vote which would bring peace and happiness to our country.

Now v-o-t-e. The next time there is an election—local, state, or national go out and vote. Through this you can show others that you are the kind of citizen everyone should be.

**UP THE FREE STAIRCASE**

This speech was given April 1, 1974 by Margaret Ronk at a Democratic Rally. Age 10.

One of the most important privileges every American citizen has is the right to be free! This hasn't always been true. This has been made possible through dedicated faithful citizens of our country such as George Washington, Abe Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson and most of all—all of our veterans who have sacrificed much time and for many their lives that we—yes all of us—might be free!

Many years ago, as winter was beginning a group of soldiers struggled into Valley Forge, in Pennsylvania. Their uniforms were old and worn. Some had blankets over their shoulders, rags wrapped around their feet because they had no shoes. These men had been fighting to protect their country to be free. They were very discouraged. George Washington was the leader of these men. He had great faith in the right to be free, he fought to keep his army together in the long cold winter at Valley Forge. Eventually he led his army to Victory. George Washington helped the 13 original colonies become independent, he became the father of our nation. Many Americans believed he was the greatest American who ever lived.

As we look at people like George Washington and other great country men it makes us appreciate our freedom more.

Many times we feel as I'm sure George Washington did very discouraged and feel that we are taking steps down instead of upward. However as I can see through continued determination if we keep struggling we'll eventually start upward. As I think of freedom I'm reminded of a very popular book that many of you have read, it is named "Up the Down Staircase" but freedom makes us want to change and think of "Up the Free Staircase." This staircase has 4 steps all leading upward.

On the 1st step I see an F which reminds me of friends. We have the right to choose our friends.

The 2nd step is a R which brings to my mind Religious Freedom. A Freedom which is one of the most important, our right to worship God as we please.

Shining bright on the next step is an E for eager. Yes, we should find ourselves to be eager to fight and defend our freedom.

And as I reach the top. The last step is marked with another E for equal rights. All men are created equally and are given the rights to choose for themselves.

If we, yes all Americans will struggle together and walk up these 4 steps FREE I'm sure our lives will be much happier and our country will remain free as we walk "Up the Free Staircase."



## SHAKING UP THE COMMITTEE SYSTEM

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as the House moves closer to consideration of the Bolling Committee report it is useful, I think, to review some of the analytical reactions of the press.

The attached article in the Wall Street Journal hints at some of the problems the plan will encounter, but quite properly, to my mind, recognizes the essential integrity and diligence which Dick Bolling and his colleagues on the Select Committee on Committees brought to their complex and onerous task.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 25, 1974]

## SHAKING UP THE COMMITTEE SYSTEM

(By John Pierson)

WASHINGTON.—Dick Bolling is too modest. Here he comes with a plan to shake up the committee system in the House of Representatives. Yet he has the nerve to sit there and say it won't change the power structure. "No, sir," declares the Missouri Democrat, a bit too blandly, "my reforms are neutral on the subject of power. All they would do is make the House work better."

Rep. Bolling's modesty has a purpose. It's in his interest now to soft-pedal his revolution. No sense in riling up the very people whose votes he still needs to pass it.

What's more, it could well be the Bolling reforms will make the House work better by letting members serve on only one major committee (and thus stop spreading themselves too thin), by forcing the House to organize right after the fall election (and thus get off to a running start in January), and by pulling the myriad strands of energy and the environment together in a single committee (where interests can clash more intelligently.)

But this author of a fine book called "Power in the House" knows better than to think his plan is "neutral" on the subject of who's in charge when it would:

Drastically reduce the power of the single most powerful man in Congress, Rep. Wilbur Mills (D., Ark.), and of the Ways and Means Committee he chairs. Mr. Mills and his committee would lose control over Social Security, unemployment and medical benefits and foreign trade. (They also would lose their awesome monopoly over tax expertise, because every committee would be required to study the impact of tax policy on subjects within its jurisdiction.)

—Lessen the authority of all committee chairmen by establishing the principle and practice that the House membership—the sweaty, anonymous, rank-and-file—can rearrange committee jurisdictions and decide who gets what piece of the legislative action whether the chairmen like it or not.

Add to the clout of Speaker Carl Albert by cutting his rival, Rep. Mills, down to size and by formalizing and broadening the Speaker's authority to refer bills to committees.

Add to the responsibilities of the Rules Committee, the House's traffic cop, by letting it play referee when a committee wants to dispute the Speaker's decision on where to refer a bill. (Rep. Bolling is likely to chair the Rules Committee one day.)

Give additional muscle to the rank-and-file by providing even the most junior member with a major committee assignment, and

by improving the flow of information to committee members, who in times past have had to depend on their chairmen for facts.

## HARD TO BE NEUTRAL

To humble Rep. Mills and other chairmen while elevating the Speaker and the membership is hardly to be "neutral" on the subject of power.

One must admit however, that while Rep. Bolling's plan would shake up power in the House, it would not move that body in any radically new direction, but rather the same way it has been jiggling in recent years—seniority and the chairmen down, the Speaker and the members up.

Things run in cycles. As Rep. Bolling shows in his book, the rise of the chairmen—buttressed by the seniority system—followed almost inevitably the overthrow in 1910 of a powerful and arbitrary speaker, Rep. Joe Cannon of Illinois. "Czar Cannon," they called him.

Now, the worm is turning again. No longer do years of service automatically entitle a member to chair a committee. The Democratic Caucus, composed of all members of the majority party, has begun electing chairmen. Thus far, the caucus has chosen to reelect all the senior men. But the threat of dismissal cannot hang lightly over the less popular or less able chairmen.

Other changes testify to the gradual and still-incomplete erosion of the once mighty power of chairmanship: open meetings; chairmen not allowed to head more than one of their own subcommittees; subcommittee chairmen entitled to hire at least one staff member of their own; chairmen obliged to announce meetings at least 24 hours in advance and to call caucuses of their committee Democrats.

The trend is accentuated by the retirement, death or defeat of the old giants and their replacement by a new breed of chairman, less schooled in the arts of leadership. The House Judiciary Committee, now conducting the impeachment inquiry, is a case in point.

Judiciary's former chairman, Emanuel Celler, represented a Brooklyn district that returned him to the House 25 times. With job security like that, Rep. Celler could stay in Washington, master his committee's subject matter and learn how to get things done, a fact worth pondering when some deplore the existence of "safe" districts.

Judiciary's new chairman, Peter Rodino, is from Newark and until recently, has had to tread water fiercely just to keep from drowning in a sea of ethnic and racial animosities; Irish against Italian against Black. Rep. Rodino's lack of leadership training—plus the new mood of democracy in committees—has forced him to run his panel in a far more collegial, for less autocratic way than Rep. Celler ever did.

Chairman Mills' decline began, perhaps, when he ran unsuccessfully for the presidency in 1972. Ill health further eroded his authority by keeping him away from the House for long periods.

Meanwhile, House Democrats have found a mechanism for overriding Rep. Mills' practice of bringing bills to the floor under a closed rule, which permits no amendments. The new weapon has been brandished once, on the trade bill, to force floor consideration of an amendment that would deny Export-Import Bank credits to the Soviet Union if it persists in making it hard for Soviet Jews to emigrate.

The 15 Democrats on Ways and Means have long served as the majority's committee on committees; under Rep. Mills' lead, they decide what committee assignments go to each Democratic Congressman. But this authority has now been diluted by the addition to the committee on committees

of the chairman of the Democratic Caucus, the Majority Leader and the Speaker.

As the power of the chairmen has declined, Speaker Albert's authority has been enhanced somewhat by the packing of the Rules Committee with Democrats usually loyal to him, and by formation of a Democratic steering and policy committee, chaired by the Speaker, to shape legislative proposals. The steering and policy committee not long ago pressured the Rules Committee to send the consumer protection agency bill to the floor.

There is, however, little likelihood that the Speaker will replace the chairmen as the real power in the House. Rep. Albert is not that ambitious, and he plans to retire after another term or two. His likely successor, Majority Leader Thomas P. O'Neill of Massachusetts is more comfortable with power.

But it may be the country has become too complex for any Speaker of the House ever to wield the power of a Czar Cannon and some of his 19th-Century predecessors. "In those days," observes a key Democratic staffer, "the country didn't want anything done. Congress would pass the tariff and go home. Blacks didn't vote. Immigrants weren't registered. The country was white, middle class and reasonably happy."

"It's easy for a Speaker to be effective when he doesn't have anything to do."

## ASSERTIVE AND INDEPENDENT

Along with a more complex country comes a more independent House membership—better educated, more assertive, more interested in issues and ideology than in going along and cutting deals.

Democracy, then, may be the watchword in the House in the years ahead. And democracy could mean achievement or chaos.

Some members put their hopes in the caucus of the majority party as the means of organizing democracy and channeling it into useful talks. To date the caucus has been mostly promise, except perhaps in 1972 when it forced a reluctant Foreign Affairs Committee to approve an end-the-war amendment to the foreign aid bill.

For the caucus to exercise real power would require party discipline. The caucus, through the steering committee, might hammer out a party position on a bill and then force a committee chairman to send it to the floor on pain of losing his job. A two-thirds vote in caucus might bind members to support the party's position on the floor.

In the past, the Democrats have shunned this kind of "binding." The party was so divided between North and South that any attempt to apply discipline just would have widened the split. Now that the enrollment of black voters has worked a wondrous moderation of Southern Democratic politics, perhaps the time is ripe for a little party discipline.

One old-style Southerner doesn't agree. Democratic Rep. Joe Waggoner Jr. of Louisiana, leader of a declining band of Southern conservatives, maintains that as the South moves toward the center, the North moves toward the left. "So the gap remains," says Rep. Waggoner, not without satisfaction.

Even if he's wrong about the North-South gap, a new division may be emerging in the Democratic ranks, and one just as poisonous—a division between old-style labor Democrats and newer Democrats who haven't much use for organized labor or New Deal solutions.

So suppose the caucus can't get it all together. What then?

"Chaos," replies Rep. Waggoner, "I don't have any reservation about it." Nor is he alone in having forebodings.

Rep. Bolling, the reformer, sees a good chance that if Democrats win a lot of seats

from Republicans this fall—because of Watergate—they'll accomplish nothing at all after the election for want of agreement on what to do. Or they'll try to ram a mess of liberal legislation down an unwilling country's throat, much as they did after the GOP's Goldwater debacle in 1964.

"If they behave as they usually do, they'll throw it out the window," says Rep. Bolling, "and that'll insure the election of a Republican President in 1976."

#### AFTER THE LANDSLIDE

Laments a liberal Democratic staffer who spends a lot of time trying to elect liberal Democrats to Congress: "I just hate to think of what this place will be like next year, if we have the kind of landslide they've been talking about . . . It'll be a zoo."

Another liberal staff man puts a brighter face on things. "We're heading back into the 1840s, to a genuinely rowdy, boisterous House of Representatives," says he. In the early days of the republic, the House was often the scene of fistfights, canings and similar expressions of a backwoods democracy's animal spirits.

"In the future," the staff man says, "you're going to see a good old legislative slugfest on the floor, where competing interests go at each other openly and the majority wins."

"It won't be good for the special interests, but it may be good for the country."

Picture it, Pete Rodino, all five-feet-seven-inches of him, strides onto the floor of the Huse in muddy boots, his coon hounds baying about his heels. He sits down with a careless manner, props his feet on the back of the chair in front of him and commences to eat an apple . . .

#### EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE

### HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of controversy surrounding the matter of Executive privilege and the Watergate affair. Twenty years ago there was also a great brouhaha about Executive privilege. At that time, when Senator McCarthy was requesting documents from the executive branch of Government for his investigation of subversion and security risks, members of the news media which are now opposed to claims of Executive privilege could not support it vigorously enough. Apparently these people believe that the Watergate affair is more important than Communist subversion, since Executive privilege in regard to the former is attacked by them as a cover-up, and in regard to the latter, is supported by them as one of the most solemn rights of the Chief Executive. The leftist liberal media are very selective about what they want covered up. In their book, Communist subversion should be protected.

Recently the Washington Post and the New York Times printed editorials attacking President Nixon's use of Executive privilege. For example, the New York Times wrote:

In his latest efforts to uphold the doctrine of executive privilege, President Nixon is warning that excessive intrusion by Congress

or other investigators upon the confidentiality of the Oval Office would leave future Presidents surrounded by a staff of yes-men and eunuchs . . . Mr. Nixon's legalistic protestations about his duty to protect the Presidency fade into nothingness. The Presidency cannot be safe unless democratic ideals and principles are fully understood and firmly lodged in the White House and in the country.

Again the New York Times wrote:

. . . it is up to the prosecution alone, and not the President or his lawyers, to determine what constitutes the necessary evidence. Any defection from such a course would be a victory for cover-up.

Contrast the position of 1974 with the position of the Times in 1954:

May 17, 1954:

The question is whether the powers of investigation which Congress has assumed, and which it seemingly must have if it is to legislate intelligently, include the power to invade the deliberations of the President or his confidential representatives, against his will, on any issue whatever. A clear line can certainly be drawn between the duty of the executive to tell why it needs money, to account for money spent and to explain and report on plans and results; and, on the other hand, its right to formulate its opinions and discuss its policies in private.

April 22, 1954:

But they [the American people] also have a right to a thorough consideration of the extent to which a legislator acting on behalf of either house of Congress may transgress upon the privileges and the domain of the Executive branch of the Government . . . By common consent everyone recognizes the independent of the Judiciary. In turn the Congress must take care to see that it does not infringe on the Executive.

May 18, 1954:

From the very outset of the fight between Senator McCarthy and the Eisenhower Administration this newspaper has maintained that the fundamental issue is an attempt on the part of the Legislative branch in the person of Mr. McCarthy to encroach upon the Executive branch, incomplete disregard of the historic and constitutional division of powers that is basic to the American system of government.

The President has been late—but not too late—in recognizing the deep significance of this issue and in standing up to it, while the committee itself has apparently swallowed Mr. McCarthy's contention that he and it are entitled to know and pass judgment upon every word, every thought that transpires within the Executive departments. . . .

The committee seems to feel that it has the right to pry farther into the conversations and discussions among members of the executive branch while they were considering a serious problem and, perhaps, reaching important decisions. The committee has no more right to know the details of what went on in these inner Administration councils than the Administration would have the right to know what went on in all executive sessions of a committee of Congress.

May 10, 1954:

Mr. Truman did his countrymen a service at his birthday party in this city on Saturday evening by speaking for a group much larger and a group infinitely smaller than the Democratic party. He spoke for all Americans who might find themselves less free or less well governed if the legitimate power of the

Executive were usurped by Congress. He spoke also as one of that little company of men, so varied in character, intellect and strength, the living and the dead, who have been called upon to fill the increasingly exacting position of the President of the United States. He spoke against the current attempt to infringe upon the constitutional and traditional separation of powers. He spoke with obvious goodwill toward a political opponent, the man who succeeded him in the White House . . .

The issue is more important than the success or failure of an administration, the rise or decline of a party . . . the legislative branch of the Government has expanded "its functions and activities into the very center of the power of the executive branch." He [Truman] properly added that "it is not the business of Congress to run the agencies of government for the President."

We all know, or should know, the heads and fronts of this legislative arrogance. We all know, or should know, the harm they have done to the honor, influence and effectiveness of executive agencies. . . .

Mr. Truman spoke with a sense of responsibility, and more mildly than some of the rest of us, unhampered by his special background, might do. But he spoke wisely. President Eisenhower may take him as a voice, at this time, for a great mass of opinion, not primarily partisan in its nature, that demands for an elected President freedom to fulfill, without arbitrary and unjustified legislative interference, the mandate of the electorate.

Nor was the Times alone in its support of Executive privilege in 1954. On May 9, 1954, the Washington Post printed an editorial which read:

The Senator's arrogance—his readiness to put his own judgment above that of others—has led him finally into an attempt, in the Senate's name, to override even a President order forbidding the publication of F.B.I. reports. This is nothing less than a direct attempt at legislative usurpation of executive authority. It would establish a congressional tyranny in place of the constitutional separation of powers. All this is rationalized, to be sure, in the name of patriotism.

In another 1954 editorial the Washington Post said:

It is a settled principle . . . a principle enunciated by George Washington and adhered to uniformly by his successors in the presidency, that it is a matter of presidential discretion to determine whether it is in the public interest to give Congress executive documents it may request.

From the editorials quoted above, one can only conclude that Executive privilege, in the considered opinion of two of the major newspapers of this Nation, may be properly invoked only if one is covering up security risks, subversives, and Communists. Executive privilege cannot be used for any other purpose, apparently, and certainly not to shield men who are not suspected of leftist leanings. By their ambivalent attitude toward Executive privilege, the Post and the Times have once again displayed for all to see the biases of which they claim to be innocent.

Of course, these papers and the other media who follow their lead could remove this impression if they would vigorously campaign for congressional investigations of subversion in Government, investigations which have not been held for



20 years. Mr. Otto Otepka might give the investigating committees some leads on where to start, and they can take it from there. The failure of the media to clamor for such investigations forces me to conclude that the media are less interested in uncovering evidence of graft, subversion, corruption, and treason in the Government than they are in getting the scalp of Richard Nixon.

## NATIONAL CANCER CONTROL MONTH

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues two columns written in 1971 by Stewart Alsop, columnist for Newsweek magazine.

Mr. Alsop, as we all know, suffers from the most dread of diseases—cancer—and his graphic description of how he learned he was afflicted with cancer and the treatment he underwent will, I am sure, make us all more aware of the suffering of those with cancer.

Tomorrow, on the last day of National Cancer Month, I will submit Mr. Alsop's remaining two columns on his battle with cancer.

The article follows:

[From Newsweek, Aug. 30, 1971]

GOD TEMPERED THE WIND

(By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—I have often wondered what it would be like to be told I had an inoperable cancer, and I suspect a lot of other people have asked themselves the same thing. This is my excuse for writing about a very personal experience, rather than the President's economic policies or some other topic in the news.

I first knew something was really wrong on Monday morning, July 19, when I threw the trash in the dump after a delightful vacation at my country place in Maryland. The dump is an old stone wellhead with steep sides about 4 feet high. My 4-year-old son Andrew and I clambered up the slippery side of the dump to throw in the trash, before going back to Washington and to work.

"Come on, Daddy," Andrew shouted, and scampered for the car. For a long moment, I couldn't move. Climbing up the side of the dump had left me panting for breath, my heart beating furiously. "Alsop," I said to myself, "face it. You're in trouble."

For a good many months, I had had similar spells of hard breathing and pounding heart, especially on the tennis court, and I had belatedly made an appointment with our family doctor, Dr. Richard Perry, for that very afternoon I'd suspected emphysema or lung cancer—I used to be a two-pack-a-day man. But I was wrong. "You're very anemic," Dr. Perry said. "I'm sending you to Georgetown Hospital right away."

### VERDICT

I spent that Monday evening being poked and pricked and questioned by platoons of doctors. At 8 a.m. on Tuesday, a young doctor gave me a local anesthetic, shoved a needle through a bone in my lower back,

and pulled out some marrow—an unpleasant experience, which makes your legs twitch like a frog's. The marrow test, I had been told, would show whether I had "aplastic anemia"—a serious but non-malignant disease—or some form of cancer.

I had to wait several hours for the verdict, and I now know what it must be like for a man charged with a capital crime to wait for the jury to decide. I also found how useful—indeed, essential—a wife's hand can be. When I felt myself sinking deep into fear, I would put out my hand, and my wife Tish would take it, and pull me back and up. In the early afternoon, Dr. Perry came in. He has a nice face—a bit like a younger Ed Muskie's—and his nice face looked embarrassed.

"I'm sorry," he said, and the two words sounded like the knell of doom, "but you have leukemia—acute myeloblastic leukemia. I've got a bed for you at the National Institutes of Health, where they know more about leukemia than anywhere in the world."

"You're sure I have this kind of leukemia?" I asked, and I was pleased that my voice was steady.

"Ninety-five per cent sure," Dr. Perry said. I didn't ask him about the prognosis because I was afraid of the answer.

### DEPENDENT

My wife spent the night on a cot in my room. I took a sleeping pill, and woke up at 4, and thought of her, and small Andrew, and the five other children, and the end of a good career and a pleasant life, and reached for her hand again, she pulled me back and up. The next day, she drove me to NIH, and I met Dr. Glick for the first time.

Dr. John Glick, who was assigned to my case, is 28, half my age, but I soon developed a dependent relationship with him, with Dr. Glick *in loco parentis*. He is a brilliant doctor and a good man, cheerful without being irritating, candid without being cruel.

The reason I'd had such a long wait for the verdict at Georgetown, he said, was that the doctors had spent hours arguing about my marrow slide. The slide was very puzzling—about 40 per cent of the cells were certainly abnormal, but they weren't typical of any leukemia. They'd finally decided on acute myeloblastic leukemia—AML for short—but there would be more marrow tests to confirm the diagnosis.

Suppose I had AML, I asked, what would happen to me? The chances were, he said, that I'd end up in a "laminar flow room," where I'd be treated with very strong drugs to knock out the bad cells, and thus get a "remission" of the cancer. The trouble was that the treatment would also kill white cells, which fight infection, and I had very few left anyway. Infection was the chief danger to life during treatment, and a laminar flow room decreased the danger by about 60 percent—air flowed out only, no one was allowed to enter the room, and everything, food, water, bed sheets, was sterilized.

"Can dry Martinis be sterilized?" I asked, and he laughed, and said they could.

How long would I stay in one of these rooms? "A month, six weeks—till we get a remission." I would lose a lot of weight, and most of my hair would fall out, but a healthy body came back fast. And how long did a remission usually last? Well, there was a man in NIH right then, who'd had a remission that lasted for seven years. What was the average? I asked.

Great advances in treatment had been made, Dr. Glick said, and more were being made all the time—in one form of Hodgkin's disease cures ran up to 75 per cent. But AML was a bad disease. Even so, more than

half the patients lived for a year after treatment. How many died before two years?

"About 95 per cent," said Dr. Glick briskly, and changed the subject.

My wife couldn't stay with me—it is against NIH rules. That night, the sleeping pill wore off again, and there was no hand to reach for in the dark, and I felt terribly alone and terribly frightened.

### DIAGNOSIS

A few days after that bad night, the first harsh diagnosis was changed to one at once more ambiguous and more hopeful, and instead of being cooped up in a laminar flow room, I am sleeping in my own bed and beginning to do some work again. I shall write once more about the emerging possibilities for controlling this dreaded but fascinating disease—and then, I hope, the subject will not be mentioned again in this space. But even before the diagnosis was changed, it seemed to me that a sort of protective mechanism was already at work, which partly answered that question that I suspect a lot of people have asked themselves.

Something of the sort happens in combat, I think. At the very first, there is a naked sense of vulnerability, but then "God tempers the wind to the shorn lamb." The protective mechanism takes over, and the intolerable becomes tolerable, the fear less fearful, and death itself—"a necessary end, will come when it will come."

[From Newsweek, Sept. 6, 1971]

TAMING THE BEAST

(By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—The British, in their great days, used to reward those who had served their country well with huge fortunes and vast estates—Blenheim Palace, awarded by a grateful nation to Winston Churchill's ancestor, the Duke of Marlborough, is an example. It might be a good idea to offer similarly generous rewards to the medical specialists who find the ways to tame the cancer-beast.

Rather against my will, I have learned a good deal recently about cancer, and especially about leukemia, or marrow cancer. Last July 20, I was admitted to the National Institutes of Health with a disease diagnosed as acute myeloblastic leukemia, or AML, a very bad disease. In early August, I was discharged with a diagnosis with few, if any, precedents in the records of the NIH: "Pancytopenia of unknown etiology."

Translated from the medicalese, this means: "This man's blood is in bad shape, and he's got some bad cells in his marrow, but we're not sure what they are, so let's wait and see." My youthful physician and mentor, Dr. John Glick, has told me that the possibility that I might have an entirely new disease "could not be ruled out." I was disappointed to learn that according to medical protocol, the new disease, if it so proved, would be recorded in the medical dictionaries, not as Alsopitis, but as Glick's disease.

### INSTINCTS

In any case, once my energies were revived by blood transfusions, my reportorial instincts reasserted themselves, and I asked a lot of questions, about cancer in general and leukemia in particular. The picture that emerges is fascinating, for cancer is a fascinating disease (although one could wish one were not so personally involved). Four great steps have been taken toward taming the beast. Four more steps remain. When they are taken—and sooner or later they will be—the beast will be tamed.

Here a brief medical lesson, parroted from Dr. Glick. The marrow has the function of producing and regulating the cells that make up the blood. Cancer that attacks the mar-

row crowds out or destroys the three main types of blood cells, so death can come in three ways.

Hemoglobin, or red blood cells, carry oxygen to the body and provide energy. If there are not enough of them, the patient dies of congestive heart failure or simple exhaustion. The platelets are the cells that mainly control bleeding, and if there are not enough of them, the patient dies of internal hemorrhage, or even a small cut or scratch. The white blood cells control infection, and if there are not enough of them, the patient dies of an infection that a healthy body would throw off easily.

#### TRANSPLANT

Transfusions can do two-thirds of the job the marrow is supposed to do. Blood transfusions, which raise the hemoglobin count, were first performed successfully at the turn of the century. They were the first true body transplants, and the first step toward controlling the beast. Platelet transfusions—the second step—are much more recent. Techniques for separating out the platelets, by a centrifugal process, and matching them precisely to the patient's platelets, were perfected only in the last five years.

A patient can be maintained on hemoglobin and platelets almost indefinitely, although there is always a risk of hepatitis. In my own case, my hemoglobin count was about half normal when I was hospitalized (the doctors were surprised to learn that I'd played a couple of sets of tennis the day before) and my platelet count was in the cellar. I had two blood transfusions and one platelet transfusion in the hospital, and since then the counts (knock on wood, cross fingers) have held steady above the danger level.

This is one reason I may have Glick's disease rather than AML. If I had classic AML, Dr. Glick remarked the other day, and I had gone this long without chemotherapy, I would probably be dead. Chemotherapy is the third great step, also taken only in recent years, toward taming the beast.

The injection of very powerful chemicals into the veins kills—or seems to kill—the bad cells, and thus induces a "remission." A patient in remission may appear to have a perfectly normal marrow. Chemotherapy thus prolongs the life of a leukemia patient—but, alas, not indefinitely. The bad cells always come back—or so nearly always that records of actual cures are "statistically negligible."

The four steps needed to tame the beast are these:

First, the hepatitis problem has to be solved. Techniques for screening blood and platelet units for hepatitis have been much improved, but some hepatitis slips through the screen. Thus, every transfusion increases the risk of hepatitis, a disease for which there is no specific cure. A person with hepatitis plus leukemia is obviously not a brilliant actuarial risk.

What reward will the researcher who comes up with a total hepatitis screen deserve? Say, \$500,000, tax free?

Second, a way needs to be found to increase the white-blood-cell count by transfusion. A body that happily accepts hemoglobin and platelets rejects white blood cells, although there are occasional successful transfusions, especially from matched siblings. (My brother Joe's blood is a fine match, although, as Dr. Glick remarked, it is "a bit old," a remark I could hardly wait to repeat to my brother.) Now, the doctors have to depend on powerful antibiotics—the fourth great step in taming the beast—as a substitute for white blood cells. But if the white cell count goes too low, even the most powerful antibiotics won't work. This is why most leukemia patients die of fever brought on by

infection (which the great Dr. Osler once remarked was as good a way to die as any).

For the researcher who first finds out how to transfuse white blood cells with consistent success, how about a cool million and a good suburban house?

#### A NEEDED DRUG

Third, and very important, a drug needs to be found that will kill the bad cells and not the good cells. Chemotherapy is like killing the crabgrass on a heavily infested lawn—too often, the grass dies too. If someone finds a drug that will zero in on the cancer-crabgrass only, the beast will be three-quarters tamed. For the discoverer of such a drug, how about \$10 million, a yacht, a country house and a fine town house?

But the grand prize—another Blenheim and a Rockefeller-size fortune—should go to the genius who answers the question I naively asked Dr. Glick: "Why do the bad cells come back?"

"If we knew the answer to that one," said Dr. Glick, "we would know what starts a cancer in the first place, and we'd be well on the way to a cure, not of leukemia only, but of all cancers." Dr. Glick is sure the answer will be forthcoming, one day. Then, at long last, the beast will be truly tamed.

#### AMERICA THE DUTIFUL

### HON. TENNYSON GUYER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable dialog and controversy over the proposed setting aside of April 30 as a day of fasting, prayer, and humiliation. The fact that the resolution passed in the Senate, yet did not emerge from a subcommittee in the House Judiciary Committee, is not nearly as important as whether the American people continue in the spirit of divine communion all the days of each year, as we move from crisis to decision, and from darkness to light, as a people united.

Hundreds of congregations and thousands of people will be voluntarily searching their hearts, asking for pardon, and pledging a new devotion, the calendar or resolution notwithstanding.

Prayer is not something you command, demand, or mandate by legislation. Nor should the privilege of prayer be prohibited by law. After a certain Supreme Court ruling, this little poem emerged:

Now I sit me down in School  
Where praying is against the rule;  
Any time my head I bow  
Becomes a federal matter now.  
Any prayers a class recites  
Violates the Bill of Rights  
Non-believers now, may have their day  
Thanks, to what we fail to say!

We can best serve our country by moving in the spirit of those who came to these shores to find a place of worship unmolested. We can best emulate our Founding Fathers whose trust in God and solid faith in His goodness, inspired our first Day of Thanksgiving.

As we near the celebration of our 200th birthday, America might well thank God for our blessings, our bounties, our opportunities—and even for our challenges.

With prosperity unequalled, comforts undreamed, freedom unmatched, and options untaken—we would indeed do well to kneel in humility and prayer.

We have Freedom of Speech—Yet all too seldom raise our voices for truth and justice

We have Freedom of Assembly—Yet somehow cannot get to meetings

We have Freedom of Worship—Yet find it hard to get to church

We have Freedom from Want—Yet seem to have no time for Grace at the table

I believe this is an excellent time for all of us to look into our own mirrors, search our own hearts, pray for more personal light, and in unity, not strife, pray for our country, its leadership, and its people.

With fewer critics and more builders, with gratitude for opportunity, with a zeal for personal regeneration, individual consecration, and collective determination to move from darkness to light, this may well be our finest hour. With privilege goes obligation. With benefits, also goes work. Now may be our most historic moment to turn America the Dutiful into a new kind of America the Beautiful.

NOW IS TIME TO REPEAL YEAR-ROUND DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in December of 1973, Congress adopted a bill providing for mandatory year-round daylight saving time. I was strongly opposed to the passage of this legislation.

The American people have now had an opportunity to judge for themselves the advantages and disadvantages of year-round daylight saving time. The results are overwhelmingly negative.

According to a Louis Harris survey, only 19 percent feel that the decision to adopt year-round DST was a good one. Another 32 percent view the decision as neither good nor bad. A resounding 43 percent, however, believe that it was a bad decision. The negative response is even greater among those living in small towns and rural areas.

I hope that Congress will take note of the strong feelings of the American people against year-round DST. Congress should move now to repeal this unpopular legislation. There is no reason that residents of Ohio's 17th Congressional District and the rest of the Nation should be subjected to yet another go-around of year-round DST.

Following is the complete text of the Louis Harris survey from the April 24 edition of the Mansfield, Ohio, News Journal:



**MOST PEOPLE SEE YEAR-ROUND FAST TIME A MISTAKE**

(By Louis Harris)

In the aftermath of the winter-long gasoline crunch, the American people tend to agree that the law making Daylight Saving Time mandatory on a year-round basis was a poor idea. Only 19 per cent rate the daylight saving move as a "good decision," while 43 per cent say it was a "bad decision," and 32 per cent say it was "neither good nor bad."

The major criticism centers on the perceived dangers to children going to school in the dark. Parents report that they became deeply worried over their offspring crossing streets in the early morning hours in darkness, citing numerous cases of children actually hit by cars and even killed.

The other major misgiving is that while daylight savings was invoked as an energy-saver, people report they used just as much extra heat and electric light in the dark hours of the morning as they believe they saved in the late afternoon. Thus, the rationale for the move lost much credibility with the public.

In late March, a cross section of 1,495 families was asked:

"In your opinion, was the decision to go to Daylight Saving Time year-round in order to save fuel a good decision, a bad decision, or neither good nor bad?"

*Winter daylight saving*

	Total public percent
Good decision.....	19
Bad decision.....	43
Neither good nor bad.....	32
Not sure.....	6

The daylight saving move was most resisted in the Midwest and South, particularly in the small towns and rural areas, where majorities could be found in opposition. These areas are especially hard hit by two conditions:

1. They contain agricultural communities where many people have to rise early to begin their chores, and they would rather begin work in daylight than in darkness, and
- 2—Children in these locations tend to have to go longer distances to school, thus increasing the dangers they might face in the early morning darkness.

When people were asked why they felt the way they did about Daylight Saving Time, the volunteered answers broke down this way:

*Behind people's views on daylight saving*

	Total public percent
<b>Why Bad Decision:</b>	
School kids endangered.....	24
Use more electricity in AM.....	11
Hate getting up in dark.....	7
Use lot of fuel in AM.....	2
Use cars to take kids to school.....	1
<b>Why Good Decision:</b>	
Like daylight saving time.....	7
Gain an hour at day's end.....	6
Saves energy.....	6
<b>Why Neither Good Nor Bad:</b>	
Didn't save any energy.....	16
No difference at all.....	11
Doesn't affect us.....	6
Not sure.....	3

The Harris Survey found the public highly vocal and opinionated on the Daylight Savings Time issue. For example, a young mother in Nashville, Tenn., said, "I have two little ones, eight and six, who had to go to school all winter long in the dark hours. They would hold each other's hands, trembling every morning as they left to walk to school. I've aged 10 years worrying about them." A businessman in Little Rock, Ark., said, "It was just plain foolishness. We all just used more

electricity in the morning and less in the afternoon, no gain at all." A mother in Stonington, Conn., reported, "They claimed that we would save energy by not putting lights on early in the evening. But I personally used up more gasoline taking my kids to school in the car every day than I ever could have saved."

The small minority who stood firm in defense of the change to Daylight Saving Time could be found mainly in the big cities in the East and West. The chief benefit they saw was to have an hour at the end of a day in daylight to spend in leisure. A Los Angeles secretary put it this way: "I like daylight saving, because it lets me get my work done early and then have some time in the late afternoon daylight to play tennis, swim, or go shopping. I think it's great." A businessman in Seattle added, "I was able to get in some extra rounds of golf and then also see the kids in daylight for a change during the winter. It was a good deal."

But the heavy weight of public opinion is against year-round Daylight Saving Time, for even those with no strong opinions on the matter mainly felt that it did not succeed in conserving more fuel.

**AIR FARES ON WEST COAST HALF THOSE ON EAST COAST**

**HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the intra-California air market is unregulated by the CAB, and despite the fact that the density of those air corridors is equal to the density of the corridors in the northeast, air fares in the West are only half those in the East.

An article by John T. Harding appeared in the March 21 Washington Post, examining this rate differential. Not only do I believe this to be an appropriate matter for review by the regulatory agencies involved, but also appropriate matter for review by the Congress.

For that reason, I insert it in the RECORD at this time for the information of my colleagues.

The text follows:

**WHY ARE AIRLINE FARES ON WEST COAST HALF THOSE ON EAST COAST?**

(By John T. Harding)

(Mr. Harding is a physicist who works for the Federal Government).

Recent articles in the Washington Post have dealt with the increasing cost of traveling by air. This week the CAB granted its airlines a 6% surcharge to compensate for rising fuel costs; in July short haul fares will rise dramatically. A comparison of CAB regulated fares and California intrastate fares (which are regulated by the California Public Utility Commission) suggests that short haul fares are already substantially higher than they need to be.

Upon moving to Washington from Southern California five years ago, I discovered that it cost over twice as much per mile to travel by air in the Northeast as it did in California. In fact, it costs more per mile to travel by bus here than by air in California. Fares have risen in both regions over the past years, but the aforementioned relationships are still valid.

Reporting on its four year passenger fare investigation, the CAB claims that its carriers' short-haul fares are not high enough, that long haul passengers are in effect subsidizing the short haul passenger.

CAB carrier costs are summarized in a "cost based" formula \$19.25+4.95c/mile. Now for the first time, a basis exists for comparing costs of CAB and intrastate carriers. Previously whenever fares in high density markets were cited as being unnecessarily high the airlines responded that they were subsidizing low density markets.

The CAB has decreed that cross-subsidization of markets is unacceptable and has obviously concluded that costs depend on distance alone and are independent of traffic density. The table attached compares intrastate fares with CAB costs on the basis of distance.

The intrastate fares shown are those currently in effect on Pacific Southwest Airlines, the dominant intrastate carrier in the California corridor. Since PSA is strictly a short-haul airline (all routes under 500 miles) and has never failed to make a profit on its airline operations, it is inescapable that PSA's costs are about half as great, at every distance from 65 to 480 miles, as those claimed for CAB carriers.

Why should a person be able to fly from Los Angeles to Fresno for \$15, yet pay twice as much to fly the same distance from Washington to New York? Surely major trunk carriers are not paying twice as much for Boeing 727 aircraft as PSA, or twice the interest rate on their bank loans.

Apparently operating costs are several times greater for CAB carriers than for California intrastate carriers. Yet a review of those circumstances over which the airlines have no control would make it appear that operations are intrinsically more difficult in California than in the Northeast, for example. Since this conclusion is at odds with conventional wisdom, consider the following information:

Myth: Northeast corridor airports are more congested than those in California.

Fact: Los Angeles International airport in fiscal 1972 produced 32% more flight operations and 7% more passenger enplanements than the busiest New York airport.

Myth: The airspace around the Northeast corridor cities is more congested.

Fact: No less than five airports in the Los Angeles area each experiences more total aircraft operations than any airport in the New York area. If all airports in the metropolitan areas are included, Los Angeles regional airports produce twice the number of aircraft operations as those in the New York area.

Myth: Northeast Corridor airports experience unusually poor weather conditions.

Fact: The Los Angeles area experiences over twice as much "Instrument Flying Rule" weather conditions as New York, Washington or Boston.

Myth: CAB airlines are subject to more stringent safety requirements than intrastate airlines.

Fact: Safety regulations are imposed by the FAA and are identical for all commercial passenger-carrying airlines. PSA and Air California have flown 15 billion revenue passenger miles without a single passenger fatality, a safety record that few CAB airlines can match.

Myth: CAB airlines provide a higher quality of service than the intrastate carriers.

Fact: PSA and Air Cal presently command 80% of the Los Angeles-San Francisco market, despite the fact that their fares are no lower than the intrastate fares of their numerous CAB competitors, United, TWA, Western, Continental and Air West. These airlines compete on the basis of service and it is clear

that 80% of the passengers find the intrastate airlines superior with respect to punctuality and service. By comparison, travel on the Eastern shuttle is spartan.

Let anyone conclude that this low cost service in California is a small scale phenomenon which is not relevant to the Northeast, the following statistics should be noted:

## CITY PAIR

Stockton-San Francisco.  
Los Angeles-San Diego.  
Fresno-San Francisco.  
Fresno-Los Angeles.  
Los Angeles-San Francisco.  
San Diego-Sacramento.  
\* Exclusive of 8% tax and security charge.  
Distance, 65 miles, intrastate fare,\* \$7.64,  
CAB "cost", \$22.47.  
Distance, 101 mile, intrastate fare,\* \$7.64,  
CAB "cost", \$24.25.  
Distance, 164 mile, intrastate fare,\* \$10.42,  
CAB "cost", \$27.37.  
Distance, 213 mile, intrastate fare,\* \$15.05,  
CAB "cost", \$29.79.  
Distance, 347 mile, intrastate fare,\* \$16.43,  
CAB "cost", \$36.43.  
Distance, 480 mile, intrastate fare,\* \$24.31,  
CAB "cost", \$43.01.

The California air corridor is the most heavily travelled in the world. In fiscal 1972 there were 5.5 million origin-destination air passengers between the Los Angeles and San Francisco metropolitan areas, as compared to 2.0 million between New York and Boston and 1.7 million between New York and Washington. The number of passenger miles flown by PSA alone exceeds the sum total to all origin-destination air traffic within the Northeast corridor (including every airline and every city between Boston and Richmond).

In 1973 PSA transported 6.4 million revenue passengers—a total of 1.9 billion revenue passenger miles. That is more passenger miles than any CAB local service carrier except Allegheny and more passengers than Continental, and almost as many as Braniff, National or Northwest.

Finally, it is irresistible to point out that had PSA collected \$19.25 per passenger and \$4.95 per passenger mile in 1973, its airline revenues would have totalled \$218 million instead of an actual \$95 million. The difference of \$123 million is the amount those lucky 6 million Californians saved by not having the CAB regulate air travel within California.

From the foregoing I conclude that there is no intrinsic reason why air fares cannot be as low here as they are in California. Comparing the CAB cost formula and the PSA fare structure, one is forced to conclude that the CAB carriers are annually incurring at least four billion dollars of expenses which are unnecessary to the providing of safe, dependable high quality air transportation. That is a staggering cost to pay for regulation!

The CAB's primary concern is to see that none of its proteges fail financially. Consequently, fares are set high enough that even the most egregiously inefficient airline does not suffer the bankruptcy it deserves.

By contrast, the California Public Utilities Commission has been concerned primarily with the public interest. Traditionally it has regulated fare increases but not decreases, and has not inhibited entry or exit of airlines in the California market. Consequently, any number of intrastate airlines which could not meet the prices set by the most efficient carriers have had to terminate service.

The net result has not been chaos as predicted by the CAB, but a highly dependable, safe and inexpensive air travel system within California. This could not have occurred without some regulation, but the objectives of the regulation have had a profound impact on whom is benefited.

Airline stockholders should be very grate-

ful to the CAB. The public must look elsewhere for their interests to be served.

## NO-FAULT AUTO INSURANCE

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been much controversy over the issue of no-fault auto insurance. S. 354, the Motor Vehicle Reparation Act, will go before the Senate for a vote in the near future. For the benefit of my colleagues, I wish to insert this article which is a vote for no-fault auto insurance.

[From Economist, Mar. 31, 1974]

## FOR NATIONAL NO-FAULT AUTO INSURANCE

After much controversy, Illinois enacted a no-fault auto insurance law a few years ago. No sooner was it passed, however, than it was knocked out by the state Supreme court on rather technical grounds. Since then, no new law has been passed, though some insurance companies do provide no-fault protection if the customer wants it.

Now there is a movement afoot to enact a national no-fault law (Senate bill 354). The bill is expected to be reported out of the Senate Judiciary committee very shortly.

As we see it, the idea of a national no-fault law makes sense. State lines are no barrier to auto travel. The average person may put as many miles on his car out-of-state as in-state, especially if the family takes an extended vacation trip by auto. Nor is there any reason why the standards should be different. The cars being insured and the driving conditions are virtually the same throughout the country.

Furthermore, the states are dragging their feet. Despite broad acceptance of the no-fault concept, only 12 states have adopted no-fault laws that prohibit lawsuits for economic loss up to a specified amount.

As proposed, the bill would set minimum national standards that would assure victims the following first-party benefits:

1. Unlimited medical and hospital expenses and the costs of rehabilitation, and up to \$1,000 for funeral expenses.

2. A monthly work loss benefit payment of at least \$1,000 multiplied by a factor representing per capita income in a given state compared to the national per capita income average. On the basis of a \$25,000 aggregate limit, work loss benefits would range from \$35,000 down to \$17,000 as each state determines its own needs.

3. Replacement services for injured persons who must hire others to perform necessary household services, subject only to daily limitations set by states.

An alternative federal plan for states failing to meet the above benefit levels would provide for unlimited medical, hospital and rehabilitation benefits; work loss benefits of up to \$1,000 per month without time limitation, and up to \$200 per week in other first-party benefits.

In addition, companies could not cancel no-fault policies without 30 days' notice and even then only if the policyholder fails to pay the premium, loses his driver's license or fraudulently acquires the policy. Payments due a victim are payable on a monthly basis with an annual interest rate of 18 per cent for overdue payments and each state must inform consumers of the rates being charged in a manner to permit consumers to compare the prices.

We are sure the uniform, strict provision on cancellation of policies would be most welcome to consumers, especially senior citi-

zens who suddenly find themselves out in the cold even though their past driving record is good. Based on the experience of no-fault states and cost analysis studies no-fault can be expected to reduce the cost of auto insurance considerably.

We believe the time has come for a national no-fault auto insurance act.

## SOURCES FOR STATISTICS

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, I delivered a statement to the House of Representatives outlining a 10-point program for tax reform. For the information of interested Members, I am providing a list of sources for some of the key statistics appearing in my statement:

## SOURCES FOR STATISTICS

1. Three hundred individuals over \$200,000 paying no 1969 tax: Speech by Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy, April 29, 1972.

2. Taxes on \$8,000 married worker range from \$565 to \$762 depending on how return filed—jointly, separately, standard deduction, low-income allowance.

3. Gulf Oil tax rate: Washington Star, January 22, 1974, P. A1, quoting Senator Percy's questioning of Z. D. Bonner, Gulf's president, Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations hearings, on January 22, 1974.

4. Rates on \$6,000 family range from 4.15 percent up to 6.35 percent depending on how return filed.

5. Opinion poll: Louis Harris Associates, New York, N.Y., May 1972.

6. Average rate of 6% on oil: statement of Stanford G. Ross, Senate Subcommittee on Multinational Corps, Committee on Foreign Relations, 1-30-1974, p. 2.

7. Revenue increase of \$3+ billion from taxing oil like other industries: +\$2.9 billion from combined repeal of percentage depletion and "intangible" deductions; tax credits for oil royalties, \$250+ million. Figures are for fiscal year starting in 1974. P. 48. House Report No. 93-927, Joint Economic Commission.

8. 1972 percentage depletion and intangibles costs: Ways and Means Committee publication of June 1, 1973. 1974 depletion and intangibles cost: Tax Notes magazine, January 21, 1974 (oil and gas only).

9. Tax credit cost and unused credits: Congressman Vanik, News release and accompanying letter from Department of Treasury, February 7, 1974.

10. \$250 million from capital gains reforms: alternative rate figure, \$100 million, Treasury (individuals only); one-year holding period, \$150 million, Office of Senator Gaylord Nelson (1972 figure).

11. \$400 million for carryover basis: staff estimate, adjusted for homestead or small estate exemption, based on Treasury estimate of \$600 million.

12. Estimated 1974 cost of exemption for municipal bonds, \$3.2 billion. Estimated proceeds to cities and states, \$2+ billion. Cost of 50% subsidy, 1974, \$3.6 billion. Additional proceeds to cities, over \$1.4 billion. Additional cost to federal government, \$400 million. Based on OMB estimates and Congressional Record, May 16, 1973, pp. 16026-27.

13. ADR estimate, Tax Notes magazine, January 21, 1974.

14. Minimum tax: pro and con analysis of HR 967—Library of Congress publication.



15. Hobby farming: staff estimate based on figures in Congressional Record, supra.

COMMENTS ON H.R. 14368, THE ENERGY SUPPLY AND ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION ACT OF 1974 AND ON THE IMPACT OF ITS PASSAGE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, this week we will be asked to consider H.R. 14368, a bill which is innocuously entitled the "Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act of 1974." This bill will be described as a moderate, necessary, and relatively non-controversial revision in the Clean Air Act. It will be said that the provisions of this bill were subjected to extensive hearings, floor consideration, and conference committee consideration. In fact, H.R. 14368 contains amendments that will delay the attainment of clean air by 2 years in most polluted areas, and actually cause a deterioration of air quality in other areas. The claim that this bill will increase the supply of any energy source, including coal, is unproven. Air pollution controls are not the main limiting factor in coal production, and this bill cannot be considered a move to increase coal supplies.

In addition to the Clean Air Act amendments, this bill contains in section 11 the authority to obtain access to energy information. The energy information section is basically unrelated to the remainder of this bill, and it could be just as logically attached to any other legislation pending before this body. The main thrust of H.R. 14368 is to amend the Clean Air Act in several particulars, and this information access section should not be considered cause to ignore the negative aspects of this legislation.

The amendments to the Clean Air Act have not been demonstrated to be necessary. The extensive hearings produced sharply differing testimony, with those who were required under the law to control their own pollution predictably protesting, but those who had less of a conflict of interest on the most part testified that the law could be met. The previous debate in this body and in the conference committee was under entirely different circumstances, since it was part of so-called emergency legislation. The provisions of this bill, which is basically only title II of that legislation, were bound with other provisions that affected the livelihood of millions of Americans. At that time we were told, in effect, that we had to take some losses in order to make some gains. The gains, the positive parts of the Energy Emergency Act that the President vetoed, are no longer linked to this package. With the exception of the energy information section, this bill could be called the "Environmental Delay and Degradation Act of 1974."

It is important to understand what

H.R. 14368 does, and to understand that capitulating to industry pressures in the particulars of this bill will only cause the industry to apply further pressures in the future. In 1970, this body resolved to make the air throughout the United States meet, by 1977, minimum air quality standards based upon health criteria. It is only 4 years later, and we have pending a proposal to allow stack emissions to continue to 1979 and allow the automobile manufacturers 2 more years to meet the auto emissions standards. I cannot help but suspect that those 2 years will be used to lobby Congress to grant even further delays, and, with the precedent of this legislation, we will probably agree to even more delays.

H.R. 14368 makes a dangerous and philosophically inconsistent switch from the Clean Air Act in the sections that allow the Federal Environmental Protection Agency Administrator to suspend local and State air pollution regulations, and other sections which allow the Federal Energy Administrator to order coal conversions without permission of a State or local agency. This is in direct conflict with section 116 of the Clean Air Act which states:

Nothing in this Act shall preclude or deny the right of any State or political subdivision thereof to adopt or enforce (1) any standard or limitation respecting emissions of air pollutants or (2) any requirement respecting control or abatement of air pollution; except . . . such State or political subdivision may not adopt or enforce any emission standard or limitation which is less stringent. . . .

The existing law allows stricter, though not weaker local air pollution regulations. Local governments would lose this authority under provisions of the bill.

The authors of the bill claim that the public health will continue to be protected, even though emissions of air pollutants will probably increase under it. If this were the case, then why does the bill not continue to use "primary ambient air quality standards" in its reference to public health instead of vague and undefined "significant risk to public health" language? The committee report on H.R. 14368 says the following about the "significant risk" language.

What is intended is that some violation of the national primary ambient air quality standards may be permitted so long as any of the public would not be exposed to significant health risks.

We are not playing games here, and this language clarifies nothing. The primary ambient air quality standards are the ones set to protect the public health, and that should be the standard used in this bill.

The sections of this bill that provide the most serious potential for environmental degradation may not be fully reviewed of Federal actions under a variety recognized in a quick reading. The existing Clean Air Act provides for judicial of circumstances. It also provides for State and local governments to establish and enforce stricter air pollution regulations. Section 2 of this bill contains the following extraordinary language on suspensions of air pollution regulations:

Any suspension . . . shall be exempted from any procedural requirement set forth in this Act or in any other provision of local, State, or Federal Law.

This same section contains a prohibition against local governments requiring a continuous reduction system for air pollution emissions. Even though these provisions are a sharp divergence from the existing language, they may not appear too drastic. However, they assume benevolence and good will on the part of the Administrator. If we have learned anything this past year, we should have learned that government is of laws, not men, and a good guy is not always in charge. Why do we need to remove the safeguards of judicial review under sections 304 and 307 of the Clean Air Act, as this bill does? And why do we need to completely supersede State and local governments to accomplish the purposes of this bill?

Section 4, relating to automobile emissions standards may not appear to be as controversial. Yet, where is the proof that this effective 2-year extension is needed? The president of General Motors, Mr. Edward Cole, was before the U.S. Senate Committee on Public Works on November 5, 1973, and was asked if GM could meet the standards if they were told that they had to do so. Mr. Cole said: "The answer is 'yes.'"

In my review of the data I have been convinced that the necessity for meeting the auto emissions standards has been proven, and this delay is not justified. This body apparently disagrees, but the body of evidence does not support further delays in cleaning up the automobile, which is responsible for over 60 percent of the Nation's air pollution.

Section 6 of this bill contains an exemption from the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 for coal conversions that are ordered within 1 year after the passage of the bill. The exemption from the NEPA legislation is completely unjustified, and again establishes a dangerous precedent. If the environmental impact of the orders under this bill is not assessed, then why should they be allowed? Environmental review should be, and under present law is, a routine procedure.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of this body may be aware of all of these factors, and still consider the passage of this legislation a positive act by the Congress. If that is the case, then the responsibility for the effects of this legislation shall be on this Congress. I suspect that many Members feel that this bill is not as bad as it could be.

Since this legislation is the product of a hard-fought compromise package that was developed during the Energy Emergency Act debate, many Members may feel that it is proper to support it now. But the situation has changed since last winter, and the sense of panic has left us. The public has not shown any desire to remove these environmental safeguards. The time to analyze these proposals has given some of us a different perspective on the matter. We now have numerous studies underway to evaluate some of the provisions of this legislation. The passage of H.R. 14368 may

appear to be a prudent decision, but it is still supporting delay and degradation of the Nation's air quality. This I cannot support. I urge that this bill be defeated.

#### THE DISTURBING AUTO STATISTICS

### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to statistics published in recent days in the Wall Street Journal concerning automobile production and sales in this country and in Japan, our fast-rising competitor in this field.

During the month of March, the Journal reports, production of new cars in the United States fell 37 percent below the year-earlier mark to complete the lowest quarter production since 1970. The count: 591,874 cars in March; 936,120 in March a year ago.

The first quarter of this year, the Journal continues, found production 34 percent under the previous year and 28 percent below the output scheduled last December. The drop reflected, of course, the energy shortage which shifted the consumer interest to small cars.

And what, then, happened in Japan? Another Journal report, this one out of Tokyo, contained words of enthusiasm from the Japanese standpoint. Exports of 199,815 units in February were up 18 percent and 20 percent from a year earlier.

The Japan Automobile Manufacturers Association said the value of the exports was \$456.4 million, or 25 percent more than in January and 42 percent above that of February 1973. Included in these statistics is a price increase averaging 20 percent made over the last year.

The Japanese export performance, good as it was in the world at large, scored most heavily in our own market. A total of 98,675 autos were shipped by Japan to this country in the month of February for a sensational rise of 58 percent over the same month a year ago.

It is easy, I submit, to dismiss these figures as reflections of the gasoline shortage here and the growing popularity of small cars which U.S. manufacturers only now are beginning to turn out in sufficient numbers to meet the new demand. But they hold a solemn truth. We are continuing to lose auto sales to Japan in a disturbing degree and this means, of course, sharp reductions in present jobs, and indeed potential unemployment, not only in our auto industry but in the many different industries—steel, glass, rubber, plastics, and so forth—which keep it supplied.

Every Japanese-made car sold here represents one less car which could have been made by an American company and American workers. And if this uncomfortable fact could be balanced against the possibility that a Japanese at the same time was riding around in an American-produced car, then we might be happy about it and feel that the interests of international trade were being served. But few U.S. cars are in Japan. The reason is that Japan, with import duties, Government-set quotas, and all the other

trade restrictions for which that land is noted, has made it virtually impossible for any save the wealthiest Japanese to come up with enough money to buy an American car.

And, still, the U.S. market is wide open for Japanese cars. Our Government, indeed, seems to welcome them. Although their prices have been boosted in recent months, they still compete briskly here with our own cars. Their virtues flood the television tube. They enjoy American acceptance, and I seem to detect a "status" thing developing about the Mazda, the Toyota, and Datsun, among many of our people. Meanwhile, the U.S. car is kept out by Japan design and purpose. Is this fair?

Involved in these statistics is more than a shift of buyer preference because of the energy problem. I point out that every American who buys a Japanese car, or any car made overseas, becomes a likely continuing customer for the foreign manufacturer. A high percentage of those purchasing cars, it has been found, replace the one they have with newer models of the same kind. Thus, the Japanese gains being made in our market now can be looked upon as gains which will persist for many years to come, or until the U.S. company is able, if ever, to win back a Mazda, Toyota, or Datsun owner.

How much worse need the disparity become in Japanese sales here with the token U.S. sales in Japan before we, as Congressmen, do something about it? Certainly, statistics showing auto production skidding here, while Japanese car exports to the United States rise by 58 percent are not something which we can leave much longer to those in Government who seem resolute in keeping this country's interests secondary on trade matters in some vaunted notion that we have responsibility to make everybody abroad prosperous at our own expense.

My district is one which turns out a large amount of the steel used in Detroit. It has other major suppliers to the auto industry. Car bodies are stamped out in a giant plant in the area which I represent. My concern is the jobs and the future of my constituents engaged in these pursuits and all those in business and other fields who depend upon them. Therefore, I intend to do everything I can to right this auto sales imbalance with Japan and hope that others in Congress, equally concerned, will join me.

#### COMMONSENSE ON OIL PROFITS

### HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcements concerning the profits of oil companies have brought about a variety of reactions throughout the country. The increase in pretax income for 1973 over 1972 must be put into the proper perspective. Mr. Robert F. Hurleigh in his commentaries over the Mutual Broadcasting Network has provided a much needed balance on the whole is-

sue. I commend these three commentaries—April 12, 15, and 17, 1974—to my colleagues.

The commentaries follow:

COMMENTARY BY ROBERT F. HURLEIGH,  
APRIL 12, 1974

During the oil crisis of the past several months the public has been bombarded with extravagant charges, and a certain amount of demagoguery, aimed at making the oil companies the scapegoats. The anger of the American motorist, waiting in long lines for a few gallons of gas, was fanned every day by new accusations by politicians, many deeply concerned and anxious to escape the voters' wrath by pointing the finger of blame at the oil industry. And when the fourth quarter and annual reports of the profits of oil companies were published in January the screeching reached a deafening crescendo. Indeed, the oil companies—taken as a group of some 30 of various size—had a pre-tax income 54 per cent higher than the year before. So there stood the oil companies: big fat cats. I'm sure many political cartoonists had a field day resurrecting that old picture of a bloated tycoon—diamond stickpin, thousand dollar bills bulging from every pocket and with his arm around a burnoosed Arab sheik. Certainly, a 54 per cent increase in pre-tax income for 1973 over 1972 was remarkable and demanded examination. But all we got was a superficial examination and what has come very close to being a very dangerous witch-hunt.

This reporter has been around a long, long time and has learned that the American people are basically fair-minded, and though their attitudes may, for a while, be present by inflammatory charges and constant repetition, they are not dumb—as Mr. Lincoln decided many years ago. Because the hostility of a few months ago may be dissipating, perhaps we can clear our minds enough to take a look at the other side of the coin, for this is what any fair-minded person will want to do. And in so doing, we should note that some of the very newspapers and television companies whose reporters were quick to take the meat axe to the oil industry had a greater profitability in 1973 than most of these oil companies. So if we wanted to talk about "unconscionable" profits, we should in all fairness recognize such facts. And there is an urgent need to understand the underlying factors responsible for the unusual level of earnings experienced by oil companies in 1973. In 1972, more than half of the overall profits of the oil companies were earned in the United States, but last year the proportion changed drastically and dropped to only 37 per cent and thus, with this larger, worldwide operation, the largest single effect on profitability came about through devaluation of the dollar—an action of the United States government. Thus, of the total growth in profits, the great bulk—more than 85 per cent—occurred outside the United States. We'll have more facts for your consideration at a later time, but, for now—so goes the world today.

COMMENTARY BY ROBERT F. HURLEIGH  
APRIL 15, 1974

A few months ago we pointed out in one of these commentaries that a Senate Subcommittee on energy problems had presented to the Senate one of the most comprehensive, all-inclusive reports, with recommendations, that had been made to that time. Now, that Subcommittee report was made twenty years ago—and has been gathering dust in the archives of Congress ever since. We have been told by energy experts that this Subcommittee report needs only up-dating to be an effective guide today. Yet, it has remained half-lost and half-forgotten for all these twenty years while several Congressional committees are writhing and wrangling to come forth with energy legislation.



As most of us know, the temper of the times is dangerous and some members of Congress seem more anxious to use the energy lag as an issue than to make a thorough, well-reasoned and open-minded assessment of all the abnormal forces which have been at work—especially in 1973 and continuing into this year. Instead of using the oil companies as scapegoats, the Congress and the Administration should be doing a little honest soul-searching, examining its own role in bringing about the energy shortage and to restrain themselves from the impulsive rush to take punitive action simply because they feel that the public, incensed by the personal frustrations and hardships of the oil crisis, is hostile and that the issue is politically attractive. The petroleum industry will have to find twice as much oil between 1970 and 1985 as it did in the preceding fifteen years. That's how much more oil the world is using every year.

The estimated cost of finding that oil and providing the facilities to satisfy this expanding world market will amount to well over a trillion dollars, and in the United States alone, the oil industry must come up with more than a half trillion dollars. This is about four times as much as was spent for the same purposes during the preceding fifteen years. So here's the trillion dollar question: Where's the money coming from? Well, half of that will have to be borrowed—loans from banks, et cetera. But profits will be needed to pay the other half and to make interest and principal payments on the loans. And no matter all the hullabaloo we've heard about the tremendously high profits of the oil companies in 1973 and probably in 1974's first half, the average annual growth in earnings of the oil companies for the last five years has been no more than twelve percent, and if we're going to expect the oil companies to do the job that must be done, they're going to require a return on their invested capital of 15 percent or better and it's about time that Congress begins to take a meaningful look at the true facts. So goes the world today.

COMMENTARY BY ROBERT F. HURLEIGH,  
APRIL 17, 1974

It takes a long time for the truth to catch up with a lie. That's an often used cliché, but it is a truism because it has been proved accurate time and again. It's astonishing that much false information—not necessarily lies, but certainly false and misleading information—is often disseminated only to be proved incorrect at a later date. We have had a considerable amount of false information spread around by people in high places, and misleading information by a gaggle of others, in regards to the oil crisis that the truth is having a hard time catching up. After all the blame heaped on the oil industry for the crisis and its resultant frustrations, we are beginning to get a different story. And yet, the media is not giving the same exposure to these corrective reports as was given to the earlier charges.

Take this case in point: During the finger-pointing and blame-casting of a couple of months ago, one of the nastier charges was to the effect that the oil industry was dishonest about its supplies and inventories. Now, buried within the papers and briefly mentioned, if at all, by radio and television, is the report of the Federal Energy Office that the oil companies were telling the truth. The Energy Office has been auditing the oil company refineries, and says the nation's system of monitoring oil imports is as foolproof as any system we have in this country. So here we have the information that the oil industry, after auditing, has been truthful in its reports on refinery operations and imports, yet I am sure that very few of the people who heard the emotionally charged accusations against the oil industry will ever know

the truth. But you and I will know, and possibly a handful that reads below the centerfold on inside pages of newspapers.

There's another bit of information that has been given almost no exposure over-all about the financial situation of the big oil companies: The stock prices of Exxon, Mobil, Texaco and others are way down—as much as 40 percent off the 1973 highs. Now that should be as much of a surprise to you as it was to me, because we all know these oil companies had soaring profits last year, and will report "embarrassingly high profits" for the first quarter of this year. But isn't it surprising that the people who own these oil companies, through their shares of stock, the share holders, lost money if they bought their stock last year and still hold it.

Most financial observers agree that the principal reason for this drop in the stock of the big oil companies is the political uncertainties hanging over the industry in almost every corner of the world, including the United States. As far as this reporter has been able to learn, that information has not been given the attention its importance warrants. So goes the world today.

#### CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM LEHMAN SPEAKS BEFORE SOUTH FLORIDA BUSINESS PEOPLE

#### HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure of filling in for a colleague and speaking before a group of south Florida business people. I am inserting into the RECORD the text of that speech:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM LEHMAN

It's a pleasure to be here with you this morning. Gillis Long told me that this group would be a particularly interesting one, and I was more than happy to have the opportunity to take his place.

I understand I'm supposed to speak about politics and retailing. Being a former small businessman myself, I am well aware of how much the Federal government can affect business, and sometimes adversely. I own a Buick dealership in Miami, which my son now runs, and often he has a lot of advice for me as a Congressman.

Our present economic state, however, is the single largest difficulty facing the businessman today. As you know, the President's wage/price authority is due to expire April 30. The House Banking and Currency Committee has tabled legislation to give the President an extension of this authority, and a Senate Committee has also gone on record as opposed to any extension. From the way it looks, the President's authority in this area will die a natural death on April 30.

As one colleague put it, and I agree, we have overmedicated the baby in trying to come to terms with inflation. Now it's time to give our marvelous free economic system a chance to straighten things out. It's plain that controls and freezes and voluntary compliance have had little, if any effect in bringing inflation under control.

For the first time, we are no longer lagging behind in our rate of inflation compared to the rest of the world. We now have the dubious distinction of being the front-runner in inflation, which increased by an alarming 10% last year, according to the Federal Reserve Board. In the last three months, the Consumer Price Index has increased by 12.1%, while the Wholesale Price Index has increased 29.4% in that same period.

The question is obvious. What can be done?

I believe that the answer lies in redirecting our enormous military and defense expenditures into the production of goods and services, and particularly housing construction. Not only will this provide employment, but increasing supply and consumer goods will provide a sound basis for combatting inflation.

Judging from my mail, another area of interest to the businessman is the Consumer Protection Act, which recently passed the House. This legislation would create an independent, non-regulatory agency to represent the interests of consumers before Federal agencies and the courts. The bill authorizes the Consumer Protection Agency to evaluate and respond to consumer complaints, and to transmit them to other agencies for appropriate action. The CPA is also authorized to develop and disseminate consumer-related information, and to promote product testing and research.

As you are not manufacturers, enactment of this legislation will not affect you as greatly. However, I know that as a car retailer, I received consumer complaints, and often I couldn't turn to General Motors and pass the buck along without incurring the wrath of my customer. Often the retailer has to bear the brunt of the consumer's anger when it comes to a product that just doesn't measure up to what the consumer thought it should.

I think it's interesting to note that Montgomery Ward, J. C. Penney and Giant Food Stores support the objectives of this legislation.

And to be candid, I think the business community is going to have to face up to the fact that there is such a thing as "consumer power." Passage of this legislation in this Congress is an indication of how widespread that power is.

One main reason for favoring a CPA is the enormous growth of monopoly and lack of competition in so many key industries. In many areas, there is nothing even resembling either price or quality competition. For example, what's the difference between Exxon Plus and Super Shell and lead-free Amoco? Hopefully the CPA will be able to provide us with this information.

Although many business organizations have voiced their opposition to the bill, it will benefit business as well as consumers. Honest business has nothing to fear. Those who sell shoddy merchandise, and I'm sure that's not true of anyone in this audience, obviously will find little comfort in a Consumer Protection Agency.

A third area of interest to you is, no doubt, the enactment of the recent minimum wage increase legislation.

As you are aware, the new bill brings minimum wage coverage and overtime coverage to workers in detail and service establishments in a series of steps, by decreasing the dollar volume limitation of the business in order to be exempt.

The wage rate itself will increase in a number of steps. After the first full month after enactment, the minimum wage will be \$1.90 an hour, increasing in incremental steps to \$2.30 an hour effective January 1, 1977.

I supported the minimum wage bill in Committee and on the House floor twice since I came to Congress. Far too many of our citizens, through no fault of their own, are in a daily struggle with severe hardships as a result of repeated upward surges in the cost of living. We can no longer ignore those working men and women who suffer most from the effects of inflation. And increasing the minimum wage so that it will be more profitable to work than go on welfare will be the only way to break the welfare cycle.

## 1974 CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

## HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, each year since I was selected to Congress and took office in 1967, I have submitted to my constituency a list of questions and solicited their responses to questions regarding matters which I think are of national importance.

This year, as in the past, I sent to all the households in my district the following questionnaire.

It is my intention, after all of the replies are received, to tabulate the results. I will then inform my colleagues of the feeling of my constituents with regard to the above questions.

A letter to the district constituents and the questionnaire follow:

SPRING, 1974.

DEAR FRIEND: The second session of the 93rd Congress is now underway. As your Congressman, I solicit your views on matters which I probably will be required to vote upon this year.

As I have done, each year since coming to Congress in 1967, I am submitting to you, and to each household in my Congressional District, my annual questionnaire.

Our system of government thrives on participation by all our citizens. I value each and every response received, and I would, therefore, like to make it possible for you to respond without incurring the cost of postage. Unfortunately, I do not have the funds to personally pay your postage, but you may, if you wish, deliver your response to my district office at 440 South Andrews Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Florida and my staff will personally deliver it to me.

As soon as the results are tabulated, I will release them to the Florida news media. I will also have the results printed in the *Congressional Record* for my colleagues to read, and try to include this information in one of my future newsletters to you.

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to my questionnaire.

Very truly yours,

J. HERBERT BURKE,  
Member of Congress.

CONGRESSMAN J. HERBERT BURKE'S 1974 CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

(NOTE: Yes or no answers for husband and wife.)

1. The President has been under attack from various quarters. Do you feel the President should:

- A. Resign?
- B. Be impeached?
- C. Remain in Office?

2. Campaign reform is essential to help prevent future campaign abuses. Do you favor:

- A. Limiting campaign spending?
- B. Limiting individual campaign contributions to a fixed amount?
- C. Public financing of campaign costs?
- 3. To help cope with the energy crisis would you favor:

- A. Developing new forms of energy?
- B. Increased gas costs?
- C. Relaxing regulations on emission control devices on new automobiles?
- 4. Do you favor our support of Israel?
- 5. The following are proposed tax reforms, which, if any, do you favor?

- A. Elimination of the oil depletion allowance?
- B. Extending to all unmarried individuals

the full tax benefits of income splitting enjoyed by married individuals?

C. Revisions of the graduated income tax to give relief to low income people?

D. Elimination of tax free bonds?

6. Do you favor federal regulations of interstate condominium and real estate sales?

7. Should wage and price legislation be re-enacted if the present law is allowed to expire?

8. Year-round Daylight Savings time was enacted last year. Would you favor repeal of this law?

## OPTIONAL

Do you have any party preference? Republican; Democrat; Independent.

Age? 18-21; 22-30; 31-45; 46-65; over 65. Are you a Veteran? Yes; No.

If you are a Veteran, which of the following applies? W.W. I; W.W. II; Korea; Vietnam.

## STATEMENT OF U.N. SECRETARY GENERAL WALDHEIM AT THE CLOSING OF GENERAL DEBATE AT THE SIXTH SPECIAL SESSION ON RAW MATERIALS AND DEVELOPMENT

## HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, at the end of general debate at the United Nations' special general assembly conference on raw materials and development, Secretary General Kurt Waldheim offered a brief statement of his impressions of the discussions. In doing so, he described the meetings as providing a "vivid picture of the world economic situation." He emphasized, however, that "No one has any illusions about the difficulties which will be encountered, or the efforts which must be made to combine and shape these proposals into agreed policies and plans of action, which will be the foundation of a new world economic order."

In conclusion, Mr. Waldheim stated his five major observations of that historic meeting.

I believe the Secretary General's views deserve the thoughtful consideration of each Member of the House. Therefore, I am inserting the text of his remarks:

TEXT OF STATEMENT BY SECRETARY-GENERAL KURT WALDHEIM AT CLOSING OF GENERAL DEBATE IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY

For the past two weeks, the General Assembly has conducted a debate of remarkable scope and depth on the most pressing and fateful issues of our time. The high level of representation in the Special Session has been matched by the quality and substance of the interventions. It is no exaggeration to say that this Special Session is an unprecedented event, not only for the United Nations but for the world community.

We now have before us a vivid picture of the world economic situation seen from many different points of view and an extraordinary wealth of constructive proposals. No one has any illusions about the difficulties which will be encountered, or the efforts which must be made to combine and shape these proposals into agreed policies and plans of action, which will be the foundation of a new world economic order.

All over the world, the proceedings of this Special Session have been followed with extraordinary interest. The world expects, and

anxiously awaits, the first concrete steps which this Assembly will take to deal with the emergency situation which, in one way or another, now faces all nations. The anxiety and expectation of the world community is heightened by the undoubted fact that, quite apart from the medium and long-term problems which confront us, the fate of millions of people may well depend, within the next few months, on what this Special Session does, or does not do.

As I said in my opening statement, the perspectives of different nations or groups of nations vary enormously. Certainly that observation has been amply borne out by the general debate. But the debate has also, and perhaps more significantly, demonstrated a striking degree of agreement among Member States on a number of important aspects of the problem before the Assembly. Clearly, the debate has provided the substance for a process of negotiation, coordination and harmonization which will endure beyond the week of the Special Session which remains to us.

At this stage in the work of the Session, however, after following the debate with the closest attention, I feel that a summary of my main impressions might be helpful in formulating the decisions which are necessary both for immediate action and for continuing expeditiously the vital work which this session has initiated. The following observations are made with full respect for the positions of Member Governments as stated in the course of the debate, and in full cognizance of the strenuous efforts being made in the *Ad Hoc* Committee to formulate a declaration of principles and a programme of action.

First, no one could have failed to be impressed by the range, the relevance and the seriousness of the general debate, illustrating dramatically the undeniable interdependence of the many issues which must be tackled in the evolution of a new world economic order. It is imperative to maintain the momentum which this debate has generated and to agree on the principles which will give it direction.

Second, it is imperative to provide now financial and other assistance to those Member States placed in the greatest jeopardy as a result of recent violent economic changes and great natural disasters. Individual Member States and groups of States have undertaken steps bilaterally, collectively, and through international organizations to meet some of these needs. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund and the other members of the United Nations system are also striving to do all they can to help. However, all these efforts are not enough. A potentially disastrous gap continues to exist between minimum needs and the resources so far made available to meet those needs. It is imperative that we take steps to mobilize greater resources before this Special Session ends.

Third, it is imperative to effect the speedy transfer of the necessary assistance to those Member States most in need, and also to make arrangements to monitor continuously future needs and responses to those needs from the world community. The United Nations system stands ready to act as catalyst and clearing-house for everyone's efforts, and would be willing to act in whatever manner and through whatever mechanisms the General Assembly may decide. I wish to emphasize that any arrangements made by the United Nations system would be complementary to those made by individual Member States and groups of States.

Fourth, it is imperative to recognize that the developing countries must earn more to pay for their imports, and that they still depend on commodities for the greater part of their export earnings. To the extent that progress could be made on this basic prob-



lem, progress could be made in ameliorating the acute financial crisis to which I have just referred. In the past, international efforts have failed to produce significant overall results in the field of commodity agreements. Today, however, and more than ever before, it is in the interests of both producing and consuming countries to initiate, during this Special Session, acting which will lead to the resolution of this problem.

Fifth, and finally, it is imperative, as I have said, that the momentum generated by this Special Session should be maintained. The basic problems so courageously and constructively faced by this Assembly will increase in complexity and intensity over the coming months. It follows logically that the sooner realistic international policies can be established and effective action taken to implement those policies, the sooner it will be possible to move from our present dangerous defensive position to one where bold and positive action can be taken to establish a new economic and social order for the benefit of all of mankind. Whatever the outcome of the Special Session, some relatively simple and effective arrangements must be made to ensure continuity and follow-up.

The Administrative Committee on Coordination, which consists of the heads of all the agencies, organizations and programmes of the United Nations system, met here at United Nations Headquarters last week. The members of this Committee, including the heads of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and of the International Monetary Fund, asked me to inform this Assembly of their readiness to make available immediately the services of their institutions in order to facilitate and support any action within their competence that may be taken by the General Assembly. Recent experience has shown the usefulness of the United Nations system in focussing many forms of assistance to the maximum effect in dealing with a critical situation.

I believe that this Special Session will prove to have been a truly historic meeting. My main concern, which I know is shared by all of the distinguished representatives in this Hall, is to get the maximum of agreement, the maximum of effective decisions, out of the few days of the Session that remain. If upon the adjournment of this Session we know where we are going, if we have begun to face up to the most urgent needs, and if we have made the necessary arrangements to follow up what has been done here, then this session will indeed prove to have been a turning point in world affairs.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS OF THE SPANISH SPEAKING

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary will conduct a hearing on the Federal employment problems of the Spanish speaking. On Monday, May 6, 1974, Mr. Irving Kator of Civil Service Commission will present the most recent statistics on Spanish-speaking employment in the Federal Government, agencywide and Mr. Edward Valenzuela will testify on behalf of IMAGE, a Spanish-speaking employee's group.

The hearing on May 6 will commence

CXX—772—Part 9

at 10 a.m. in room 2226 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. Persons wishing to submit statements for the record may write to the Judiciary Committee, 2136 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

#### DIESEL TAX SUSPENSION

### HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, with another possible nationwide independent truckers strike tentatively scheduled for May 13, with all the adverse economic effects it could bring to all segments of the country, I am today reintroducing the Emergency Diesel Fuel Tax Suspension Act with additional cosponsors.

In addition to the original cosponsors, I am pleased to announce that the following Members have joined in support of this legislation which I believe is as urgently needed today as when it was first introduced last February: Mr. ALEXANDER of Arkansas; Mr. BADILLO of New York; Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina; Mr. DELLUMS of California; Mr. FULTON of Tennessee; Mr. STARK of California; Mr. VANDER VEEN of Michigan; and Mr. VIGORTO of Pennsylvania.

This now brings to 21 the number of cosponsors of this legislation.

Previously, the following Members joined as cosponsors: Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House to which this legislation was referred; and Mr. TIERNAN of Rhode Island; Ms. ABZUG of New York; Mr. BROWN of California; Mr. EDWARDS of California; Mr. MILLER of Ohio; Mr. PEPPER of Florida; Mr. RIEGLE of Michigan; Mr. SEIBERLING of Ohio; Ms. SCHROEDER of Colorado; Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey; Mr. WALDIE of California; and Mr. WHITEHURST of Virginia.

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

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

It is reassuring in this regard that a number of colleagues have indicated their continued concern with this problem by asking to cosponsor the legislation which I introduced initially last February 7 and reintroduced again on March 14. I believe this interest shows the responsiveness of Congress even where the problem has become subsurface and no longer commands immediate public attention.

The legislation would suspend collection of the Federal tax on diesel fuel

for 6 months tied to a freeze at January 15, 1974 price levels.

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

In addition, the fact remains that the problem—spiraling diesel fuel costs—has not and will not go away at any early date.

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

Because of the continuing nature and seriousness of the problem and the threat of another nationwide strike, I continue to invite additional cosponsors and to urge consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### GREAT LAKES WATER LEVELS CONTINUE UNCHECKED

### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the March, 1974 monthly bulletin of Great Lakes Water Levels published by the National Ocean Survey of the U.S. Department of Commerce has been published. As usual, it shows that the millions of Canadians and Americans that live in the Great Lakes basin still face enormous problems and will continue to face them for an unknown amount of time.

Each of the Great Lakes is significantly above their "long term averages," the best factor to use in comparison of the incessantly fluctuating levels. The Bulletin shows these statistics:

Lake Superior—5 inches above long term average;

Lakes Michigan-Huron—19 inches above long term average.

Lake St. Clair—32 inches above long term average;

Lake Erie—32 inches above long term average; and

Lake Ontario—14 inches above long term average.

Mr. Speaker, with water levels at these heights, the Great Lakes are nothing but a catastrophe waiting to happen. Even a mild storm can whip the waters to a fury that knows no bounds—natural or man-made. Beaches and sand bars that previously helped dissipate the tremendous force of wind driven waves have long since been eroded or drowned under the additional water. Elaborate manmade measures, constructed at the cost of millions of dollars, have been reduced to underwater piles of broken concrete and rusting reinforcement after only several heavy Great Lakes storms.

Our propensity to spend moneys on shoreline protection structures is an expensive treatment of the symptoms of

the high levels of the Great Lakes, but it unfortunately does nothing to cure the causes of those symptoms. While millions are being spent on protection, most of it is for naught; practically nothing is being done to prevent high water levels from occurring or reoccurring.

It is interesting to note in the water-level statistics above that two of the Great Lakes, Lake Superior and Lake Ontario, were much closer to their long-term averages than the other three "middle" Great Lakes. Both Lake Superior and Lake Ontario are equipped with regulation facilities. These facilities allow control of water outflow and thus provide an important measure of regulations not available to the other lakes. Although there obviously are limits to the amount of water that can be discharged—depending on downstream water levels, weather conditions, and so forth—control facilities on each Great Lake would mean the water-level problems could be treated as a system-wide situation.

Such a system-wide control would allow low-level lakes to accept a small amount of water from upstream high-level lakes, thus creating an equity in water-levels arrangement that would benefit all the lakes in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues, and particularly those Members from the Great Lakes States, to give consideration to installation of such controls on the middle lakes—three would be required, one on the St. Clair River below Lake St. Clair and north of Detroit, another south of Detroit on the Detroit River's path to Lake Erie, and a third on the Niagara River between Lake Erie and Ontario.

While we are currently in the midst of close-to-historical high water levels, middle lake control facilities can also serve to prevent low water levels that have caused an equal amount of damage and concern in other years. As recently as 1964-65, our complaints were that the Great Lakes did not have enough water. Boats were grounded, beaches were turned into unusable expanses of mud, and inter-lake commerce was severely crippled.

Middle-lake controls would allow us to prevent the natural discharge of water from lakes facing water shortages during those periods.

The cost of such facilities would be expensive. Maj. Gen. Ernest Graves of the Corps of Engineers, in his testimony before the House Subcommittee on Water Resources in April, 1973, estimated adequate control works could cost about \$350 million. But what are the consequences of continuing to follow the treat-the-symptoms-only arrangement?

The State of Ohio estimates that the disastrous fall storm of 1972 caused \$22 million in damage and resulted in seven Ohio shoreline counties being declared disaster areas.

An equally devastating storm over the Great Lakes Basin in the spring of last year caused more heavy damage. High waters, wind, and wave action caused \$12 million damage in Chicago alone within only a 5-month period.

The second highest water levels in history were in the spring of 1951. Damage estimates for that period amounted to \$61 million according to the National shoreline study. In that same storm, the Corps of Engineers estimated that a recurrence of a similar storm in the same Great Lakes shoreline region would cause a minimum of \$120 million in property damage. That figure does not include consideration of the development that has occurred on the shorelines since the end of that period of enormous destruction in 1952.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, millions of dollars of private and public money is spent on programs to halt the shoreline erosion that the exceedingly high water causes. Private citizens often spend thousands of dollars apiece in what usually turns out to be fruitless attempts to save their land and homes. Railroad ties, poured concrete, truckloads of broken cement and sandbags, have all proven to be at best only short term deterrents to the wrath of storm driven high waters.

Clearly, we must give middle lakes regulation serious consideration as the one way in which we can halt the continuous disastrous cycle of high and low water levels.

#### "CHANGING INFLUENCES IN AMERICAN EDUCATION," AN ARTICLE BY WILBUR COHEN

### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the wisest and most experienced spokesmen for education in our country is the Honorable Wilbur J. Cohen, former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and now dean of the school of education of the University of Michigan.

I believe that Members of the House will read with interest the thoughtful address delivered by Dean Cohen at the 26th annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education on February 22, 1974 in Chicago, Ill.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of Mr. Cohen's remarks:

#### CHANGING INFLUENCES IN AMERICAN EDUCATION<sup>1</sup>

(By Wilbur J. Cohen)

In preparing my remarks for this occasion I had recurrent conflicts as to whether to develop my views as a professor concerned with such issues as the improvement in the quality of teaching and the learning process and changing faculty-student relationships; or as a dean concerned with institutional relationships involved in recruitment of faculty, students, and money, promotions, salary increases, and the teacher surplus; or should I discuss issues from the standpoint

<sup>1</sup> Delivered at the 26th Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, February 22, 1974, Chicago, Illinois.

of a former Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare interested in the fascinating process of federal education legislation; or as a former Undersecretary to John Gardner interested in developing the Office of Education into a model of excellence; or as a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare concerned about national priorities and policies in education and the respective roles of the federal, state and local governments in financing, administering, and improving what has now become a \$100 billion a year educational system that involves about 7 percent of the Gross National Product.

Because tomorrow morning you will be hearing from my distinguished colleague and friend, Elliot Richardson, it occurred to me that it might be appropriate to discuss some current issues on which Mr. Richardson and I have had identical experiences. We were both Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Acting Secretary, and Secretary of H.E.W. Irrespective of differing policies and views, however, no one who has shared these three responsibilities can fail to have some sympathy and understanding for the other.

Mr. Richardson was an outstanding Secretary of H.E.W. under great handicaps. I wish he were still there.

#### THE CURRENT SCENE: APPROPRIATIONS

The federal situation in education is currently somewhat more favorable than it has been in the last five years. The President's legislative and budgetary recommendations for education are now in a more constructive direction. The largely negative and restrictive approach of the Executive Branch in earlier years at last has been superseded by a more cooperative approach toward Congressional views.

My own opinion is that this sharp turn-about is due largely to Watergate—in the sense that the President now believes it necessary to be more cooperative with the Congress as a countermeasure to the resignation-impeachment campaign.

The five years in which Congressman Perkins and his colleagues, such as John Brademas on the House Committee on Education and Labor and Senators Williams, Pell, and Javits on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, have withstood the pressures from the Executive Branch have at last paid off. Likewise, the unwillingness of the Subcommittee on Appropriations under the Chairmanship of Representative Daniel Flood and Senator Warren Magnuson to accept the Executive Branch's cutbacks in federal education and health appropriations have been important factors in making this turnabout a reality.

To this factor I must add the vigorous opposition of the NEA and the ACE and their affiliates, and the opposition of the Committee on Full Funding of Education Legislation.

Many of the Administration's budget recommendations for education are still disappointing in my judgment.

Although the Budget requests \$37.9 million for the Head Start program—an increase of 10 percent over this year—according to the Budget this is only to keep up with inflation and is not an increase in the 379,000 children served by the program.

If this policy of taking account of inflation were followed in other education programs, it would have meant increases for other programs. But the Budget cuts \$150 million from aid to libraries, reduces assistance for construction of college and university facilities; cuts the funding for foreign language training and area studies; eliminates aid to land-grant colleges; reduces federal support of the training and development of university teachers; and provides zero funding for university commu-



nity services, State Post-Secondary Education Commissions and veterans' cost of instruction programs.

I urge my fellow deans and faculty colleagues to interest themselves in the specific appropriation requests and urge individual members of the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees to make education a higher priority in the Federal Budget.

There are 10 members of the House Subcommittee and 13 members of the Senate Subcommittee. This gives an opportunity for deans and faculty members in more than a hundred schools to participate in influencing a major redirection of national policy.

#### THE CURRENT SCENE: LEGISLATION

The President has also receded from his advocacy of the Better Schools Act and has indicated his willingness to work with the Congress in a more cooperative manner in revising the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Both the House and Senate Committees have formulated revisions which are still under consideration.

Action in the House and Senate will probably take place during the coming months. I am optimistic that the legislation will include a number of improvements. But each of us should follow closely the discussions and be ready to give our recommendations and revisions if needed.

In reviewing the proposed legislation I made one small observation. At no point in any of the provisions are the schools or colleges of education recognized as a focal point of value, or importance. I believe the institutional importance of schools of education should be recognized in some way in federal legislation. Unless and until we convince federal and state legislators and administrators and federal and state lobbyists that we represent an important institutional, academic, intellectual, faculty, student, teaching, learning system, we will continue to be treated as second class in the university and in budgetary priorities at the federal and state levels.

If we believe we have something to contribute, if we believe we have more to contribute, I believe we must find a way to dramatize our concern about improving the quality of teachers and teaching, the importance of our programs, and our willingness to work with all the parties involved in educational policy.

#### INEQUALITIES AMONG THE STATES

Now let me turn from the immediate to the longer run. A major factor affecting the future of education in the United States is the wide range of financial resources, personnel, and services among the 50 states. The state with the highest per capita income is about twice that of the lowest state. Personal income per child of school age also varies by more than two to one. State and local tax yields vary by nearly sixty percent. Per capita state expenditures for all education varies among the states by four to one. Public school graduates as a percentage of ninth graders four years previously range from sixty percent in one state to ninety percent in another—a fifty percent variation. Median school years completed also varies by about one-third from nine years to twelve years.

The educational potential of many children is clearly affected by these variations as well as by variations in health and medical conditions. Infant mortality varies among the states by more than two to one; physicians and dentists in relation to population by about three to one. Welfare aid per child varies even more widely—over five to one.

These variations are portrayed in 132 ranked items of state data, published each year by the National Education Association in a useful report entitled *Ranking of the States*. This is one of the most significant statistical reports affecting the future of our

nation; it raises the fundamental question as to whether we can permit the continuation of such conditions on the basis of political boundaries.

The need for raising the educational, health, and social services in those states with lower levels of performance must become a major focus of national policy during the coming years. State "rights" must not continue to be the excuse for perpetuating state "wrongs." An intelligent national policy of reallocating financial responsibilities among various programs can help the states and localities to meet their responsibilities more effectively. At the same time we must increase local participation in improving the quality of services and their accessibility, effectiveness, and flexibility to meet a variety of needs.

Such a national program would involve:

1. Transferring the financial and administrative responsibility for cash payments for the welfare of children and the working poor from the states to the federal government, along the lines recommended by President Nixon and supported in 1972 by Secretary Richardson and Senator Ribicoff;

2. Establishing a national health insurance system covering everyone, along the lines recommended by Representative Martha Griffiths of Michigan, Senator Edward Kennedy, and numerous other members of Congress, which would reduce the mounting burden on the states for the financing of Medicaid;

3. Redirecting federal revenue sharing to (a) encourage and require states and localities to deal with education, health and other public services on a wider metropolitan basis, (b) reduce the property tax as a major element in financing education.

4. Increasing substantially the federal funding of education programs of great national concern, particularly early childhood, vocational, community, and continuing education programs; programs for the disadvantaged, the handicapped, and the gifted; and research and experimental education programs.

5. Strengthening state and local social services which are directed toward improving human welfare, such as child welfare services, services for older persons, vocational rehabilitation, and community mental health services.

These five measures would do a great deal over time to reduce existing variations, discriminations, and inequities; they would make it possible for states and localities to spend more money, time, energy, and thought on improving the quality of education and other human services.

The interstate competition for keeping state taxes low (in order to obtain industries and jobs) must not be a factor in perpetuating substandard conditions in health, education, welfare, housing, and social services. Only truly nationwide policies on major universal programs can assure every child and every person of the constitutional guarantee of equal protection of the laws. This assurance should be our high priority goal by the 200 Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

Politicians who proclaim the advantages of states' rights, decentralization, and the greater wisdom of state legislatures over the National Congress, neglect the basic economic fact that competition among states and localities to keep down taxes has acted as an important factor in preventing the improvement of educational, health, and social services in many states and localities.

If we retain federal revenue sharing, we should make a greater effort to overcome the interstate competitive factor and to see to it that there are some minimum standards which should be met in every state.

A case in point are the proposals for minimum standards for state unemployment insurances. After nearly 40 years, many States

still do not have a minimum desirable level of benefits. It is clear that only federal legislation can assure each state that it will be able to meet the standard in relation to other states' competitive tax situation.

Likewise, the movement for federal standards in state workmen's compensation is a vital need after 65 years of such state laws.

Two important questions—and objections—usually arise from the issues I have just discussed. The first is: where is the money going to come from, and won't increased federal and state taxes stifle incentives and restrict the options of individuals in utilizing their incomes as they think best? The second is: doesn't greater reliance on the federal taxing power lead to centralization, the abuse of power, invasion of privacy, and the wider impact of errors?

On the cost and tax question, let me say that educators need to take a more effective leadership role in advocating the closing of tax loopholes in our federal tax system. An additional \$10 to \$20 billion a year in federal revenues could be raised by closing tax loopholes.

Another \$10 to \$15 billion a year could be obtained by the elimination of waste and low priority programs in the Defense and Agriculture Departments.

And \$10 to \$20 billion a year additional in tax yields could become available from the technological and other growth factors in the economy.

We clearly should be able to direct more resources to education, health, and welfare by a longer-range plan which makes human services a higher priority than they are now in our national, state, and local budgets.

As for the questions related to centralization, privacy, and options, I can only say that there is no substitute in laws or in institutions for the policy that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. We must continue to depend on the freedom of the press, a multiple political party system, academic freedom and tenure, and the independence of higher education and the judiciary.

#### SOME EDUCATIONAL QUESTIONS

There are some specific controversial educational policy questions I would like to comment on.

I believe that a number of difficult educational problems could be handled better if we had fewer school districts. School district lines should not be drawn, retained, or gerrymandered to represent a single cohesive social, racial, or income group. We need a broader geographical, income, ethnic, and racial distribution in school districts. The organization of separate school districts by central city and suburban areas will in the long run help neither to save the central city nor the suburbs, but rather will lead to judicial intervention in order to assure carrying out the constitutional requirement of equal protection of the laws.

In this area of state responsibility, the State Departments of Education, the Legislatures, and the Governors, in my opinion, have been derelict by not taking leadership to redefine the boundaries of school districts in the light of urbanization and metropolitan development. This is a state function but the states have largely avoided it as well as other important areas of educational concern within the jurisdiction of state power.

Fortunately, the number of school districts has been declining. Educators, however, should help this process to proceed more rapidly, but more importantly to re-examine the boundaries and programs of school districts with a view to making them more consistent with economic, political and social realities and needs. This action will be vigorously opposed by various local power blocs, but this opposition should help to indicate the importance of the change.

Another area of vital concern is the need to reexamine the importance and function

of the so-called "neighborhood school," a concept derived from earlier and simpler days. Why should a handicapped or gifted child go to a neighborhood school which does not have the specialized talent and resources to meet the child's needs? Why should every neighborhood school try to be a replication of other schools? Why not try for diversity and allow families to select schools which meet their needs whether the schools are in or out of the neighborhood?

I am concerned and not enthusiastic about the various voucher proposals which are being discussed and experimentally implemented. I believe they could create a breakdown of public responsibility for education and encourage racial, ethnic, and social class segregation. But if school systems gave parents a limited and periodic choice of schools within the community and tried to offer different patterns of educational emphasis, we could probably retain a system which emphasized both quality and diversity.

We should also give serious consideration to lowering the compulsory school-attendance age and at the same time making carefully supervised real work opportunities available to youth, beginning at age 14. There are many problems in this kind of proposal, but there are also difficult problems in continuing our present emphasis on compulsory education and on schools as a place of incarceration, serving a custodial function during the period of adolescence.

I would prefer to emphasize the role of schools in community and lifetime continuing education. If some people drop out of school at age 15, let us entice them back at age 25, 35, or 45 by making educational facilities and resources convenient, attractive, and necessary. The fact of the matter is that many of today's dropouts from schools and colleges are talented and highly creative persons who are frustrated and alienated, not only from the schools but also from teachers, principals, parents, and community values.

This prompts me to suggest that we allow some individuals to leave secondary school before four years if they pass appropriate examinations which would entitle them to a graduation certificate. What is so sacrosanct about four years for a high school certificate?

Individuals in both secondary school and college should be able to fulfill a substantial number of course requirements by passing written examinations. Why hold students back to meet requirements they can satisfy? Let them concentrate on areas in which they need more personal attention, time, and study.

#### CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

The general purpose of these provocative and controversial remarks is to urge the deans, department heads, and faculty members to take a more affirmative role in moulding national policies affecting education.

My experience during the eight years I was in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare convinced me that deans of schools of education and their faculties were not very noticeable, influential, or articulate in federal educational policies.

I now think they could and should be more influential. They have a perspective and an experience which should be a more meaningful input into educational policy.

The deans of medical schools are a model we could follow. They make their views known. They are forceful, persistent, and vocal.

As a first step in this direction I suggest we press for legislation to provide federal and/or state institutional grants to schools of education with more than a certain number of students. I think this would bring us the attention and experience we need to move ahead.

I think that those of us in schools of education must take a major leadership role in developing new policies for the future. Im-

portant changes in our political, economic, and social institutions are underway. We must be prepared for major changes in the way we handle energy, water, air, and human creativity.

#### THE U.N. CONDONES MURDER

#### HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the Security Council of the United Nations has chosen to condemn Israel for her April 12 raid into Lebanon. That punitive expedition was made after three Arab terrorists made their way into a settlement in northern Israel at Qiryat Shemona, and butchered 18 noncombatant civilians, including a number of women and very small children. Their crime was to be Jews living in range of these terrorists. This is not the first time such an atrocity has been perpetrated. Nor, regrettably, shall it be the last.

Israel, aware that retaliation against the government allowing murderers to mount such efforts from its territory was imperative, sent a military expedition across the Lebanese border to destroy part of the sanctuaries utilized by these groups. Lebanon has been amply warned in the past that such retaliation would follow that kind of attack. The whole world knows Arab terrorists utilize these shelters as bases for mounting offensive operations.

Israel has become the subject of a peculiar international double standard. She is attacked by surprise by the Arabs in October, while her people observe the holiest day of the Jewish year. Yet the world largely cheers the Arabs on. Terrorists hijack planes and murder Israeli civilians, and the world calmly watches, saying nothing. Murderers committing these crimes blithely walk the streets of a dozen Arab capitals, while as many European nations allow those captured after perpetrating these crimes to walk away unscathed from any and all efforts to punish them.

On all this, the United Nations, posing as both setter and observer of international standards of morality, places its imprimatur. This latest action is almost as violent as the actual atrocity against Israeli civilians the U.N. chose to ignore. It is to the shame of our own country that we chose to go along with the Security Council's condemnation of Israel.

It is utterly vital for us to place the U.N. in perspective, rather than to merely rail against the obvious hypocrisy and immorality of this latest action. The average person in this and many other countries has had it drummed into their head that somehow, in spite of all errors, the U.N. in some manner symbolizes international honor, integrity and decency. Many an apologist for this organization will deprecate such acts as this, offering the excuse that in the end, and after all, the United Nations is "man's best hope." To any intelligent observer this kind of logic is of course fraudulent.

It is essential for us to place the U.N. in perspective, noting that its official condoning of international acts of murder and terror is a further danger to world peace and order it claims to seek. By setting itself up as a moral guardian, the glib, well-meaning and blind believer are encouraged to place a misguided faith in this basically fraudulent organization. The menace to the entire world emerges in the form of a false reliance on this body.

Let us say that, still reposing some element of confidence in it, we allow the U.N. to assume some significant role in "keeping the peace" in some extremely volatile future international situation. Inevitably there will emerge some challenge to its role, such as Nasser's demand that U.N. buffer forces remove themselves from the area between potential contending forces. We all remember that Nasser's demand of U Thant in 1967 was acceded to by that man, directly encouraging Nasser to set in train the very events culminating in the 1967 war. It can almost be predicted with certainty that in some future situation the U.N. will do what it deems politic or what will serve the interests of its true clients, such as the so-called "third world and non-aligned nations." These countries are often client states of the Soviet Union, or, in the case of the Arabs, intent upon serving more short term selfish interests at the expense of Israel or some other target country. International morality as such, becomes a tool to serve national or regional expediency. That, by itself, is not surprising, because again, most observers know the U.N. has increasingly become such a creature.

However, to continue to repose misplaced faith in it, and to encourage masses of well-meaning people to share that belief, is to set the stage for tragedy of a massive order. If the great powers are intertwined in such a dispute, as they are today, the potential exists for world calamity. It is therefore vital that the United Nations be examined and judged by us as an undertaker would examine a corpse: with few illusions and minimal expectations.

The U.N. is a tool for nations seeking American money at the expense of American interests. It will mute its hatred and championing of anti-American interests temporarily at contribution time. The U.N. is far more attuned to international socialism as the Soviet Union expresses it than to any form of parliamentary democracy. It is institutionally anti-Western and acts accordingly, and our support for that organization is an active contribution to those forces which seek an end to the United States as we know it. By assailing our few real allies, such as Israel, the U.N. aids the cause I believe it supports. For us to delude ourselves that this is not the case is to indulge in destructive self-delusion.

Surely, when the U.N., as it did in this recent condemnation, acts as callously as the League of Nations did toward Ethiopia, we can delude ourselves no longer. If Jews are to be subjected to



an ages-old anti-Semitism in a relatively sophisticated form, then it is up to us to at least understand that our Nation is being subjected to a similar double standard. Let us strip away the rhetoric of world peace, see the U.N. for what it is, and treat it accordingly.

If Israel and a number of other dues-paying nations were to leave that body, it would be effectively crippled. Not to do so leaves it viable and able to continue its masquerade, in turn guaranteeing worse betrayals in times to come.

#### SUMMER FUEL USE GUIDELINES

### HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased at the action of the House today in passing the conference report authorizing the establishment of an independent Federal Energy Administration. I believe this legislation reflects the general recognition of the House that our energy problems, though alleviated somewhat in recent days since the lifting of the Arab oil embargo, will remain with us in varying forms and degrees of severity well into the future, and that the Nation needs to plan now for its future energy requirements.

Particularly, I am pleased that the authorizing legislation includes intact an amendment I offered on the floor when this bill was first before the House with respect to obtaining clear and comprehensible indications from the Energy Administrator of the amount of fuel expected to be available for summer vacation use by citizens.

The uncertainty which has surrounded summer vacation planning has badly hurt the tourist industry not only in my own State of Florida but all regions of the country.

Recently, the Federal Energy Office has finally moved to recognize the problems faced by the tourist industry and citizens alike who have been uncertain how far they could hope to travel this summer on their vacations, or whether they could travel at all. Mr. Simon recently gave general approval to going ahead with summer vacations and indicated specifically, for example, in connection with my own State, that travelers need not shun their customary summer Florida vacations. Creation of a special tourism advisory panel by FEO, though much belated, represents another welcome step toward recognizing the clear need to alert citizens generally about the suitability of travel during the upcoming summer months.

Hopefully, passage of the conference report today with the tourism amendment I offered will further prod the Energy Administrator to indicate with additional precision the suitability of summer travel and assist citizens in planning their vacations.

The amendment provides that—

Not later than 30 days after the effective date of this act, the Administrator shall issue preliminary summer guidelines for citizen fuel use.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the new Federal Energy Administrator will comply with this provision to the fullest and issue such guidelines in as much detail as possible, and hopefully will not wait until the full 30-day period allotted by the provision expires, given the lateness of the time and the fact that summer is already fast approaching.

The tourist industry in my State and other States has been badly affected already by the uncertainty that continued for so many months and the lack of guidance available from the Federal Energy Office. With the lifting of the Arab embargo and clear indications of the amount of fuel available for citizen use this summer, there should be no further delay in removing the psychological obstacles to travel that may still exist because of lingering uncertainty or confusion.

#### NATIONAL COAL POLICY

### HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, this week the House of Representatives will be asked to approve significant modifications in our Nation's clean air laws in order to facilitate the greater utilization of coal in both manufacturing processes and in electrical power generation.

I fully support the establishment by this Congress of a "national coal policy." In a country which has a supply of coal of up to 400 years, burning oil and gas to produce electricity is shamefully wasteful. But we must not convert to coal so quickly and recklessly that this and future generations of Americans will pay the horrible price of increased emphysema, lung cancer, and other respiratory diseases which are associated with the high levels of sulphur dioxide and other pollutants which will be spewed into the air if we allow coal to be burned without regard to the proven public health threat of uncontrolled plant emissions.

Unless this country is faced with a critical energy shortage that is an immediate and substantial threat to worker's jobs and our Nation's national security, there can be no defense for the adoption of an inflexible policy that would endanger American's health. To adopt such a policy would be to run the risk of trading the "energy crisis" for a "health crisis."

The danger of such a health crisis was pointed out by Charles G. Watson, M.D., in a recent column in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. Dr. Watson argues that:

Relaxation of air pollution standards and/or passage of legislation to compromise enforcement of these standards can only jeopardize the community's health.

I recommend that all my colleagues study carefully Dr. Watson's persuasive

analysis. His statement, which has won the endorsement of the Allegheny County Medical Society's Committee for Environmental Problems, could not be more timely.

Dr. Watson's statement follows:

ENERGY CRISIS COULD BECOME HEALTH CRISIS  
(By Charles G. Watson, M.D.)

The current "energy crisis" has spawned a complex array of challenges to our society.

There is endless comment about the necessity to convert from low sulphur fuels to relatively high sulphur fuels because of relative availability. The cost of energy is rising sharply, and there are considerable pressures on lawmakers to compromise existing obtainable standards of environmental quality.

It is unfortunate that the fundamental question of the community's health has received little exposure in the public forum. Unquestionably, air pollution beyond a certain degree has a significant effect upon human health. At what point does this occur, and who is susceptible?

To answer these, we must recognize short-term effects (for example, the effects of an air pollution "episode" upon a person suffering from asthma) and long-term effects (such as the effects of chronically polluted air upon an entire community after decades of exposure).

Short-term effects are easily identifiable and can, in part, be measured. Long-term effects are insidious, intertwined with other environmental and constitutional factors and, by and large, immeasurable. Some data have come from the experimental laboratory. Most have come from observations of the health status of a community acutely or chronically exposed to known pollutants—epidemiologic data. (Epidemiology is a science that deals with the incidence, distribution, and control of disease in a population.)

In 1969 and 1970 the federal Environmental Protection Agency brought together all available experimental and epidemiologic data and, on the basis of these, established air quality standards for the individual pollutants found most commonly over our cities. They identified 24-hour standards, levels of pollutants that could safely be exceeded in a community only once a year, and annual standards, the safe upper limits of an average of daily pollutant concentrations throughout one year. Each state was mandated to achieve these air quality standards by May 31, 1975.

In Allegheny County, we have a comprehensive monitoring system which measures those two pollutants which locally have the greatest effects upon health, namely particulate matter and sulphur dioxide ( $SO_2$ ). Seven monitoring stations operate through the three river valleys. Their data are expressed in terms of an air pollution index, issued for each monitored community and, as an average of the values obtained from the seven stations, for the county.

The index was designed so that a level of 100 (first stage alert) would correspond to the federal 24-hour air quality standard, the level that may be exceeded in any one locale only once per year. Similarly, an index of 25 corresponds to the federal annual air quality standards. According to the health effects criteria adopted by the federal government, the average of 365 consecutive daily air pollution indices in Allegheny County or for any one of its individually monitored communities must be less than 25. As mandated by the federal Clean Air Act, our county must meet this standard by May 31, 1975.

What has received scant publicity to date is that the average composite index for the county for the preceding 365 days has ranged between 45 and 50 for the past year. And during the past year we have had several pollution "episodes" in which the county index has exceeded 100. Expressed in more relevant

terms, levels of particulate matter and sulphur dioxide in the county are significantly in violation of existing federal standards, standards based upon existing reliable health effects data.

And while sulphur dioxide concentrations in the county have fallen over the past year, particulate matter concentrations continue to rise. The annual index, therefore, has remained almost twice as high as the federally accepted safe upper limit of 25.

Relaxation of air-pollution standards and/or passage of legislation to compromise enforcement of these standards can only further jeopardize the community's health. The asthmatic or individual with significant chronic bronchitis or emphysema is usually well aware of the effect of an index of 100 upon his or her breathing.

The effects of chronically polluted air upon a healthy individual are far more insidious and unpredictable. This we must all be aware of. This must be the sole premise underlying the establishment and uncompromising enforcement of safe air quality standards.

The "energy crisis" must not be permitted to become a potential "health crisis" by weakening or failing to enforce existing effective and well-thought-out environmental legislation at county, state or federal levels.

## POLLSTERS CANNOT COUNT ON PUBLIC

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since more than any other American city in the country, Washington, D.C., specifically the Government establishment, greets every public poll with intense interest, I believe that thorough review of the techniques of pollsters might be in order.

A column by Orv Lifka, editor of the Suburban Life, a publication serving Cook County, Ill., treats the subject of pollsters in a fascinating fashion in the April 25 edition of the newspaper.

The article follows:

POLLSTERS CAN'T COUNT ON PUBLIC  
(By Orv Lifka)

Professional pollsters are nibbling nervously at their pencils because Washington isn't the only place where questions are going unanswered these days.

According to the opinion takers, an increasing number of queries made at American doorsteps are floating away untouched, like soap bubbles in the breeze.

They fail to realize that more questions are being asked, as the teenager complained about his parents. Furthermore, many of the answers rest with the pollsters themselves, if they are doing any resting.

When a poll taker approaches a citizen he may fire the first shot, like Syria on the Golan Heights, but he's only inviting a reciprocal barrage. "Who are you? Why should I tell you anything? Do you know that our Doberman pinscher is right behind you, and he hasn't been fed today?"

By answering just these three questions the pollster is bound to improve the national average.

Their bosses could help by asking some questions of themselves: "How long is the American public going to hold still for this stuff? Are these intrusions appreciated, as the man said when he poked holes in the hornets' nest? How did I ever get into this racket anyway?"

The average American's life is a quiz show without prizes. He isn't up more than ten minutes before someone asks how long he's going to be in the bathroom. At the breakfast table his wife asks whether he mailed the letter she gave him yesterday and if he knows he just dribbled egg yolk on his shirt.

No sooner has he backed his car onto the street than someone asks where he learned to drive. On reaching work he's hit with "Did you forget that we start at 8:30?" and "Who left the half-eaten cheese sandwich on the switchboard?"

When he goes to lunch the waitress wants to know how he wants his hamburger, what kind of dressing he prefers for his salad, his choice of beverage and how he expects her to live on 15 cent tips.

Home once more, he's given some multiple choice questions by his helpmate: Does he want to eat before she tells him what Junior did? Would he like to try fixing the basement water pipe himself, or should they call the plumber right away?

Television poses a raft of questions ranging from selecting the programs to commercials asking whether the wavering picture isn't due more to his stomach distress than the termites in the set.

Taking all these things into consideration, as the tax assessor said when checking his house, it's no wonder he has no desire to play school with opinion surveyors. The question is how he managed to put up with them so long.

Gallup, Roper and others who fondly finger the public pulse may have to find other ways of learning what lurks in the hearts and minds of men. Perhaps they could give trading stamps; certainly their polls must have disclosed that this is another business that could use help.

They must realize by now that the world will never run out of questions. But nobody has all the answers.

DR. ALAN F. GUTTMACHER

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that we note the death of Dr. Alan Guttmacher last month. Dr. Guttmacher, obstetrician, gynecologist and author, is best known for his work in family planning and for his leadership of the planned Parenthood-World Population Federation.

Dr. Guttmacher worked to advance the right of the individual to control personal reproductive decisions and to alleviate the ignorance common in discussions of family planning. He believed deeply in spreading the word about birth control both here and abroad. It was during Dr. Guttmacher's years as president of Planned Parenthood that the United States saw the greatest growth in national programs to make contraceptive information available to all.

Though this outline of his professional career conveys only a distant impression of the man, Dr. Guttmacher's humanity is reflected in his writings and his competence by the organization he led. His life was spent in the intelligent service of those who wish more control over their lives, and his death is a loss to us all.

## CHAIRMAN MCFALL SPEAKS TO AERO CLUB

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Aero Club of Washington had the privilege, April 23, of hearing an outstanding address by the distinguished chairman of the House Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, JOHN J. MCFALL. As a member of this subcommittee myself, I enjoy serving with Chairman MCFALL whose efforts, like mine, are directed toward encouraging a climate in which our national economy can benefit through the continued healthy growth of the air transportation industry.

Chairman MCFALL's speech follows:

LEAVE YOUR PARACHUTE HOME

I appreciate the invitation to be with you this afternoon at your monthly luncheon.

At a recent hearing we were told that our nation's air transportation industry has moved out of its youthful and exciting era of providing a new transportation medium to a more mature phase of development. In taking this step, I hope this great industry has not lost the enthusiasm that has made it so great.

Clearly, our air transportation industry has matured rapidly. Within a few decades aviation has become vital to our industrial growth and overall national prosperity, as well as our national defense.

During this early development period, we in the Congress have worked with industry to achieve improved air transportation both domestically and internationally.

Domestically, the Airport and Airway Trust Fund has provided the funding mechanism to modernize our air transportation system. In the three years that I have been Chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, well over a billion dollars has been appropriated for airport construction and new facilities. Research funding has also been substantially increased. These efforts, I believe, are essential both to upgrade our existing system and to develop a system that will meet the challenges of the 1980's.

We have worked hard together for the promotion of aviation safety. As a result, our nation's safety record is unsurpassed by any other country in the world.

In the international arena, great progress has been made and, again, much of the credit goes to you people in industry. Today, most of the international air carriers fly American-made aircraft. Recently, the United Kingdom installed a NAS Stage A type system with U.S. made equipment. Other countries, including some behind the iron curtain, are interested in the modern air traffic control and navigational equipment and systems used in this country.

It is evident, in my judgment, that we have a highly successful, dynamic, and vitally important aviation industry. An industry that not only benefits this country but the world-at-large. It is also evident that this success has been achieved through the cooperative efforts of industry, Congress, and the Executive branch.

But while our accomplishments are great, we must not allow ourselves the luxury of complacency. If we are to keep the best aviation system and industry in the world we must maintain our efforts. That is why I supported a U.S. SST. That is why I recently approved the development of a preoperational aeronautical satellite. And that is why



I have opposed, and will continue to oppose, additional taxes or user charges which may place an unreasonable burden on aviation.

However, if we are to maintain our supremacy in air commerce, you in the private sector must also continue to do your part.

Our aviation industry has always been willing to take the initiative and move ahead with new technology. We were recently told that among our nation's railroad companies interested in one area of technology, there was a rush to be second for fear of being first. This rush to be second has never been a characteristics of our aviation industry—and I hope it never becomes one.

In some industries, problems are most typically dealt with by turning them over to the Government with a shrug of the shoulders. This has not been the case with the aviation industry. You have demonstrated the ability to turn adversity into advantage and problems into profitable service. And if new problems provide new challenges then you should feel very challenged indeed these days. Along this line, I would like to mention a few things which I feel industry should be considering.

Of immediate concern to all of us is the fuel problem. It may be mitigated to some extent shortly—but all of us should continue to be aware of the need to conserve. Considerations of the past were cost per mile, cost per revenue passenger, and so forth. But today the fuel situation impacts on aircraft manufacturers, air carriers, general aviation, and the traveling public. Clearly, industry must develop new ways to conserve fuel and still provide adequate service to the public.

Ground congestion is another thorn in the side of the traveling public. Many of our nation's airports need improved ingress and egress to relieve present peak-hour ground congestion. In many areas, off-airport access, although often not within the jurisdiction of the airport sponsor, still requires improvements to meet current and future demands. If we ever get a national transportation policy, hopefully, it will provide some guidance in the area of integrating the various transportation modes.

As I have said in the past, if we had an integrated transportation policy, we would know where to locate our transportation facilities. We would be able to project the use of airports, for example; and perhaps to deal with the problems of loading capacity and ground passenger service. We would be able to spread the passenger load more evenly—not only among airports, but among the alternate modes of transportation. We would have an important leg up on the problems of noise and congestion if we knew well in advance where we are going to put our new transportation facilities.

Today, industry and government are working hand-in-glove to improve the environment by reducing noise and air pollution. The public must be informed of the amount of effort going into this field. We must let them know what we have accomplished, and what we expect to accomplish in the near future, if we are to benefit from their cooperation and assistance. And without that cooperation and assistance, the continued growth of commercial air transportation could be endangered by the very ones whom it seeks to serve.

As you know, many of our present civilian aircraft were essentially spin-offs from the development of military aircraft of the future. We may not have this luxury for the aircraft of the future. Because of this, there is a need to determine what the civilian market will require in terms of capacity and performance in the future before further development work is performed. Neither the public nor industry can afford an Edsel-with-wings, any more than it can afford to ignore future aircraft development.

Both airport and air carrier operators can

work to improve the use of cargo transportation devices for the loading and unloading of wide-bodied aircraft, as well as the potential for sharing equipment, gates, and passenger transporters.

Air carriers should also be looking at flight schedules and gate usage practices to determine if added efficiencies can be introduced to reduce landside delays.

I realize that some of what I have discussed is not amendable to simplistic or rapid solutions. But the solutions are there. It remains for us to seek them out and develop them. In the contemplation of pressing problems we must be mature enough not to baffle and leave the American public stranded. We are counting on your competence and youthful enthusiasm to meet these challenges, and to keep our aviation industry in the lead throughout the world.

#### UNITED STATES SUPPORTS ISRAEL'S ENEMIES

**HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, when Arab guerrillas murdered 18 persons, mostly women and children, at the Israeli town of Kiryat Shemona, the United Nations was unconcerned. But when Israel reacted by striking the bases in Lebanon from which the Palestinian terrorists had struck, the United Nations was quick to condemn Israel.

There would be nothing new about this outrageous double standard were it not for the fact that for the first time it had the support of the United States.

Israel has long considered this country her truest and best and possibly her only friend in the community of nations.

The Nixon administration has shown exceedingly poor judgment in this matter. I am deeply disturbed by this action and the administration's seemingly headlong rush into Arab arms.

The Security Council resolution condemned Israel's raid against the guerrilla bases in Lebanon but was conspicuously silent on the question of what prompted that action in the first place—the Palestinian slaughter at Kiryat Shemona.

The United States did attempt to insert a reference to that attack in the resolution but was defeated 7 to 6. At that point, the United States should have vetoed the one-sided measure or, at the very least, have abstained from voting.

Other nations which might also have abstained as a form of silent support for Israel had the rug pulled out from underneath by the United States.

The result was, in the words of Israel's representative,

Another example of the bias and inequity which prevail in Security Council debate on the Middle East.

By voting for the resolution the United States sided with those nations who consistently have opposed Israel and have always condemned as wrong any actions Israel has taken to defend herself. This must be viewed as the best news the Arab guerrillas have had since they began their campaign of terror and murder.

The position of the Nixon administra-

tion could not possibly be more remote from that of the American people in this matter. It violates all standards of justice.

#### THE END OF A PAINFUL LESSON

**HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, hopefully, our Government—this Congress—has learned the painful lessons of Federal wage and price controls. After nearly 3 years of sustained effort, during which many of my colleagues and I warned that a controlled economy would inevitably result in shortages while failing to control inflation, we finally stand on the eve of the expiration of the authority for the implementation of economic controls, the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970.

The American people continue to suffer from the destabilizing effects of "economic stabilization," as reflected in a decline in real income and productivity for the first quarter of 1974 while prices have continued to soar at double-digit annual rates.

Such discouraging trends will undoubtedly be cited as evidence that some form of controls remain necessary to prevent runaway inflation. Nevertheless, the effort to perpetuate or to reinstate controls must by all means be resisted, for it is nothing but an attempt to avoid dealing with the real causes of inflation, which are the failure of the Federal Government to control expansion of the budget and the money supply. Business Week magazine of April 27, 1974, quoted an official of the Cost of Living Council as saying:

The program was a cover for highly expansionary fiscal and monetary policies.

It is time we stopped using economic controls to cover up the effects of irresponsible fiscal and monetary policies. There is no reason why the American people should continue to suffer from the failure of their Government to live within its means.

The article in Business Week is an excellent history of the effects of economic controls. I am inserting excerpts for the attention of my colleagues and strongly commend that they read the entire article:

[Excerpts From Business Week, Apr. 27, 1974]  
DID CONTROLS FLUNK THEIR FIRST PEACETIME TEST?

On a warm August evening 32 months ago, President Nixon startled the nation by proclaiming a "new economic policy," which abruptly scrapped his much-vaunted gradualist economic game plan and imposed a freeze on prices and wages. The move, coordinated with actions to float the dollar and cut taxes, clearly violated the President's own noninterventionist economic philosophy. But it seemed at the time a brilliant maneuver to dampen the fires of inflation while stimulating an almost stagnant economy.

Next week, America's latest experiment with controls is expected to pass into history, and few will mourn it. Yet in an age of relentless worldwide inflation, it would be both premature and politically naive to assume

that America's experimentation with incomes policies in general and controls in particular is ended. Indeed, Congressional Democrats this week were already talking of extending controls authority. An important precedent has been set, and the example of Western Europe suggests that once a country resorts to an incomes policy, it is very likely to pursue the same path again and again.

This makes it imperative for government policymakers to make a swift assessment of the value of the 1971-74 controls. Already several fundamental conclusions stand out clearly:

The longer a controls program is imposed, the more diminished its effectiveness. The initial shock can work wonders. But over the long pull, controls simply fight natural economic forces.

Peacetime controls are far more difficult to manage than wartime controls. It is simply a matter of motivation: It is easier to get cooperation when a nation is on a complete war footing than when it is at peace.

The newest economic factor undermining the success of even the best-planned controls program is the international—and multinational—nature of economic enterprise. In the controls program now ending, for example, it was repeatedly demonstrated that companies restricted by price constraints on the domestic market simply slipped out the side door and sold goods abroad. Meanwhile, affluent foreigners traded huge dollar holdings for scarce U.S. commodities.

In the light of these conclusions, it is no wonder that a vigorous debate is already under way among economists. While there is no simple division between conservatives and liberals, at least three separate schools of thought stand out:

*Opponents of controls.* "To the extent that controls suppress prices in one period, you induce the backup of demand and a disinclination to expand supply, which induces worse inflation down the road," says Alan Greenspan, a long-time advisor to the Nixon Administration and head of Townsend/Greenspan Associates. "Price and wage controls never work, period."

*In the middle of the road.* "To judge the controls program from what happened in the past year is like judging Jack Johnson fighting a bear," says Arnold Weber, a Carnegie-Mellon University dean who was executive director of the Cost of Living Council during the first freeze. "Controls worked well during Phase II, and I favor maintaining them now on a standby basis—to be used surgically on selective trouble spots in the economy."

*Proponents of some controls.* Social and political pressures, rather than purely economic considerations, suggest "the need to institutionalize some form of permanent prior review of price and wage increases," says Robert F. Lanzillotti, dean of the business college at the University of Florida in Gainesville and a former member of the Price Commission.

Such views show there is no single, sharply focused verdict to guide policymakers if government once again finds it must turn to an incomes policy. Nor is there any consensus on what goals the 1971-74 control program was supposed to serve. Controlling inflation, of course. But Marina Whitman, a member of the Price Commission during Phase II and later a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, believes that failing in that goal does not necessarily imply total failure. She says: "Though there is no clear evidence that the inflation is lower today than it would have been without controls, they may have enabled us to hold down unemployment, and that's a plus for the program." A CLC official puts it more pointedly: "The program was a cover for highly expansionary fiscal and monetary policies."

#### CONTROLS ONLY WORK SHORT-TERM, COST-PUSH

C. Jackson Grayson, Jr., dean of the business school at Southern Methodist University, headed the Price Commission from October, 1971, until it was disbanded in 1973 at the beginning of Phase III. He and Louis Neeb, the commission's executive director, have just finished a book about their Washington experience. In an interview with *BUSINESS WEEK*, Grayson takes a last look at the controls program and what can be learned from it.

*Q. Is it appropriate to abandon controls when inflation is accelerating as it is now doing?*

GRAYSON. Yes. Controls can only work a short while, and they work best in a cost-push inflation. They cannot handle a demand inflation or a supply inflation, which is what we have now.

*Why were controls undertaken in the first place?*

Because the President decided that the economy was about to recover. He wanted to assist that without having inflation. He was going to stimulate the economy. If people had felt that we were about to take off on another inflationary binge, then they would have acted to protect themselves. Wages would have gone up; prices would have been raised. Under these conditions, controls probably work better than at any other time. But you could see demand inflation coming near the end of Phase II.

*What is your general assessment of our experiment with controls?*

I hope that the nation has learned a lesson: that controls are not the only answer. They work under very limited conditions for a very limited time. We kept them on too long.

*How would you rate cooperation with the controls program?*

Very good throughout most of the program. The period in which I began to see it eroding was in Phase IV, when people progressively began to get disenchanted with the ability of controls to work. During Phases I and II, I think controls were more successful in holding down price hikes. Real earnings rose, and that means wages rose faster than prices.

*It is claimed that controls failed because the controllers never believed in them. What's your response?*

I disagree with Professor Galbraith and others that the best people to run controls are those who believe in them as a way of life for the economy. I think if you do that you are very likely to perpetuate the controls. I think it is better to put people in who want to get themselves out of the job.

*Do you have advice of officials who may design a future controls program?*

I would warn that any control program tends to move toward controlling returns on investment. We had that in World War II and to some extent in the Korean War. And that's a very dangerous direction, because it ends up beginning to make allocation decisions in society as to which industries get what return.

*What do you see ahead for inflation?*

I am very concerned that the inflation rate for years ahead is not going back to the levels of the early 1960s. There are too many inflationary biases in the economy, even with the dropping of controls. While there are going to be some leading wage settlements in the double digits, I don't see double-digit wage settlements across the entire economy. There are a lot of people trying to exercise restraint because they know that inflation is self-defeating. The problem is that wages are not now going to be coupled to productivity; they will be coupled to prices.

*Will we see a return to controls?*

I really fear that this is going to happen,

that the nation will be weary of inflation, trying to keep up, each person ineffectively protecting himself. We'll begin to think, well maybe this time we could do it differently—better. If they go in at the right time, they will have a little impact. But they will probably stay in too long again and we will probably end up worse off than when we started.

*Do we need some kind of standby controls authority?*

Absolutely no. The only way that you get price decreases is if business doesn't worry that it is going to get slammed when it lowers prices. If businessmen think that authority is there waiting, like a sniper's rifle sitting over the economy, they might not lower their prices sufficiently.

*Could you sum up your experience with controls?*

Yes. Here is a poem written by A. A. Milne, called *The Engineer*:

Let it rain! Who cares?  
I've a train upstairs,  
With a brake which I make  
From a string sort of thing,  
Which works in jerks,  
'Cos it drops in the spring,  
Which stops with the string,  
And the wheels all stick  
So quick that it feels  
Like a thing that you make  
With a brake, not a string . . .  
so that's what I make  
When the day's all wet.  
It's a good sort of brake  
But it hasn't worked yet.

#### OUR PRESENT ENERGY SHORTAGE

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, I recently came across an interesting and useful article in the November/December, 1973, issue of the *Sierra Club Bulletin* which I would like to share with all my House colleagues. "The Crisis We Won't Face Squarely," by Robert Entwistle, provides a clear analysis of the roots of our present energy shortage—our unchecked demand for energy.

Despite evidence to the contrary that should have served a strong and forceful warning, the United States, over the past decade, has acted as if it had an ever-increasing supply of energy. Our annual increase in energy consumption over the last 10 years has been 5.4 percent. Our rate of demand for electricity alone increases even faster, at the rate of 7 percent annually. A Department of Interior study projects that while per capita use of electricity was about 2,000 kilowatt-hours in 1950 and 7,800 kilowatt-hours in the year 1971, at current rates of increase the per capita consumption will reach 32,000 kilowatt-hours by the year 2000.

Mr. Entwistle argues convincingly that we cannot afford to base our society's future on a belief in infinite energy resources. Last winter's energy crunch and the continuing fuel shortages indicate how finite those resources actually are. We must squarely face the "real" energy crisis—the crisis of demand.

Then we must take strong, immediate steps to change our Nation's patterns of energy consumption. This is our only recourse.



Mr. Entwistle's article follows:

THE CRISIS WE WON'T FACE SQUARELY

(By Robert Entwistle)

NOTE: Graphs are not reproduced in RECORD.

A country that runs on oil had better run fast.

Alfred Toynbee has suggested that civilizations rise because of some fortunate set of characteristics and usually fall from an excess of those same characteristics. These days, the average American uses more energy in a week than a man living 150 years ago used in a lifetime. Our production and distribution of cheap energy is far beyond anything known before in history. Cheap energy in huge quantities is at the root of our affluence—and may be at the heart of our imminent demise.

Since 1945 our domestic consumption of oil has been rising at the rate of 5.4 percent a year, and this pattern of exponential increase shows every sign of continuing. Yet in 1971 our domestic extraction of oil, which had been following the upward trend of demand and use, suddenly stopped increasing.

The oil supply crisis is bracketed between our geometrically increasing consumption and the plain fact that we are in the first stages of running out of domestic oil supplies. We mistake the real problem when we talk about a shortage of oil, for what we are actually facing is a consumption rate far in excess of a rational oil budget.

There is little that we can do to increase our oil supply. Exponentially increasing oil importation is almost certainly fiscally unsound and politically undesirable, while new sources of refinable fuels will be economic (and environmentally acceptable) only some years in the future. But the most frightening aspect of this problem is the continued silence of the federal administration in the face of national confusion about the cause of the oil shortage. It is as if the administration did not trust the American people to know the truth.

There is strong evidence that much of our oil consumption is more a habit of consumption than something essential to our affluence or standard of living. We will argue (with the support of the President's Office of Emergency Preparedness) that an all-out "crash" program of oil conservation is our best hope, perhaps our only hope.

#### THE OIL CRISIS DEFINED

The United States has six percent of the world's population, nine percent of the world's oil reserves—and uses 49 percent of the world's energy. That said, it should not be surprising to see the tremendous gap between our consumption and extraction rates that is illustrated by chart A. In 1971, our rate of domestic extraction no longer matched our rate of consumption. The extraction rate, in fact, leveled off, and it is expected to stay at 1971 levels for the next 15 years or so before starting to drop sometime after 1990. Consumption, on the other hand, continues to rise at the rate of about 5.4 percent a year. This is caused partially by the rise in our population, but a far more significant cause is our steady increase in the per capita consumption of energy: year after year, Americans are using more and more of the stuff that feeds our technology. The difference between domestic extraction and consumption, then, is our "oil deficit." It is, simply, the difference between what we have and what we use.

That deficit is increasing at the rate of about 300 million barrels a year. The deficit for 1973 will probably reach 1.7 billion barrels. By 1981, the oil deficit will approximately equal every barrel of oil we can suck out of our own ground and tidelands. The paucity of our own resources is appalling. While oil companies recently have shown some urgency in getting at the oil off the west coast of Florida, for example, the sad

fact is that if we could obtain this oil all at one time it would be consumed in a little over four months. Similarly, the much-heralded Arctic oil reserves, the subject of so much antagonism lately between the oil industry and environmentalists, probably represents less than four years of a fuel supply. Such sources are far from solutions. There is no solution so long as the problem continues to be viewed in terms of meeting our growing levels of consumption. A survey of choices shows us blocked at every turn.

#### THE FALLACY OF IMPORTATION REVEALED

We may be able to alleviate the deficit for the next several years by increasing our importation of foreign oil. To think this is a solution, however, is a snare and a delusion, for importation is economically dangerous and ultimately self-defeating.

We spent the past 25 years teaching the world about economic diplomacy, and now there is some evidence that the Middle East states have learned. Not only have several of these states cut us off from their oil supplies altogether (although hopefully temporarily), several others have raised their prices to five dollars a barrel and the others are likely to follow. The effect of the probable rise in oil prices over the next several years is illustrated in Chart B. The cost of importing our oil needs could be as high as 15 billion dollars a year within five years.

This is ruinously expensive, obviously, but it has another effect which is more insidious—and damaging. We have had a negative balance of trade for some years now, and increasing prices for imported oils are not likely to help the situation. Our current high interest rates have helped maintain the value of the dollar, such as it is, on the international market by attracting foreign holders of dollars to investment in the United States—but some of these investments are possibly sinister in their implications, such as Japanese investors getting involved in the strip mining of American coal and the clear-cutting of American forests. We may ultimately find ourselves in the peculiar position of letting our non-oil resources get ripped off by the Far East so that we can afford to buy the oil resources of the Middle East.

If we insist on maintaining our present rising oil consumption rate, we will have to make some difficult compromise that might not be worth the cost. Attempting to solve the problem by exponential importation may require that we sell our economic soul—and even that solution would be temporary, since like our oil, our soil is probably finite.

#### OTHER SOURCES CONSIDERED

Two sources appear marginally feasible now. They are shale oil and the high-temperature reduction of coal (pyrolysis). There is some research now going on in shale oil, but with our conventional technology costs are still extremely high even considering the rising price of conventional oil. While leases are now being granted, the Bureau of Mines estimates that substantial fuel from shale oil is 10 to 15 years away, and the environmental effect would probably be profound. Under conventional methods, the extraction of shale oil would mean massive strip mining projects in Colorado and Utah. Ten times as much material has to be mined and processed to obtain the same amount of energy out of oil shale as compared with coal. And an enormous burden on water supplies would be placed on an area already short of water.

Coal pyrolysis is more promising. The Russians have reported moderate success, and our Bureau of Mines has been running a pilot plant for some years. Again, the process has a long way to go before it becomes competitive with present oil costs, with estimates varying between 8 and 15 years before substantial quantities of fuel can be produced.

Given the technological, environmental, and economic problems involved with shale

oil extraction and coal pyrolysis—not to mention the time it will take for either to become practical—we cannot reasonably consider them to be present solutions. They are just two more definitions of the problem.

#### THE HEART OF OUR DILEMMA ILLUMINATED

There is no way that this writer can detect to increase our oil supply to actually meet our ever-growing demand. As noted, there are a number of things we can do to maintain our present supply level for the next 15 or 20 years, perhaps even increase it slightly. But the real problem simply will not go away. That problem is the consumption rate, compounded by our increasing population and an increasing per-capita use of energy. It is clearly telling us, as it has been telling us for years, that we have been extracting oil at rates which were not in our long-range best interests. We apparently have chosen to ignore that lesson in the past; we cannot afford to ignore it any longer.

The information that we would begin to run out of oil in the early 1970's has been known for at least 25 years. But consider only the past 10 years, how we have reacted:

We permitted automobile efficiency to decline almost 9 percent.

We permitted our mass transportation systems to almost disappear.

We doubled our use of oil to produce electricity.

We spent almost \$50 billion on an interstate highway system.

Suppose we had taken just one of those highway billions and put it into the research for a truly economical 100 mpg personal transportation system; not only would this have saved us billions of barrels of oil, and improved our international economic situation by perhaps billions more, it could have cut our automobile emissions by more than half. Suppose we had put a couple more of those billions into modernizing the 19th-century technology of the railroads. Suppose we had put one of those billions into research that would have shown us how to use high-sulphur coal without pollution in generating plants, instead of oil.

The fact is that the choices we made with respect to energy were more often the wrong choices. We were approaching oil bankruptcy and we ignored the fact. We tended not toward an oil conservation policy, but toward increased use of energy-inefficient systems. This is well illustrated in the transportation sector.

We use 61.8 percent of our oil consumption, or 9.8 million barrels per day, for transportation. Have we made the most efficient use of our transportation technology in terms of conserving oil? In *Energy Trends and Their Future Effect on Transportation*, W. E. Mooz used the term "energy intensiveness" to describe the relative energy efficiency of the various transportation systems. (The data in the passenger sector are shown in figure 1.) Driving an automobile requires more than three times the energy of a bus, and 17.4 times more energy than riding a bicycle. In the typically congested urban situation a bicycle is about as fast as a car. The use of the airplane is growing faster than any other mode and illustrates that we are actually trending toward the lowest energy-efficient system.

FIGURE 1

Mode	Energy intensiveness, Btu-passenger mile	Percent of use
Airplane	7,150	9.3
Automobile	5,400	88.8
Train	2,620	7
Bus	1,700	1.2
Backpacking (2 mi/h)	906	Neg.
Walking (3 mi/h)	524	Neg.
Bicycle (8 mi/h)	310	Neg.

The automobile accounts for 4.6 million barrels of oil a day, or more than 29 percent of our total consumption. Since 1940 the energy efficiency of the automobile has declined from 15.3 mpg to 13.4 mpg because of increases in the weight of cars and the size of the motors. In 1973 that 30-year trend toward bigger and faster cars will require that we use 201 million more barrels of oil. That's a lot of oil for a sex symbol.

Anti-pollution devices will impose a further 15 percent decrease in automobile energy efficiency and increase oil consumption by 4 percent. But suppose we could double the energy-efficiency of cars? That would cut oil consumption by almost 15 percent and would reduce emissions very greatly. After years and billions of dollars worth of advertising, about the only way we have to change the big car habit is to recognize what big cars are really costing us and to add part of that cost to their price.

An annual tax, which would be zero for 30 mpg cars and gradually rise to \$1,000 for cars getting less than 10 mpg, could be an effective approach. If we imposed 10 percent of the tax next year and increased it 10 percent every year for ten years, we could effect a significant change in both oil consumption and air pollution. Bills now before Congress recognize the need for progressive taxes, but none of them imposes penalties adequate to force the swift development of more economical automobiles.

As Rogers Morton observed, present emission control regulations will be canceled out in ten years by the increase in automobiles. A 50 percent reduction in emissions could have a dramatic and long-range effect. It would save us billions in our foreign trade deficit, and save lives through decreased lung cancer rates.

The transportation of freight uses 3.3 million barrels of oil per day, or 21 percent of our total consumption. As shown in the table below, the patterns away from energy-efficient systems are almost identical to the passenger sector.

Mode:	Energy intensiveness B.t.u./ton mile
Airplane	63,000
Truck	2,400
Rail	750
Ship	500

Of the oil used for freight transportation, 60 percent is used by trucks, but they only carry 19 percent of our freight. The \$40 billion spent on the interstate highway program stands in stark contrast to the \$900 million doled out to the near bankrupt railroads in the same period. Clearly, the Highway Trust Fund amounts to a significant subsidy of the relatively inefficient trucking industry.

The long-range fact of the matter is that automotive and trucking fuel is almost a minor part of the problem. Indirectly, the automotive industry alone employs one in every seven people. The energy used to produce and support the automobile and truck is almost as large a part of our budget as the fuel. In 1968 the breakdown of automotive materials consumption appeared as it is shown below:

Item:	[In percentage] Gross market consumption
Steel	21.0
Aluminum	10.4
Lead	54.7
Nickel	14.3
Natural rubber	68.8
Zinc	36.5

Our oil problem is the first dramatic example of what Dennis Meadows was talking about in *The Limits of Growth* when he predicted a catastrophic decline in population as a result of exponential growth and the consequence depletion of raw materials. Automobiles and petroleum are the single

most dominant influence on both the American and the international economy and upon our usage of raw materials, and the great majority of our seemingly unregulated conservation problems can be directly traced to their influence.

#### A SOLUTION PROFFERED

Can we reduce oil consumption and general consumption without reducing our standard of living? Clearly "yes" if we measure affluence as a matter of "quality" rather than "quantity." I would guess that almost a hundred billion has been spent on production/consumption advertising in the past 25 years. General Motors alone spends a quarter billion a year. Most of this incredible fortune has been spent to convince us that "newer," "bigger," and "more powerful" would improve our masculinity, sexuality, and social standing.

Consume we did. But I doubt that the advertising has done much more than reduce our complaints about the absence of alternate values. The key question reduces to, "Can we make our powerful industrial complex serve the long-range needs of the people?"

Part of the answer to date lies in the strange energy-related faction of the Administration. This is compounded by the presence of a detailed study by the President's Office of Emergency Preparedness outlining energy conservation measures which they estimate would reduce consumption 30 percent over what would be projected at present levels of increase. Chart A shows the effect of oil conservation measures suggested by the OEP beginning in 1971. However, that date is long past. Also shown in Chart A is the effect of the same mild conservation measures (home insulation, car pooling, etc.) starting in 1975. The same intensity of effort toward conservation has a lower effect because consumption has continued to increase. The procrastination means that through 1990 the consumption deficit will be 16 billion barrels worse or the conservation effort must be more intensive.

Why does the Administration procrastinate? Why does the President tell us "drive slower and have faith in free enterprise?" The impression is that it is explained either by an unwillingness to face reality or an overawareness of that \$61 million in largely industrial campaign contributions, or a little of both. In any event, the interests of the American people are being poorly served.

The warnings about our energy consumption levels are now coming home to roost. We are well along in the first stages of running out of oil, and there is very little we can do if we maintain the present increasing level of consumption.

The short-range question asks if we can make the transition from our assumption of an unlimited supply of oil to the realistic position of living within a declining oil budget. Can we make that transition in an orderly fashion, seeing it as an opportunity, or will we resist reality and produce economic chaos? We taught ourselves and the world the affluence produced by a production/consumption society. Now can we lead the world toward the acceptance of quality rather than quantity, toward population control and an economy that serves the people while living within a rational natural resource budget? And the answer is: If we want to.

#### TWENTY-FOURTH CENTURY CLUB

#### HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you and our colleagues in the

House of Representatives will agree with me that periodic newsletters and questionnaires are an essential means of keeping our constituents abreast of our legislative activities and also serve to keep us informed of their views and concerns. As you know, there is an expense involved in this kind of communication for which there is no congressional allowance. Therefore, in order to provide for the cost of constituent-information mailings, my supporters have formed the "Twenty-Fourth Century Club" to establish an operating fund. The club operates as a trust, and the treasurer and assistant treasurer are the trustees of the account. None of these funds are disbursed to me directly and no disbursements are made to cover any personal expense to me. All funds are applied to public information activities to benefit all the voters in the 24th Congressional District. The club does not have a political campaign purpose, and the funds which are solicited and received by the members of the club are kept in an account separate from any campaign activity. I want this information to be made public and I am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that purpose at this time. The following is a letter sent by the chairman of the Twenty-Fourth Century Club to the entire membership with a complete statement of receipts and expenditures.

The letter follows:

TWENTY-FOURTH  
CENTURY CLUB,  
Arcadia, Calif., April 15, 1974.

To the MEMBERS,

Twenty-Fourth Century Club:

This organization was founded for the purpose of funding Congressman Rousselot's Voter Information Program, of which his Washington Report is the principal increment. The Twenty-Fourth Century Club operates as a trust for the benefit of all the voters in the Twenty-Fourth Congressional District of California. Mr. Joseph M. Crosby, Treasurer, and Mr. Clark J. E. Hunt, Assistant Treasurer, are the principal trustees of Club funds. Mr. Crosby is president of California Liquid Fertilizer Company, and Mr. Hunt is a California certified public accountant (retired).

Enclosed you will find a financial report up to December 31, 1973, showing both receipts and disbursements as well as the funds on hand at the ending date. As can be seen from the enclosed report membership dues are the backbone of this program.

We are grateful to all those members who participated in the initial year of the Twenty-Fourth Century Club by paying their dues for 1973. If you have not renewed your membership for 1974, will you please send in your \$100.00 dues now?

Very truly yours,

DONALD E. BUTLER, Chairman.

Twenty-Fourth Century Club, statement of receipts and disbursements, year ended December 31, 1973

#### RECEIPTS

Membership (86 (a) \$100 each)	\$8,600.00
Miscellaneous small contributions	3,183.50
Transfer from Washington Report account	3,444.43
Interest received	173.79

Total receipts..... 15,401.72

#### DISBURSEMENTS

Preparation and printing of Washington Report	3,070.92
Preparation and printing of membership appeal	1,806.16



Miscellaneous printing.....	\$149.49
News media subscriptions.....	225.00
Press clipping service.....	161.60
Professional services of research assistants, etc.....	1,371.63
Miscellaneous supplies and expense.....	363.24
<b>Total disbursements.....</b>	<b>7,148.04</b>

## CASH ON HAND, DECEMBER 31, 1973

Wells Fargo Bank—account 0616-010492.....	4,827.76
Lincoln Savings & Loan Association—account 10-142455.....	3,425.92
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>8,253.68</b>

We certify that the above information is complete and correct for the entire period of the existence of the Twenty-Fourth Century Club from its beginning up to December 31, 1973.

JOSEPH M. CROSBY,  
Treasurer.  
CLARK J. E. HUNT,  
Assistant Treasurer.

## ABOUT FUTURE COST OVERRUNS BY PENTAGON

## HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon is attempting to cover up millions of dollars in future cost overruns by juggling the financial data used to prepare quarterly reports to Congress on the status of new weapons.

I have publicly released an internal Pentagon memorandum which outlines the efforts to blame more and more cost increases on inflation. The memorandum orders changes in the preparation of the selected acquisition reports—SAR's—which are approximately 10- to 15-page reports provided each quarter to the 4 congressional committees which oversee Pentagon spending. The SAR report is the principal document used on Capitol Hill to check the progress or troubles of new Pentagon weapons.

The change involves increasing the amount of each cost increase that would be considered inflation. At present, a system of "then year" dollars is used to account for cost increases. Under this system, the cost of changes such as correcting technical problems or schedule delays are expressed in the dollars of the year the particular change occurs.

Under the new proposed system outlined in the Pentagon memorandum the cost of all changes will be expressed in the so-called base year constant dollars plus inflation from the base year to the year the change occurs. The "base year constant" dollar will be the value of \$1 in the year when the first estimate of the cost of the new weapon was made.

Generally speaking, changes occur several years, or as many as 10 years after the first estimate of base year constant dollars are calculated. But all changes will be expressed under the new proposal in "constant base year" dollars

plus inflation no matter when the change and resulting cost increase takes place.

Thus, if a change resulting from mismanagement, a schedule change or correcting a technical foulup occurs today, the cost of the change will be calculated in constant base year dollars of the first year an estimate was made, plus an inflation charge.

The net impact is to make inflation appear to be the largest single cause of the cost increases.

One difficulty with the new system is that it will make it more likely that the program manager will make costly program changes since a great deal of any change will be considered inflation.

There are already too many pressures on project managers to make program changes now and with this new system, program managers are even more likely to make expensive changes.

Technological problems such as new innovations as well as problems with contractors currently create pressure on project managers to make changes. Change orders coming at the right time can save a contractor who is in trouble because the cost of the contract is increased due to the changes. The whole system is known as "contract nourishment."

Mr. Speaker, this new system is very unrealistic and designed consciously to mislabel cost overruns as inflation even though many cost increases are directly the result of the Pentagon's foulups. All cost charges should be calculated on the basis of the best estimate or then-year dollars. The decision to make a change which costs money can only be calculated on the basis of what the change really costs today—not what it could have cost some years ago. This way cost overruns can be properly separated from inflation.

Take the hypothetical case of a new missile on which an estimate was first made in 1968. The missile misfires in tests in 1974 and needs extensive redesign, then the change is calculated in 1968 dollars plus inflation. But, this change occurred in 1974. Using 1968 dollars is a phony, irrelevant measure in which large inflation or escalation allowances disguise the true cause of the cost overruns. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that this change was a deceptive accounting trick that will make cost overruns appear to be a thing of the past, even though they are continuing unabated.

Certainly inflation is a real factor affecting costs, but it cannot become a catchall for all miscalculations and mismanagement.

These proposed changes have been under consideration since last November when a committee chaired by an official of the Department of Defense's Comptroller's Office and representatives of the military department was formed. The memo which I have released is the result of the committee's work. One thing is clear: some military officers would clearly prefer to scrap the SAR report.

One military officer told a member of my staff that the SAR was "redundant" and duplicated other information provided to Congress.

The stage was set for change after Secretary of Defense Schlesinger pub-

licly expressed dissatisfaction with the current format of the SAR report in congressional testimony. Schlesinger told the House Armed Services Committee on February 7, 1974, that—

The present composition of the SARs, the selected acquisition reports, presupposes a degree of clairvoyance for the Department of Defense we cannot pretend. We do not know what the strategic situation will be 8, 10, or 12 years from now. We cannot tell you for sure whether the number of F-15's, to be procured should be 750, 600 or 1,500. That depends on the evolution of the strategic conditions and development of alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, I do wish to endorse one decision contained in the Pentagon's memorandum which requires outlining various future inflation factors based on inflation rates of 2, 4, 6, and 8 percent. Given the instability of our economy the calculation of the ranges of possible future inflation in a sound proposal.

The SAR report was originally initiated in 1967 by former Pentagon Comptroller Robert Anthony. The earlier SARs covered only eight major new weapons systems. In February 1969, Senator JOHN STENNIS asked the Pentagon to compile a similar report on all new major weapons systems.

Today the Pentagon, on a quarterly basis, sends to Congress approximately 45 reports on individual systems which outline costs, schedules, and technical characteristics of each system. Problems of new weapons usually come to the attention of Congress through the SAR report.

At present, according to Pentagon regulations any new weapons which cost \$50 million for research or \$200 million for procurement should be included on the SAR reporting system.

The memo follows:

## SELECTED ACQUISITION REPORTS (SAR)

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARATION OF PROGRAM ACQUISITION COST AND COST VARIANCE ANALYSIS SECTIONS

A. Program Acquisition Cost Section. This section will be prepared in accordance with the format shown in Enclosure 1 but will continue to reflect the data element breakdown currently reported.

1. Development Estimate (Column 1). Enter as the baseline estimate the Planning Estimate (PE) or Development Estimate (DE) whichever is applicable for the particular system. Also, head the column appropriately. Enter the program cost for Development, Procurement (in terms of total and the data element breakdown currently reported), and Construction in constant base-year dollars with the year of PE/DE approval as the base year. Enter the amount included in the PE/DE for escalation as Economic Change. Complete and label total lines as shown in Enclosure 1.

2. Changes (Column 2). For appropriation totals and the escalation amounts only, enter the cost variance between the PE/DE and the CE. Escalation changes will be distributed between Economic Change as defined in Enclosure 3 and escalation related to all other variance categories.

3. Current Estimate (Column 3). As at present, reflect the best current estimate of the Program Acquisition Cost, with the composition of that estimate completed in the same manner as described in paragraph 1 above for the PE/DE, except that program change related escalation will be shown separately.

4. Unit Costs. As at present, divide the procurement quantity into the procurement

cost and the total quantity into the Program Acquisition Cost for the Procurement Unit Cost and Program Unit Cost, respectively, and enter these unit costs in the applicable PE/DE and CE columns. Use the breakdown between Development and Procurement Escalation shown in the Cost Variance Analysis for both the PE/DE and the CE to compute the unit costs less escalation and those with escalation included.

5. **Funding.** By appropriation, enter that portion of the TOA (including escalation) for the current and prior fiscal years, programmed for the budget year, and required to complete the program.

6. **Estimates.** Identify the annual rate assumed in the PE/DE for escalation for the entire program period. Identify also the annual rate and total amount assumed in the CE for future escalation applicable to the "To Complete" segment. Then, in the table which follows, enter the changes to the CE which would result from alternative rates for future escalation. Thus, if one of these rates was selected in lieu of the rate assumed in the CE, the latter would be adjusted by the amount shown for that rate.

B. **Cost Variance Analysis.** This section will be prepared in accordance with the format shown in Enclosure 2. As at present, it will continue to quantify and explain the cost

variances between the PE/DE and the CE. However, the cost variances will now be classified and reported according to the categories listed and defined in Enclosure 3, and as indicated therein, escalation associated with each variance category will be reported in that category but separately identified in the Escalation column. Thus, all other cost data as reflected in the Development, Procurement, and Construction columns will be expressed in constant base-year dollars. The remarks should explain concisely but completely the cause and circumstances of each change.

1. **Development Estimate.** Enter in the appropriate columns the applicable costs reflected in Column 1 of the Program Acquisition Cost section.

2. **Previous Changes.** For each variance category, enter in the appropriate columns the cost variances between the PE/DE and the CE which represent changes through the previous submission. Economic changes will be entered in the Escalation and Total columns only and will reflect escalation attributable solely to Economic Change as defined in Enclosure 3. For all other types of changes listed, the escalation associated with each variance category will be identified and reported in the Escalation column. It is recognized that due to the lack of adequate

source records, it may be difficult in the case of some older programs to make an accurate distribution, by category, of the escalation associated with Previous Changes. In these instances, all of the escalation variance may be entered as Economic Change, subject to OASD(C) approval for the particular program.

3. **Current Changes.** For each variance category, enter in the appropriate columns the cost variances between the PE/DE and the CE which represent changes reported in the current quarter. Economic changes will be entered in the Escalation and Total columns only and will reflect escalation attributable solely to Economic Change as defined in Enclosure 3. All Escalation changes including those associated with variance categories other than Economic which are the result of a revision in the current quarter of the assumed escalation rate previously used in the "To Complete" segment of the CE will be reported as Economic Change.

4. **Total Changes.** Enter the total of the previous and current changes.

5. **Current Estimate.** Enter the applicable costs reflected in Column 3 of the Program Acquisition Cost section. The Development Estimate line (1 above) plus or minus the Total Changes line (4 above) must equal the Current Estimate line.

E-XX

[Dollars in millions]

	(1) Development estimate (fiscal year 1970-fiscal year 1979)	(2) Changes	(3) Current estimate (fiscal year 1970-fiscal year 1982)	Funding	Current and prior years	Budget year	To complete	Total
Program acquisition cost				Development.....	\$222	\$100	\$53	\$375
				Procurement.....	75	173	2,479	2,727
				Construction.....				
				Total.....	297	273	2,532	3,102
Development.....	\$282	\$27	\$309	Quantity:				
Procurement.....	1,490	342	1,832	Development.....	14			14
Airframe.....				Procurement.....		50	829	879
Engines.....				Total.....	14	50	829	893
Avionics.....								
Etc.....								
Construction.....								
Total, less escalation.....	1,772	369	2,141					
Escalation:								
Economic change.....	591	238	829					
Program change related.....		132	132					
Total escalation.....	591	370	961					
Total cost.....	2,363	739	3,102					
Quantities:								
Development.....	14		14	Escalation rate				Dollar
Procurement.....	729	+150	879					(millions)
Total.....	743	150	893	2 percent.....				-370.0
Unit costs:				4 percent.....				+80.0
Procurement:				6 percent.....				+461.1
Less escalation.....	2.04	.04	2.08	8 percent.....				+941.2
With escalation.....	2.78	.32	3.10					
Program:								
Less escalation.....	2.38	.02	2.40					
With escalation.....	3.18	.29	3.47					

## COST VARIANCE ANALYSIS—BASE YEAR: 1970

[Dollars in millions]

	Base-year dollars				Escalation	Total	Remarks
	Dev.	Proc.	Const.	Subtotal			
Development estimate.....	\$282	\$1,490		\$1,772	\$591	\$2,363	
Previous changes:							
Economic.....		+12		+12	+21	+21	
Quantity.....	-15			-15	+4	+16	
Engineering.....		+66		+66	+21	+87	
Schedule.....							
Etc.....							
Subtotal.....	-15	+78		+63	+46	+109	



	Base-year dollars				Escalation	Total	Remarks
	Dev.	Proc.	Const.	Subtotal			
Current changes:							
Economic.....					+\$217	+\$217	
Quantity.....		+\$249		+\$249	+97	+346	
Engineering.....	+\$42			+42	+5	+47	
Schedule.....		+15		+15	+5	+20	
Etc.....							
Subtotal.....	+42	+264		+306	+324	+630	
Total changes.....	+27	+342		+369	+370	+739	
Current estimate.....	309	1,832		2,141	2961	3,102	

1 \$54 dev., \$537 proc.

2 \$66 dev., \$895 proc.

#### VARIANCE ANALYSIS CATEGORIES

Program Acquisition Cost variances should be identified separately for development, procurement, and construction. The cost variances should also be classified according to the categories specified below. Escalation associated with each type of change will be identified as a part of the change but also separately identified as escalation. However, changes in escalation associated with variance categories other than Economic will be reported as Economic when such changes result from a revision in the assumed escalation rate previously used in the "To Complete" segment of the Current Estimate.

a. *Quantity Change.* A change in quantity, either of the entire system or a major component thereof, to be procured. The cost of such a quantity change will be computed in terms of the cost-quantity relationships and learning used in the Baseline estimate. Consequently, that portion of the current price attributable to change in other categories will be excluded.

b. *Engineering Change.* An alteration in the physical or functional characteristics of a system or item delivered, to be delivered, or under development, after establishment of such characteristics.

c. *Schedule Change.* A change in a procurement or delivery schedule completion date or intermediate milestone of development or production.

d. *Economic Change.* A change due solely to the operation of one or more factors of the economy. This includes changes from the Baseline estimate for escalation after considering escalation experienced to date and a revised assumption on future escalation. This does not include escalation associated with other types of changes except as indicated in the underlined portion of general guideline above.

e. *Unpredictable Change.* A change by Acts of God, work stoppage, Federal or State law changes or other similar unforeseeable events. Unforeseeable events include extraordinary contractual actions under the authority of P.L. 85-804, except that formalization of informal commitments should be reflected under the other categories, as appropriate, and not included under this category.

f. *Contract Performance Incentives.* A net change in contractual amount due to the contractor's actual performance being different than was predicted by performance (including delivery) incentive targets; as differentiated from cost incentive targets; established in a Fixed Price Incentive or Cost Plus Incentive Fee Contract. This category also includes any changes in amounts paid or to be paid a contractor due to (1) award fee contract or (2) the sharing provisions of a value engineering incentive clause included in any type of contract.

g. *Contract Cost Overrun (Underrun).* A net change in contractual amount over (under) that contemplated by a contract target price (FPI contract), estimated cost plus fee (any type cost reimbursement contract) or redeterminable price (FPR contract), due to the contractor's actual contract costs being over (under) target or anticipated contract

costs, but not attributable to any other cause of cost growth previously defined. Offsetting profit or fee adjustments attributable to cost incentive provisions, if any, shall be considered in determining the net contract cost overrun (underrun).

h. *Estimating Change.* A change in program cost due to a correction of error in preparing the Baseline estimate. These include mathematical or other errors in estimating. Excluded from this category should be revisions of cost estimates that occur because of other change categories, i.e., engineering, schedule, etc. For example, a cost change which occurs because of the addition of a new warhead is an engineering change, and not an estimating change; a revised production schedule is a schedule change, not an estimating change.

#### FIRST CONVICT THEN TRY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, nationally syndicated columnist Nicholas von Hoffman certainly does not qualify as a superfan of the President.

Therefore, I was rather intrigued with his remarks in a column in the Wednesday, April 24, Chicago Tribune's "Perspective" section.

Since the House Judiciary Committee, in receiving further funds for its operation this afternoon, gave assurances of "impartiality" as the closeness of a possible vote on impeachment approaches, it behooves all Members to maintain their objectivity and political impartiality.

I commend Mr. von Hoffman's article to the Members for serious consideration. FIRST THEY CONVICT NIXON, THEN THEY TRY HIM

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

WASHINGTON.—A congressman was overheard, the other day, saying in tones of angry laughter, "We're going to impeach his ass. We're going to do it."

He's right. We're going to do it, altho nobody will quite know why. In the case of President Andrew Johnson, policy as well as pride and personality were involved. Nixon's policies, such as they are, would never get another man impeached. Nevertheless, one senses the decision has been made and that some time in the next year or so, if not sooner, Nixon will be impeached, convicted, and thrown out onto the sidewalks of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Your daily newspaper will carry a picture of the rear end of the moving van, and a caption will explain that some of the van's contents may become tax-deductible gifts.

None of this has to do with whether or not there are enough votes in the House of Representatives to do him in now. Before too long there will be. But the formal process of legal impeachment has to wait upon a kind of informal social impeachment, whereby the man is stripped of the reverence, protections, and deference with which we treat our Presidents.

He has to be tried, convicted, disgraced and expelled before he is formally accused.

That goes against our much-quoted dictum that a man is innocent until proven guilty, but such is our awe of the Presidential office that we can't lay rough, legal hands on its occupant, unless we are already certain of his guilt. The process is terribly unjust to Nixon, who can't possibly get a fair trial, but it will preserve the kind of monarchical Presidency that we dote on.

To accomplish this, Nixon must be turned into a pariah before the House Judiciary Committee recommends his impeachment. We have a thousand devices for that. Until a few months ago, any American President could have sent the IRS his American Express slips and doodles on April 15th and gotten a pass.

But now under the dispensation of impeachment, Nixon is going "to be treated like everybody else." A President is only treated like everybody else when he is on his way to being turned into a non-President.

You strip Nixon of the golden aura of potens et majestas by having galloping poll takers bounce around the country, asking if we think the President should be impeached. An even better example is a recent Harris Survey that ran in one paper under a headline reading: "Public Believes Dean over President."

The wording of the question itself would have laid Harris open to charges of blasphemy and lese majesty a year ago: "Who do you think has been more truthful about the Watergate cover-up—President Nixon or John Dean?"

Small, unflattering tidbits about Nixon and his family are now broadcast and repeated with the special satisfaction of the self-righteous. Other Presidents have had to take this kind of insulting deglamorization from their enemies, but Nixon is getting it from almost everybody.

Had the French come forward with a bunch of documents to prove that Louis XVI wasn't really the legitimate king of France, they would be doing what we're doing. We're showing ourselves that we aren't committing regicide, because this character Nixon isn't our real king.

In all of this, Nixon has been unfailingly cooperative. By playing with his Yo-Yo in public, by swearing he isn't a crook, by his hand-pumping vulgarities at Pompidou's funeral, by two-dozen gaucheries large and small, he makes it easier and easier for his friends to disavow him.

The way he has released the tapes and evasions he gets no points for cooperation, and the trickle of information is slow enough so that the whole nation has time to focus on each petty theft, each tax delinquency,

each bit of rottenness that affronts our ideal of the Presidency.

Beyond all questions of guilt or innocence, he must be impeached because we, the Super Bowl people, have been promised the show. We're gearing up for it emotionally the way we did when the ballyhoo built up for the Billie Jean King-Bobby Riggs match.

The business is already so advanced that some people, like James Reston of the New York Times, are pressing for a TV blackout, but that can never be. We are a free people and we have been guaranteed the right to watch everything live in our living room.

## WHAT IS BEYOND LAND USE CONTROL?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Newsday writer George Biderman recently pointed out an unfortunate truth in the Federal land use control question:

Today we are moving toward a new era in the assertion of public interest which preempts an individual's right to use his land any way he wants to . . . and sometimes even tells him he can't use it at all.

This statement may come as a shock to American property owners who have always looked upon the fifth amendment prohibition against Government seizure of property without just compensation as protecting their private property rights. A number of groups, individuals and agencies are hard at work determining just how far the "taking issue" can go before it becomes seizure and therefore subject to the just compensation clause of the Constitution. In fact, the Council on Environmental Quality commissioned a study to look at the taking issue. The subtitle of that 329-page document is most revealing of the motives behind Federal land use controls.

The Taking Issue, a study of the Constitutional Limits of Government Authority to Regulate the Use of Privately-owned Land Without Paying Compensation to the Owners. (Emphasis added.)

Essentially what the public interest scholars and lawyers are concerned about is how they can rip off the private citizen landowner of his property legally. We have gone from an era when the watchword of the robber barons was "the public be damned," to a period when the attitude expressed "in the public interest" is "the individual citizen be damned."

It should not even be needed to make mention of the simple fact that there is no such thing as group rights, only individual rights. By prohibiting the Government from infringing upon liberty and freedom of individual citizens, the Constitution has secured the rights of us all. Any attempt to take away the individual right—property, speech, worship—is actually an attack upon all Americans.

If there is such a groundswell of support for Federal laws to regulate the uses a private citizen can make of his property, then it should be done by amend-

ing the Constitution by changing the fifth amendment—not by passing additional State and Federal laws.

I insert the related newsclipping at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 27, 1974]

### PRICES PAID FOR PUBLIC LANDS RAISE QUESTIONS

(By George Biderman)

NEW YORK.—Mention the Fifth Amendment and you will probably evoke memories of mobsters reciting into microphones: "I respectfully decline to answer the question on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate me."

But the Fifth has provisions other than the protection against self-incrimination, including its final phrase, "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." A mere dozen words, but the ways in which they have been interpreted when we try to create new parks or to save wetlands, open space and wilderness often lead to greater ripoffs of the public purse than organized crimes—except that these are usually both legal and "respectable."

The key to the ripoff potential lies in the last two words: "just compensation." "Compensation" isn't a controversial word in this context. It means money. What the authors of the Bill of Rights said was that if the government wants to take a man's property or use it, it must pay him. This has become one of the most cherished rights in our free society, cherished in the very special ways that we cherish money and property.

The controversy comes in deciding how much money is "just" payment. Lawyers have become rich, judges gray and juries hung in the process of deciding how much the taxpayers will have to pay a private property owner for the use or ownership of his property. And a number of once-respected politicians, lawyers and businessmen have become convicts as a result of criminally upping the ante to the taxpayers.

Like most other laymen, I once thought that "just compensation" is easy to define in practice: The owner is entitled to get from the government what he could have got from a private buyer. "Fair market value," the lawyers call it. As a matter of fact, I thought that this was the only way to be "just."

But when I became interested in conservation some 30 years ago, I discovered that "fair market value" can be grossly unfair to the taxpayers and bring windfall profits to real estate speculators. Historically, this most often happened when taxpayers' money was used to create a public project which, in turn, zoomed surrounding land values.

Highways are a good example. Once a highway is built, land that formerly had been usable for farming or forestry suddenly becomes immensely valuable. Filling stations, hot dog stands and automobile dealers line the roadway; new housing subdivisions breed shopping centers. . . . The wheels turn and land prices climb. An advance tip on a proposed highway route can mean fortunes for speculators and "cooperative" office-holders (witness, among other cases the recent Maryland trials).

But what happens when you want to save part of this newly valuable land for a park or wildlife refuge, say? Do the taxpayers then have to pay the owners the inflated price created by the highway that public taxes built? That's what happens most of the time. Is it "just?"

The question becomes more complicated when the public health, safety and welfare are involved. Nothing in the constitution gives a private property owner the absolute right to use his property in a way which injures or endangers the public; that is the basis for anti-pollution laws.

The public interest also can override other ways in which a private property owner may

want to use his property. Local building and zoning codes are written to protect or to enhance all sorts of public values like preserving open space, vegetation, the "character" of a community, a neighbor's view or the value of his property—all legal objectives. Through the years, none of these have been held (after bitter court battles) to be a "taking" of private property under the fifth amendment. Yet all in one way or another take away some of the owner's freedom of action.

Today we're moving into a new era in the assertion of public interest which preempts an individual's right to use his land any way he wants to . . . and sometimes even tells him he can't use it at all.

Congress probably will pass a national Land-Use Policy Act in this session or next despite President Nixon's withdrawal of support. Under the National Coastal Zone Management Act, millions of federal dollars are going to state and local government this year to begin to protect our vanishing shorelines.

Well intentioned state and local land-use laws—and there will be many more to come—call for "just compensation" to many property owners. So it is illuminating, and frightening, to look at some examples of how some present land management laws have worked:

A woman who owned 160 acres in the heart of Yosemite National Park in 1956 offered to sell the land to the government for \$20,000. The law establishing the park allowed her to keep her land and cabin, but it also required maintaining the area in its natural state for the enjoyment of future generations. Someone in the National Park Service didn't want to spend the money, so her offer was turned down. In 1968, real estate operators began bulldozing for a vacation home subdivision. The government hastily condemned the property for \$265,000 of our money. "Just compensation?"

The 65,000-acre Point Reyes National Seashore near San Francisco was established in 1962. Congress appropriated \$14 million to buy about half the acreage, leaving the other half in private ownership so long as the owners continued its "pastoral use," mainly for grazing land and dairy farms. Enter the resort developers who started to buy up the "pastoral" land for motels, vacation homes and dude ranches. It cost the taxpayers an extra \$43 million to buy up the threatened land at the new fairmarket value. Fair?

An Islip, N.Y., builder obtained a town permit for a bayfront boater on Fire Island. The National Park Service notified him that the property would be subject to condemnation because the Fire Island National Seashore Act regulations prohibited both commercialization and multiple dwellings. He went ahead and built the boater anyway, before the bureaucratic machinery could move. The government decided that condemning both the land and the boater would be "too expensive." Is the builder entitled to "fair-market value" for an illegal building?

Shortly after a New York State Tidal-Wetlands Act was enacted, an individual bought slightly more than a third of an acre, mostly wetlands, on the Fire Island bayfront. A decade or so earlier, the previous owner had paid \$2,600. The New York Department of Environmental Conservation granted the new owner a wetland building permit because condemnation would have been "too expensive." Does "just compensation" mean "no-risk gamble"—if the property were to be condemned, you get your money back and maybe, some profit; if not you get to build on some choice land?

These are only a few examples of how "fair market value" has become the Catch 22 of land-use and conservation laws. It forces the public either to pay exorbitant amounts or to permit the very development the law sought to stop to go on its merry (and profitable) way.



"Just compensation" can be interpreted so that both the public interest and the right of private property owners are protected. Some public-interest lawyers tell me that not only is this constitutional but that it has been done in a number of cases where public officials were willing to dig in their heels and refuse to pay "fair-market value." The formula is simple: The owner is entitled to get back the amount he has invested in the property plus a reasonable rate of return for the period of time that he had held it, based on prevailing interest rates. No costly lawsuits over appraisals, no inflation of appraised "real-market value" by the seller and deflation by the buyer. "Just compensation."

What about the person who bought at an inflated price after the law was passed? Then it's up to the public officials who are supposed to protect the taxpayers' interests to "hang tough." The prohibitions or restrictions on use of the property were on record when it changed hands. It makes no sense for the taxpayers to shell out a "fair market value," which assumes that the law doesn't exist.

Congress and state and local lawmakers should put this formula into the land-use laws rather than relying, as is commonly the case, on "fair-market value."

(The customary prohibition on paying no more than fair-market value originally was intended to keep venal officials from offering outrageous settlements in condemnation cases and splitting the take.) Until this happens, enlightened public officials and all of us beleaguered taxpayers should fight any definition of "fair-market value" that defies both common sense and the public interest.

That fight will be carried on over the kicks and screams of real estate lawyers and their clients. And don't forget that many lawmakers and judges once practiced real estate law themselves, so they're wedded to the "fair-market value" shibboleths.

#### TAX ANALYSTS AND ADVOCATES SAYS "EVIDENCE IS THIN" ON DISC'S

**HON. CHARLES A. VANIK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the April 29, 1974, issue of Tax Notes, a publication of the public interest tax study group, Tax Analysts and Advocates, contains an article by Gerard M. Brannon, entitled, "Treasury on DISC: Evidence Is Thin." In the article, Mr. Brannon discusses the report issued by Treasury on April 15, 1974, on the effectiveness of the Domestic International Sales Corporation tax provision.

Because of the importance of this tax loophole and its growing cost to the public, I would like to enter Mr. Brannon's article in the Record at this point. The author concludes that:

The data just isn't around to say that DISCs produced an effect that would not have occurred without them.

Mr. Speaker, I have also provided an analysis of the Treasury DISC report in the April 23, 1974 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 11499. I also entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28 on page 8828 correspondence from the General Accounting Office regarding the lack of adequate information on the DISC tax loophole.

The repeal of DISC must be one of the priorities of this year's tax reform efforts.

The Tax Analysts and Advocates article follows:

#### TREASURY ON DISC: EVIDENCE IS THIN (By Gerard M. Brannon)

The Treasury Department made a small step in the right direction with its April 15 report on the operations and effects of a major tax preference for exporters. But the data is sparse and the evidence for the effectiveness of DISC is thin.

It is rare, even unique, for Treasury to analyze and report publicly on the effectiveness of a specific tax incentive. The Revenue Act of 1971 included a controversial tax preference for exporters, which provided that corporations can defer indefinitely half their profits from exports sold through domestic international sales corporations (DISCs). The law also required that Treasury make annual reports on the operation and effect of the DISC incentive.

The report contains the eye-catching statistic that the use of DISCs cost the Treasury \$250 million in calendar 1972, more than twice the \$100 million forecast by DISC proponents in 1971.

However, the report is generally unsatisfying because there just wasn't much data to analyze. For one thing, the DISCs only went into operation in 1972 and the approximately 2,200 returns analyzed are generally for that first calendar year. In addition, many other events, including two devaluations, occurred which had an obvious effect on exports. The data just isn't around to say that DISCs produced an effect that would not have occurred without them.

The main information in the report is the material that describes how DISC works. The DISC sales covered about \$16 billion of exports, nearly one-third of the total U.S. exports for 1972. About 40% of this was export of goods which had been run through DISC ownership and the rest were commission sales.

The first striking statistic is that the DISC profit on these sales was \$1.2 billion. The real punch in the DISC tax rules is the provision that export "profits" can be arbitrarily assigned to DISC by formula even if the DISC is a mere paper organization.

#### BETTER FORMULA POSSIBLE

Under the law, a DISC can claim as profit 4% of sales or it can claim half the combined taxable income of itself and its related supplier attributable to exports. Nearly all DISCs opted for the second alternative. This means that total profit on DISC sales was about \$2.4 billion (15% of the \$16 billion in exports). Most of the revenue estimates assumed that the profit rate would be 8% on sales (not 15%), which is about the average profit rate for all U.S. manufacturing.

Thus, the revenue cost for 1972 was \$250 million, compared with the official estimates of \$100 million when DISC was approved by Congress.

It is not clear whether this suggests that the long run estimate (about \$300 million) is also too low. Export profits may have been abnormally good in 1972 since this was so close to the devaluation that occurred after the Smithsonian Agreement. Export profit rates, on the other hand, may be higher than we thought. There is also another explanation which the Treasury report doesn't list: business may be able to juggle costs so that profits on the tax-favored sales look very good.

The basic question emphasized by this profitability figure is why the DISC provisions were written as they were. As long as we were devising arbitrary formulas to allocate some of the manufacturing profits to the DISC, a straight assumption of an average overall profit rate of 8%, with half being

reported as DISC profit, would have been conceptually better. At root, DISC is an export subsidy and there is no reason to make the subsidy higher in cases where the profits on exports are higher. Where the export profits are high, there is less need for an incentive. Basing the tax rule on product by product profits not only yields the wrong conceptual result, but it means that the whole provision and its administration is far more complicated. It can also mean, as happened in 1972, that the export subsidy enacted is far more generous than the Congress thought it was enacting.

Another interesting statistic as to how DISC operated in 1972 is the revelation that about 90% of DISC sales were by subsidiaries of corporations with over \$100 million of assets. These corporations account for less than half of corporate sales in 1969, and probably near half in 1972.

An interesting analysis is the brief material in Chapter 5 dealing with the export effect of DISC. Not much could be done here. In the first place, there was a devaluation of the dollar averaging 9% at the beginning of 1972. Devaluation means that an export sold for a price in pounds, or francs or whatever, that would have converted to \$1.00 in 1971 would convert to \$1.09 in 1972. This was a benefit to exporters three times as great as the DISC benefit, and it must have dominated the total export growth in 1972.

Treasury made a stab at making a defensible comparison between 1972, when the DISC program went into effect, and 1971 when it was not in operation. It asked for exports of the DISC, its parent and any related U.S. company. It asked for all exports, not just those made through DISCs.

#### EXPORT EFFECT

Treasury said that if one assumed that the proportions of each type of export (i.e., parent corporation, related corporation and DISC) in the total are constant, then the percentage change in these figures provides an estimate of the percentage change in exports passing through DISC's. On the basis of this assumption, Treasury said, the data can be said to measure DISC exports for the reporting firms. A total of 166 returns gave figures for 1971 and 1972.

Using this data, Treasury takes some solace from the fact that exports for the 166 rose by 14.14% while the total U.S. exports rose by only 12.37%. Treasury said that the group of 166 is heavily weighed with transportation equipment exporters, mainly automobiles, an export category which did badly in 1972. Treasury said this would have tended to distort the export results for DISC-users downward.

This is too flimsy a data base to give much information. It is also striking that total exports in 1973 rose 40%, led by a staggering 88% increase in agricultural exports. These were clearly related to the additional devaluation in early 1972, the worldwide food shortage and the worldwide inflation. Little DISC is going to be hard to find in these large patterns.

#### MANY FACTORS

Even if there were not so many other things happening there would be a tough analytical problem. It is how to separate results due to DISC from things that happen to DISC firms. Treasury's analysis was quick to dismiss the poor performance of DISC firms in the transportation equipment line as something that happened to DISC firms and implies that the other cases of above average export increases is due to the DISC incentive. But this doesn't follow at all. A particular firm planning to expand exports would be glad to use DISC.

Another firm planning to drop exports in favor of an overseas subsidiary would not use DISC because its deferral under DISC would be soon cut off. The data would then show

DISC firms expanding exports faster than non-DISC firms.

Whether we can find out anything about causes from the DISC-non-DISC comparison that Treasury attempts is to my mind doubtful. It is worth the effort in data collection but my own judgment is that any results one gets from this will be very suspect if they cannot be reconciled with independent information on the sensitivity of exports to price changes.

Basically, the DISC revenue loss of \$250 million on \$16 billion of exports is identical to the after-tax profit that could be enjoyed by a 3% price increase, or it could be explained as financing a 3% price decrease. In the long run the latter explanation should prevail. If the DISC arrangement attracts new exporters this should increase the supply of U.S. goods in foreign markets and push down the price (or keep it lower than it would have been). When the price decrease effect offsets the tax advantage there would be no further reason to expand exports. (Prices must be important because people concerned about exports are forever yakking about our "pricing ourselves out of the world market.")

If DISC causes prices on U.S. exports to be lower than they would have been the revenue loss is even greater than the apparent one. (A tax benefit passed along in lower prices cuts the before tax profit and implies a greater revenue loss. This effect was conspicuous in the discussion of "pass through" of investment incentives for public utilities.)

Finding out how the DISC provision changes U.S. exports is going to be a tough job that will have to get into the basic questions of price effects of DISC and the effect of price changes on exports. The rinky-dink figures in the Treasury report don't even scratch the surface.

#### U.S. COMPANIES' 1974 INVESTMENT IN MIDDLE EAST OIL

##### HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, despite the recent Arab oil embargo 12 major U.S. companies plan to invest more for oil and gas projects in the Middle East in 1974 than they did in 1973 according to a study of oil company investment strategies which I am publicly releasing today.

Last year the group of 12 companies invested \$516.7 million in the Middle East. In 1974, they plan to invest \$536 million in the same region.

This survey which was conducted by my staff by telephone, and in some cases letters, the companies were asked to provide detailed information on capital budgets for 1974 and actual expenditures for 1973. Specifically, each of the companies was asked to provide data on foreign versus domestic investment for 1973 and 1974 as well as the amount of foreign investment which took place in the Middle East. All the information contained in the survey was provided directly to my staff by responsible officials of the companies concerned.

Mr. Speaker, this half billion dollar investment by 12 major companies in the Middle East is completely contradictory to the administration's goal of

energy independence. I believe that it is foolish for the United States to invest capital in a region where security of supply is practically nonexistent. Worldwide, including the Middle East, the 12 companies plan to invest at least 43 percent or \$6.4 billion overseas. Last year the same companies and in addition Mobil Oil spent 46 percent of the capital outlays or \$5 billion outside the United States. Mobil refused to provide any information on their 1974 capital outlays.

Apparently the administration's Project Independence has had negligible impact on big oil's investment strategy—they still plan to spend practically the same percentage of their investment funds on foreign projects this year as in 1973. These companies maintain great flexibility in changing their capital budgets and could easily accommodate the goals of Project Independence.

In fact, several companies significantly altered their 1973 capital outlay plan because of higher profits and the high cost of successful lease bids.

Mr. Speaker, the big oil companies are ignoring the goals of Project Independence and the Nixon administration is doing absolutely nothing about the industry's attitude and investment plans.

When asked what the administration was doing to change the oil companies' investment strategy toward increased domestic capital outlays, Eric Zausner, the Assistant Administrator of FEO, candidly admitted in a discussion with a member of my staff that Project Independence is in the planning stage and no definite proposals on the way to achieve energy independence will be available until this fall and early winter after the completion of an administration study of energy self-sufficiency.

Mr. Speaker, there is a basic and fundamental contradiction between the achievement of energy self-sufficiency and the structure of multinational, U.S.-based oil companies. Multinational companies want to maximize profits worldwide and President Nixon wants to make us self-sufficient. Until the administration develops ways to keep investments at home Project Independence will be another one of Mr. Nixon's pipedreams.

The study reveals that three U.S.-based companies—Exxon, Gulf, and Standard of California—plan to invest more abroad than in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as a first step toward achieving the goals of self-sufficiency, a foreign tax credit should be eliminated. The administration has suggested some changes in the tax laws but the overall result of these changes would be to leave untouched existing incentives for oil companies to invest abroad. The oil companies can reduce their tax liability on foreign source income by practically zero through the use of the foreign tax credit.

One encouraging development revealed by the study is the increase in domestic investment planned by the 12 companies. According to the study the domestic investment will increase from \$5.8 billion last year to \$8.7 billion this year. Overseas investment will rise from \$5 billion in 1973 to \$6.5 billion in 1974.

The details of the study follows:

#### U.S. OIL COMPANY CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

[Capital expenses in millions]

	Domestic	Foreign	Middle East	Percent domestic
<b>1973</b>				
Arco	507.0	85.5	3.3	85.6
Ashland	186.0	48.0	5	79.5
Cities Services	374.7	25.3	10.2	93.7
Exxon	944.0	1,986.0	19.2	32.2
Getty	198.0	17.2		96.5
Gulf	306.3	346.4	15.5	46.9
Mobil	764.0	569.0		57.4
Murphy	58.2	57.5	412.0	50.3
Phillips	178.7	173.0	10.1	50.8
Standard of California	576.0	624.0	195	48.0
Sun Oil	213.0	111.0	3	65.7
Standard of Indiana <sup>2</sup>	631.0	268.0	65	70.2
Texaco	896.0	704.0	190	56.0
Total	5,831.0	5,003.0	516.7	54.0
<b>1974</b>				
Arco	962.0	217.2	8.8	81.6
Ashland	200.0	50.0	9	80.0
Cities Services	453.7	30.8	7.9	93.8
Exxon	3,000.0	3,100.0	22.0	49.2
Getty	159.7	68.4		70.1
Gulf	750.0	756.0	17.6	49.9
Mobil	Will not provide information.			
Murphy	113.0	59.0	3.45	65.7
Phillips	321.0	215.0	20.5	59.9
Standard of California	768.0	832.0	209	48.0
Sun Oil	336.0	272.0	8	55.3
Standard of Indiana	568.0	286.0	80	66.5
Texaco	1,100.0	900.0	150	55.0
Total	8,730	6,480	536	57.0

<sup>1</sup> Includes all capital expenditures.

<sup>2</sup> Domestic defined as United States and Canada. The Middle East is defined as those countries bordering the Eastern Mediterranean, Persian Gulf, Red Sea, Gulf of Aden, and Gulf of Oman.

<sup>3</sup> Includes exploration and production expenditures only. Does not include marketing, manufacturing, and transportation operations which would be mostly domestic.

#### ARDEN HOUSE REPORTS

##### HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, in 1950, Dwight D. Eisenhower founded the American Assembly at Columbia University. Its purpose being to conduct in-depth discussions on important issues and to report its findings and recommendations for national policy.

The topic of the 44th American Assembly was choosing the President. The participants met at Arden House, Harriman, N.Y., on December 16-19, 1973; they represent a broad range of experience, competence, and leadership. Those attending paid their own travel expenses, with only meals and housing provided during the session. The discussions were conducted in an open and nonpartisan climate. The conclusions reached were not unanimous, but this is as it should be. For the true strength of this Nation lies in the individual's right of free expression and respect for opposing points of view.

The serious thought and discussion which took place at Arden House is only a beginning. For this work to be truly meaningful, it must stimulate discussion, and eventually action, on a much larger plane. It is for this reason that I am



inserting the assembly's final report in the RECORD:

FINAL REPORT OF THE 44TH  
AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

(At the close of their discussions the participants in the Forty-fourth American Assembly, on *Choosing the President*, at Arden House, Harriman, New York, December 16-19, 1973, reviewed as a group the following statement. The statement represents general agreement; however, no one was asked to sign it. Furthermore, it should not be assumed that every participant subscribes to every recommendation.)

The Presidency of the United States may be the most powerful office in the world. But it is far from all-powerful; in our multi-centered system it depends—in fact as well as in Constitutional theory—on active co-operation from other institutions. And when the Presidency strays beyond the bounds of law or broad consensus, those other institutions can, if they will, call it to account.

The fundamental way we enforce accountability is the national election to decide who shall leave and who shall enter the White House. Through a long and not untroubled history the presidential election process has worked its way every time, determining the peaceful transfer of authority. Such a record in meeting one of government's most difficult problems cautions against radical change in the basics of the system, particularly because history provides so many examples of new rules producing surprising and sometimes unwelcome results.

Therefore we do not take lightly the responsibility to explore, as thoroughly as we can, what changes in structure and substance are needed in the choosing of Presidents. The past decade's disarray in the Presidency impels a hard look at the long run, not some temporary patchwork to meet a current crisis with fashionable solutions. It is in that spirit that the Forty-fourth American Assembly urges the following reforms:

1. *The number of people given serious consideration for the Presidency should be larger than at present and the early stages of the winnowing process made more competitive.*

Effective choice requires a reasonably large array of possibilities. Yet over the past quarter century only about a hundred individuals (nearly all white males) have been considered "serious" potential candidates. Furthermore, there is strong evidence that usually, by the time the formal nomination process starts, a front-runner has been identified who then goes on to win the nomination. Thus the parties and the public are all too often presented with a virtual *jait accompli*.

Therefore, we recommend that, well before the formal nomination process begins, national, state, and local party organizations, members of Congress, state and local officials, and private organizations, not only assess such candidates as present themselves, but also conduct a systematic search for persons who should be encouraged to contend. Serious consideration by such organizations should stimulate appropriate attention by the media.

2. *Those who bring forward potential candidates should be prepared to argue that the persons they propose are fit to be President, not just to win the election.*

In practice, the present system over-emphasizes name familiarity, manufactured charisma, access to large financial resources, and premature calculations of electability. We do not suggest as an alternative any comprehensive list of qualifications for the Presidency. Rather, we call upon candidate-proposers to argue thoroughly and directly the case that their candidate has what it takes to lead the nation with excellence for the next four years. That argument should

reach beyond mere assertions of intent to the facts of the candidate's political and other experience. In particular the candidate's capacities for fulfilling administrative and executive roles should be demonstrated. At a minimum, he should have demonstrated, in practice, devotion to the rule of law, talent and desire for political negotiation, and a capacity to seek the truth, to articulate it effectively to the public, and to keep his word.

3. *Party responsibility and grass roots democracy in the nominating process should be revitalized.*

The role of the parties has been undercut by the spread of direct primary elections for national convention delegates and by candidates who fight general election campaigns with personal organizations separate from—even hostile to—the party. Neither primaries nor personalized organizations can substitute effectively for the continuous attention, experienced judgment, and persistent energy of party leaders organized across the nation to bring forward candidates for office at all levels. We should recognize that responsible leadership is vital to public decisions; the parties should insist that a presidential candidate who wears the party label represent the party.

We are as opposed to a return to boss rule as we are to a national direct primary. A party, if it is to retain its vitality, needs the continual infusion of new members and an open, democratic structure from the grass roots to the top. We urge effective means to achieve fair representation of and the widest possible participation by all segments of a party's adherents including distinctive social, economic, and ethnic constituencies.

To these ends, we recommend the following measures:

a. Reduce the number and variety of state presidential primaries, or at least discourage their spread.

b. To the extent that presidential primaries are retained they should be held at simultaneous times in different regions of the country. These elections should be staggered across time.

c. Restrict participation in primaries, caucuses, and conventions to party members only.

d. Vigorously publicize the opportunities for participation in caucuses, conventions, and primaries and in other ways encourage far greater participation of party members.

e. Insist that the deliberations of caucuses and conventions be conducted fairly and openly. All official deliberations must be open to press and public.

f. Require that delegate selection take place in the same calendar year as the presidential election.

g. Where primaries are held, encourage preference ballots over binding delegate elections, with the objective of maximizing the responsible decision role of the delegates at the national convention. To the same end favorite son candidates should not be discouraged.

h. Where primaries are held, require delegate candidates to list their presidential preferences, if any, on the ballot.

i. Require all employers to release employees elected as state or national convention delegates for the period necessary for their service, just as employees are released for jury duty.

j. Provide for a significant number of convention seats for a representative group of elected officials and other party leaders as voting delegates.

4. *The influence of money in choosing the President should be brought under new and stringent controls.*

Money has emerged as the root of more evil in presidential politics than the public should put up with. As striking as the violations of law that have come to light are

the vast inequalities of resources among contenders, particularly in the early phases, a factor which distorts fair competition as it corrupts the competitors. The magnitudes are new; the problem is old and difficult, and we must guard especially against abridgments of Constitutional rights. Recognizing the complexities and the temptation to leap too quickly to too much control, we recommend the following five measures:

a. Substantially extend the principle of public financing of presidential nomination and election campaigns. Such a program should encourage small contributions from private sources, be formulated so as to reduce the advantage of incumbency, and provide reasonable support for minor party candidacies.

b. Channel all public presidential general election funds through the national party committees, in order to strengthen the party's responsibility for their nominee's campaign.

c. Limit the amount an individual or organization (other than the national party committees) can contribute to any single candidate in a primary or general election.

d. Require complete and reasonably prompt public disclosure of the taking, transferring, and spending of all campaign monies.

e. Establish an independent Federal Elections Commission, with full powers of audit, investigation, subpoena and prosecution, to police the use of money in Federal campaigns. Lack of an effective enforcement agency, with strong, independent powers, has substantially vitiated the impact of previous control legislation. The Commission should be fully staffed; it should receive prompt reports of every transaction.

5. *Access to television and radio time should be allocated more fairly among presidential aspirants.*

The present situation is grossly unfair. It deprives the electorate of information it needs to choose intelligently. An incumbent President enjoys the immense advantage of immediate access to as much time as he requests. Well-heeled candidates can buy their way into far more exposure than their poorer competitors. Thus far, Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934 (the equal time provision) has frustrated attempts to get even rough equality in exposure among major candidates. We recommend:

a. The networks and stations should be required to assume as a condition for the renewal of their licenses the obligation to provide substantial free time to candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, in both the nomination and the election campaigns. Public broadcasting stations, television and radio, should be encouraged to make their facilities available to such candidates, and the public broadcasting system should be strengthened to permit such communication throughout the country.

b. Any television or radio broadcaster carrying an address by the incumbent President should provide equal time for response to the major opposition party national committee.

c. The equal time provision of the Federal Communications Act should be repealed and a formula for differential equality of access for major and minor candidates should be adopted.

d. The independent stations and public broadcasters should initiate new forms of programming on the presidential election process that facilitate rational comparison of potential or declared candidates, sustained exploration of issue stands, and the thorough and objective review of the candidate's political experience.

6. *The presidential election should be by direct popular vote.*

We urge the Congress to put forward an amendment to the Constitution that would abolish the electoral college and create an

improved system of electing the President by direct popular vote.

7. *The system for selecting vice presidential candidates should be changed.*

Of the ten post-World War II candidates for the Presidency, four had been Vice Presidents. As long as we retain that office, the Vice President must be considered as a potential President. The practice of choosing the vice presidential candidate at the national convention is, to say the least, an accident-prone procedure. Therefore we propose that parties devise a different and more deliberative system. One attractive alternative is to give the presidential nominee the option of bringing a recommendation to the national committee within thirty days after his nomination for their advice and consent.

In the long run, changes in public attitudes, the character of issues, the relations between formal democracy and private interests, and the predilections of the mass media may prove more significant than any of these reforms. But we need not stand waiting for slow and anonymous historical evolutions. What we have proposed can be done now. And of our recommendations, none is more urgent than a revival of political parties willing and able to meet their foremost charge.

#### PARTICIPANTS

##### THE 44TH AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

Archibald S. Alexander, Attorney at Law, Bernardsville, New Jersey.

Herbert E. Alexander,<sup>1</sup> Director, Citizens' Research Foundation, Princeton, New Jersey.

James David Barber, Chairman of Political Science, Duke University.

Robert Bendiner, Editorial Board, *The New York Times*.

Richard W. Boyd, Assistant Professor of Government, Wesleyan University.

David S. Broder,<sup>2</sup> *The Washington Post*.

Courtney C. Brown, Chairman, The American Assembly.

Michael J. Bucuvalas, Harriman Scholar, Columbia University.

Keller H. Bumgardner, Chairman, Election Systems Project, and Director, League of Women Voters of the United States, Columbia, South Carolina.

Oscar C. Carr, Jr., Vice President for Development, The Episcopal Church, New York.

Bice Clemow, West Hartford, Connecticut.

Arthur W. Cowles, Vice President, Koppers Company, Inc., Pittsburgh.

Thomas E. Cronin,<sup>2</sup> Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara.

Fred K. Darragh, Jr., Chairman, Darragh Company, Little Rock.

Patricia M. Derian, Democratic National Committeewoman, Jackson, Mississippi.

Murray Edelman, Professor of Political Science, University of Wisconsin.

John D. Feerick, Attorney at Law, New York.

Robert H. Finch, Attorney at Law, Los Angeles.

Stanley Frankel, Vice President, Ogden Corporation, New York.

David H. Gambrell, Attorney at Law, Atlanta.

David Ginsburg, Ginsburg and Feldman and Bress, Washington, D.C.

Ralph M. Goodman, Chairman of Political Science, San Francisco State University.

Josephine L. Good, Convention Director, Republican National Committee, Washington, D.C.

Stanley T. Gordon, Executive Director, Herman Goldman Foundation, New York.

Erwin Hargrove, Professor of Political Science, Brown University.

W. Averell Harriman.

Stephen Hess, Senior Fellow, the Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

David Hom, Harriman Scholar, Columbia University.

Robert J. Huckshorn, Chairman of Political Science, Florida Atlantic University.

Charles Hyneman, American Enterprise Institute, Washington, D.C.

Jacob K. Javits,<sup>3</sup> U.S. Senator from New York.

Gerl Joseph, Contributing Editor, *Minneapolis Tribune*.

Roger G. Kennedy, Vice President, the Ford Foundation, New York.

John H. Kessel, Professor of Political Science, Ohio State University.

Sidney Lens, Author, Northbrook, Illinois.

C. Peter Magrath, President, State University of New York, Binghamton.

Harvey C. Mansfield, Professor of Government, Columbia University.

Donald R. Matthews,<sup>1</sup> Center for Political Studies, University of Michigan.

Warren E. Miller, Center for Political Studies, University of Michigan.

Steven Muller, President, The Johns Hopkins University.

Clint Newton, Staff Director, Democratic Charter Commission, Durham, North Carolina.

Michael Novak, The Rockefeller Foundation, New York.

Neal Peirce,<sup>2</sup> Fellow, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington, D.C.

Ross Pritchard, President, Hood College.

James Rabun, Professor of History, Emory University.

Austin Ranney,<sup>1</sup> Professor of Political Science, University of Wisconsin.

James H. Rupp, Mayor, Decatur, Illinois.

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Schweitzer Professor of Humanities, City University of New York.

Mark Schwartzberg, Harriman Scholar, Columbia University.

Frederick H. Sontag, Co-Director and Public Affairs Consultant, Study of American Political Parties, South Orange, New Jersey.

C. Grant Spaeth, Attorney at Law, Palo Alto.

James L. Sundquist, Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

Seth Taft, Cuyahoga County Commissioner, Cleveland.

Adam Yarmolinsky, Ralph Waldo Emerson, University Professor, University of Massachusetts.

#### CONGRESSMAN SEIBERLING'S ARTICLE ON THE CUYAHOGA RIVER VALLEY

#### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the May 1974 issue of the *Environmental Journal* of the National Parks and Conservation Association carried an excellent article by our colleague from Akron, Mr. SEIBERLING, on the Cuyahoga River Valley in northern Ohio. Congressman SEIBERLING, along with myself, Congressman REGULA, and 43 other Members, has introduced legislation to create a park of up to 20,000 acres in this "miracle of greenness" that lies still undeveloped between the major cities of Akron and Cleveland.

The distinguished chairman of the House Parks and Recreation Subcommittee (Mr. TAYLOR) has already held one hearing on this legislation, H.R. 7176, and we are hopeful that the committee will soon be able to journey to Ohio to inspect the parklands firsthand.

I include the article by Representative SEIBERLING in the RECORD, as follows:

#### CUYAHOGA VALLEY: SYMBOL OF GRACE IN A CONGESTED WORLD

(By JOHN F. SEIBERLING)

Several years ago the Cuyahoga River in northeast Ohio became famous as the river that caught on fire. An oil slick ignited, and debris in the river burned for several days. It was a freak occurrence, but it demonstrated to the world the extreme problems of water pollution. Within the confines of Cleveland, the river is greasy, grossly polluted, and devoid of marine life. Totally dominated by factories, docks, and warehouses, it is inaccessible to the public.

By contrast, only a few miles upstream the Cuyahoga flows virtually unimpeded through a greensheathed floodplain. North of Akron the river changes again, becoming a narrow, wandering, scenic, and nearly wild stream in a pastoral setting. Here, only a few miles away from the factories and smokestacks of Akron and Cleveland, the river flows through the Cuyahoga Valley—a swath of green, nestled between the sprawling suburbs of the cities.

The Cuyahoga Valley is one of the most scenic areas in northeastern Ohio and is the only major open space remaining between Akron and Cleveland. Through a quirk of nature, the valley until now has been spared from heavy industrialization. Its steep, wooded slopes, while contributing greatly to the valley's scenic beauty, presented a great physical impediment to commercial development. Most of the valley is located on a floodplain, presenting serious problems to potential developers. The alluvial soil, although agriculturally productive, has low bearing capacity. And builders were further discouraged by the limits to the size of future development imposed by the width of the valley floor, which varies from five hundred to five thousand feet.

Thus the Cuyahoga Valley and its river have been left as a tremendous resource to the people of Ohio, the Midwest, and the entire country. But today it is threatened on all sides by prospective commercial and high-density developers who wish to build in the area in spite of the inherent difficulties presented by geography. Several priceless parcels of land have already been lost to urbanization, despite activities of local park boards and the state of Ohio to acquire threatened lands in the valley. A bill now before Congress would make the valley into a national resource and would help meet the critical national shortage of public recreation lands near urban areas. And it would preserve for future generations the outstanding natural and historical qualities of one of our nation's largest urban areas.

The Cuyahoga Valley is biologically unique. It is a "botanical crossroads," a meeting place for plant life of the East, West, North, and South. The western edge of the Appalachian plateau crosses the Cuyahoga River near the town of Independence and turns south just west of the valley. The Cuyahoga thus becomes a dividing line between eastern mountain and western prairie botanical provinces. Beeches and sugar maples dominate the hillsides along the river. Stands of oak and hickory crown the drier ridges, while red maples, ashes, and a few remaining American elms occupy the more moist upland areas. Ohio buckeye is common in the valley floor. On the floodplain are lofty sycamores, cottonwoods, box-elders, and black walnut trees.

Northern hemlocks survive in many of the hundreds of ravines that run back from the valley floor into the rolling uplands. An outstanding example is Tinkers Creek Gorge, a registered national natural landmark. Here northern and southern vegetation meet. The gorge contains a virgin forest, representative of presettlement forests. A beech-maple-hemlock association thrives on the moist, cool floor of the gorge, while an oak-hickory association grows on the drier areas at the top.

<sup>1</sup> Discussion leader.

<sup>2</sup> Rapporteur.

<sup>3</sup> Delivered formal address.



Several species of willow thrive on sandbars and along the riverbanks. Wildflowers and grasses color the open fields. In spring the woods are dotted with trillium, may-apples, Solomons sea, hepatica, anemone, dogtooth violets, Dutchman's-breeches, wild ginger, and trailing arbutus. The Stumpy Basin Nature Conservancy area supports a dozen or more rare species of plants including buffalo berry, two species of juniper, yellow oak, burr oak, three species of gentian, rough-leaf dogwood, and prairie grasses.

The river, marshes, meadows, and woods offer permanent and temporary homes to a variety of animal life. Among the more familiar animals are cottontail rabbits, opossum, white-tailed deer, red foxes, chipmunks, woodchucks, and raccoons. Birdlife includes common birds such as the cardinal, eastern blue jay, song sparrow, turtle dove, bank swallow, redwing blackbird, robin, goldfinch, downy woodpecker, wood thrush, tufted titmouse, and black-capped chickadee. The valley is also frequented by less common species such as the indigo bunting, pileated woodpecker, scarlet tanager, eastern bluebird, evening grosbeak, Baltimore oriole, and bald eagle. It is within the winter range of the snowy owl and the summer range of the turkey buzzard. Migrating ducks and geese find the floodplain a favorable resting place during their long flights north and south on the flyway.

The Cuyahoga Valley has long played a significant role in American history, and many historical landmarks remain. An Indian tribe of the mound-building culture occupied the valley from 600 B.C. to 800 A.D., and more than 300 sites of archeological interest have been identified. Later residents included other Indian tribes, explorers, missionaries, farmers, and craftsmen. The Cuyahoga offered the shortest portage between the Great Lakes and the Ohio and Mississippi valleys. It was so important to the Indians as a trading route that they declared the valley sacred ground to ensure that it remained open and free from warfare.

The Indians named the river the Cuyahoga, which is generally thought to mean "crooked river." It is one of the most unusual rivers in the world because its upper reaches run parallel to and in opposite direction from its lower reaches. It begins as a trickle many miles east of the valley mouth and joins with another stream flowing south until the combined waters meet the Akron escarpment. After cascading over waterfalls in a magnificent ravine, the river makes a majestic turn from its southerly course to flow north to Lake Erie. The river's mouth forms the port of Cleveland.

For a short time the Cuyahoga River was the boundary between the United States and Indian lands. It soon became a major gateway to the Northwest Territory when settlers streamed across the Indian lands to the west of the rivers.

Prosperity came to the valley with the construction of the Ohio Canal in 1827. The river and its tributaries were harnessed to power gristmills and sawmills. This was the valley's most colorful era. The canal provided the means of opening up and developing inland Ohio. It provided a water passage between the Great Lakes waterways and the overland route to the east and the south, making it possible to transport goods cheaply.

The canal's demise began with the coming of the railroad in the 1850s, and the canal ceased operations in 1913. However, much of the canal, with its locks and diversion dams, remains intact. The village of Peninsula, which once sported five hotels and fourteen bars and was the resting spot for barge passengers and crew, has been restored. A 1½-mile section of the canal near Tinkers Creek is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The area includes two locks, an aqueduct over the creek, a mill, and a house all dating from 1832.

Today the Cuyahoga Valley is a sleepy,

rural area with few permanent residents. Although the river is polluted, most of its tributaries are not. The Army Corps of Engineers has undertaken a major restoration program for the river, and construction of a regional sewage treatment plant is underway. In addition, many local citizens have participated in projects to clean up the river and have strongly supported efforts to preserve the valley's natural and historical resources.

The idea of preserving the Cuyahoga Valley is not new. As long ago as 1925, the famous landscape architectural firm founded by Frederick Law Olmsted declared that the valley was the most important scenic asset in the Akron area and recommended that it be preserved in its entirety as a rural park. In the mid-1960s an Ohio State Department of Natural Resources report reached the "indisputable conclusion that the valley must be preserved as open space land."

Following publication of the study, the Akron and Cleveland Metropolitan Park Districts joined in an effort to create a 20,000-acre park in the valley region. The state of Ohio named preservation of the Cuyahoga Valley the state's most important recreation goal and has joined with the two park districts to help preserve 14,500 acres. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has provided \$6 million in matching grants as the beginning of a \$35 million, twenty-year program. However, within five years, many large and key sections of the valley may be lost to development. The price of land, which is still relatively reasonable, will escalate sharply in the time period outlined by the state plan.

In 1972, the National Park Service conducted an intensive feasibility study on the proposed plan to create a Cuyahoga Valley National Historical Park and Recreation Area. The unofficial draft report recommended a federal area of about 15,000 acres. It would be managed in cooperation with 7,500 acres of nonfederal areas abutting the federal unit to form an "umbrella" park of some 22,500 acres.

Within the park would be such public and quasi-public areas as the historic Jonathan Hale Farm—a preservation project honoring one of the valley's first settlers—and the nineteenth century Western Reserve Village, which has been reassembled in the valley. Also within the park area would be the Blossom Music Center, the outdoor summer home of the Cleveland orchestra. Adjacent to the park would be several public and private areas such as Cleveland's lovely Brecksville Reservation and Akron's Virginia Kendall Park, which contains cliffs exposing the most magnificent Paleozoic rock found in the valley.

The Park Service study envisions an overall transportation network including the canal and railroad. Automobile traffic would be limited to local traffic. Trail systems for bicycling and hiking would be integrated with those of the metropolitan parks of Cleveland and Akron. With much of the valley ultimately restricted from development, an 1800s aura can be restored. Primitive, walk-in camping areas could be provided along the river. Large areas of the park would remain undisturbed, offering a vast outdoor laboratory for students and visitors. Access to the river would be available to boaters, canoers, and picnickers. Most service functions and facilities would be located on the edge of the park.

The park would serve the recreational needs of some four million people who live less than an hour's drive away. Ohio, the sixth most populous state in the nation, has no national parks or national recreation areas. Indeed, the eastern north-central region of the country—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin—makes up 20 percent of the total population of the country, yet only 1 percent of all federally administered recreation areas are located within this five-state region.

The Cuyahoga Valley National Historical Park and Recreation Area would preserve for present and future generations a magnificent

scenic and historic open green space. The image of the upper river as a haven for canoers and rafters would replace the image of the "burning river" mouth. The Cuyahoga would cease to be an example of the worst of pollution and would become a symbol of how America can preserve natural grace and harmony within easy reach of the residents of our congested, urban world.

Thoreau's words, spoken of a village, are yet truer for the inhabitants of a modern metropolis, who will be "saved not more by the people in it than by the woods and swamps that surround it."

Congressman John F. Seiberling represents the Fourteenth District of Ohio, which includes Akron and part of the Cuyahoga Valley. A member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he serves on the subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, Mines and Mining, and the Environment. He has lived in the Cuyahoga Valley for fifteen years and has photographed it extensively.

## IMPEACHMENT AND RESPONSIBLE JOURNALISM

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the following is an editorial presented on Friday, April 26, by WGN radio and television in Chicago, Ill. I heartily approve of the position taken by WGN. I should like to commend them for their representation of the public interest. The resolution which I have filed provides for the televising of possible impeachment proceedings. I am pleased that this excellent broadcasting company has joined me.

### IMPEACHMENT AND RESPONSIBLE JOURNALISM

With the House Judiciary Committee expected to begin impeachment hearings early in May, questions are being asked about electronic coverage of the impeachment process. The questions are not limited to the activities of the House Judiciary Committee. Whatever the committee recommends, there will be debate on the floor of the House of Representatives. And, if the House should vote to impeach President Nixon, he will be tried before the Senate.

Like most other procedural questions, there is little precedent, and none where the electronic media are concerned. The closest parallels we can find are in the rules of the House and Senate. At present, neither allows live broadcast reporting of its floor proceedings.

Generally speaking, we feel the electronic journalist should be as free to report with the tools of his trade as is the reporter representing a newspaper, wire service or magazine, provided, however, there is no disruption of the event itself. And, modern technology makes broadcast coverage without disruption routine.

Now to the specifics of the impeachment process. There is concern that the presence of microphone and camera could cause some of those taking part in the proceedings to play for the media, to create a show for their own purposes. We would hope that the nature of the matter being considered would dictate only the most serious and sober conduct . . . by all concerned.

We think the public can determine for itself how members of Congress and other participants conduct themselves.

There is provision for the House Judiciary Committee, and even for the full House and Senate, to meet in closed session to discuss

impeachment evidence. However, when public sessions are held, they should be open to all media.

The national interest in the impeachment proceedings is overwhelming. The public should be kept as fully informed as possible, as fully informed as the broadcast media can keep them. We hope Congress sees it the same way and modifies its rules accordingly.

#### SUPPORT FOR S. 628 REAFFIRMED

**HON. JEROME R. WALDIE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, as the result of an apparent mechanical failure of

the electronic vote recording system, my vote in support of S. 628 was not recorded. For the record, I would like to make it clear that I continue to support S. 628, for which I was floor manager in the House of Representatives on Wednesday, April 24, 1974.

## SENATE—Tuesday, April 30, 1974

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

NATIONAL DAY FOR HUMILIATION, FASTING, AND PRAYER—TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 1974

Hear the words of the 139th Psalm: "Search me, O God, and know my heart: try me and know my thoughts; and see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting."

Let us pray:

O God, our Creator, Redeemer, and Judge, to whom all men and nations are accountable, in all our humanity and imperfection, we bow in Thy presence today seeking Thy forgiveness. We have offended against Thy holy laws. We have left undone those things which we ought to have done; and we have done those things which we ought not to have done. Forgive us, good Lord, and by Thy Holy Spirit equip us as we lead in affairs of state so also to lead in morality and in things spiritual.

Almighty God, who has blessed this Nation beyond measure, forgive us if we have been unmindful of Thy providence, cold in our love of Thee, callous in our attitude toward others, insensitive to the claims of Thy Spirit. Forgive us for our love of ease, our devotion to things, our absorption with pleasure, our unbridled pursuit of profits. Deliver us from all falsehood and idolatry, from all covetousness, from hard bargaining and ruthless competition. Save us from class warfare and class hatred, from racial antagonism, from self-serving partisanship, from living to ourselves alone, and from putting our trust in our own strength when our trust should be in Thee.

May a new life and a new spirit be born in this Nation, shaping our conduct and directing our destiny. Make us a new people for new times. By Thy higher wisdom, guide the President and all who are in authority over us, and all citizens of the Republic, that this Nation, born in Thy faith and nourished in Thy truth, may seek to serve Thy great purposes for mankind. Help us, O Lord, not only to pray for but to believe in Thy forgiveness and in the resurrection of a cleansed and renewed nation. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 29, 1974, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate is very much aware of the fact that the period between the hours of 10 a.m. and noon today has been set aside for statements in connection with the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 183, proclaiming April 30, 1974, as the National Day for Humiliation, Fasting, and Prayer.

The Senate will return to its regular business at the hour of noon today.

#### QUORUM CALL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 183— NATIONAL DAY FOR HUMILIATION, FASTING, AND PRAYER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to 2 hours of discussion on the National Day for Humiliation, Fasting, and Prayer as provided for by Senate Joint Resolution 183.

The distinguished Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) is recognized.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be reported.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### S.J. RES. 183

Joint Resolution to proclaim April 30, 1974, as a National Day for Humiliation, Fasting, and Prayer.

Whereas it is the duty of nations, as well as of men to owe their dependence upon the overruling power of God, to confess their sins and transgressions, in humble sorrow, yet with assured hope that genuine repentance will lead to mercy and pardon, and to recognize the sublime truth, announced in the Holy Scriptures and proven by all history, that those nations are blessed whose God is the Lord; and

Whereas we know that we have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of Heaven; we have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity; we have grown in numbers, wealth, and power as no other nation has ever grown; but we have forgotten God; and

Whereas we have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own; and

Whereas intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us; and

Whereas we have made such an idol out of our pursuit of "national security" that we have forgotten that only God can be the ultimate guardian of our true livelihood and safety; and

Whereas we have failed to respond, personally and collectively, with sacrifice and uncompromised commitment to the unmet needs of our fellow man, both at home and abroad; as a people, we have become so absorbed with the selfish pursuits of pleasure and profit that we have blinded ourselves to God's standard of justice and righteousness for this society; and

Whereas it therefore behooves us to humble ourselves before Almighty God, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby proclaims that April 30, 1974, be a "National Day of Humiliation, Fasting, and Prayer"; and calls upon the people of our Nation to humble ourselves as we see fit, before our Creator to acknowledge our final dependence upon Him and to repent our national sins.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that millions of Americans today are observing this day as a national day of prayer, humiliation, and fasting, on behalf of our Nation and its people.

An article appears in the Washington Post this morning, under the byline of Marjorie Hyer, entitled "Millions To Pray For U.S. Today," which indicates that 33 States have followed the suggestion of this resolution, and their Governors have issued proclamations declaring a day of prayer, humiliation, and fasting, as of April 30, 1974.

I have also been informed that dozens of mayors across the Nation have likewise issued proclamations declaring for their cities a day of prayer, humiliation, and fasting.

Many of the churches and synagogues across our Nation have voluntarily, without publicity or solicitation, declared an appeal to their parishes and their congregations that their people observe, in their usual ways, in their synagogues, churches, and temples, a day of prayer for our Nation, a day of humiliation, seeking forgiveness for our sins, and a day of fasting, as appealing to Almighty