

LIAM STANTON, Mr. BLACKBURN, and Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts):

H.R. 14490. A bill to establish a program of community development block grants, to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BARRETT):

H.R. 14491. A bill to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DENHOLM:

H.R. 14492. A bill to amend the Emergency Highway Energy Conservation Act to provide for a national highway speed limit of 65 miles per hour; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. KOCH):

H.R. 14493. A bill to protect the right of privacy of individuals concerning whom identifiable information is recorded by the Federal Government by enacting principles to govern Federal agency information practices; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (for himself and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 14494. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and other statutes to increase to \$10,000 the maximum amount eligible for use of simplified procedures in procurement of property and services by the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. RODINO,

Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. POCELL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. REES, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. HUNT, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. VANDER VEEN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Ms. BURKE of California):

H.R. 14495. A bill to amend the Mineral Lands Leasing Act to advance oil shale research and development by establishing a Government-industry corporation to further the technology required for commercial development of nonnuclear in situ processing of oil shale resources located within the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RARICK (for himself, Mr. ALEX-

ANDER, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURLISON of Texas, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. GROSS, Mr. HAYS, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HOGAN, Miss JORDAN, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, and Mr. MIZELL):

H.R. 14496. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RARICK (for himself, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. FREY, Mr. FUQUA, Mr.

GONZALEZ, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MANN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. McKay, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. SALTERFIELD, Mr. SISK, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio, Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. TREEN, and Mr. WAGGONER):

H.R. 14497. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RARICK (for himself, Mr. BOWEN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. HANRAHAN):

H.R. 14498. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 14499. A bill to extend and amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14500. A bill to reenact, amend and extend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 14501. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to determine if bounties, grants, or export subsidies are paid by foreign countries with respect to dairy products imported into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BRADENAS, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. MEEDS, Mrs. MINK, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey):

H.J. Res. 993. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the eligibility of a citizen to hold the Office of President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.J. Res. 994. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., and Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri):

H. Res. 1075. Resolution in support of continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FROELICH:

H. Res. 1076. Resolution to amend the House rules to require that the report of each House committee on each public bill or joint resolution reported by the committee shall contain a statement as to the inflationary impact on the national economy of

the enactment of such legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MANN:

H. Res. 1077. Resolution in support of continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr.

MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. TREEN, Mr. LENT, and Mr. BEARD):

H. Res. 1078. Resolution requiring the administration of an oath to each Member of the House prior to the consideration of any resolution of impeachment; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 14502. A bill for the relief of Eugene M. Osman, Heutenant colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

H.R. 14503. A bill for the relief of Jesus Cruz-Figueroa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

442. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to the Community Action Program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

443. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of New York, relative to the persecution of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

444. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to requiring the marking of the sides of railroad cars with light reflecting material; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

445. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to State regulation and preservation of natural resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

446. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to the establishment of a national health care system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

432. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Common Council, Buffalo, N.Y., relative to the designation of April 30 as "National Pledge of Allegiance to our Flag Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

433. Also, petition of Gary Grant and other members of the Washington State Senate, relative to impeachment of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"NU-LIFE" FOR AMPUTEES AND PARALYZED PATIENTS

HON. JAMES B. ALLEN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, it is with no small amount of pride that I bring

to my colleagues' attention a medical and scientific "breakthrough" which can ease the suffering of thousands of patients who are forced by accident or disease to depend either in whole or in part on the services of hospital personnel or others for even the simplest personal, daily activities.

The thought of lying in bed totally incapable of performing a function as

simple as turning a dial to call a doctor or nurse, or helplessly awaiting the "rounds" for someone to dial a telephone number, is almost beyond the comprehension of the healthy. Nevertheless, there are many persons throughout the country who are afflicted to such an extent that their lives, literally, have become a series of minor movements. Without help from the healthy, such

persons have been doomed to total reliance on institutional compassion and/or the compassion of friends and relatives. There is a good chance that some of the agony of suffering of those so afflicted can now be alleviated.

A small Alabama concern, Scientific Systems International, has devised a proven, electromechanical system which could immeasurably brighten the future of many severely disabled persons. Called "Nu-Life," it is a system of environmental controls using the most advanced techniques and products of solid state physics and space technology. It is especially designed for the hospital, rehabilitation center, extended care facility, and home. Its modular design makes it highly flexible; it can be adapted to the needs of a variety of medical institutions; and it can be quickly modified to accept new, practical, functional components as they are developed. The Nu-Life is a system using different types of input devices operated by the patient to perform a variety of "activities of daily living—ADL."

These devices are switches that are activated by bodily functions which the patient still possesses—even if he or she is a paraplegic.

Scientific Systems International of Huntsville, Ala., is a small, new, but vibrant firm that has the potential of bringing relief to the severely afflicted at a reasonable cost. I should like to emphasize the last point once more: The SSI systems are obtainable for a reasonable cost. We are not talking about millions of dollars, we are considering a new product or group of products which can go into use—right now—selling in the neighborhood of \$4,000. Dr. Sener San-car, is struggling to bring this Nu-Life system to the attention of the public at large.

I have no hesitation in asking our colleagues and interested professionals to investigate the concept more fully. A complete descriptive brochure about the company and the concept is available from Scientific Systems International, 2024 Wooddale Drive, Huntsville, Ala. 35801. SSI has brought space-age technology to bear on one of the great physical and psychological problems in the medical rehabilitation field. I commend your attention to this new-life, space-age concept.

PROBE AIMS AT CEA'S CALDWELL; INQUIRY STEMS FROM 1960 INCIDENT

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in recent months the spotlight has been turned upon activities of the commodities futures markets. The Des Moines Register in some investigatory reporting has helped to interpret the problems and changes in this very important industry so that the millions of people who are affected could better understand how it works and what changes were needed. Recent legislation passed in the House should go a long way toward correcting

some of these problems. However, a great deal of the necessary activity cannot be spelled out specifically in legislation and must continue to be the responsibility of the boards of trade and the Government commissions involved in their regulation.

One example of this is the handling of individual grievances by investors who believe the rules have not been complied with or that they have been damaged in a way warranting recovery. A recent article by Clark Mollenhoff and George Anthan in the Des Moines Register, deals directly with an example of this. It involves a case of an individual by the name of Bernard Rosee. It now appears that the Commodities Exchange Commission is concerned and that the board of trade involved will be asked to provide the answers to certain questions connected with this case. If this is true, it illustrates an awareness of the importance of due process at the level of the Commodities Exchange Commission and the board of trade to assure that it gives fairplay to the public and for investors generally. There will need to be a continuing and activated procedure and a better understanding of how this has operated as well as how it can be expected to operate in the future. The Rosee case can be an example to illustrate these processes and procedures. The article is as follows:

PROBE AIMS AT CEA'S CALDWELL; INQUIRY STEMS FROM 1960 INCIDENT

(By Clark Mollenhoff and George Anthan)
WASHINGTON, D.C.—The long-dormant Community Exchange Commission (CEC) is stirring and is deeply involved in a precedent-shattering investigation that could have widespread repercussions in the policing of the \$400-billion-a-year commodity markets.

The investigation is aimed at Alex Caldwell, the veteran administrator of the Commodity Exchange Authority (CEA), who has been a one-man show in the regulation of the commodity markets since January, 1960.

Before that he was deputy administrator for several years, responsible for policing of boards of trade to assure that the public was properly protected through segregated accounts.

THE CHARGES

The charges against Caldwell, the Chicago CEA office, and the Chicago Board of Trade stem from a complaint filed by Bernard Rosee, a veteran Chicago commodity trader who lost his seat on the Chicago Board of Trade in 1960.

Rosee claims he was defrauded of more than \$500,000 by the Baggot and Morrison commission house, and that Caldwell and others have engaged in a pattern of collusion that has included malfeasance, misfeasance and nonfeasance in office in violation of the federal laws and the rules and regulations of the Chicago Board of Trade.

Although an Illinois court awarded Rosee a \$750,000 verdict against Baggot and Morrison and its partners, Caldwell has persisted in asserting that he finds no federal law violations in the admitted destruction of commodity records by Baggot and Morrison officials.

Within the last two months Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz has stepped into the case and has requested Ervin Peterson, chairman of the CEC, to get to the bottom of the long-standing case.

Rosee contends that reconstruction of Baggot and Morrison's trading records in a crucial period in the fall of 1959 will prove that officials of the firm embezzled his funds, by crediting his account with "accounts number 35 and number 45" that were not his.

For more than 12 years Caldwell has rejected Rosee's plea for access to those accounts and the original daily trading card records of Baggot and Morrison in the crucial period.

ASKED CALDWELL

Peterson told The Register last week that he has asked Caldwell to supply the records for him to examine along with the record of the hearing by the Chicago Board of Trade that led to Rosee losing his seat.

Peterson, whose regular job is administrator of the agricultural marketing service, has a long background in federal and state government that has included regulatory work for Oregon.

Peterson who makes no judgment on the validity of Rosee's charges against Caldwell, other CEA officials or the Chicago Board of Trade, says the charges "are sufficiently serious" to warrant an unprecedented investigation of the administration of the CEA.

Peterson says the seriousness with which he is taking the charges against Caldwell is indicated by his enlistment of the personal help of John A. Knebel, the 37-year-old general counsel for the Department of Agriculture.

"The secretary of agriculture told me he wants this thing investigated thoroughly, and cleaned up once and for all," Peterson said.

"My first job is to get all of the trading records that are available from the CEA, from the Chicago Board of Trade, and from the Baggot and Morrison firm, to examine them and determine whether they generally support the charges that Rosee and his lawyers have made against CEA officials," Peterson said.

The 65-year-old former Oregon County judge said he already is convinced that there has been a general laxity in the policing of the commodity markets as a result of the part-time nature of the jobs on the CEC.

The CEC, as originally conceived in 1920, was to provide cabinet-level authority for protection of the integrity of the commodity markets. The chairman was the secretary of agriculture and the other two members were the secretary of commerce and the attorney general.

By its inactivity over the years, it abdicated its responsibility to the single-headed CEA, which has been permitted to operate as a one-man show under Caldwell because the CEC, without staff or offices, depended upon him to call their attention to problems in the commodity field.

It was obvious that Caldwell would not call attention to any matters that would reflect unfavorably upon him, and he was the one CEC members would call if they heard complaints from others.

Despite a highly critical report on the CEA by the General Accounting Office (GAO) in 1965, the CEC has never conducted an investigation of CEA's administration of the commodity markets beyond asking a few questions of Caldwell who has always assured Democratic and Republican administrations that all was well.

The "all is well reports" have continued even in the face of several congressional investigations of CEA, and overwhelming House Agriculture Committee approval of a drastic commodity market reform law.

Peterson's decision follows a House Small Business Committee report lambasting the inadequacies of the CEA in policing the commodity markets, with the threats of the Senate investigation getting into the specific problems of the 14-year-old Roscoe case.

On the one hand, it is regarded as such an old case that it will cause relatively little furor, and yet the mere fact that it remains unresolved and active after 14 years makes it a classic study of the inadequacy of CEA in protecting the commodity traders and the public.

INTERNAL REPORTS

Internal reports of the Agriculture Department have long been highly critical of Caldwell's weak administration of laws that were originally designed to protect the public and traders from the very pattern of fraud that Rosee says he experienced.

Peterson and the CEC members will not be able to make final judgments on Rosee's case until they have reviewed the 14-year record of Rosee's effort to obtain access to daily trading records and cards that are required to be kept by law.

Rosee has contended that the records of daily trading can be reconstructed to prove that Baggett and Morrison's firm had cheated him out of between \$500,000 and \$1 million.

If he is successful in his appeal to the CEC to force the Chicago Board of Trade to give him back the seat he is expected to seek reinstatement of a multimillion-dollar damage suit against the Chicago Board of Trade, which he contends was involved in collusion with the Baggett and Morrison officials to deny him due process of law. And he is also expected to seek a reconstruction of the trading records he had been promised by the then-secretary of the Chicago Board of Trade, Warren W. Lebeck. Lebeck has since become president of the Chicago Board.

Baggett and Morrison officials, the Chicago board, and the CEA officials in Chicago and Washington have firmly resisted the efforts of Rosee and his lawyers to obtain the records under the Freedom of Information Act.

Although the commodity trading records are required to be preserved, as a barrier against fraud, Caldwell and his CEA associates have contended that the records involving his own trades and trades credited to him by Baggett and Morrison are "confidential business records" and one of the exceptions to the act.

Rosee's lawyers have argued unsuccessfully to the CEA that since the trades in two particular accounts—accounts 35 and 45—are the heart of Rosee's dispute with Baggett and Morrison officials, there should be no question of access.

Caldwell has remained adamant in preserving the secrecy of those records even in the face of a 1973 U.S. Supreme Court decision (the Ricci case) which declared that the CEA officials should make such trading records available for examination in carrying out the public protection intent of the commodity exchange laws.

RECENT RULINGS

But more important than the recent Supreme Court ruling ordering the CEC to conduct the unprecedented investigation of CEA are the highly critical investigations of CEA in 1973 and the likelihood that more congressional investigations loom ahead.

There is a good chance that one or more of these Senate inquiries of the regulation of the commodity market will touch at least briefly on the Rosee matter, and the trouble-plagued Department of Agriculture does not wish to be any more vulnerable to charges of mismanagement. The criticism on the Soviet wheat deals and on the dealing with the dairy lobbyists on the 1971 boost in milk price supports has been more than enough.

Peterson, with experience as director of the agricultural stabilization organization in Oregon, and with long experience as an assistant secretary of agriculture with duties in the regulatory field, comes to the CEA investigation with the freedom to take whatever action is necessary to clean up commodity regulation.

THE QUESTION OF IMPEACHMENT

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year my office sent out a questionnaire on impeachment and public financing of campaigns. In March, under a special order, I announced the results of that poll which showed that 62 percent of those answering were in favor of impeaching the President. A reprint of my statement, sent to the residents of the Sixth District of Washington, generated an occasional strong response from those who do not favor impeachment. One of those so responding requested that I bring to the attention of my colleagues his letter. Consequently, I submit the following from Rev. Charles F. Schreiner of Port Orchard, Wash.:

PORT ORCHARD, WASH.,

April 10, 1974.

Congressman FLOYD V. HICKS,
6th District, Washington, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HICKS: Thank you for your copy of the speech you entered into the Congressional Record concerning impeachment of Mr. Nixon.

However, I do not believe there is any way that the President of the United States can get a fair hearing from The Congress of the United States! With so many members of the House of Representatives, and of the United States Senate already passing judgment, even before testimony has been taken or witnesses have been cross examined by Mr. James St. Clair, it appears that the professed announcement to impeach has already precluded even a minimal rule of moral conduct or fairness.

With inflation that is rising in every spectrum of our economics, what does Congress do about this? Apparently nothing! What does the White House do? Sends a lop sided inflated budget. It does nothing! All that Congress (and this I'm sorry to have to write during Holy Week,) does . . . is carry on the vendetta against Mr. Nixon, with no rule of conduct to at least censure the verbal headline getters. It's becoming like a carnival, with Mr. Nixon in the cage; the Judiciary Committee as the "seller" or "barkers" and the Country seems to be forgotten.

You had your staff take a poll for you. But you did not suspend judgment. Hence your speech in the Congressional Record. The Grand Jury leaked reports that were given to Judge Sirica, and one was reported by CBS, NBC as if it were an indictment of the President. Innuendo corrupts through propaganda, and you in the Congress seem to think that you're giving us something as a people that we can all take. Well, as one historian from Seattle University I cannot do this, and I ask you as my representative to read this into the Congressional Record. It may not do any good, but at least, there may be some members left with a minimum standard of fair play and perhaps some may take a new look at what they are doing to the Nation. With kind regards, I remain,

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES F. SCHREINER.

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX
MODIFICATION

HON. MIKE GRAVEL

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, the Bureau of Labor Statistics is currently making alterations in the Consumer Price Index. Now tailored to meet the needs of millions of average Americans who seek and need information on the impact of inflation on their earnings and family budgets, the Consumer Price Index plays an important role in adjusting our economy to changes in the cost of living. Over 50 million people, including many wage earners, approximately 29 million social security recipients, and retired civil service employees receive increases in income based on changes in the CPI.

The current method of calculating the price index satisfactorily meets these individuals' needs. Based on the cost of goods purchased by urban wage earners and clerical workers, the index is extremely accurate for people covered by cost-of-living escalators in their contracts and for social security recipients. It also provides the information needed by millions of other workers who need to evaluate the impact of inflation on their wages.

Unfortunately, the administration has already set in motion the machinery to alter the CPI to include the expenditure patterns of the more wealthy. Including those who spend less of their income on such basic items as food and fuel will result in smaller increases in the Consumer Price Index, because these items, which are in large part responsible for the rapidly rising rates of inflation, will be weighted less heavily in the new index.

Implementing these changes will distort the index Americans have come to understand, use, accept, and depend on. They cannot depend upon a new, expanded, average index that does not accurately measure the impact of inflation at their budget level.

I have cosponsored S. 3361, legislation that would prohibit altering the current index in the manner planned by the administration. This bill would not prohibit, however, the computation of any additional indexes the administration might desire to produce.

In addition to the Consumer Price Index which measures changes in the cost of living over time, the Bureau of Labor Statistics also compiles an urban family budget study to compare the relative cost of living in different areas of the country. Recognizing that these relative differences between areas depend on the market basket of goods selected for the survey, and that different expenditure patterns are found at different income levels, the budget study data is already reported for three budget levels. If the administration wants additional Consumer Price Index information, it should follow this pattern.

The budget study data now collected

for Anchorage, Alaska, illustrates the inadequacy of trying to use one index to cover all income levels. At the lower, intermediate, and higher budget levels, the differences in the cost of living between Anchorage and the U.S. urban averages are 50 percent, 32 percent, and 27 percent respectively. The differences in these levels are due to the relative weights of goods in the various market baskets used for each budget level. While the Consumer Price Index is computed in a different way, this example illustrates that the relative weight of goods used to compute cost-of-living variations has a significant impact on the final determination of the cost of living. Thus, it would be a great injustice to a majority of the American people to expand the CPI and distort its accuracy as applied to their income level.

In addition to vehemently disagreeing with the alleged merits of altering the index, I take strong issue with the secretive manner in which BLS set about making the change. On February 7, without telling Congress or the American people, BLS decided to implement the expanded index. Without checking with anyone outside the administration, millions of dollars were spent to develop the data base needed to institute the new index. There were no outside discussions or independent evaluations.

The administration has operated behind closed doors. It disregarded traditional methods of involving citizens in the decisionmaking process and, instead, announced a de facto decision. This is not the way a democracy should work.

In summary, Mr. President, I would hope that my colleagues will support S. 3361, not only to prohibit a hastily conceived and injurious change in the method used to compute the Consumer Price Index, but also to assert the right of the people to be involved in making the policies of Government.

CONSERVATION FEDERATION SUPPORTS THOMSON BILL

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, further support for my bill, H.R. 11603, to create an Upper Mississippi River National Recreation Area, was recently voiced by the Conservation Federation of Missouri during its annual convention on March 24. Those of us concerned about the environment need to take a long look ahead so that our preparations today preserve for future generations those benefits of our tremendous natural heritage. The coordinated use of the recreational resources along the Mississippi River between St. Louis and the Twin Cities should be an important priority now to preserve the unique resources of the river. I include at this point in the Record the resolution adopted by the Conservation Federation of Missouri favoring passage of H.R. 11603.

RESOLUTION No. 10

Whereas the Upper Mississippi River from St. Louis to Twin Cities, Minnesota possesses some of the finest wildlife habitat and other recreational resources left in the Midwest; and

Whereas there has recently been introduced in the Congress by Congressman Vernon Thomson H.R. 11603 to establish the Upper Mississippi River National Recreation Area; and

Whereas the present plan for the National Recreation Area would be administered by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and would be advised by a thirteen-member Upper Mississippi Recreation Area Council; and

Whereas 565,000 acres of the proposed area is already in federal ownership and only 58,300 acres of additional lands would need to be acquired in fee title or lesser interest; and

Whereas the establishment of the National Recreation Area would give protection to this unique resource in the future;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Conservation Federation of Missouri assembled in Annual Convention in Jefferson City, Missouri, this 24th day of March 1974 joins with organizations from the four other states involved and the many national organizations in endorsing and supporting H.R. 11603 or similar legislation to establish the Upper Mississippi River National Recreation Area; and

Be it resolved that Congressmen Hungate, Sullivan, Symington and Clay, whose constituents are most directly affected be asked to join in the sponsorship of H.R. 11603 and we request our Senators to consider joining in Senate legislation for the same purpose; and

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Missouri Delegation in Congress, Governor Christopher S. Bond, the Secretary of the Interior, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, National Park Service, and the Army Corps of Engineers.

WATERGATE TAPES

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge respectfully that our Judiciary Committee refuse to accept the transcripts of the Watergate tapes that the President is pretending to be so generous about. I would hope that the committee sees fit to return the material, unopened, to the White House—on the ground that Mr. Nixon has not been responsive to the subpoena which he forced the committee to have served on him. That subpoena, Mr. Speaker, does not say transcripts. It says tapes. We should not back off. If we had to settle for mere transcripts—and how can we be so submissive as to abandon our constitutional responsibility by accepting a White House handout?—we could get the transcripts for 10 or 15 cents by buying a newspaper. For what the President is proposing to give to us he is also, very generously, furnishing to the newspapers.

I heard the President's speech last night, and I did not miss the point. His

point was that he still insists on setting the ground rules for his own impeachment. But, of course, Mr. Speaker, how can he be the fair judge of a matter in which he might end up being accused? How can we believe him when he says the transcripts are complete as to Watergate? It begins to look more and more, Mr. Speaker, that he refused to turn over the tapes themselves, because for him to do so might be tantamount to submitting a signed confession.

His offer to permit the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee to verify the transcripts by listening to the tapes is also unacceptable. The committee, Mr. Speaker, needs to have actual physical possession in order to assure the integrity not only of the transcripts but also of the tapes. Otherwise, there would be no telling how many more 18½-minute gaps might exist.

WHAT CONSTITUTES GROUNDS FOR IMPEACHMENT?

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, there are new experts on the subject of impeachment appearing every day. Depending upon how they feel about the President, they each have many and varied reasons why he should be impeached. Recently, Paul Harvey, the columnist and radio newscaster, wrote a very provocative column on this subject which points out some very serious charges that could have been used against recent Presidents, but the question of impeachment was never raised. I commend this column to the attention of my colleagues as we further consider this question:

PAUL HARVEY NEWS

If impeachment had threatened President Truman, he'd never have dared fire Gen. Douglas MacArthur; maybe that would have been good.

But neither would he have dared drop the big bombs which ended the Pacific war and saved thousands more lives than they cost—and that would have been bad.

Every President is prone to mistakes in judgment.

And because your hindsight is so much better than their foresight could possibly be, a review of some old newspapers would make some of them appear grotesquely inept.

But did they deserve to be impeached?

I was at Pearl Harbor when our Navy's ships, theretofore dispersed, were brought into the harbor and lined up side-by-side so that it would be more convenient for naval officers to attend social events ashore.

So the Sunday it rained bombs they sank in bunches.

And 4,675 Americans died that day, and there were a million more casualties in the war that followed.

Whoever let the Japanese get the drop on us, our own Commander in Chief, Franklin Roosevelt, was responsible.

Yet in no back issue of The New York Times or The Washington Post do I see any demand for "impeachment."

When President John Kennedy authorized and aided the reinvansion of Cuba in 1961, then mistakenly withheld the promised U.S.

air power—and so wasted the lives of 1,500 brave men—that was not one of our nation's finest hours.

Yet rereading *The Post* and *The Times* of those dates I see no mention of "impeachment."

In 1964 President Lyndon Johnson contrived a false alarm in the Gulf of Tonkin as an excuse to intensify our military involvement in Vietnam.

The essential facts concerning this misrepresentation were duly noted by *The Post* and *The Times*, but neither of them nor any of the papers nor pundits which parrot them ever suggested "impeachment."

Hindsight shows the buggy burglary of Watergate to have been a goofy exercise in overkill, yet it killed nobody.

It did not leave any bomb-dismembered bodies on sunken ships or blood-soaked beaches.

Indeed, the only casualties of the abortive invasion of Watergate are the perpetrators caught in their own backfire.

Yet, for this misdemeanor by his subordinates, President Nixon is the target of impeachment proceedings.

Our nation's founders intended the President, the Congress and the courts to check one another. But when news writers presume to law-making—or law-interpreting—that balance is distorted.

And if the day ever comes in our country when this coalition can harangue and harass and hound and overwhelm anybody, then it can "anybody."

INFLATION IMPACT STATEMENT

HON. HAROLD V. FROELICH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, the American people are concerned about inflation.

Rising costs and rising prices make it difficult for people to maintain, much less improve, their standard of living. For people living on fixed incomes, the burden of coping with inflation is nearly impossible.

Although every Member of Congress shares the public's concern about inflation, many of us feel hard-pressed to contribute any realistic solution to the problem. The experiment of wage and price controls has proven a false panacea, with deeply disturbing economic fallout, and it is proper now for this authority to expire.

Today I am introducing a small but important resolution to help assure that we in the Congress do not unconsciously worsen the problem of inflation through our own legislative actions. My resolution provides that each committee report on a bill or joint resolution of a public character in the House "shall contain a detailed analytical statement as to whether the enactment of such bill or joint resolution into law may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy."

There are times, Mr. Speaker, when Congress will enact legislation that has an adverse inflationary impact because we have decided that some other objective has a higher priority. This is inescapable. But when we take action of this nature, let us acknowledge forthrightly what we are doing and why we

are doing it. Let us not try to conceal the expected consequences of our actions.

The case for an economic impact statement was extremely well stated by Dr. Richard W. Rahn in the October 1973 issue of the *Ripon Forum*. Dr. Rahn's article is highly relevant to my somewhat narrower proposal, and I insert it at this point in the *RECORD*.

THE NEED FOR ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENTS

(By Richard W. Rahn)

Should economists and legislators who determine economic policy be held accountable for the results of their policies? Traditionally, economics has been viewed as such a mystical science that it seemed perhaps no more fair to blame the economist for the world's economic situation than it was to blame the preacher for the world's moral situation. In reality, however, the science of economics has now developed to the stage where the effects of most policy changes are reasonably predictable.

The economic problems now facing our country result largely from the implementation of policies whose probable outcome could have been forecast by the policy framers. For instance, our present inflationary cycle began when the Johnson Administration greatly increased both domestic and Vietnam War spending without increasing taxes to pay for the spending. The resulting inflation was predictable.

For the most part, bad economic policy is implemented because both Administration and congressional economic policy makers feel pressured to respond to the political realities of the short run rather than the long run needs of the nation. Economic policymaking could be substantially improved if each new policy proposal were accompanied by an economic statement of the long run results of such a policy.

If we compare our economic environment to our physical environment, we recognize that induced changes usually have both positive and negative effects. It has become apparent that we cannot continue to alter our physical environment without considering the long run effects of such alterations. The same is true with our economic environment. In order to grow and prosper in a healthy environment, we must adopt policies which have long run beneficial effects rather than short run policies which tend to exacerbate current difficulties over a period of time.

Specifically, it is recommended that, in the case of any new legislative proposal or administrative policy that would have major impact on the economy, the Congress or the Administration be required to append a formal and detailed statement of the expected long run effects of such an action to the proposal.

The Russian wheat deal, the recent price and wage controls, and the recently vetoed minimum wage bill all illustrate the need for such "economic impact statements." The Russian wheat deal is acknowledged by most observers, including Treasury Secretary George Shultz, to have been a colossal blunder. It now appears that when the Department of Agriculture gave its approval to sell one-fourth of the entire U.S. wheat crop to the Soviet Union, not one official in the department first evaluated the effect of such an agreement on our existing grain stocks, let alone the price of wheat given the anticipated harvest in relation to expected domestic and foreign demand. A careful economic analysis of the deal may not have revealed that the price would eventually rise to \$4 a bushel as it did, but it would certainly have revealed that such a transaction would cause major upward pressure on the price of wheat.

The shortages, the cessation of production of marginally profitable products (e.g. lower priced grades of paper), the rise of black markets, and the ballooning of prices when the

controls were lifted, were all easily predictable results of the recent price freeze. If the Administration had been required to produce an "economic impact statement" describing the negative aspects of the freeze, there probably would have been a far more healthy opposition to the freeze. Perhaps then it would not have been allowed or at least would have been shortened. It is unlikely that prices for the American consumer are not now any lower as a result of the freeze, and he has been forced to accept artificially created shortages.

Minimum wage legislation provides a prime example of the need for an "economic impact statement." Those advocating an increase in the minimum wage from \$1.60 to \$2.20 an hour have provided a rather persuasive emotional case for raising the living standards of millions of impoverished workers, particularly in these inflationary times. A generation's experience with minimum wages has shown that they are not the panacea for poverty that they would appear to be.

We know that no rational employer is going to pay an employee \$2.20 an hour when he only produced \$2.00 per hour's worth of product. In reality, many low wage workers will not have their wages increased, but will be fired. Even the distinguished economist Paul Samuelson (a notorious non-conservative) has said: "Minimum wage rates. These often hurt those they are designed to help. What good does it do a black youth to know that an employer must pay him \$2.00 per hour if the fact that he must be paid that amount is what keeps him from getting a job."¹

Kosters and Welch found in their highly regarded study of the minimum wage that: "Minimum wage legislation has had the effect of decreasing the share of normal employment and increasing vulnerability to cyclical changes in employment for the group most marginal to the work force—teenagers. Thus, as a result of increased minimum wages, teenagers are able to obtain fewer jobs during periods of normal employment growth and their jobs are less secure in the face of short-term employment changes. . . . A disproportionate share of these unfavorable employment effects appears to have accrued to non-white teenagers. The primary beneficiaries of the shifts in the pattern of employment shares occasioned by minimum wage increases were adults, and among adults, particularly white males."² The President's proposal to have a lower minimum wage might have received far more favorable treatment in Congress if the opposition had been required to show that their proposals to increase the wage for all workers to \$2.20 an hour would in all likelihood substantially increase the rate of teenage unemployment—particularly among black teenagers.

This proposal for required "economic impact studies" is predicated on the notion that the long run effects of our actions are at least as important as the short run results, and that economic forecasting has developed to the point where it is at least as much of a science as it is an art.

Economic policy makers ought to be as accountable to the public for their actions as are other professionals. As John Kenneth Galbraith recently said: "Then there is the remarkable nonaccountability of economists—something of which, as an economist, I am very reluctant to complain. A surgeon, in a general way, is held accountable for results. If, delving for a brain tumor, he gets a prostate, he is open to criticism. Even

¹ Paul A. Samuelson, *Economics*, 9th Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York 1973 pp. 393-394.

² Marvin Kosters and Finis Welch, "The Effects of Minimum Wage on the Distribution of Changes in Aggregate Employment," *The American Economic Review*, (June 1972) p. 330.

lawyers are held to certain standards of performance; John Mitchell is in trouble for changing sides on the matter of crime. But not economists. No matter how great the disaster, we are still revered."

It is hoped that the requirement of an "economic impact statement" by economists and other public practitioners of the economic sciences will help bring closer the day when economists are reversed for a reason.

Resolution to amend the House rules to require that the report of each House committee on each public bill or joint resolution reported by the committee shall contain a statement as to the inflationary impact on the national economy of the enactment of such legislation

Resolved, That clause 27(d) (1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Each report of a committee on each bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by such committee shall contain a detailed analytical statement as to whether the enactment of such bill or joint resolution into law may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy."

THREE GOVERNMENT BRANCHES UNEQUAL

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we face separation of power questions, the following analysis may be instructive:

CLASH COMING: THREE GOVERNMENT BRANCHES UNEQUAL

(By Jeffrey Hart)

We keep hearing—from pundits, the President, and professors of political science—that the U.S. government consists of three separate but equal branches. That is false. The system established by the founders and set forth in the Constitution is, in the last resort, one of absolute congressional supremacy.

One of the fascinating features of the current impeachment process is the way in which the separate-but-equal theory is being shown up for the myth it really is.

The White House thus may twist, turn, and delay—but it knows that it has no choice but to surrender to the Peter W. Rodino committee any required tapes and other evidence. Backed by the weight of the full House, the Rodino committee, is, quite simply, irresistible. To resist is to be impeached. The committee is restrained, if at all, only by the sentiment of Congress. In this confrontation, the White House is hardly an "equal branch."

The truth about the American system, though it is hardly ever mentioned, is that Congress possesses ultimate, decisive weapons that it can use against the other two branches. Neither the President nor the court has any comparable weapons to use against Congress.

In a mild collision with the President, for example, Congress can override his veto. In a serious collision, it can impeach him. It can refuse to appropriate salaries and operating expenses for the executive branch. As in the legislated end to the Cambodian bombing, it can even have the final say in foreign policy. An "equal branch?"

³ John Kenneth Galbraith, "Why the Nixon Economic Policy is so Bad." New York, (September 3, 1973) p. 29.

The nation's highest court has the adjective "supreme" attached to it, but that doesn't mean that it is "supreme" relative to Congress. Congress has been reluctant to collide with the court, even under severe provocation, but there is no doubt about what the result of such a collision would be.

Under Article III, Section 2 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to remove specific legislation from the appellate jurisdiction of the court. It can do this with regard to busing, abortion, or any other issue. It can impeach judges, refuse to pay their salaries, refuse to confirm them. That doesn't sound like the relationship between "equal branches."

Or consider the following scenario: Mr. Nixon is impeached by the House and then convicted by the Senate. He refuses to leave the Presidency and carries his appeal to the Supreme Court. James St. Clair, Mr. Nixon's lawyer, argues that the phrase "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors" does not describe the specific acts for which the Senate convicted Mr. Nixon. By a 5-4 vote, astounding everyone, the court overturns Mr. Nixon's conviction.

At that point, Congress could reach for the ultimate weapon, the untrumpable trump, and impeach the justices.

What the separate-but-equal myth actually does is describe not a system of government but a system of manners. In practice, and tacitly, over much of the course of American history, the three branches have agreed to behave "as if" they were really equal—though in fact, as we have seen, they are not. The myth of separate-but-equal branches expresses the fact of mutual restraint. By and large, Congress has not been obliged to flex, let alone use, its constitutional muscles.

In our time what we have seen is the breakdown of that traditional restraint. In the post-World War II era, the first serious assaults, came from the court—in rulings on busing, pornography, prayer. Restraint gave way to ideological aggression. And now Congress finds itself on collision course with the President. The sleeping constitutional giant of congressional supremacy has begun to awaken.

TOCKS ISLAND DAM CALLED PORK BARREL LEGISLATION BY THE WASHINGTON POST

HON. JOSEPH J. MARAZITI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. MARAZITI. Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD, I would like to submit an editorial by one of the Nation's leading newspapers on an environmental issue that is of interest to all those in the Nation who are concerned about preserving our natural resources and cutting out waste in Government spending:

PRESERVING AN ISLAND—AND A VALLEY

A few hours north of Washington, along the upper New Jersey-Pennsylvania border, is an amazingly beautiful valley. Above the Delaware Water Gap, a 40-mile stretch of magnificent land is flush with wildlife—including black bear, deer, trout and foxes—and is a preserve of natural and historic scenery not usually associated with the industrial areas of northern Jersey and eastern Pennsylvania. Somehow, the polluters and exploiters have stayed away from this land that was settled by English and Dutch colonials in the mid-1600s. Currently, though, the purity of the Delaware Valley

and the Delaware River that winds through it are threatened by the proposed construction of the Tocks Island Dam.

As authorized by Congress 14 years ago, the purpose of the dam was flood control. At the time, the idea of a dam may have seemed feasible, because hurricanes in the area had caused floods a few years earlier. But now, years later, too many arguments against the proposed dam suggest that it would be better not to build it at all. Rep. Joseph J. Maraziti (R-N.J.) told the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Appropriations Committee that the dam project "is fiscally irresponsible, unjustified from a cost-benefit-ratio point of view, environmentally dangerous and unnecessary. Alternatives still exist for flood control, water supply, power and recreation in the Delaware Basin at far less cost without destroying one of the last free flowing rivers in the East."

In the past, public works projects like this were often constructed with few environmental or social considerations given. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—involved here too—usually went ahead with little opposition beyond what a few unorganized conservationists offered. But those bulldozing days are over, as such recent examples as the halted Florida barge canal illustrate. As for the Tocks Island Dam, the pork barrel temptations may still be present but the strong opposition from a local representative, Mr. Maraziti suggests that Washington should keep its pork. Significantly, the congressman's views are shared not only by many of his constituents but also by the federal Council on Environmental Quality. Chairman Russell Peterson said: "I feel strongly that there is a pressing need to evaluate alternative measures to the Tocks Island Dam project, particularly to assure that water supply, power and recreation needs of that region can be met in a reasonably effective and economically efficient manner."

The opposition raised to the construction of the dam is not from isolated parties who might be labeled as being "anti-progress." Instead, the coalition of local citizens, politicians, and federal environmentalists suggests a broad realization that the preservation of this valley far outweighs any benefits the Corps of Engineers or real estate speculators might envision. On the state level, New Jersey Gov. Brendan T. Byrne has the opportunity to take decisive action, and Congress can do its part by refusing any further funds. If anything, what is needed is more funds to preserve the area, not to maul it.

POSTCARD VOTER REGISTRATION

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, throughout the discussion and debate on the postcard voter registration bill, a great majority of State and local officials have been critical of the bill and fear that it would result in administrative chaos.

Following is a very thoughtful analysis of the proposed legislation from Mr. George A. Mann, registrar of voters-recorder for Santa Clara County in California. It was prepared by the county and distributed to Members from California, but its criticisms are universal and will probably interest all Members.

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED FEDERAL POSTCARD
REGISTRATION LEGISLATION

While I am generally in favor of a well-conceived statewide system of voter registration by mail, I have grave concern that the proposed national programs, specifically H.R. 8053, would result in administrative chaos.

Major examples:

1. The biennial mailing of postcard registration forms to every postal address would result in hundreds of thousands of persons who are already registered submitting the new forms merely as a matter of insurance. This would require that countless wasted hours be spent in searching the files to eliminate duplicate registrations.

2. If the State were not to enact legislation to permit persons registered under the federal system to vote in state and local elections, the number of complaints received from persons not eligible to vote in other than federal elections would be staggering. While the county would have no legal liability in this matter, the sheer volume of complaints would paralyze the office in terms of carrying out our regular responsibilities.

3. The time in which the mailing, return and processing of postcard registrations must be accomplished (150 days maximum—90 days minimum) is entirely inadequate considering the potential volume of work.

4. The single copy of the postcard affidavit is not compatible with existing State law governing the manner of identifying voters at the polling places; i.e., comparing the voter's signature in the precinct roster with that on his affidavit of registration. In order to ensure against loss of the postcard affidavits it would be necessary to photocopy or microfilm each one.

In summary, we would encounter major technical difficulties and exorbitant costs if this type of legislation is enacted. The ultimate victim, however, would be the voter whom this bill is purportedly designed to accommodate. Any program so technically complex and cumbersome has a high potential for crumbling under its own weight, and this could only result in the disenfranchisement of thousands upon thousands of voters.

As an alternative, the Frenzel Substitute (H.R. 11713) appears to be a sound method of allowing individual states, embracing a wide variety of registration systems and regulations, to obtain financial assistance to develop improved and more liberal methods of voter registration along lines which best fit their unique needs. Many states, for example, might be able to function under provisions similar to those in H.R. 8053 because they do not provide such services as mailing sample ballots, notices of polling place location, arguments and other literature to voters; nor are they required to provide precinct voter lists and computer tapes to political parties and candidates. In California where these, and many other services are provided, we need considerably more lead time than is allowed under H.R. 8053.

There is a Joint Senate-Assembly Committee for the Revision of the Elections Code in California, and an advisory committee composed of registrars, city clerks and representatives from State agencies and the public. The advisory committee has been attempting to develop a proposal for a statewide system of registration by mail which would be compatible with the requirements and safeguards deemed necessary to insure fraud-free elections in this State. One of the major delaying factors in the progress of the committee's work has been the lack of funds for adequate staff, necessary travel, etc. Funds made available by the Frenzel Substitute could aid in accelerating the modernization of California's registration and election laws.

FEO AND THE GAS LINES

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, Milton Friedman probably is one of the best known and respected economists in the country, if not the world. I would like to offer to my colleagues the opportunity of reading the views of Dr. Friedman as presented in "The Freeman," a publication of the Foundation of Economic Education—FEE—a' Irvington on the Hudson, N.Y.:

FEO AND THE GAS LINES

(By Milton Friedman)

As I write this in Chicago, lines are forming at those gas stations that are open. The exasperated motorists are cursing; the service station attendants are fuming; the politicians are promising. The one thing few people seem to be doing is thinking.

How is it that for years past, you and I have been able to find gas stations open at almost any hour of the day or night, and have been able to drive up to them with complete confidence that the request to "fill up" would be honored with alacrity and even with a cleaning of the windshield? To judge from the rhetoric that pollutes the air these days, it must have been because there was a powerful Federal Energy Office hidden somewhere in the underground dungeons in Washington, in which an invisible William Simon was efficiently allocating petroleum products throughout the land, riding herd on greedy oil tycoons lusting for an opportunity to mess things up and create long lines at their gas stations.

Of course, we know very well that the situation is precisely the reverse. The lines date from the creation of a real Federal Energy Office run by a very visible, able and articulate William Simon. Which is the cause and which the effect? Did the lines produce the FEO or the FEO the lines?

After the Arabs cut output, Germany imposed no price controls on petroleum products. It did initially restrict Sunday driving but soon removed that restraint. The price of petroleum products jumped some 20 or 30 per cent, but there were no long lines, no disorganization. The greedy consumers found it in their own interest to conserve oil in the most painless way. The greedy oil tycoons found it in their own interest to see to it that petroleum products were available for those able and willing to pay the price.

Other European countries, like the U.S., imposed price controls. And, like us, they had chaos.

The Arab cut in output can be blamed for higher prices, but it cannot be blamed for the long lines. Their creation required the cooperation of shortsighted governments.

The world crisis is now past its peak. The initial quadrupling of the price of crude oil after the Arabs cut output was a temporary response that has been working its own cure. Higher prices induced consumers to economize and other producers to step up output. It takes time to adjust, so these reactions will snowball. In order to keep prices up, the Arabs would have to curtail their output by ever larger amounts. But even if they cut their output to zero, they could not for long keep the world price of crude at \$10 a barrel. Well before that point, the cartel would collapse.

The effects of consumer and producer reactions are already showing up. The Euro-

pean countries that introduced rationing and restrictions on driving have eliminated them. World oil prices are weakening. They will soon tumble. When that occurs, it will reveal how superficial are the hysterical cries that we have come to the end of an era and must revolutionize our energy-wasting way of life. What we have been witnessing is not the end of an era but simply shortsightedness.

At home, unfortunately, our problems will not be over so soon. The panicky FEO forced oil companies to shift so much production to heating oil that we face a glut of heating oil but a paucity of gasoline. The FEO's allocations among states have starved some, amply supplied others. Its order that refineries operating at high levels must sell oil to those operating at low levels sounds fine. In practice, however, it reduces the incentive for the recipients to buy oil abroad and produces a wasteful use of oil at home.

We have the worst of both worlds: long lines and sharply higher prices—indeed, higher than I believe they would have been without the waste resulting from FEO controls.

Is rationing the solution? Far from it. It is the problem. We already have rationing of producers and distributors. Coupon rationing of final consumers would simply be the hair of the dog that bit you.

The way to end long lines at gas stations is to abolish FEO and end all controls on the prices and allocation of petroleum products. Within a few weeks, your friendly dealer would again be cleaning your windshield with a smile.

How can thinking people believe that a government that cannot deliver the mail can deliver gas better than Exxon, Mobil, Texaco, Gulf and the rest?

SOVIET-UNITED STATES SPACE CO-
OPERATION OR MASSIVE SOVIET
TECHNOLOGY GRAB?

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, the forthcoming space linkup between Soviet and U.S. spaceships raises some interesting questions. The Soviets have traditionally treated their space program, with certain limited exceptions, as a matter of national security. However, it is well known that Soviet space technology lags behind ours in certain categories. However, given the generous and naive nature of most Americans, there is no doubt that this space cooperation will enable them to catch up even as the transfer recently of some of our computer technology enabled the U.S.S.R. to speed up its schedule for MIRV missiles. Therefore, it was with a great deal of interest that I recently learned there are no less than 75 Soviet engineers and other technicians now in Houston gathering information. The number of U.S. people that will be in the Soviet Union is 10, and you can expect their access to Soviet information to be severely limited.

The article from the London Daily Telegraph of April 16, 1974, follows:

[From the London Daily Telegraph, Apr. 16, 1974]

SOVIET-UNITED STATES SPEED-UP FOR SPACE
LINK

Preparations for the Russo-American space rendezvous next year are being stepped up

at the Johnson Space Centre in Houston this week.

This follows the arrival yesterday of a group of Russian cosmonauts and other members of the Russian team. Some members of the team have been in Houston for various periods, and it now numbers no fewer than 75 engineers and other technicians.

The purpose of the present trip is not training but discussion of plans, although some of the cosmonauts may seize the opportunity to take spins in American space simulators.

TRAINING PERIODS

The first training period is to start in July at Star City, outside Moscow, where the cosmonauts have their quarters, and for that the American prime and back-up crews and a few members of the American team, a total of nine or 10 in all, will travel to Russia.

Russian spacemen and some of their support team will go to Houston for the second training period in September.

For the space rendezvous the Russian Soyuz spacecraft is to carry a crew of two, and the larger and much more sophisticated American Apollo, designed for trips to the Moon, a crew of three.

The target date for the launch in Russia of the Soyuz is July 15, 1975, followed about seven hours later by the Apollo launch at Cape Canaveral, and then by rendezvous and docking in earth orbit.

The American prime and back-up crews and some other members of the American team are learning Russian, and many of the Russians involved understand English. But an interchangeable "space lingo" is one of the things that has to be worked out.

NATURALIZED CITIZENS AND THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the privilege to testify before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Judiciary Committee regarding a resolution which I have introduced to enable naturalized citizens to hold the office of President of the United States.

I was accompanied by two young people from Joyce Junior High School in Woburn, Mass. They were representing their classmates who had first written to me 2 years ago to raise the problem created by the language in article II, section I, clause 5 of the Constitution which provides that only "natural born" citizens shall be eligible to hold the Office of President. It is this barrier which House Joint Resolution 491 is intended to remove.

These young people—Nanci Donahue and Thomas Foley—were chosen from over 400 of their classmates to come to Washington for these hearings today. The selections were made on the basis of essays which were written by students at Joyce Junior High School under the direction of Mr. Laurence Gilgun, principal, and Mr. Daniel Sweeney, who is a member of the faculty.

Nanci Donahue has been a straight A student since the first grade and is pur-

suing an honors program at Joyce Junior High School. Thomas Foley is in the college preparatory program and also has a good academic record.

The essay contest became a matter of community interest and was sponsored by the Woburn Daily Times and Woburn Kiwanis Club. I would like to extend my personal thanks to Mr. Paul Haggerty, Sr., publisher of the Daily Times, and Mr. Joseph Breen, Esq., first vice president of the Kiwanis Club, for their participation in judging the essays.

I would like to include at this point the statement which I gave to the subcommittee this morning and the two essays:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE TORBERT H. MACDONALD

I am pleased to appear before this distinguished Committee this morning, and I commend Senator Fong for bringing this important legislation to a hearing.

As I am certain the members of this Committee are aware, Article II, Section I, clause 5 of the Constitution provides that only "natural born" citizens shall be eligible to hold the Office of President. This provision precludes naturalized citizens, who otherwise have the same rights as natural born citizens, from holding the highest elective office in the country. No similar prohibition exists with regard to the offices of Representative or Senator.

While the Founding Fathers might have been justified in limiting the Office of President to natural born citizens, obviously times have changed since the Constitution was ratified 183 years ago. This nation's greatness is due to the contributions of men and women who immigrated here from all over the world, and it is inequitable to perpetuate a barrier which prevents naturalized citizens from seeking the Office of President.

The 1970 Census revealed that there are over 6 million naturalized citizens in this country. In the past decade, more than 500 thousand persons have attained this status, and last year alone the Immigration and Naturalization Service reports that 120 thousand persons earned the rights of American citizens. As long as these millions of citizens are barred from seeking the Office of President, they are being accorded only second-class citizenship.

There is no reason to perpetuate this injustice by preventing a naturalized American from holding the Office of President and serving his country if he or she is the choice of the majority of citizens of the United States.

For a few examples—the son of a great U.S. President who was born in Canada, namely Franklin Roosevelt, Jr., would have been excluded from running for President. The status of past Presidential contenders such as George Romney, the former Governor of Michigan who was born in Mexico, had been clouded as a result of this inequity. I note that Senator Barry Goldwater was born in the Territory of Arizona, three years before it entered the Union, and that Senator Lowell Weicker was born in Paris, France.

I have introduced legislation which provides for an amendment to the Constitution to allow a citizen who is not native born to be eligible to hold the Office of President if he or she has been a citizen for at least twelve years on the date of election for such Office, and if he or she has been a resident within the United States for fourteen years on such date.

The fourteen-year residency requirement is the same as that which now exists in Article II for natural born citizens, and the twelve-year requirement assures that any naturalized citizen who chooses to seek the Office of President will have held his status

for a sufficient time during this period of residency. I realize that in this latter respect H.J. Res. 491 and H.J. Res. 589 which I have introduced differ from your bill, Mr. Chairman; however, I am not as much concerned about the form which this amendment takes as I am that we take some action to remove this long-standing inequity in our Constitution.

I first introduced this legislation two years ago after I received a letter and a petition pointing up the problem signed by several hundred students at Joyce Junior High School in Woburn, Massachusetts, which is part of my Congressional District. At the time that I introduced my legislation during the last Congress, the only other bill was the one that you had introduced, Mr. Chairman, in 1971. There was no similar legislation before the House.

The 92nd Congress adjourned without taking action on these measures, and I reintroduced my bill again this past year along with several cosponsors. When I received the invitation from this Committee to appear this morning, I spoke with officials at Joyce Junior High School and suggested that the school be represented at these hearings. As a result, the school asked those students who had originally written to me two years ago as seventh graders and are currently in the ninth grade to submit essays explaining why they feel this Constitutional amendment is necessary. From over 400 entries, two essays were chosen, and the students who wrote those essays are with me here today.

They are Nanci Donahue and Thomas Foley and have been accompanied in their trip to Washington by Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Sweeney. Mr. Sweeney is the member of the faculty who encouraged the original petition. I might mention that this has become something of a community project in Woburn, because the students' trip is being sponsored by the Woburn Daily Times and the Woburn Kiwanis Club.

I would appreciate it, Mr. Chairman, if these two essays could be included in the record of these hearings at this point, and I would like to personally commend these young people and the hundreds of others whom they represent for their continuing interest in our system of government.

ESSAY

(By Nanci Donahue)

I feel that a naturalized citizen should be allowed to run for the office of the presidency of the United States of America for a number of reasons. First, consider the people who have become naturalized, and in having done so, the things that they have gone through and given up. They have chosen to leave their homes and families, and to relinquish their citizenship in their native land in order to become naturalized citizens. This is only one way that they have shown their devotion and respect for the United States.

Throughout the past, many foreign born people who had come to this country have helped a great deal to make the United States the world power that she is today. For example, the Marquis de Lafayette was very influential in persuading the French king to come to the assistance of the colonists in their battle for freedom at the time of the Revolutionary War. Irish and Chinese immigrants helped to build a system of railroads in the 1870's, and in doing so increased trade and prosperity within the nation. Henry Kissinger, our internationally famous Secretary of State, helped end the cold war between the United States and the Communist nations of the world. These people who have been mentioned are only a few out of the great number who have contributed to the growth of the United States.

Although the President of the United States is considered as one of the most powerful officials in the world, his power is some-

what limited. Stated in the Constitution are the duties of the President. They are basically to observe that laws and treaties be executed and enforced, and to also preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution. He does not make the laws. Therefore, with our democratic system of checks and balances, there should be no fear that any naturalized citizen who has attained the office of the presidency, could lead this country into the hands of any foreign power.

The Declaration of Independence states, "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Therefore, should we deny those people who may have been born in another country an equal opportunity to contribute to the future growth of our nation? Without such people, where would America be today?

ESSAY

(By Thomas Foley)

A naturalized citizen should be allowed to become President because many naturalized citizens have more respect and knowledge concerning our government than many native born American citizens. People in the United States tend to take rights and privileges for granted, whereas a person from another country with fewer rights would relish the opportunity to live, work, and vote here. If a naturalized citizen can vote for the President, why should we deny him the right to be President?

According to Constitutional law, in order to become President, a person must have been born an American citizen, lived in this country for fourteen consecutive years, and be thirty-five years of age. A native American does not choose his place of birth, yet he is given the right to the presidency because of it; the naturalized citizen has chosen the United States as his country, yet he is denied the right to be President. It seems to me that if a naturalized citizen fulfilled the other requirements, and had lived in this country for fourteen years since becoming a citizen, he should have the right to become President.

Some people say that our foreign policy might be a little lenient toward the country of the President's origin. In the same light, couldn't you say that a President might be lenient toward the country of his heritage? Since there are no real natives of the United States but the American Indian, and no American Indian has ever become President, all our Presidents have been of foreign descent.

Becoming President is now possible for citizens of Hawaii or Alaska, who have all become naturalized citizens as a result of the acquisition of their lands, yet a person who has taken an oath of allegiance to the United States is denied the right to govern because of something he couldn't control—his place of birth. It is not fair to deprive a person of the right to lead his adopted country to prosperity and peace. If we were to deny a brilliant leader of men the right to the presidency and the power over world peace that it holds, it would be a tremendous loss, not only to the United States, but to the world and to posterity.

THOMAS FOLEY.

CHRISTIAN SOCIAL CONCERNS

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to have the following article reprinted in

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the interest and enlightenment of all my colleagues. It is taken from the Reformation Visitor, a publication of the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, 212 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

CHRISTIAN SOCIAL CONCERNS

The mental health of the individual and the family is the strength of a nation. Religion is a prominent factor in achieving good mental health and remaining emotionally secure. In Reformation's poll of social concerns, mental health was among the first listed and is to be the topic of the sixth social concerns forum to be held in the Parish Hall Sunday, May 12, at 9:45 a.m. Dr. Joseph J. Baker, Director of Mental Health and Behavioral Sciences Service of the Veterans Administration and a member of Reformation Church, will be the moderator. The following statement is presented as background information for the forum. You are invited to share in the discussion of how to achieve and maintain good mental health.

MENTAL HEALTH

Mental health implies a healthy mind, a good personal adjustment, and a well-organized life. It is synonymous with good emotional balance. The person who has good mental health is a mature person. He deals with his problems effectively and he adapts successfully to both the inner and outer demands being made upon him.

Psychiatrist Earl Menninger defines mental health as "the adjustment of human beings to the world and to each other with a maximum effectiveness and happiness . . . It is the ability to maintain an even temper, an alert intelligence, socially considerate behavior, and a happy disposition." People with good mental health feel comfortable about themselves and with other people. He who has good health enjoys people, has affectional ties, friendship, love, compassion, understanding, and concern for his fellow man, and feels the need to share. The kind of life he lives is momentous for himself, his community, and the world. Mental health requires a proper balance of love, play, work, and worship.

The person with mental health has a sense of well-being, personal dignity, and self-respect. He feels he is wanted, appreciated, and understood. He has a feeling of being purposeful and productive. He has the ability to meet the ordinary demands of living. He identifies with worthwhile work, significant causes, and high social values. He is constantly widening his interests. He is generally good natured, amiable, and cheerful. He has stability, peace of mind, and control over his emotions. He has confidence in himself and in what he is doing. He accepts things he cannot change. His worries are passing. He does not carry grudges. He readily admits his own mistakes, is able to laugh at himself, and maintains a sense of proportion.

Dr. George S. Stevenson, long-time consultant for the National Association for Mental Health, offers 10 signs of good mental health. They are:

1. A tolerant easygoing attitude toward yourself as well as others.
2. A realistic estimate of your own abilities—neither underestimating or overestimating.
3. Self-respect.
4. Ability to take life's disappointments in stride.
5. Ability to give love and consider the interests of others.
6. Liking and trusting other people and expecting others to feel the same way about you.
7. Feeling part of a group and having a sense of responsibility to your neighbors and fellow man.
8. Acceptance of your responsibilities and

doing something about your problems as they arise.

9. Ability to plan ahead and setting of realistic goals for yourself.

10. Putting your best efforts into what you do and getting satisfaction out of doing it.

HOW TO ACHIEVE GOOD MENTAL HEALTH

"Without exaggeration," says Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, "it can be said that frustrated, disintegrated, inhibited, unhappy people who cannot match themselves with life and become efficient personalities, constitute the greatest single tragedy in the world." There is no rule of thumb, no standard for achieving and preserving mental health, but there are things we can do.

We start with a child. In helping him grow up we should safeguard his mental health and happiness. Parents have the responsibility for building and perfecting the physical and mental health of their children. Mental health comes most easily to children who have good relations with parents who are happy and relaxed. Family quarrels and parental division of authority should be avoided. Parents should examine their own prejudices and beliefs and discover and shore up their own deficiencies. As the child grows, he should be given a feeling of self confidence and security. He should not be compared unfavorably with others. His needs for recognition and status should be satisfied. Projecting fears into children should be avoided. If fears are present, the child should not be shamed out of his fears. A feeling of being loved, calm assurance, and an explanation that there is nothing to be afraid of are the best care. And it should be kept in mind that each child has his own characteristics and rate of development. He should be accepted for what he is—an individual with unique potentialities. He should not be forced into anyone's mold of a "perfect" child.

Most of us have good mental health traits as well as some not so good. Our task is to discover which are the bad ones and then try to correct or alleviate them. Some of us are able to change our mental habits and attitudes by recognizing our difficulties and understanding our problems. If we are unable to resolve them we should seek help from a reliable person. The pastor, a trusted friend, a teacher, a member of the family, a counselor or sometimes a co-worker, often can be helpful.

To achieve good mental health we must engage in worthwhile tasks. We should cultivate a wide range of wholesome interests, activities, and social contacts related to good health and high morals. The more we can socialize our desires, the more comfortable we can live. Being needed and standing for something greater than ourselves gives us a sense of personal worth and self-respect. Without self-respect, no great living is possible. We must learn to cope with frustrations and disappointments and roll with the punch in case of personal adversity. We must be able to turn a minus into a plus.

SPIRITUAL LIFE AND MENTAL HEALTH

Nothing stabilizes a shaken life more effectively and helps a person achieve and preserve good mental health than a positive faith. "Through religious experience, confidence, stability, and courage." The sovereign cure for worry is religious faith, says William James, world renowned philosopher-psychologist. "Every sort of energy and endurance of courage and capacity for handling life" James asserts, "is set free in those who have religious faith."

Commenting on his 30 years of dealing with emotionally disturbed patients, Carl Jung, eminent psychiatrist, said: "It is safe to say that everyone of them fell ill because he had lost that which living religions of every age have given to their followers, and none of them has been readily healed who did not regain his religious outlook." Side

by side with the decline of religious life among his patients, Jung found neuroses were noticeably more frequent.

A constructive faith, Dr. Fosdick states, is the supreme organizer of life and is necessary for mental health. The ebbing of religion as an effective force in multitudes of people has been accompanied by an incalculable increase in nervous disorders. One of the main therapeutic functions of religion, he points out, is the dissipation of guilt and a troubled conscience through the gospel of God's forgiveness. Self-respect must be relieved if healthy personal living is to be achieved.

Fosdick reminds us that through Christ's ministry he kept laying his hand on unlikely people, saying you are needed, and so awakened in them a transforming respect for the importance of their lives.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 15 OF THE NEW MEXICO STATE LEGISLATURE

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, today I was pleased to receive in the mail a copy of House Joint Resolution No. 15 of the New Mexico State Legislature urging congressional action to establish a lands claims commission to deal with the matter of restoring the Mexican and Spanish community land grants in the Southwest, including New Mexico.

It was on June 24, 1971, after first receiving correspondence from Sr. Santiago Tapia y Anaya, president of the Alianza Federal de Pueblos Libres, a Mexican-American organization based in Albuquerque, N. Mex., that I introduced initially H.R. 9422, the Community Land Grant Act. Subsequently, during this Congress, I have introduced the Community Land Grant Act as H.R. 4532, H.R. 4953, H.R. 5230, and H.R. 10205, together with 24 cosponsors.

In a letter of September 27, 1973, to Chairman JOHN MELCHER of the Public Lands Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I requested a "full and early hearing" on the Community Land Grant Act. In that letter I asked that all interested groups and organizations be invited to come and present their views.

For the above reasons, I am particularly glad to see the New Mexico State Legislature taking this action to urge us here in the Congress to do our duty in respect to the rightful claims and lands of so many of our Mexican-American citizens.

As I have told this body on more than one previous occasion, the Community Land Grant Act would return over 100 million acres of rural public and private land from Texas to California to several million descendants of Mexican-American—Chicano—settlers in that area for rural community homesteading purposes. These lands had originally been protected to these settlers under the United States-Mexico Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo of 1848. Most of the ground involved was taken from the present-day

Mexican-American citizens of the Southwest or from their forebears through illegal means of all sorts—both official and unofficial—and ranging from tainted court proceedings to raw violence.

Much of the poverty of the Chicano of the Southwestern United States can be directly or indirectly traced from this theft of his land that began in 1848 and continues even to the present day.

It is because the Community Land Grant Act constitutes a major effort at fulfilling the claims for historical and social justice upon our society by our Nation's Mexican-American citizens that I was, indeed, happy to see the action by the New Mexico Legislature.

It is with pleasure that I insert the full text of the short resolution in the RECORD:

[The Legislature of the State of New Mexico]

A JOINT RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ESTABLISH A SPANISH-MEXICAN LAND CLAIMS COMMISSION

Whereas, New Mexico has a unique history of the acquisition of ownership of land due to the substantial number of Spanish and Mexican land grants that were an integral part of the colonization and growth of this area of the country; and

Whereas, various provisions of the treaties agreed upon by the parties concerned under prior sovereigns have not yet been fully implemented in the spirit of Article VI, Section 2 of the constitution of the United States; and

Whereas, congress did establish an Indian claims commission which successfully adjudicated hundreds of disputed land possession questions; and

Whereas, there still exist serious questions about prior ownership, particularly about certain public lands; and

Whereas, many of these questions involve lands in several of the United States; and

Whereas, the legislature has yet to receive a response from congress on its petition for assistance on the question embodied in House Memorial 32 of the first session of the thirty-first legislature;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the legislature of the State of New Mexico that the congress of the United States is respectfully requested and urged to establish by appropriate legislation a Spanish-Mexican land claims commission to adjudicate and make conclusive determinations, including where possible the restitution of public lands, rights and appurtenances thereof, and the awarding of monetary damages for the taking of property, and the subsequent alienation of those equities, by other than honorable means from the various claimants and their heirs, whose rights derive from the prior sovereigns of the southwest; and

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to the presiding officers of each house of congress.

CAN THE UNITED STATES AFFORD MASS TRANSIT?

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in the past several months there has been a lot of talk about mass transit but all of the articles that I have seen dealing

with the subject matter are based upon what I believe to be incorrect or incomplete assumptions. The kind of mass transit that could work in an area where a new city is being built is not necessarily the kind of mass transit which should be constructed in existing cities to carry suburban Americans to their jobs.

Most of the opinions and articles that I have seen fail to fully consider where Americans are traveling to and from and where the increases in travel problems are occurring. The only article that I have seen that deals with these kinds of very important questions is an article in the Des Moines Sunday Register of April 28 by George Anthan. I think it is worthwhile reading for everyone who has access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I am therefore inserting it at this point.

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register, April 28, 1974]

CAN THE UNITED STATES AFFORD MASS TRANSIT? D.C. SUBWAY COST TO BE \$4 BILLION—NEARLY EQUAL TO HIGHWAY BUDGET

(By George Anthan)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—When the long lines began forming at gasoline stations around the country early this year, many citizens, including President Nixon, began extolling the virtues of mass transit.

By revitalizing America's bus, subway and commuter rail systems, the President said, the country could save scarce oil, lessen congestion and improve the environment as well.

Now, there is a strong push in Congress to provide a substantial increase in aid to transit systems and to allow local communities to use some of their federal highway money to improve various modes of transportation.

But at the same time, evidence is mounting that Americans, from the President to members of Congress and ordinary citizens, may have underestimated the capital costs involved in mass transit, especially in constructing urban subway and rail systems.

CAPITAL SUBWAY

For example, some congressional transportation experts estimate the subway system now under construction in the nation's capital eventually will cost \$4 billion, almost as much as the Nixon administration is spending this year for all the highways, roads and streets in the U.S.

The Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) have estimated the Washington subway will have a per capita cost of \$913.

The UMTA has estimated that residents of the San Francisco-Oakland, Calif., area will pay \$413 each for their new BART system. Per capita capital costs of other proposed rail or rail-bus systems are: Seattle, Wash., \$787; Baltimore, Md., \$647; Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., \$623; Honolulu, \$476; Atlanta, Ga., \$467; Pittsburgh, Pa., \$322, and Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif., \$265.

This estimate, according to agency officials, does not take into account the inflation of costs that is certain to hit such projects before they are completed.

Take, for example, the financial history of one of the most highly touted of the new "people movers"—the 2.2 miles of elevated concrete guideway that runs from the business district of Morgantown, W. Va., to the campus of West Virginia University.

Morgantown was designed to be the U.S. Transportation Department's showcase example of how new technology could be used to lessen motor car congestion and pollution and at the same time provide a fast, convenient and cheap method of moving people to places they want to go.

COSTS SOAR

Costs have increased to \$64 million, and the total could go as high as \$125 million.

Yet the system, which was ceremoniously dedicated by President Nixon in 1972, has not carried a single fare-paying passenger.

As a result, officials of West Virginia University have hinted they may insist the system be dismantled. Also, a Transportation Department plan for a "second generation" Personal Rapid Transit (PRT) system at Denver, Colo., has been downgraded from an \$11 million project to a \$500,000 study.

There is little question but that some major American cities could not function for long without public transit, and that some form of readily available transportation is needed in virtually every metropolitan area.

A strike last year by Long Island Railroad employees, for example, resulted in monumental traffic jams in the area, even though only a fraction of the commuters on the island travel to New York City by train.

But within the Transportation Department, opposition to rail or fixed guideway mass transit as the universal public transportation solution is mounting.

Transportation Secretary Claude Brinegar told a House appropriations subcommittee recently, "Cities that do not now have rail transit systems should carefully consider all alternatives prior to starting new systems."

He emphasized, "the solution for most cities is more in the direction of traffic management, special bus systems, incentives for car pools and peak-hour stretch-outs."

Brinegar echoed the argument of highway and automotive interests by adding:

"Improved public transit can attract a great many new riders, yet the automobile will likely remain the dominant form of transportation for all but the largest cities for a long time. We should recognize this and move to do all we can to make sure that the automobile is energy efficient and non-polluting and that its role in the city is effectively managed."

DOT experts are skeptical that Americans can, in any large numbers, be convinced to abandon their cars.

They base their arguments not only on the much-discussed love of the American for his car, but on economic factors.

Government economists have estimated that for every 10 per cent jump in gasoline prices, there is a 2 per cent drop in consumption, but that this soon can be offset by a shift to smaller cars with greater mileage.

There also is strong evidence that such disincentives to auto commuting as hefty parking taxes in downtown districts do little more than encourage a shift from long-term parking to cheaper short-term arrangements.

Martin Wohl, professor of transportation system planning at Carnegie-Mellon University, believes that gasoline prices could double "without significantly affecting community patterns."

For one thing, the average commuter trip from home to work is something like seven miles, so that the fuel price is a relatively small part of the fixed expenses involved in owning a car.

And despite infusions of federal money into public transit systems and loudly-voiced concerns by public officials over the automobile's influence on the American lifestyle, one basic reason the U.S. has such poor public transportation will not change in the near future.

SHIFT TO SUBURBS

Over the last 15 years, and ironically since the end of World War II, public transit has declined as large masses of people used their new affluence to buy cars and move out of the cities into the countryside.

From 1960 to 1970, the population outside central cities increased by 33.5 per cent as against 1.5 per cent in the cities. In 1970, there were 14 million more people living outside the central cities.

It's clear to just about everybody that

America's suburbs are automobile-oriented. Housing and population densities are low, and parking is readily available.

Because of the low population densities and because the places suburbanites want to travel to in the metropolitan area are widely scattered, conventional public transit normally has not been able to operate profitably there.

Washington's subway is being extended into the city's Maryland and Virginia suburbs, at great expense to the taxpayers of those states, but most suburban commuters will have to take a bus or drive to a rail station.

Also, U.S. Census Bureau figures show that an increasing number of suburbanites work in the suburbs, indicating that new public transportation systems should not be geared exclusively to moving people into and out of the old central business districts, as Washington's subway will do.

This is countered, though, by some transit experts who say rapid transportation lines eventually will create the densities and demand, inducing people and companies to locate around them.

Dr. William J. Ronan, chairman of New York's Metropolitan Transportation Authority and president of the Institute for Rapid Transit, asked:

"Had we waited for density to materialize before building our rapid transit system in New York, where would we be? The development of New York City, or of Boston or, to take a more recent example, of Toronto, reflects a planning decision to proceed with urban transportation investment in order to shape development..."

BOTTOMING OUT?

The American Transit Association currently is enthused because of indications that a 25-year decline in passengers may have bottomed out.

While bus, subway and commuter rail systems have been losing patrons at a rate of 4 per cent to 6 per cent a year since 1950, totals for 1973 show a 1.4 per cent gain.

And some big mass transit bright spots are emerging across the country.

In Denver, a transit company characterized by dirty buses and haphazard schedules has been transformed into a publicly-owned system that has grown by about 15 per cent since 1971, and this year has enjoyed a 22 per cent increase in passengers.

After area voters approved a \$4-million bond issue to buy the old system, the fare was dropped to 35 cents, a "tell us where to go" promotional campaign was launched, and new buses were bought with federal help.

But like just about everywhere else, Denver's system doesn't pay for itself. Local sales taxes make up a deficit estimated to reach \$2.5 million this year, part of the \$700 million that public transit systems across the country are expected to lose in 1974.

BRIGHTEST SPOT

The brightest transit spot on the populous East Coast is the 14.5-mile Lindenwood line, between Philadelphia, Pa., and its New Jersey suburbs. It pays its operating expenses entirely from farebox receipts from 42,000 daily riders. A recent survey showed that 42 per cent of its riders had switched from cars.

But the Lindenwood line was built on existing railroad, subway and bridge facilities, and it cost the owners, the Delaware River Port Authority, \$88 million in 1969. Today, it probably would cost up to \$250 million.

The staff of the U.S. House Public Works Committee believes that relatively inexpensive bicycle paths and other bicycle facilities could do more to lessen auto congestion than expensive transit improvements.

"Who is to say," the committee staff asked in a report, "that the legal use of state gas tax funds . . . to construct bicycle paths, and tax-supported bicycle facilities that are underway in a number of cities, is not the cutting edge of a movement that eventually

will have more impact on ameliorating rush-hour congestion than many conventional methods?"

The Nixon administration has sent to Congress a new unified transportation assistance program, to provide some \$16 billion in transit aid over the next six years, including \$2.5 billion in the fiscal year starting July 1.

Much of the money would come from existing programs, but federal capital assistance for transit systems would increase to \$1.4 billion, from the present \$1 billion. Also under the administration plan, local communities could use more highway money for transit improvements.

The American Transit Association also advocates federal operating subsidies of some \$600 million a year and an emergency transit aid program totaling \$1 billion a year for at least two years.

ARTHUR SAMPSON

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to learn recently that Arthur Sampson, Administrator of the General Services Administration has been named the 1973 Outstanding Public Official by the D.C. Metropolitan Subcontractors Association—MSA. This is the latest in a series of major public awards won by Mr. Sampson for his leadership in the design and construction industry. Other recent awards include the Fire Protection Man of the Year award from the Society of Fire Protection Engineers, honorary membership in the American Institute of Architects for "distinguished contributions to the architectural profession," the American Public Works Association's man of the year award, and honorary membership in the Federal Government Accountants' Association for his management record. In my position as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I have had the opportunity to work closely with Mr. Sampson, and I know these awards have been richly deserved.

I would like to commend Mr. Sampson for this most recent award and share with my colleagues some of the background on the awards presentation.

GSA ADMINISTRATOR RECEIVES SUBCONTRACTORS AWARD

Arthur F. Sampson, Administrator of the General Services Administration, has been named the 1973 Outstanding Public Official by the D.C. Metropolitan Subcontractors Association (MSA).

The MSA presented Sampson with a "Subby Award" plaque during its annual banquet held Saturday night at the Washington Hilton Hotel, which was attended by nearly 800 people. Six other persons and companies also were honored at the banquet for their individual and collective leadership contributions to the construction and building industry.

Sampson was selected for the 1973 R. L. Jackson First Presidents Award by the 250 corporate members of the local MSA. The GSA Administrator was specifically cited for his sponsorship and support of favorable legislation, regulations, policies and programs which pertain to the construction industry.

The six other MSA award recipients include the George Hyman Construction Company, the MSA's 1973 Outstanding General Contractor; Kettler Brothers, Outstanding Owner/Builder; Vosbeck, Vosbeck, Kendrick and Redinger, Outstanding Architect; Heinzman, Clifton and Kendro, Outstanding Engineer; Schnabel Foundation Company, Outstanding Subcontractor; and Joseph Burns of the Charles L. Smith Company, Outstanding Job Superintendent.

The MSA's 1972 Outstanding Public Official was Chief Jerry V. Wilson of the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department.

THE THREAT OF REIMPOSING CONTROLS WILL ENCOURAGE INFLATION

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the wage-price control authority expires at midnight tonight, and we must let it expire completely.

As long as Congress indicates that there is a possibility that the control authority might be extended or reinstated, American industry and American workers will be panicked into raising prices and seeking higher wages. An article in today's Wall Street Journal points out that administration economic officials have substantial reasons to believe that the threat of Senate action to extend the control authority will actually encourage an immediate increase in prices and wages. The article quotes a Treasury official as saying,

Businessmen and unions will be encouraged to grab everything they can while the getting is good, so they will be in a good position if controls are reimposed.

Congress is, itself, encouraging inflation by holding controls over the heads of our industries and labor, and at the same time ignoring the answer to curbing the inflationary spiral—reduce Federal spending. Inflation must be attacked through its cause rather than its symptoms. I urge all Members to read the following Wall Street Journal article carefully:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 30, 1974]

ADMINISTRATION WORRIES THAT PRICE BULGE MAY BE WORSENER BY FEARS OF NEW CURBS

(By James P. Gannon)

WASHINGTON.—Even as their wage and price controls expire, some Nixon administration economic officials are worried that the possibility of a revival of the curbs could worsen the post-control price bulge.

Their concern is that businessmen and labor unions may rush to raise prices and wages substantially in the fear that Congress will move to reimpose controls soon. The worry of these officials has been heightened by a move by Senate Democrats to retain standby controls authority—a measure the Senate will consider tomorrow.

As of midnight tonight, the Phase 4 program of controls will legally die—two years, eight months and 15 days after President Nixon imposed the first mandatory peacetime wage-price restraints in U.S. history. The controls are expiring because Congress so far has refused to extend the basic law

authorizing them, despite the worst inflation rate since the Korean War price spiral of 1951.

But administration economists, eyeing the last-ditch attempt of Senate Democrats to keep controls authority alive, are concerned that uncertainties about a possible future reimposition of controls may worsen inflationary pressures stemming from decontrol. If company and union officials fear a new round of controls a few weeks or months from now, they will be more inclined to immediately use their new economic freedom to push prices and wages much higher, the officials reason.

"Businessmen and unions will be encouraged to grab everything they can while the getting is good, so they will be in a good position if controls are reimposed," a top Treasury official said in an interview. Such an attitude could "worsen the inflation problem" immediately after expiration of Phase 4, he added.

Another Nixon administration economist said the uncertainty over controls "creates an environment that gives people an incentive to anticipate" any future recontrol. He said such anticipatory price and wage behavior was evident in mid-1971 before the Phase 1 wage-price freeze and during Phase 3 before President Nixon imposed a second price freeze in June 1973. In both cases, there were widespread expectations of tough controls action by the government.

The Senate could ease the administration officials' fears tomorrow by defeating the standby-controls bill backed by liberal Democrats. The administration in asking last February for only a narrow controls extension that would apply just to the health-care and construction industries, had argued against such broad standby powers on the ground that they would prompt anticipatory wage-price boosts.

The banking committees of both the Senate and House killed all moves to extend controls, reflecting a consensus that the controls were ineffective, unfair and doing more harm than good in causing shortages and other economic dislocations. The Nixon administration had argued that most controls had outlived their usefulness, though it wanted the limited health and construction curbs and authority for its controls agency, the Cost of Living Council, to keep functioning as an inflation watchdog.

In view of strong business and labor opposition to any controls renewal, the Senate move faces an uphill fight. And even if the Senate adopts the Democrats' bill, its prospects in the House wouldn't be bright.

Defeat of the Senate bill would lessen, but might not end, the uncertainty over the future of controls. One White House economist yesterday expressed worry that a continuation of recent inflation rates would build political pressures for new controls.

At a forum on inflation sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce of the U.S., Gary L. Seevers, a member of President Nixon's three-man Council of Economic Advisers, said he thinks "there would be great pressure for rigorous wage and price controls" if a 10% inflation rate continued for 10 to 12 months. Mr. Seevers repeated, however, the Nixon administration view that inflation will abate in 1974's second half.

Another panelist at the forum, Federal Reserve Board member Henry C. Wallich, indicated the Fed will continue its fight against inflation by restraining the growth in the nation's money supply, which consists of checking accounts and currency in circulation.

"Inflation must be controlled—we have no alternative," Mr. Wallich declared. Noting that the nation is "confronting two-digit inflation," he said "the problem has to be given priority if we don't want inflation to continue accelerating."

Mr. Wallich, echoing views recently ex-

pressed by Fed Chairman Arthur Burns, said the central bank's policy should be one of "permitting a moderate growth" of the money supply but "not an explosive growth of the kind we have had in some months recently."

But he asserted that "certainly a recession isn't the means" for bringing inflation under control. "What is needed is a gradual winding down" of inflation pressures, he said, implying that the Reserve Board is pursuing a policy of gradualism rather than a policy of severe restraint that could produce a bad business slump.

On another front, officials confirmed that restraints on interest rates and dividends will end along with other controls tomorrow as expected. The White House is expected to announce formally the demise of the voluntary interest and dividend guidelines that have been administered by the administration's Committee on Interest and Dividends since late 1971. Officials indicated the committee will be disbanded.

Termination of the panel and its guidelines may trigger dividend boosts and increases in interest rates on small-business and consumer loans, which the committee has watched closely.

ALBERT PARKER—A DEDICATED MAN

HON. BO GINN
OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, I know that all Members of Congress have constituents who they rightfully praise for their important contributions to this Nation. I would like to say to the House today, however, that in the First District of Georgia we have a man whose accomplishments are exceptional. I am referring to Mr. Albert Parker, a skilled businessman, an active participant in community activities, and one of the dynamic leaders in the State of Georgia.

It was my pleasure recently to read an article in the Claxton Enterprise concerning Mr. Parker and I insert this in the RECORD at this point.

ALBERT PARKER—A DEDICATED MAN

As Editor of The Claxton Enterprise, I have been going through the old newspaper files for the past few years and have become very interested in Mr. Parker and the Claxton Fruitcake Bakery.

The Claxton Fruitcake is world famous and can be purchased anywhere in the world. Claxton and Evans County has been the benefactors of the success of the Claxton Fruitcake in several ways.

Our files reveal to us that early in Mr. Parker's career as Mr. Fruitcake, he became interested in the community in which he lives; determined to share his good fortune with the city that helped him succeed by using the name of Claxton as the name of his product.

In the early 50's, Albert Parker and others realized that industrial development and growth was the key to our survival as a community here in Evans County. Albert Parker played a major role in helping establish Claxton's first industries. At this time, two of these industries are employing in the excess of a thousand people, creating within the Evans County area several hundred additional jobs and causing stable economy to exist.

Our files reveal that the Evans Memorial Hospital has also received the leadership of

Albert Parker, and is considered one of the finest small town hospitals in existence today, because people like Albert Parker have cared enough to serve as a member of the Board in furnishing good, sound, leadership in administering the program of the Evans Memorial Hospital.

The Pinewood Christian Academy in Bellville certainly owes Albert Parker a debt of gratitude for his interest in education.

U.S. Highway 301 has helped make the Claxton Fruitcake famous and with the opening of I-95, U.S. Highway 301 stands to lose in the excess of 75% of its traffic flow. The Claxton Fruitcake, being a national tourist attraction, can now help save U.S. Hwy. 301 by bringing the people to Claxton to see the bakery and to get that "world-famous" fruitcake.

In talking with people in Claxton in regards to Albert Parker, we have been told that all of the churches in Evans County have been helped by Albert Parker, especially the First United Methodist Church in Claxton. The large social hall at the First United Methodist Church in Claxton was built by Mr. Parker in memory of his mother, Mrs. I. D. Parker.

The Parker Recreation Center was built by Albert Parker and donated to the First United Methodist Church for its use in building a better Christian recreational program within the city.

Our files reveal that Albert Parker is a member of the Board of Directors of the Evans County Industrial Authority. He is one of the nine persons that are now in the process of developing a 250 acre Industrial Park just west of Hagan, Georgia. Our prediction is that this project will be a success because of the outstanding leadership that this Board is giving.

In conclusion of these remarks, we have only begun to tell the story of Albert Parker.

Claxton and Evans County will never repay the debt of gratitude due this man for his willingness to get involved and share with the community his success in becoming the King of the Fruitcake Capital of the World.

FORCED BUSING

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great controversies facing our country has been the forced busing of schoolchildren in order to achieve "racial balance." While we may endorse the concept of equality of opportunity in the education of all Americans, the busing of schoolchildren across cities and towns throughout the country has proved to be disruptive to the educational process and disruptive to our entire society. This forced busing of schoolchildren to enforce bureaucratic regulations regarding equality has caused more problems than it has solved. Poll after poll has revealed overwhelming opposition to forced busing by the American people.

The House of Representatives by a vote of 233 to 124 adopted a prohibition against the use of Federal funds to promote busing on November 4, 1971, during the debate on the bill which became the Education Act Amendments of 1972. This amendment, unfortunately, was weakened as a result of the conference committee report and was made meaningless in the adoption of the final law. The

House voted on March 27, 1974, 239 to 168 to add the same language of the 1971 amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1974.

This anti-busing amendment states the intention of the House of Representatives and the majority of the American people very clearly. It emphatically states that no Federal funds can be used for carrying out a program which would provide for the transportation of students or teachers or for the purchase of such equipment for busing students or teachers in order to overcome racial imbalance in any school or school system. This amendment would also prohibit Federal funds being used for transportation or busing in order to carry out a plan of racial desegregation of any school or school system. This amendment expresses a message loud and clear: Federal funds should not be used to aid, encourage, or provide an incentive for busing schemes.

It is my sincere hope that if this bill is signed into law, it will become law with this strong anti-busing amendment as a part of it.

It is time that Congress take a long range view of this entire problem and pass a constitutional amendment which will prohibit forced busing.

A LOSS TO OREGON

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I rise today to inform my fellow Members that Louis Raymond Norris, the director of the Oregon Retail Council and an authority on taxation for Associated Oregon Industries since 1969, succumbed to a chronic heart condition early on the morning of January 24 of this year.

Memorial services were held in Salem on February 12 by the Reverend John R. Stewart, and there, former State Senator Harry D. Boivin delivered the following tribute:

A LOSS TO OREGON

Louis Raymond Norris was born the son of Perry and Edna Norris in Dresden, Kansas on Nov. 4, 1923. He left us on January 24, here in Salem at the age of 50.

Lou graduated from Kansas State University in Manhattan. He served with the Marines second amphibious division during World War II and came home after the war to marry Betty Jane Moore in Salinas. They have four children: Kathleen, Lindsay, Perry and Todd and one granddaughter, Gina Lou.

A wise philosopher once said: three things a man must learn to do; If he would make his record true. To talk without confusion clearly—to love his fellowman sincerely—and to act from honest motives purely—

This is how I knew Lou Norris, a dedicated tireless worker, and a clear thinker to whom honesty and sincerity were natural attributes.

All of you here were friends of Lou. Many of you have been closer to him and have known him longer than I—but by chance we happened to work closely together during past legislative sessions when I served as

chairman or member of the senate committee on taxation.

We have many so-called experts in the field of taxation. But during the years I spent working in this area of state government, there were always two men in Oregon whose opinions I respected and whose advice and counsel I sought and who over the years have made such a distinct contribution to Oregon's tax system. One of these men was Lou Norris.

Lou was with the Oregon Farm Bureau when we first met. And I was immediately impressed with his interesting ideas about state government and his simple and practical approach to many of its problems. He was a student—perhaps even a scholar of that nebulous thing we call the Oregon system. He liked the people of this state and was sincerely interested in their welfare.

Lou was honest. On many occasions he would say this is what my employers think, but this is my own personal opinion and what I believe in.

He had a tendency to apply his own reasoning to a problem. A legislative approach, that when coupled with knowledge of the subject and ability to convey ideas clearly, was most convincing.

At the same time, Lou represented his people with a knack not generally found among those in or connected with government service.

Gradually, I hope through mutual respect, our association ripened into a friendship both in and out of the legislature.

Lou had a knack of being critical but never mean. Looking back I don't ever recall him saying anything real unkind about anyone.

He was a great man, a great story teller and a very special person.

We join in expressing to Jane and her family our sincere sympathy.

His loss is not just that of a friend, but a loss to Oregon.

SPEECH BY SENATOR HELMS AT WORLD FREEDOM DAY RALLY IN TAIPEI

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, last January the World Anti-Communist League sponsored a World Freedom Day Rally in Taipei commemorating the decision of over 14,000 Korean Communist soldiers to stay in South Korea rather than return to the North Korean "Workers' Paradise." Our own Senator HELMS, a man of great insight and ability, attended the rally on January 23, and addressed the participants who had traveled from all over the globe. I would like to place Senator HELM's speech in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

SPEECH BY HONORABLE JESSE A. HELMS, SENATOR OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AT WORLD FREEDOM DAY RALLY IN TAIPEI, JANUARY 23, 1974

My dear friends, I come today to thank you on behalf of my fellow countrymen who believe, as you do, that the nations of the Free World must stand together in defense of the liberties of man. And I salute the Republic of China—which to me will forever be the only real China, and the only China that is interested in a true and lasting peace.

This day marks an epochal event in the history of modern mankind. For on this day, twenty years ago, 14,340 Communist soldiers, captured during the Korean War, chose to

live under the government of the Republic of China rather than return to those areas of China dominated by the Communist regime of Mao Tse-tung.

Think of that, my friends. These were the crack troops, the heavily indoctrinated and motivated troops, molded by every trickery of brainwashing developed by Communist ideology. They had performed to the utmost for the Communist cause. Thousands of their comrades lay dead in the campaign they had fought. But the moment that they were given the choice, they chose freedom.

But is it really so remarkable that they chose freedom? Isn't it the natural instinct of mankind to choose freedom, if and when given the choice? Is there any man alive, anywhere in the world, who would not leap at the chance to throw aside a tyranny that controls his every action, that destroys his personal and family relationships, that attempts to dictate even his very thoughts?

My friends, the evidence is very clear. The fourteen thousand prisoners of war made their decision in 1954. But in Germany, the Communists are still shooting at men who make the same decision every day at the Berlin Wall. And thousands brave the cold waters for the exhausting and dangerous swim to Hong Kong. Meanwhile, men who want their freedom in the Soviet Union are thrown into mental hospitals and jails.

Occasions like this remind us of the eternal truth that the natural laws of human nature cannot be repealed. No treaty, no communique, no diplomatic agreement can permanently abrogate the natural laws. When given a choice, men will always choose freedom.

We need to remember this because there are some who would have us believe that tyranny is good for people. Tyranny, the people are told, can feed their bodies. The people are told that tyranny can build factories and tyranny can sweep the streets. People who live under tyranny are told that they ought to be grateful that tyranny is so good to them. And those who tell us this propose to deal with tyranny by drinking toasts to each other.

My good friends, I come today as one United States Senator who does not believe in tyranny, and as one who is proud to join hands with you in every way, at any time, to combat the forces of tyranny in the world, wherever they may be.

My good friends, let us be plain. Not all Americans agree that the United States' policy of dealing with the Communist regime on China's mainland as though they were legitimate rulers has been a triumph of statecraft and diplomacy. You must remember that some Americans often confuse actions with wisdom. In the brief history of our nation, a quarter of a century is a millenium, while in the rich history of the Chinese people, a millenium is only a moment's pause.

But a policy that is so fraught with error cannot long endure. The novelty of secret diplomacy and dramatic shifts in alliances is fading. As the fruits ripen, their taste is surprisingly bitter.

We set out on a policy of stepping up trade with the Soviet Union so as to increase mutual understanding. But we found out that the Communists understood the capitalist markets perhaps better than we. With typical Communist duplicity, they secretly negotiated for feed grains while they secretly bought our wheat in such huge quantities that a market of surplus turned into a market of scarcity. Food prices in the United States went up twenty-two percent in one year. Now the United States, which emptied its granaries for political reasons, is faced with the possibility that it may have to import wheat this year.

We set out on a policy of bringing the Vietnam War to a close. But the costly victories on the battlefield were swept aside by the secrets of the conference table. The tragic re-

sult was an incredible document giving de facto recognition to the enemy in the South, leaving even the enemy troops and supply lines effectively in place. It is only the heroic determination of the people of South Vietnam that has kept the enemy from launching its long-planned assault on the free regions of the country.

We set out on a policy of detente with the Soviet Union so that the two so-called superpowers could work together to bring peace to the world. But while we were speaking daily to officials of the Soviet Union about peace, the Soviet Union was shipping arms of war to the Arab nations and laying plans for war. And not only did war break out because we were blinded by the illusions of detente, but the economic systems of the free world have been placed in jeopardy and the freedoms of our people have been under constraint. In my view, if we had worked directly to satisfy the legitimate grievances of all peoples in the Middle East we would have been much more quickly successful in preventing war than by pursuing the illusions of detente.

My friends, if I speak in criticism of some of my country's policies, I do so because it is a sign of hope. The American people are learning that foreign policy and domestic policy are no longer separate categories. The politics of the negotiation table abroad affect the menu of the dining table at home. We are learning, the hard way, that you cannot simultaneously and separately out-double-deal the two greatest masters of duplicity and expect to divide anything except our own freedoms.

And that is why the United States needs the firm friendship of the Republic of China. Oh, it is true that there are differences in the amount of territory our respective governments control, and the size of our economic and military power. But the United States needs the Republic of China more than the Republic of China needs the United States. For size and economic power will not be the determining factors in the struggle for the survival of freedom. History is filled with the records of great and powerful civilizations that have ceased to exist. The determining factors are the will to resist and the conviction of the rightness of your cause. Maintain that conviction and the American people will not be able to abandon you.

For who really represents the Chinese people? Is it a regime that imposes its power through force and thought control? Or is it the government of the Republic of China, which encourages each man to work out his own destiny?

Is it the ideology tyranny that has swept away centuries of Chinese culture and philosophy? Or is it the Republic of China where universities are flourishing, art treasures are protected, the theater is recreated, and poetry is recreated, and poetry is cherished?

Are the Chinese people represented by a morally corrupt regime, torn with purges and executions, that wipes out individual property and choice of livelihood? Or is their true representative the government that enables the farmers to buy and till his own land, the businessman to use his own initiative, and the worker to choose his employment? In my mind, there is no choice between freedom and tyranny. For my part, my choice is the Republic of China.

The Republic of China can be proud of its accomplishments here on Taiwan. But never forget that your economic success is strong only because it grows out of individual freedom. And your freedom is strong only when it is based on a determination to stand up against tyranny as well as against the foolish mistakes of your friends. You are a beacon in a world that sometimes is not sure of its bearings. Do not forget that history has appointed you to set an example for the free world; the American people need that example, and they will never be able to forget your courage.

AN "IMMODEST PROPOSAL"

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, screams of anguish have been coming from thousands of New Yorkers and suburbanites as they have been opening their electric bills. Con Edison, that mismanaged, incompetent monopoly which thinks only about its stockholders and never about consumers, has tripled and quadrupled its charges, blaming it all on the energy crisis. In some cases, New Yorkers are finding their electric bills are higher than their rents or carrying charges. Can you imagine electric bills of \$300 or \$400 a month?

This is an impossible situation, and demands are increasing for an investigation of Con Edison. In the meantime, writer Dan Greenburg has come up with a proposal for a consumer boycott and I believe that people are desperate enough to do just that. Here is Mr. Greenburg's suggestion:

Mr. CHARLES F. LUCE, Chairman, Con Edison Co., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. LUCE: A funny thing happened while paying my bills this month. I found out that Con Edison is charging me \$336.33 for one month's service. Funny, huh?

I was sure there was some mistake, even though I have an all-electric apartment, so I phoned my friendly Con Ed office. A nice man named Mr. Deitch told me there was no mistake—Con Ed really does think I owe \$336.33 for service from February 1 to March 6.

I said my Con Ed bills for the past 13 months average out to \$75 a month and that the current bill is more than a 400% increase. Mr. Deitch didn't seem upset by this. I said maybe that was because he was too close to the situation, working for Con Ed and all. I said "Imagine you walked into your grocery store to buy a quart of milk and found it was \$55—do you think you'd squawk?" Mr. Deitch chuckled and said he guessed he would squawk all right. "Well," I said, "that's what I'm doing—squawking."

Mr. Deitch explained that of the \$336.33, only \$136.14 was for the electricity I actually used. The other \$200.19 was a Fuel Adjustment. I was too polite to point out that the two figures didn't add up to \$336.33 but, more importantly, I didn't understand what a Fuel Adjustment was. Mr. Deitch said that a Fuel Adjustment was the extra cost Con Ed had to pay for its own fuel, on account of the energy crisis.

Well, I sure was sorry to hear that Con Ed had to pay so much for its own fuel, but as far as I can see, that's Con Ed's problem and not mine. I mean Con Ed is running a business and so am I. Con Ed is in the energy game, I'm in the writing game. If my fuel bills go up 400% I can't pass that along by upping my writing fees 400%, so I don't think Con Ed should be allowed to lay off its excess fuel bills on me either. Fair is fair.

Well sire, Mr. Deitch said he'd have to get his supervisor to talk to me. Now what could his supervisor possibly tell me that would make me happy? That I don't have to pay the \$336.33? His supervisor doesn't have that kind of power at Con Ed. Nobody does, except for the top guy.

So, Mr. Luce, I've decided to save everybody's time (except yours, of course) and go straight to the top guy. I want my bill reduced, Mr. Luce. I'm sorry as hell you folks have to pay so much for your fuel these days

but, my Heavens, I expect you can afford it better than I can. I want my rates reduced because, quite frankly, I can't afford the new ones and I don't intend to pay them either.

What can one guy do against a powerful company like Con Edison? Not much, probably, but I sure mean to try. Maybe there are a few other folks out there who feel the way I do. If there are enough of us, maybe we can do something together. Like what? Oh, I don't know, like have a consumer boycott or something.

Hey, how about that *A Consumer Boycott—nobody pays their Con Ed bills till the rates come down to reasonable levels. Maybe they pay their money into an escrow account, like during a rent strike.* Shucks, probably not many folks would go along with that. Maybe only 30 or 40% of your customers at most would go along with it. Maybe only 10% would go along at first. Still, even 10% is a start. Look how few guys it took to get the United States of America going, right?

Anyway, that's why I'm writing. And I figured as long as I was at it I might as well let some others in on what I'm doing, so I'm sending copies of this letter to the Public Service Commission, to my attorneys, to various consumer groups, to my congressman Ed Koch, to your old buddy Ralph Nader, and to the editors of various newspapers and magazines and TV stations. I thought maybe they'd get a kick out of my Consumer Boycott idea.

Maybe you can even use it yourself—have Con Ed boycott the oil companies who overcharged you so shamefully. At the very least this should temporarily get your mind off all the fuss Nader has been kicking up about your nuclear generators and how, if they don't blow up and kill several million of us, the radioactive wastes will only get a couple hundred thousand of us.

Well, that's about it for now. I'll sure be anxious to see how all this comes out, won't you? Do drop me a line if you get a minute free.

Sincerely yours,

DAN GREENBURG.

P.S. Listen, I hate to mention it at a time like this, but as a good businessman I have to charge for my time. I'm sure you sympathize. I get about a buck a word for writing stuff like this, so you can either send me a check directly or credit my account for the \$900. I should warn you I may be forced to raise this figure to \$3,600. My overhead has risen drastically, what with the energy crisis and all.

TRAGIC COMMEMORATION OF ARMENIAN MASSACRE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, this past week millions of Armenians both in this country and throughout the world commemorated the solemn occasion of the Turkish massacre of the Armenian people in 1915. This shocking and tragic event was responsible for the killing of over 2 million Armenian citizens who at that time were under the rule of the Ottoman Empire. This represented the first instance of genocide recorded in modern history.

This occasion takes on added significance this year in light of actions taken by the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. The delegation supported Turkey and other nations in their efforts to delete

any references to the Armenian massacre from the final report of the Commission. I and thousands of other Americans were shocked at this inconsistency by the United States which has always been in the forefront of opposition to the persecution of any minority group.

The Armenian nation and their people have endured years of oppression and ruthless occupation by foreign nations. Many of the Armenians living in America today were forced to flee to this country to avoid death. Now, after many years here, these citizens have proven themselves to be outstanding contributors to the welfare of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate this black day in world history, let us take time to acknowledge the contributions of the Armenian-American. And let us as a Nation begin to champion the causes of all oppressed minorities so we can, indeed, make this a generation of peace in the world.

U.S. RELATIONS AND SUPPORT OF ISRAEL

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, I was privileged to attend the combined campaign breakfast of Temple Judea of my home town of Massapequa, Long Island, which was held on behalf of the United Jewish Appeal, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, and State of Israel Bonds.

This breakfast, in celebration of the 26th anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel, honored two outstanding men of our community, Stan Albert and Abe Broizman. Both these gentlemen exemplify the finest qualities of unselfish giving and community service and I was proud to be present to share in their joy. I would be pleased to share my remarks addressed to the congregation and friends of Temple Judea with my colleagues:

REMARKS OF HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

I am pleased and honored to be here with you this morning. Had this breakfast been held for just one purpose, to celebrate the 26th Anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel, this alone would have been enough. Yet this occasion is even more meaningful to me because you mark this joyous event as an opportunity to honor two outstanding men of our community—Stan Albert and Abe Broizman—and to serve your fellowmen by holding this breakfast on behalf of the United Jewish Appeal, State of Israel bonds, and the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies.

I know that throughout history, an integral part of Judaism has been the mitzvah of giving and I was very moved to learn that the reason behind this being a combined campaign, the UJA and State of Israel bonds as well as the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, was to see that in the great outpouring of assistance to Israel in the wake of the Yom Kippur war, the needs of the more than 425,000 Jews living at poverty levels in Greater New York would not be forgotten. This to me is a wonderful thing.

At the time of Israel's formation, Presi-

dent Truman stated that his support for the new country was "... based on the desire to see promises kept and human misery relieved." The support of the United States for Israel, over the past quarter of a century, has been reflected not only in the Truman Doctrine but also in the Eisenhower and Nixon Doctrines—all of which have constituted pledges of assistance to nations which would defend their democratic institutions against aggression and subversion. We cannot forget that now, as then, the national interest of the United States continues to be clearly involved directly in the survival and security of Israel.

Surrounded by hostile Arab nations, dedicated to its destruction, Israel has had to feel strong and secure and confident of its survival before it could turn to thoughts of tomorrow—or even the day after tomorrow. These Arab states have perpetrated four wars and numerous vicious acts of terrorism against the people of Israel. The attacks were made possible by massive quantities of arms which have been poured into the region by the Soviet Union. They exacted a cruel toll upon the Israeli defense forces, especially in light of Israel's very limited reserve of manpower and material. Despite the overwhelming odds, Israel's forces rallied each time and repulsed the attackers. Losses in Israeli lives and material always were great. Today, the Soviet Union continues to fill the insatiable demands of the Arab armies.

During these past twenty-six years, Israel has often felt that it stood alone. There is no doubt, however, that the support of the United States, both moral and material, has contributed to a major extent to the creation, to the growth, and to the survival of this democratic nation. We strongly demonstrated our support during the recent Yom Kippur war even as others turned away.

On the eve of Israel's independence day last week, Mrs. Golda Meir stated that, "At such a time we must be prepared for two things; to make thorough preparations for war, should it come—and no one can guarantee it will not; at the same time, we must make every possible effort to achieve peace or at least a partial settlement which could perhaps, and I say perhaps, open the way for peace." We here all hope a meaningful peace agreement will emerge in the region. But we cannot be blind to the lesson that the radical Arab states scorn weakness and continue to probe for signs of Israel's military vulnerability. The United States must continue to support Israel's continuing strength, not only to insure the integrity and survival of these indomitable people, but also because only in Israel's strength can a meaningful peace finally merge.

I would just like to add this one last comment. As you know on Wednesday, the UN passed a resolution condemning the Israeli action into Lebanon without making one mention of the unprovoked Arab terrorist attack which murdered 18 Israeli men, women and children. I have written to Secretary of State Kissinger expressing my protest that the United States did not veto such a resolution. However, there is an important lesson to be shown here—one which Jews throughout time have known and which I too understand. The Jew has always been a minority and has often had to endure being falsely blamed and accused by others who strove to serve their own selfish ends. This again is the case in the UN as the majority of nations seek to serve their own purposes at the expense of Israel.

The lesson here is that each of us must conduct his life in an unfaltering moral fashion no matter what others may do or say falsely. So long as we continue our lives in this manner, always trying to convince the world that what we do is right, but never losing faith if they fail to listen, then we shall survive and live in peace with ourself, our G-d, and our fellow man.

SENIOR CITIZEN HELP

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, although the responsibility of aiding the Nation's senior citizens rests with the Federal and State Governments, there are certainly many activities that communities can undertake to improve the lives of their senior citizens.

Mrs. Maria Redo of Manhattan's Yorkville section has demonstrated what can be accomplished on a community level to help senior citizens. After nearly 2 years of hard work, she has been able to persuade more than 1,300 businesses in New York to provide sales discounts to senior citizens who live on fixed incomes.

I would, therefore, like to take this opportunity to express my admiration for this woman's efforts on behalf of the elderly, and to include in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues the article which recently appeared in the New York Times on her project:

ELDERLY GETTING RETAIL DISCOUNTS

(By Reginald Stuart)

After nearly two years of virtual store-to-store solicitation, a small but growing number of citizens led by a Manhattan housewife have persuaded more than 1,300 small businesses in the city to establish a retail sales discount for elderly persons on fixed incomes.

Mrs. Maria Redo, a 48-year-old mother of two living in Yorkville, has seen her one-woman campaign spread from Yorkville, where a handful of merchants were involved in late 1972, into a project extending into almost every community where there is a concentration of older persons on fixed incomes.

Most of the businesses participating in the project, which now operates under the name of Community Concern for Senior Citizens, provides merchants where involved in such services as dry cleaning, shoe repair, drug store products and housewares. Among the larger stores in New York City only Korvette's participates in the project by offering a reduction on the price of hearing aids.

The discounts are set by the individual merchants, Mrs. Redo said in a recent interview. Businesses post the green and white Community Concern decal in their display windows to alert citizens that they can get price reductions in the store. Prices are reduced for senior citizens on fixed incomes from 5 per cent to 20 per cent of the regular price.

A Medicare or half-fare transit card establishes eligibility.

"It's good will, that's all it is," said Mrs. Redo, who tells her story to various groups in the city each week. "All you have to do is simply approach the businesses with the idea and usually they respond," she said.

There are more than 500,000 persons over age 65 living in New York City on fixed incomes of \$3,880 a year or less, according to the Mayor's Office for the Aging, which has assisted Mrs. Redo for more than a year in printing and typing materials to distribute to merchants and community groups.

Businesses that participate in the project are mentioned in handbills distributed in their communities.

"We can't always guarantee they will get the cheapest price, but they will get a break from whatever the price normally is," Mrs. Redo said. "We're trying to extend discounts from college students to another group of people who need them as much."

TELEVISION AND IMPEACHMENT

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post editorially supports the position to televise possible impeachment proceedings. Also appearing on the same page are two articles debating the issue. George Reedy, known well to almost all of us as President Johnson's brilliant and effective press secretary and now dean of the College of Journalism at Marquette University, acknowledges the need for my resolution which is now before the Rules Committee. Jerome Barron, distinguished professor of law at George Washington University, articulately presents the other view. I commend the Post for giving its readers an opportunity to read both opinions. I am therefore inserting the texts of their remarks in addition to the Washington Post editorial, Television and Impeachment:

TELEVISION AND IMPEACHMENT

With the impeachment inquiry gaining speed, Congress should no longer put off serious debate about what role television and radio should play in informing the country about the House Judiciary Committee's public sessions, the House floor debates and, if it comes to that, the Senate trial of the President. Unless congressional rules are changed, live and taped broadcasting of all those sessions will be barred. Thus one arm of the media will be grossly restricted in its reporting of deliberations which will be open to the writing press and to as many citizens as the galleries can hold. The question is whether the nation's interest will be advanced if the rules are amended to enable radio and television to perform their unique service of providing complete, direct, nationwide coverage of these somber and momentous events.

Opponents of full coverage advance, in essence, two overlapping arguments, one by analogy and one from fear. The first, summarized by Jerome Barron in an article elsewhere on this page, is that because impeachment is a quasi-judicial proceeding, the cameras have no more place in the Senate chamber than they would have in any common court. The second assertion is that television is some kind of pernicious force which is likely to poison the proceedings by turning the most responsible legislator into a posturing demagogue and converting sober deliberations into a raucous spectacle. This adds up to the suggestion that full television coverage will somehow fundamentally change the nature of the impeachment process, and that something or other—the Congress, the system, the country—could not stand the added strain.

This is a little hard to swallow. For one thing, it involves a massive mistrust of the people's elected representatives, suggesting that they are so immature, undisciplined or publicity-hungry that they would trifle with the most important responsibility which they may ever bear. That possibility does of course exist, but the very restrained, careful performance of the House Judiciary Committee and most other legislators so far is welcome evidence that they recognize the danger and are resisting it. Moreover, to the extent that mistrust might be justified, it seems a bit misplaced. One can argue with equal facility that members would be much less likely to manufacture sensation, strike poses or otherwise misbehave under the watchful eye of television than they would when they have only a passing reference in

a newspaper or 30 seconds on the nightly news to worry about—or to play to.

The more basic consideration is the nature of the process at stake. For all the obvious similarities, a Senate trial of a President is not an ordinary criminal trial writ large. The Judiciary Committee's inquiry is even less a grand version of a grand jury probe. Impeachment, however judicious it ought to be in its findings and its processes, is not strictly speaking, judicial. It is a political process in the most fundamental, constitutional sense, the means by which the people's representatives deal with alleged gross abuses of the public trust. Its purpose is not to punish—in the sense of fines or imprisonment, removal from office is the only penalty. Moreover, while Congress will be judging the conduct of the President, the public will be evaluating the conduct of both, and will be arriving at the ultimate and essentially political verdict both on the judgment and on the manner in which it is attained.

From this perspective, it is hard to see how the national interest will be served if the deliberations on Capitol Hill are not transmitted fully and directly to the people, but instead arrive only through the necessarily selective, compressed and confined form of news summaries and the printed press. The difference is roughly the difference between listening to an entire tape and reading an edited transcript. Last summer's Watergate hearings should have made this point, for those weeks of complete coverage enabled millions of Americans not only to hear and weigh significant testimony about startling events, but also to observe and assess the character and conduct of every participant. Whether those evaluations were favorable or not is beside the point. The point is that there is no substitute for full information as the raw material for judgment.

The issue, as George Reedy writes, is the restoration of public trust in the integrity, capacity and accountability of government. Whatever the outcome of the impeachment inquiry, that cause will be advanced if the Congress permits—and the broadcasting industry fulfills its obligation to provide—full coverage of the proceedings which have now begun.

PUBLICITY WOULD BECOME ALL PERVASIVE
(By Jerome Barron)

Impeachment trials, fortunately, are such rare events in this country that there is little direct, authoritative guidance on whether impeachment of a President should be televised: We have no experience on the question of mixing impeachment with television.

When the Billie Sol Estes case came before the Supreme Court in 1965, Justice Tom C. Clark, speaking for the court, said that the "chief function" of judicial machinery was to "ascertain the truth." Rather tartly, the court said: "The use of television, however, cannot be said to contribute materially to this objective."

In an impeachment proceeding, the senators are the jurors.

"If the community be hostile to an accused, a televised juror, realizing that he must return to neighbors who saw the trial themselves, may well be led 'not to hold the balance nice, clear and true between the state and the accused,'" the Supreme Court said. Furthermore, is there any real answer to the court's anxiety that television inevitably fixes the jury's eyes on the camera rather than on the testimony?

In an era when the law has extended due process concepts to more and more areas of American life, surely it is hard to argue that due process and its implications for criminal trials should not also apply to the question of televising an impeachment.

It may be said that hearings of the Senate Watergate Committee were televised, and that if the proceedings of the committee that led to an impeachment could be televised,

why shouldn't the impeachment trial also be televised?

The two are not comparable. Only at the outermost perimeters of its legislative responsibilities did the Watergate Committee touch on questions of guilt or innocence as they might affect criminal defendants; the *raison d'être* of the impeachment trial, however, is the guilt or innocence of the accused.

Excluding the television cameras would not deprive the public of its right to know. Coverage by the print press of any impeachment will be continuous, extensive and free-wheeling. News and commentary on radio and television would be similarly free and extensive. That is our tradition, and the precedent of the Andrew Johnson trial. But televising an impeachment would allow publicity to become all pervasive.

In an impeachment, the Senate is, in effect, a courtroom, and we therefore should remember the counsel of Chief Justice Earl Warren in his separate opinion in the *Estes* case: "We must take notice of the inherent unfairness of television in the court room and rule that its presence is inconsistent with the 'fundamental conception' of what a trial should be."

I think the conclusion is clear. Televising the national torment of a President's impeachment would be unwise.

NO BARRIERS BETWEEN PUBLIC AND THE FACTS (By George Reedy)

Even though Congress still has to decide whether President Nixon should be impeached and tried, it is not too early to give careful—and, I hope, favorable—consideration to allowing full, live television coverage of the proceedings.

There are issues of public confidence at stake which go beyond the usual questions of press freedom and access to news—and the decision should not be made casually.

Traditionally, both Congress and the Judiciary have been reluctant to admit television cameras to their proceedings. I can concede that there are coherent reasons for this reluctance even though I am not certain the reasons are wise. But impeachment is an extraordinary procedure, and whatever may be the merits of the precedents, they cannot be made to apply without some unusual logical acrobatics.

After all, impeachment is a device whereby 535 men and women—435 through indictment, and 100 through trial—can take from a man a grant of ultimate power which was given to him by all the people. In the best of circumstances, it would be hazardous for a small group to reverse a decision made by the entire electorate. Our constitution provides no method for direct public participation in the deliberations. But television provides a method for direct public witnessing of the proceedings, and there are values to this that are incalculable.

Admittedly, no device can make the final decision satisfactory to everyone. President Nixon's implacable foes—those who hated him even before Watergate—would regard anything less than 100 per cent impeachment and conviction as evidence of legislative cowardice. His last-ditch defenders would regard anything less than 100 per cent acquittal as evidence of a sinister plot to railroad their hero. A Senate vote somewhere between 50 per cent and the two-thirds required to convict would open up nightmares of recriminations.

But the ultimate popular verdict will rest upon the majority which is in between the two poles. This is a group which can render a reasonable judgment—especially when its members have seen events with their own eyes. In terms of the future of American unity, the popular verdict is fully as important as the legislative verdict. There should be no barriers whatsoever between the public and the facts.

Legislators, of course, have always resisted

the presence of television cameras during legislative sessions. The reason is simply that floor sessions are only a small part of the legislative process and here the lens can distort because it makes one—and not the most interesting—part look like the whole. But an impeachment session would not be a legislative session. All of the events of major importance would take place right on the floors of the House and Senate chambers. The legislators could be relied upon to be present and to listen to the arguments. The speeches would be relevant and cogent. And finally, there would be no precedent established other than the presence of television during an impeachment session—not during a legislative session.

When everything is added together, it seems to me that there is more than ample justification for televising the proceedings in both the House and the Senate. The President should have an interest in having his side of the case stated directly to the people as well as to the Congress. The Congress should have an interest in giving the people an opportunity to see for themselves that the legislative conduct is rigidly fair. The print media should have an interest in permitting the readers to observe for themselves that interpretation and backgrounding is based upon fact and not distortion.

But the most important interest to be served is that of the people themselves. The presidency belongs to them—not to the Congress or to the media. If Congress is to direct a change in the occupancy of the office, they have the right to be present, at least as spectators, and there could be grave consequences were they to be denied a right so readily available.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on May 15-18 the Annual International Bilingual Bicultural Educational Conference will be held in New York City and will be officially welcomed by the United Nations. This perhaps has inspired the President to proclaim the week of May 13 "Bilingual Education Week." It is my hope that a growing number of people are beginning to recognize the long overdue need to properly educate our Nation's several million non-English speaking children.

Whereas Alaska is the home of 70,000 Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts, it is of utmost concern that the educational system in Alaska be geared to foster the teaching and knowledge of foreign languages and therefore provide a suitable and upgraded system of education. If we are ever to expect these children to become productive citizens of our Nation, we must realize the importance of the concept of bilingual education in giving them equal educational opportunities. It is of great sadness to think that because a child is not taught his own language that that language, an important part of a whole culture, will eventually die.

H.R. 69 has authorized \$135 million for title VII which is the Extension and Amendments of the Bilingual Education Act, for fiscal year 1975. This act has been strengthened by both the House and Senate education committees, but it

must be understood that the programs must be developed and administered properly or this will remain a fruitless endeavor.

At a time when all cultures are finally beginning to be appreciated, it is of extreme importance that bilingual education be recognized for its very possible influence in the promotion of peace and harmony among all peoples of the world.

SHOULD UNITED STATES INVEST IN SOVIET GAS AND OIL?

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the Export-Import Bank has recently approved \$38 million in loans to the Soviet Union for four projects. This means that the bank has granted, since the beginning of 1973, loans totaling \$160 million to the U.S.S.R. and is understood to have made preliminary commitments to the Soviet Union for another \$200 million.

Why our Government wishes to finance Soviet gas explorations—one of the key elements involved in future plans for U.S. aid—is difficult to understand. A nation's defense capacity is directly related to its resources in the field of energy. With less than half of the GNP of the United States, the Soviet Union spends as much as we do on defense, perhaps more. How can we, in the face of this situation, pursue trade and credit policies which will permit the Soviet Union to further expand its military machine?

Beyond this, recent events show us the lack of reliability of the Soviet Union in its relationship with other countries, particularly in the energy field.

The Washington Post noted that:

A sobering comment on Moscow's reliability as a supplier of natural gas and oil is contained in recent accounts of its dealings with two veteran customers in Western Europe, Finland, for one, found that the Russians raised their price last fall to the level of the world price set by the oil cartel. This added at least half a billion dollars to Finland's annual energy bill. . . . So great was the shock that the socialist premier of Finland was led to compare the additional burden, five per cent of GNP, to the postwar reparations which Moscow imposed on the Finns. . . .

In another instance, the Soviet Union simply stopped delivering natural gas and oil to West Germany and then resumed the flow but at much higher prices. In its editorial of March 29, 1974 the Washington Post declared that:

. . . neither on the supply front nor the price front have they treated their traditional customers well. . . . If the Russians began to run short of energy themselves, as many foreign experts expect they will, would they fulfill their contracts for export sales? These are matters which must be taken into account in the United States' own deliberations on the advisability of making large long-range investments in Soviet gas and oil.

I wish to share this editorial with my colleagues, and insert it into the Record at this time:

MOSCOW'S HAND ON THE PUMP

A sobering comment on Moscow's reliability as a supplier of natural gas and oil is contained in recent accounts of its dealings with two veteran customers in Western Europe. Finland, for one, found that the Russians raised their price last fall to the level of the world price set by the oil cartel. This added at least half a billion dollars to Finland's annual energy bill. But the price of the goods which the Finns sell to Russia remained the same. So great was the shock that the socialist premier of Finland was led to compare the additional burden, five per cent of GNP, to the postwar reparations which Moscow imposed on the Finns—about two per cent of GNP. By their particular political dependence on the Soviet Union, the Finns are locked into this one-sided arrangement, which illustrates all too well the economic aspect of "Finlandization."

In respect to West Germany, the Russians evidently realized during the oil panic last fall that they could get a higher price by exporting elsewhere. So they slowed and then stopped delivering crude oil, though a contract had been in force for more than 15 years. They had contracted to deliver 3.4 million tons of crude in 1973; actual deliveries were 2.86 million tons. Exploiting Germany's temporary duress, the Russians pushed their price to \$18 a barrel. Veba, the German oil buying agency, then suspended its contract with the Russians. It was put back into effect, at new higher prices, only a few days ago.

Meanwhile, Moscow Radio has just felt compelled to deny an Iranian newspaper's report that the Soviet Union is buying natural gas cheap from Iran and selling it dear in the West. Even if the Kremlin wanted to perpetrate such an uncomradely deed, Moscow Radio says, it couldn't because there is no pipeline. But there is a pipeline—a fact which has to be set against Moscow Radio's denial.

The Soviet Union has made a good thing in the past about being a fair and reliable trading partner. This reputation has served it well, the Economist recently noted, in inducing West Europeans to deliver large quantities of steel pipe and other equipment, against promises to be paid in future oil or gas. Yet in the Finnish case, the Russians jacked their prices through the roof. With Germany, they simply stopped delivering for a while and then resumed the flow but, again, at much higher prices. In brief, neither on the supply front nor the price front have they treated their traditional customers well—customers with whom they have no outstanding political differences, moreover. If the Russians began to run short of energy themselves, as many foreign experts expect they will, would they fulfill their contracts for export sales? These are matters which must be taken into account in the United States' own deliberations on the advisability of making large long-range investments in Soviet gas and oil.

DAMAGE BY FIRE ANTS

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Environmental Protection Agency is currently conducting hearings to determine if the pesticide, Mirex, should continue to be used to control fire ants. Mirex is the only known deterrent to this deadly insect, and because some officials in the Environmental Protection Agency

apparently have doubts about the danger of this insect, I am submitting a copy of an article from the Macon, Ga., Telegraph, which illustrates explicitly what damage these insects can render:

[From the Macon Telegraph, Apr. 23, 1974]

FIRE ANTS PUT TWO IN HOSPITAL

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.—The sting of vicious little fire ants left one person in shock and another hospitalized with cardiac arrest in what officials say is becoming a menacing infestation of the insects in Florida.

The bite of the imported South American fire ant—nearly indistinguishable from the common ant—causes blisters similar to chicken pox. In some instances the sting produces severe redness over the body, shock and heart failure.

Two Pinellas County residents recently suffered severe reactions.

Vera Busk, 51, of St. Petersburg was hospitalized for two weeks after being stung.

"I had on open sandals and was bitten on the bottom of my feet," she says. "When I got home my feet started swelling, and it got worse and spread up to my waist. I started to get giant hives and a rash. . . It spread up to my neck and my tongue swelled up."

"By the time I got to the hospital I felt like I was slipping. One nurse held my tongue down. . . It swelled so much I couldn't breathe. I had cardiac arrest. I knew I was dying," Mrs. Busk said.

Doctors say she suffered temporary loss of memory and paralysis and damage to the heart.

James Paradiso, 66, of Madeira Beach stumbled into his kitchen and collapsed after being stung in a vacant lot next door.

Dr. Roger Laughlin, who treated him, said he was red and blotchy. "He had no heartbeat that I could detect," said Laughlin. "He was going to go into cardiac arrest. I thought he was going to die."

Laughlin said by applying massive doses of adrenaline and by treating Paradiso for shock he was able to keep the retiree alive.

"He was in my office 45 minutes after being stung," said Laughlin. "I would have given him another five minutes and he probably would have been pronounced DOA (dead on arrival)."

Dr. William Schmid, a St. Petersburg allergist who is helping a University of Florida research team investigate fire ant stings, describes both conditions as "extreme."

He says many people react only at the point of contact, but others allergic to the venom can develop systemic or general reactions that can lead to death if not promptly treated.

The American Academy of Allergy says 40-50 people die annually from the sting of wasps, fire ants, bees and hornets.

The Florida Department of Agriculture Extension Service says it has received numerous complaints of fire ant stings recently.

A report from the University of Florida research team notes that the fire ant has heavily infested the Tampa-St. Petersburg area, Orlando, Jacksonville and the stretch across the Panhandle from Pensacola to Madison.

SHAKING UP THE COMMITTEE SYSTEM

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Committees has been discussing changing the jurisdiction of certain House committees to other commit-

tees. It has been said this will not change the power structure of the House of Representatives. For the interest of my colleagues, I would like to insert this article which is one man's opinion on this issue:

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 chairmen, 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, far 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 Waggonner 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. Waggonner, 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. Waggonner, "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, Peter Rodino, all five-feet-seven-inches of him, strides onto the floor of the House 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. . . .

ADJUSTMENT URGED ON TAX RETURN FORM

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 4 years, since August 1970, I have returned to my district each weekend and conducted a Saturday morning "Congressional Workshop" with the residents of a specific community. I have held approximately 150 such meetings, visited every municipality in the district at least once and talked with an estimated 15,000 people. I am proud to say that frequently the people of the 20th District have made constructive recommendations for the improvement of our Government and the betterment of all Americans.

The most recent example occurred a few weeks ago during a "Workshop" in the community of Munhall. A gentleman pointed out an omission on the present Federal income tax form which provides the opportunity for the violation of rights of millions of taxpayers and the illegal diversion of millions of dollars of tax funds for the purpose of financing presidential election campaigns.

Mr. John J. Tarabek of 3447 West Run Road, Munhall, astutely noted the present tax form provides a "checkoff" space for individuals desiring to contribute a dollar of tax funds to presidential campaign funding. But, he also noted, there is no provision made on the form for individuals to record their desire not to contribute.

Such persons signify their choice on this question merely by leaving the present "check off" space blank. As Mr. Tarabek points out, this permits the opportunity for the form to be altered somewhere during its processing. The blank "check off" space could be filled in, designating the taxpayer as wishing to contribute to campaign funding.

The taxpayer would not know his form was altered since he never sees the original copy after it leaves his possession. He would never know a dollar of his taxes had been diverted to finance a Presidential election campaign since the contribution does not affect either his tax payment or refund. He would never know his right as an American to a freedom of choice had been violated.

I am sure we all agree that if only one taxpayer was so treated, it would be a grievous wrong; one that must be corrected. But, gentlemen, as Mr. Tarabek observes, there are millions of taxpayers who indicate on their original forms they oppose tax contributions to finance Presidential elections. If it should ever occur that even a small percentage of these forms be altered, a grievous wrong graduates into a crime of great magnitude.

The rights of millions of taxpayers would be violated and millions of tax dollars, intended for use in other Federal programs and projects, would be illegally channeled into a political pipeline.

In response to Mr. Tarabek's plea that corrective action be taken to eliminate such a possibility, regardless of how improbable it might be, I have contacted our esteemed chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS. I have asked him to consider revising the present tax return form to include an extra "check off" space, giving the taxpayer a "yes" or "no" choice on the question of contributing to Presidential campaign costs and protecting that choice. The simple addition of this extra space would also eliminate any tinkering or tampering with the taxpayer return.

Mr. MILLS has assured me he will give this suggestion serious consideration. He also has graciously asked that I convey his thanks to Mr. Tarabek for his interest and willingness to help our Government operate as effectively and efficiently as possible. It is a request I am most happy to comply with for I feel Mr. Tarabek has earned the appreciation of millions of Americans.

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, today, April 10, 1974, is a day that has been set aside by the U.S. Senate as a "National Day for Humiliation, Fasting, and Prayer."

In the last few days and weeks, millions of words have been written and spoken about what is wrong in America. One event has followed another so rapidly in the past few months that some of them seem almost like ancient history.

During the nearly 10 weeks in which I have had the privilege of representing the people of the 12th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, I have been continually asked, "What is wrong in America?"

It is almost a paradox that our Nation, which possesses all the economic affluence for enjoying life, virtually leads the world in immorality, crime, and narcotics abuse.

This country has at its command all the necessary armaments for national security, but we are still insecure. We have all the material possessions deemed essential for happiness, but we are unhappy.

No one can deny that our Nation faces one of the gravest crises of its history. We have always survived past crises and have become all the more strong because of them. However, the past crises have been external ones whereas the problem facing our country today is an internal one.

We face the crisis of disintegration from within. One of the factors of the present crisis is, of course, the political atmosphere in our country. Watergate

has had a profound and unsettling effect on our Nation. This sordid affair has sent shock waves through our whole political system. The worst tangible evidence of this affair is the lack of confidence in our political system.

Democracy cannot survive when people have lost confidence in it. No democracy can function efficiently and effectively in an atmosphere of mistrust.

Second, we face an economic crisis. We enjoy the highest standard of living of any nation in the history of the world, but we are paying the price for our luxurious living and our deficit spending. Inflation has hit every American, especially those on fixed incomes.

The worst crisis, however, is neither economic nor political. It is a crisis of our moral fiber as a Nation. We have forgotten, both individually and collectively, how we became the greatest Nation in the world. We have no real belief in our money which states "In God We Trust." The words on the back of our Great Seal, "God hath ordained our undertaking," is no longer a viable consideration in our daily evaluation of the decisions which need to be made.

We tend to live as though our national self-righteousness has no need of further acknowledgement of God.

Our Nation, which comprises only 6 percent of the world's population, last year consumed 40 percent of all energy used on this planet. Regardless of this experience, we are now realizing, through the aid of the energy crisis, that our materialism, our wealth, and our gross national product are not the ultimate answers for the future of our country.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to join with my colleagues, especially the Senator from Oregon, the Honorable MARK HATFIELD, in recognizing this day as a "National Day for Humiliation, Fasting and Prayer."

MAYOR JOHN HOGAN

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mayor John Hogan of Northvale, N.J., died April 20 of cancer at the age of 50. Not only is this a loss for the people of Northvale, but it is a sad occasion for the people of Bergen County and the State of New Jersey as well. We all have lost a friend.

John Hogan was a man of integrity and diligence; a man who won and retained the respect of people of all political persuasions. Hard working his entire life, Mayor Hogan was working in his Northvale office a few hours before he was rushed to the hospital for the last time. In fact, just a few weeks ago, in the midst of his final battle with the disease which would claim his life, John Hogan announced that he would seek another 4-year term.

The town of Northvale, as it stands today, is a vibrant tribute to the legacy of John Hogan. He was instrumental in

such things as bringing sanitary sewers to the area, establishing a public library, building a volunteer ambulance corps, and helping Northvale obtain its Borough Hall. Moreover, he was a credit to the profession of politics, a friend to the people of his community, and a credit to his family and himself.

I would like to take this opportunity to extend my deepest sympathy to Mayor Hogan's family and to the people of Northvale. Having had the privilege of working personally with Mayor Hogan for many years, I share their grief.

Mr. Speaker, an article concerning Mayor Hogan appeared April 21 in the Record, a Bergen County daily newspaper, and it provides some additional insight into Mayor Hogan's achievements. As a result, I would like to share this article with my colleagues. The article follows:

NORTHVALE MAYOR JOHN HOGAN, 50

(By John H. Kuhn)

NORTHVALE.—John L. Hogan, mayor for the past 9½ years, yesterday lost his three-year battle against cancer. He was 50.

Hogan, who underwent a laryngectomy in September 1971, died early yesterday morning at Pascack Valley Hospital where he was taken Thursday night.

Active to the last at his first love—politics and government—Hogan was in the Borough Hall working on town business only a few hours before he was hospitalized.

Only two weeks ago, Hogan had announced he would seek another four-year term as mayor, mentioning he was encouraged to do so by his doctor.

Known as Jack by both friend and foe, Hogan continued his mayoral duties despite the loss of his voice. Speech therapy after his first operation brought back some speech, but he lost this after additional operations. His written comments at meetings were read by a councilman.

Hogan learned politics as a boy, the eighth of 15 children. His father was elected mayor of Piermont, N.Y., when Hogan was 10.

After graduation from high school, Hogan enlisted in the Army for World War II. He was assigned to Panama where he contracted malaria.

After the war he entered the milk distribution business, married the former Viola Iannaccone, and built his home in Northvale 21 years ago.

Hogan's first try at political office in 1957 was his only defeat, as he lost a council seat by 85 votes. He came back the next year to win the first of two, three-year council terms. Hogan was elected mayor in 1964, and re-elected in 1966, 1968, and 1970.

Hogan was appointed to the district state sales tax office in 1966, working there a short time before entering the real estate business.

The mayor served on the Bergen County Sewer Authority for a brief period and was president of the Bergen County Democratic Mayors Association in 1966 and 1967.

Hogan is credited with bringing sanitary sewers to the area. He helped establish a public library, helped build a volunteer ambulance corps, and saw the town obtain its Borough Hall. He was a Lions Club member.

Even Hogan's political enemies respected Jack's knowhow in getting things done.

One comment after the mayor's first operation was, "You may not like him, but you have to admit he has guts."

Besides his wife, Hogan is survived by a son, John S.; a daughter, Frances; his mother, Margaret Hogan of Piermont; three sisters, Cecelia Goswisch of Piermont, Margaret Rogers of New York, and Helen; and eight brothers, William of Nyack, Francis and George of Tappan, N.Y., Paul of Orangeburg, N.Y., Robert of Haverstraw, N.Y., Edward of

Mahwah, Roger of California, and Aloisious of Piermont.

The funeral will be from the Northern Valley Memorial Home, 120 Paris Ave., Tuesday at 9 a.m. with a mass at St. Anthony's R.C. Church at 10 a.m. Interment will be in Rockland Cemetery, Sparkill, N.Y.

NATIONAL CANCER CONTROL MONTH

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, on this, the last day of National Cancer Control Month, I would like to reprint two more of Mr. Stewart Alsop's columns dealing with his personal battle with cancer.

He writes with graphic description of the agony of the cancer patient and how the patient grasps for any straw that may mean continued life, providing us with a rare opportunity for special insight into the suffering of a victim of cancer.

Mr. Alsop is only one of millions of Americans who hold out the hope, no matter how remote, that the Nation which sent man to the Moon can meet the challenge with equal success to identify the cause and find a cure for one of the most painful and cruel killers.

Since we will be considering the authorization of appropriations for the national cancer program this week, I believe my colleagues will find these articles of particular interest.

[From Newsweek, July 31, 1972]

"ALL WILL BE WELL"

(By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—Last week, it was just a year since I was told that I had a kind of leukemia that was quite likely to kill me in a year, and almost surely in two years. I wrote a couple of columns about this experience, and then promised to shut up about it. But one more column seems to be justified, after a year, on what it is like to live with a life-threatening disease.

There was a glorious time, last fall, when the cancer specialists at the National Institutes of Health suspected that I might not have leukemia at all, but a kind of mimic cancer. In September, I had a mysterious flu-like sickness, and thereafter, the bad cells in my marrow began to fade away—from more than 50 per cent to 6 per cent—and my blood came back to normal. The hemoglobin, which gives you energy and *joie de vivre*, was supernormal, and I felt just dandy.

I felt dandy until February, and then the bad cells began to come back—16 per cent in February, 23 per cent in March, 40 per cent again by April. John Glick, my brilliant 28-year-old doctor, kept me working—and even playing indifferent tennis—with blood transfusions. But by late April, it was clear that something had to be done.

BAD CELLS

Doctor Glick, Dr. Ed Henderson, his able chief, and the other NIH cancer specialists had a conference to decide what my disease was and what to do about it. Leukemia is caused by malignant cells in the marrow, which makes the blood. The bad cells gnaw away at the marrow, so that the marrow ceases to make the life-giving blood cells. An untreated victim soon dies of infection, or congestive heart failure, or uncontrolled bleeding.

The only defense against classic leukemia is to use powerful chemicals to kill the

bad cells and induce a "remission." But chemotherapy kills the good cells too, and it also tends to destroy the mysterious X factor that resists the cancer. So a relapse—and death sooner or later—is statistically almost inevitable after chemotherapy.

I had had no chemotherapy, and if I had had the kind of leukemia originally diagnosed, I would certainly have been dead. Moreover, most atypically, I had no malignant cells in the blood. So the doctors decided that I must have a very rare kind of leukemia—a "smoldering" or "a-leukemic" leukemia.

Chemotherapy, the doctors agreed, was a last resort. There is evidence that flu, like the sickness I had had in September, can induce a remission by stimulating the resistance of the body to the bad cells. A drug called Poly I-C, which causes a kind of artificial flu, might do the same thing. It was a shot in the dark, but at least it was worth a try, the doctors decided.

John Glick explained this "highly experimental" treatment to me—the idea, he said, was to use Poly I-C to prod the marrow into producing the life-giving blood cells. I said it sounded like trying to get an old bird dog, who wanted only to lie by the fire and doze, out into the field hunting birds again, and John said the analogy was about right.

CHILLS AND FEVER

On Friday, June 9, I had my first dose of Poly I-C. John Glick stuck a needle into a vein, and a bottle of colorless liquid, about the size of a beer bottle, dripped into my body. In about two hours, I had a violent chill, so violent that the bed shook, while my wife, Tish, piled heated blankets on top of me. The chill lasted for 45 minutes, and then my temperature zoomed to 104. It seemed to me that John Glick was looking a bit nervous. But the temperature soon dropped, and I felt well enough to play tennis over the weekend.

For three weeks, on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, I repeated this chills-and-fever routine. Intermittently, there were signs that the old bird dog was at least trying to stagger to his feet. Then there was a marrow test, and good news—the bad cells were down from 40 per cent to 25 per cent, and blood tests showed that the marrow was making more blood.

But last week, the tests showed that the lazy old dog was lying down again, and so I am to have another three-week course of Poly I-C. During that first three-week course, I managed to fill this space, but it wasn't easy, so for a while my myopic political musings will not appear here.

What has it been like, then, to live for a year with this peculiar kind of leukemia?

Oddly enough, it hasn't been as bad as it sounds. There have been some moments of fear, and some pain (a marrow test is no fun).

There have been a few times when I felt very sick, and when my blood was so thin as to put my life at risk. But when you feel sick enough, you don't much fear death, and even half-welcome it. In such ways, God tempers the wind to the shorn lamb.

A good deal of the time, I have felt fine—a blood transfusion is better than a couple of Martinis—and all the finer because I seemed to be defying the undefiable. And most of the time I have been able to forget about my damnable marrow, aided by the need to fill this page. It is a dusty old cliché that work is an anodyne, but it is true.

I wish I could claim that the past year has given me profound spiritual insights, but it hasn't. I was an agnostic before I got sick, and I am an agnostic still.

Among the adults in the NIH leukemia clinic, there is a kind of almost cheerful fellowship, as in an elite military unit under fire—I think of the clinic as the Nos Morituri Brigade. People are brave, when there is nothing else to be. It is the children that make the clinic so hard to take. Some of

them are beautiful, and on some of their wasted small faces there is already clear the mark of death.

MYSTERIOUS

If there is a God, why did He choose them? Mind you, I am an agnostic, not an atheist. But if there is a God, He surely "moves in a mysterious way."

It may seem a bit fatuous to say so, but what has surprised me most about this experience is how nice people are. Most of us live out our lives behind a thick outer tegument, or carapace, that separates us from other people. The threat of death breaks the carapace. It makes you deeply dependent on other people—in my case, my wife, my family, my doctor, my friends and colleagues, above all my wife. Once the carapace is broken, you realize how amazingly nice—there is really no other word for it—most people are.

When I first got sick, I came across a sentence in an old piece by Winston Churchill: "For the rest, live dangerously; take life as it comes; dread naught; all will be well." I repeat it like a talisman, and so I expect to be back filling this page shortly, with my old dog of a marrow doing its job again.

[From Newsweek, March 11, 1974]

I DIDN'T STOP IN BALTIMORE

(By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—I woke up suddenly, feeling very wide awake, pulled the light cord, and sat straight up in bed.

"We'll be stopping in Baltimore," I announced loudly, in an authoritative voice. I looked around me. A private car, evidently. Good of the railroad people to supply those fruits, and all those flowers. The furniture looked a bit shoddy, but what can one expect these days? My wife was no doubt in the next stateroom. Where was the connecting door? I got up to explore.

The car was swaying heavily—the roadbed must be a disgrace. I supported myself on a table, and then a desk. Then there was a space of empty floor. I was halfway across it when the car gave a lurch, and I fell down. I sat on the floor for a bit, getting my bearings, then scrambled to my feet again, and opened a narrow green door. A locker, with my own clothes in it. I opened another door—a small bathroom.

Then I came to a much bigger door, and opened it, and leaned against the doorjamb. The swaying had stopped the train, apparently, had halted. Outside was what I assumed was the Baltimore station—wide platform, dim lights, green tile. A whimpering noise, then silence, and no one to be seen. There was something hellishly grim about the place. Suddenly I was quite sure I didn't want to stop in Baltimore.

"We won't stop here," I said, again in a firm, authoritative voice. "Start up the train, and carry on."

SAFE

I turned back toward my bed, and the big door closed behind me. I fell down twice on the way back—the crew must be pouring on the power, I thought—and getting into bed was like mounting a bucking horse. Safe in bed, I turned off the light, and was asleep in an instant.

This small episode did not happen on a private railroad car. (Who the hell did I think I was? Some ancient Belmont or Vanderbilt?) It happened in my room on Floor 12, the Solid-Tumor Ward of the cancer clinic of the National Institutes of Health. My room, a room I'd been in for going on eight weeks, was the private car, and the corridor of the Solid-Tumor Ward was the Baltimore platform. But the falling down was real enough—the next morning I had the bruises to prove it.

I was in the Solid-Tumor Ward because NIH, for mysterious bureaucratic reasons, has ended the adult leukemia program, and the adult leukemics who are still about are

taken care of in other wards. Leukemia is a sneaky disease—it attacks by indirection. It weakens the blood cells that fight infection, and then sends in surrogate diseases to finish off the victim.

In the two months I was in the Solid-Tumor Ward my leukemia (or whatever it is—it is a most atypical disease) tried hard to finish me off. I had pneumonia; then an infection of the lower intestines; then a lung clot; then an edema of the lungs; then a second pneumonia; then two minor operations and a major operation; then another infection.

STUBBORN

The major operation—opening my chest and snipping off a thumbnail-size bit of lung—was necessary because pneumonia can't be treated unless the doctors know what kind it is, and my second pneumonia stubbornly refused to identify itself. The bit of lung was given every known test—and the brilliant doctors at NIH know every known test—but it still refused to identify itself. Meanwhile the lethal "infiltrate" continued relentlessly to spread across both lungs, and my wife was told that the prognosis was "grim."

It was four days after the operation that I decided not to stop in Baltimore. The next day the able young doctor in charge of my case, Jack Macdonald, told me that he might be imagining things, but the X-rays of my lungs looked a bit better—certainly no worse. The day after, he said there was no doubt about it—the infiltrate was receding. Some days later, my battered old lungs were as close to normal as they will ever be.

Why? Jack Macdonald and the other doctors say frankly they don't know, though they all have a favorite guess. I have a favorite guess, too. My guess is that my decision not to stop at Baltimore had something to do with it. In a kind of fuzzy, hallucinated way, I knew when I announced the decision that it was a decision not to die.

Death is a word rarely mentioned in the NIH cancer clinic. But one is more aware of its presence in the Solid-Tumor Ward than in the now defunct leukemia ward. Leukemia is a sneakier disease than solid-tumor cancer, but it is also kinder at the end. Most leukemias drift into a quiet death, while the victims of a solid tumor can (although they by no means always do) suffer agonies before death comes.

All the rooms at NIH are double rooms, and almost all the patients (except those thought soon to die, which may be why I was alone on my private car) have roommates. Several of my roommates were terminal solid-tumor patients, who were given opium-based analgesics or painkillers at predetermined intervals, usually four hours. Almost always, the analgesic wore off too soon. To hear grown men, and brave men, whimpering, or howling, or pleading with a helpless nurse for another "shot" is not an experience likely soon to be forgotten.

As a result of that experience, I reached certain conclusions. NIH, like most hospitals, goes to great lengths to prevent suicide—patients are forbidden pills of their own, and the windows and even the rooftop solarium are firmly screened. It seems to me that a patient suffering beyond endurance should be given the option of ending his own life, and the means to do so should be supplied on request. An unquestionably terminal patient should be given another option. He should be given as much painkilling drug as he himself feels he needs. The drug probably ought to be heroin, which is estimated to be about four times as effective an analgesic as the synthetic painkillers now mostly in use. If a human being must die, it is surely better that he die in the illusion of painless pleasure—and heroin is very pleasurable—than in lonely agony.

MYSTERIES

Another conclusion is harder to define. Shakespeare, as usual, came closest, in the

familiar cliché-quote from Hamlet: "There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy." Perhaps my decision not to stop in Baltimore had nothing to do with my astonishing recovery. But there are mysteries, above all the mystery of the relationship of mind and body, that will never be explained, not by the most brilliant doctors, the wisest of scientists or philosophers.

For the rest, I hope to put back some (but not all) of the 43 pounds I have lost, to get a bit of rest, to get rid of the tail end of that second infection, and then again to examine in this space the more mundane mysteries of political Washington.

THE NASSAU HIGHER EDUCATION CONSORTIUM: A PUBLIC-PRIVATE INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERSHIP

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, recently the Nassau Higher Education Consortium—NHEC—was established to further and strengthen the Nassau college spectrum. Dr. William M. Heston of Garden City, a very able and competent educator, was selected as executive director. His recent remarks on this event should be considered by my colleagues in the Congress and they follow:

THE NASSAU HIGHER EDUCATION CONSORTIUM: A PUBLIC-PRIVATE INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERSHIP

(Remarks presented by Dr. William M. Heston, Executive Director of the Nassau Higher Education Consortium at the Nassau HUB Executive's Breakfast, February 13th, 1974, Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York)

I appreciate the opportunity to present a thumbnail sketch of our newly established Nassau Higher Education Consortium (NHEC), composed of five nonpublic and two public colleges in Nassau County. The sponsoring institutions are Adelphi University, Hofstra University, Molloy College, Nassau Community College, New York Institute of Technology, C. W. Post College of Long Island University, and SUNY College at Old Westbury. There are 53,000 students, both full- and part-time, currently attending these seven institutions, which employ 6,500 persons and have a combined operating budget of \$109,000,000 this academic year. The economic implications of expenditures of this magnitude on the local economy I know I need not dwell on. Suffice to say, however, it is generally agreed that institutions of higher education generate approximately three times their budgets in economic benefits to their areas. Nathaniel Giffin,¹ President and Chairman of the Suffolk County Federal Savings and Loan Association, spoke of this and its importance to Long Island's economy in a very interesting article he published in the December 10th issue of the *American Banker* entitled "Long Island's Future Is Tied to Education and Research". A national study released two years ago noted that the 31 most economically advantaged areas in the United States were the very same 31 areas in which their colleges and universities were the most healthy educationally and economically.

If one were to attempt to make a generalized statement about what is the single most important trend in higher education today, I

would say it is the development of conditions leading to the need to rely increasingly on centralized planning, coordination and control of all postsecondary institutions, public, private and proprietary. As Lyman A. Glenny² noted "The challenge to planners and coordinators . . . is to encompass all new postsecondary educational forms, delivery systems, and types of programs, while promoting innovation, flexibility, adaptability, and opportunity". Roger Heyns³ in October 1972 noted that cooperation was one of the three principal challenges facing higher education in this decade. He said, "The third task . . . is that of developing and strengthening mechanisms for collective planning, coordination, and control. I refer to the whole range of regional and state commissions and councils, both statutory and voluntary, advisory and decision-making. No one else can seriously doubt that such mechanisms are needed if we are effectively to utilize our resources and respond intelligently to the requirements of our society."

Recognition of the need to develop the ability to respond intelligently to the rapidly changing demands of our society that Dr. Heyns spoke about is the basic reason for the formation of the Nassau Higher Education Consortium. We saw in such a cooperative approach the opportunity to explore an entirely new range of solutions to difficult problems no longer available to each of the members singly. The formation of the Consortium is also consistent with the position taken by the Board of Regents of the State of New York in their Paper No. 13, which discusses the financing of postsecondary education in New York State and the need to develop cooperative regional approaches to planning and implementation. Clearly, the Consortium is an idea whose time has come.

The Consortium, although legally chartered by the Regents only last March 23rd, had its beginnings on December 1, 1970, when five of us agreed (Old Westbury and Molloy joined us later) to meet to discuss the advantages of developing a more formal and committed vehicle for improving interinstitutional cooperation among ourselves. We began by discovering what other consortia were attempting, where they had succeeded or failed, how they were organized and funded, and where and how we could improve our own individual institutions through such an association. We quickly came to the conclusion that we enjoyed certain highly favorable attributes, such as geographical proximity, different types of institutions with differing strengths and weaknesses, which enhanced our flexibility to respond, a clearly circumscribed geographical perimeter, and a growing population which placed a premium on higher education, to mention a few of the more obvious.

We then began developing a set of purposes and objectives and an organizational framework we believed would maximize our chances of success. Simply stated, we said that the overriding purpose of the Consortium is to act and serve primarily as a coordinating organization by and through which its members may by joint and united action improve their educational effectiveness and fiscal efficiency without losing their individual identities. More specifically, we saw this as an opportunity to improve the number and variety of educational opportunities available to students; to share institutional resources; to reduce or avoid unnecessary or wasteful duplication; to make full use of specialized faculty talents, quality program offerings, and unique instructional and research facilities; to structure solutions to problems that cannot be dealt

¹ Glenny, Lyman A. "Pressures on Higher Education." *College and University Journal*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (1973).

² Heyns, Roger W. "Renewal, Financing and Cooperation: Tasks for Today" (October, 1972).

³ Giffin, Nathaniel M. "Long Island's Future Is Tied to Education and Research", *American Banker*, p. 17 (Dec. 10, 1973).

with effectively by one institution alone; to provide mechanisms for the exchange and dissemination of information needed to improve the operating efficiency of the Consortium members; to pool programs through which contributions to solutions of regional problems can be upgraded.

We also saw the Consortium enlisting the cooperation of other area educational, cultural, service and governmental institutions in programs beneficial to the Nassau County area. We insisted from the very beginning that any real success was based on close relationships between both public and private institutions, and therefore we deliberately did not become chartered until the legal and financial intricacies of full membership by the public institutions had been resolved.

We also spent a lot of time talking about the feasibility of extending our Consortium to include all educational institutions in Suffolk County as well. As a matter of fact, our Charter contains a provision to include institutions in Suffolk County. We concluded the Consortium should concentrate on operational, project-oriented activities having identifiable results and visible impact. With this uppermost in our minds, we reasoned that until we achieved a good track record we would limit the number of member institutions, taking advantage of the geographical proximity of the present seven member institutions. Each member institution is free to participate or not to participate in any program or project proposed through the Consortium. Appropriately, the legal responsibilities of the participating member institutions are to be spelled out in each project that is undertaken. These features are characteristic of voluntary consortia of which the Nassau Consortium is a good example.

With action as our goal, we then set about developing a governing and operating structure to support this goal. While it is undeniable that no Consortium will endure without active support of each member institution's president, it is just as undeniable that presidents simply do not have sufficient time to develop and finally implement detailed cooperative action projects. Enter the Vice President, Provost, Dean of Faculty, or whomever else the Presidents designate. Thus, we established in our by-laws an Administrative Committee composed of the seven, second trustees from our seven member institutions and the Executive Director. There are fifteen trustees altogether: the seven presidents, a second trustee designated by each president, and the Executive Director. The Chairman of the Trustees is one of the presidents; the Vice Chairman, one of the second trustees. The Vice Chairman also serves as chairman of the Administrative Committee which meets every other Wednesday morning. This Administrative Committee acts on behalf of the corporation in any matter when the Board of Trustees is not in session, except with respect to membership in the corporation and appointment of the Executive Director. Thus, virtually all resolutions for action come from the Administrative Committee composed of the seven second trustees and the Executive Director to the full Board for ratification. We believe this type of arrangement points us toward our goal of action-oriented projects.

My duties as Executive Director are to: (1) seek out, evaluate and recommend specific activities, programs and projects for joint action; (2) request the assistance and cooperation of the Consortium's member institutions to obtain background, concepts and information necessary for such activities, programs and projects; (3) guide the activities, programs and projects approved for operation and periodically evaluate their effectiveness; (4) prepare and distribute re-

ports on all such activities, programs and projects as well as information requested by the Board of Trustees of the Consortium; (5) prepare and manage the Consortium budgets.

The most difficult task facing any Consortium is to establish a well defined and achievable list of priorities for action. To accomplish this, the Consortium itself must be a priority. To this end the Trustees established a set of eight action priorities for the first 18 months, committed their institutions to three years of support at an annual core staff budget of approximately \$66,000, hired a full-time Executive Director effective June 1, 1973, and committed themselves to a three-year lease of suitable office space off campus. It is obvious that in so doing they placed a high priority on the Consortium. Thus, the Consortium began full-time operation on June 1st after having been on a half-time basis for the preceding nine months.

We believe that action can best be obtained by involving in our feasibility studies those who eventually will be called upon to implement any recommendations that result. Thus, we have established a number of task forces usually composed of one individual from each member institution. These task forces make recommendations based on their studies and then are either disbanded or are asked to develop procedures to implement and monitor an approved project. These task forces are based upon the eight priorities the Trustees selected for action: (1) establish and maintain an inventory of academic and other supportive institutional resources, the main purpose of which is to facilitate cross registration among member institutions and other cooperative efforts; (2) establish a common academic calendar; (3) explore the prospects for a transportation network among the member institutions and other depots; (4) effect a central information service utilizing available media with the intention to improve retention of college-bound students in Nassau County; (5) develop health and insurance programs, medical counseling and drug and alcohol education; (6) establish centralized career counseling and placement services; (7) build a common data glossary to facilitate information sharing; and (8) identify specialized library collections, work with the Nassau County Reference Library, and consider developing a central depot for relatively inexpensive storage. All task forces are now in operation, and three have already submitted their reports for Trustee consideration. Altogether, 18 such task forces have been established to date.

Where are we now after just seven months of full-time operation? Are we going to meet our deadline of September 1, 1974, for recommendations on those eight priority objectives? Since last June 1st when the Consortium's office was opened in Hempstead at 393 Front Street, there have been 60 meetings of 16 different task forces. It has been a most interesting and rewarding experience to see seemingly impregnable barriers begin to give way to a willingness to explore other ways of responding. I know I need not remind you that it *does* take time to change from the competitive mode to the cooperative mode, but I am convinced we are making good headway. For example:

1. We have agreed on the broad parameters of a cross registration program in which students can register with the approval of their academic advisors for courses at one of the other Consortium institutions and receive regular grade credit at his home institution. This program will focus initially on those areas of strength in each institution and will begin no later than the spring semester of 1975.

2. Six of the seven institutions are on virtually the same calendar, thus greatly facilitating cross registration, the sharing of faculty, and the developing of Consortium pro-

grams. We have agreed to plan future academic calendars to be as facilitative to cross registration as possible.

3. We now have an analysis by zip code of where our students, faculty and staff live, thus giving us an opportunity to study the potential for the development of car pools, bus routes, and interinstitutional bus routes. Post, Old Westbury and New York Tech have already instituted bus service among themselves and the LIRR, which undoubtedly will be expanded as our cross registration programs gain headway.

4. In the area of affirmative action, we have shared information about individual programs and sources of qualified minorities and women, have developed common reporting forms to meet EEOC regulations, and are just now completing work on an internal administrative fellowship program for women faculty and administrators on our campuses. A brief report on this work is being prepared for national distribution upon request from the American Association of Higher Education.

5. We have developed a proposal jointly with Nassau BOCES to fund a three-year cooperative program of faculty/staff interchange in the three areas of guidance, special education and career education. This joint proposal is now being reviewed by a federal granting agency. We will know within two weeks whether this proposal has been selected for the next review process.

6. The Career-Counseling and Placement Task Force has submitted its report to the Administrative Committee. Many areas for cooperative activities in placement and career counseling have been identified and are now under intensive review by the Trustees.

7. We have agreed to develop a common brochure to encourage students to remain in Nassau County and are now in the process of preparing the brochure with a convenient tear-out form for admissions information.

8. In the area of computers, we have analyzed the equipment the seven institutions have and their plans for the development of administrative data processing systems in an effort to explore the potential for joint systems development and equipment sharing. We are now also sharing academic computing programs and techniques with each other.

9. In the business affairs areas, we have established subcommittees to explore joint purchasing, to investigate cooperative approaches in plant operations matters, and to review cooperative food service contracts.

10. We have analyzed the holdings of each of the libraries of the member institutions together with that projected for the Nassau County Reference Library and are now in the process of formulating plans for the coordinated, selective development of strength, the reduction of duplication, and the development of a workable call system drawing on computer techniques for college-to-college book transfer.

11. We have developed a Consortium-wide Student Volunteer and Community Services Program based on the H.E.L.P. program initiated at Hofstra five years ago. The Consortium received a grant of \$14,000 to expand this program to the seven campuses. This consortium program is unique, to the best of my knowledge.

12. The Student Cultural and Social Affairs Task Force is now well along in developing proposals for a series of Consortium-sponsored lectureships and special charter flights for overseas learning experiences during the January intersession.

Time does not permit me to go into further detail. However, these few samples are representative of the progress we have already made toward reaching the goals we established at the time the decision was made to launch the Consortium on a full-time basis last June. Incidentally, there are a substantial number of cooperative projects between

two or more of the Consortium institutions such as joint use of biology laboratory space as NYIT between OW and NYIT, joint use of chemistry laboratory space at Post by OW and Post, and joint use and development of library resources for the MBA and teacher education programs at Post and MYIT, to mention a few.

Yes, much yet remains to be accomplished, but we are making progress toward our common objectives and we are sitting down together on a regular basis and talking very openly and very directly with each other. We believe this partnership approach utilizing the resources of both the public and private colleges in Nassau County will provide the educational and economic benefits we are seeking. Much is at stake, not only for our students but for Nassau County as well, for as I indicated at the beginning of my remarks, the economic health of our area is closely linked to the educational and economic vitality of the colleges that make up the Nassau Higher Education Consortium.

SKYLAB MAPS WAY FOR SHUTTLE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in 1979 we are scheduled for the first time to launch a true low-cost transportation system for the routine utilization of space—the Space Shuttle. From our Nation's experience in Mercury, Gemini, Apollo, and Skylab, we already know that large and direct benefits await us when we use space on a routine basis with a reusable low cost transportation system. Mr. David F. Salisbury, staff writer of the Christian Science Monitor, points out in a recent article the gains provided from Skylab and the importance in indicating the need to vigorously pursue the development of the Space Shuttle for the benefit of the Nation.

The article follows:

SKYLAB MAPS WAY FOR SHUTTLE

BOSTON.—With the successful return of Skylab's last crew Friday, a chapter in man's adventure into space has ended. The next is already coming off the drawing boards.

In 1975 an American and Russian crew will rendezvous in orbit in Apollo and Soyuz capsules designed so they can link together. All future U.S. and Russian spacecraft will use this design, so that they will be compatible.

After that, U.S. efforts will center on development of the space shuttle. This is a glider piggybacked on a rocket—a system designed to be recyclable and provide a less expensive boost into space. Contracting has begun, and in 1974 \$475 million will be spent.

70 MILLION MILES LOGGED

Three Skylab crews spent a total of 171 days in space, where they circled the globe almost 2,500 times and traveled 70.5 million miles. Space agency officials are proclaiming that the mission illustrated, in several ways, the potential of the shuttle and prolonged space flight.

Man's first attempt to build a home in space was a qualified success. The three crews were able to live and work there effectively.

Medical experimenters working with the crew have seen no reason that human beings cannot spend long periods in weightless-

ness—either traveling to other planets or manning an orbiting space-station.

Because of their rigorous exercising, the final crew is re-adapting to earth even faster than anticipated after their record 84 days in weightlessness, doctors report. A measure of how adapted they were to space comes from the report that one of the returned astronauts, without thinking, let go of a bottle in mid-air. In Skylab it would have just hung there, but not on earth. He caught it just before it hit the floor.

During the more than 500 man-days that the three Skylab crews spent in orbit, they performed a series of experiments and, more important, repair work that has convinced some skeptical scientists manned space flight may have a secure place in astronomy and other scientific exploration.

THEORIES DISPROVED

Preliminary results on all the Skylab experiments are promising. Pictures of the sun have disproved many former theories. Earth resources satellites of the future may be based on Skylab designs, NASA scientists predict.

Experiments with manufacturing exotic alloys and materials in space have been successful. They have opened the door for placing small factories in the shuttle bay to make materials that are impossible to fabricate on earth.

INTERNAL SECURITY—NOW MORE THAN EVER

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, under a special order of the House on Monday, April 29—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 12059—I mentioned briefly a few of the many fine organizations which have gone on record against the abolition—in whatever parliamentary guise it may be clothed—of the House Internal Security Committee.

Two of the major organizations, representing a combined membership of almost 4½ million members, are the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

In an article in the April 1974 issue of the American Security Reporter entitled "Internal Security—Now More Than Ever!" the VFW stated that it was mandated to support the embattled House Internal Security Committee. "This we shall do," it declared. The text of the article follows:

INTERNAL SECURITY—NOW MORE THAN EVER!

With the recent and continuing breakdown in internal security, as exemplified by the Patricia Hearst kidnapping by the self-styled Symbionese Liberation Army and airplane hijackings, the need for an effective and vigilant Congressional body charged with internal security matters would seem to self-evident.

Not so, it now appears, to some in Congress and the Administration.

The Subversive Activities Control Board was permitted to die on the vine.

The old Internal Security Division in the Department of Justice is now but a far smaller "section."

In the United States Senate this function has been relegated to a "Subcommittee."

Finally, the Internal Security Committee of the United States House of Representatives is now under attack, but it is fighting back.

Rep. Richard H. Ichord (Mo.), its Chairman, recently reiterated his opposition to any transfer of the Committee's jurisdiction which would not give assurance that its work would be done.

Ichord said he intends to fight the transfer proposal which has been made as part of an overall committee reorganization plan proposed by the Select Committee on Committees chaired by fellow Missourian Rep. Richard Bolling.

In a letter to Bolling, Ichord said his opposition is based on the fact that the proposal, which would shift internal security jurisdiction to the Committee on Government Operations, "does not give full assurance to Congress that the work in the internal security field . . . will be pursued continuously and vigorously."

Ichord said he intends to offer an amendment on the floor of the House to retain the present Committee on Internal Security.

To do the needed job, the House Internal Security Committee should be empowered with a mandate which would cover internal security generally, subversive activities, whether of domestic or foreign origin; treason, sedition, espionage, sabotage, conspiracy, assassination, kidnapping, or assault of federal officers and employees, riots, mutiny, malicious mischief and related activities, and federal personnel loyalty and security, including United States personnel employed with international organizations.

Also, security of classified information, federally-administered industrial and industrial defense facilities security programs, internal security aspects of immigration and naturalization and activities of organizations or groups having a purpose to overthrow or destroy the government of the United States or of any state by unlawful means, or by such means to obstruct and oppose the lawful authority of the government of the United States in the execution of any law or policy affecting its internal security, as well as federal investigative agencies in relation to their internal security functions.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is mandated to support the embattled House Internal Security Committee. This we shall do.

VFW Commander in Chief, Ray Soden, also dispatched telegrams in mid-April to a number of key House Members which firmly endorsed the continued existence of HISC and the VFW's strong feelings against any "legislative sleight-of-hand or package proposal." The Commander's wire follows:

On behalf of your many friends in the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I urge you to support the continued existence of the House Internal Security Committee and not permit this irreplaceable national asset to disappear through any legislative sleight-of-hand or "package" proposal.

The V.F.W. mandate in support of the HISC is clear and the growing pattern of political terrorism, alone, argues convincingly that the crucial work of the HISC should continue undiluted.

I call upon you and all responsible members of the U.S. House of Representatives to reject the paranoid pressure tactics of the so-called "National Committee Against Repressive Legislation" and support the only duly constituted body in the Congress charged with overwatching and countering extremist groups committed to the violent destruction of American lives, values and processes.

THE AMERICAN LEGION

The position of the Legion, always a loyal and staunch supporter of HISC as

stated in its biannual, and still valid resolution of 1972—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD March 21, 1974, page 7832—was expressed in its April 8, 1974, letter to House Members by the Legion's National Commander, Robert E. L. Eaton, which follows:

As you know, the Select Committee on Committees has reported H. Res. 988 to reform the structure, jurisdiction and procedures of the House of Representatives. The American Legion applauds the efforts of the Select Committee to overhaul and streamline the House Committee structure for more efficient operation. We are deeply concerned, however, about the proposal to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and transfer its jurisdiction to the Committee on Government Operations. Many of our members feel very strongly that such action will mark the beginning of the end of House efforts in the field of internal security.

The American Legion has long supported the work of the Committee on Internal Security. We believe this standing Committee of the House has rendered valuable service to the Congress and to the Nation. The phase-out of surveillance operations in the Executive Branch makes its work more important than ever before. We believe that the increased activity of terrorist organizations in recent months makes it imperative that the American people be reassured that work in the field of internal security is vigorously pursued.

The American Legion supports the recommendation contained in H. Res. 988 to retain the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries as a standing Committee of the House. Retention of this Committee with jurisdiction over the Merchant Marine and Coast Guard is in accord with the Legion's long standing belief that a strong and viable maritime fleet is an economic necessity in time of peace and vital to our national security in time of war.

In order that all Members may have an opportunity to express their views and properly discuss this sweeping proposal, it is our hope that the Committee on Rules will send H. Res. 988 to the House floor under a rule whereby amendments are in order. We urge you to lend your influence and support to that end.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. L. EATON,
National Commander.

GUS LESNEVICH

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, many great athletes have come out of North Jersey and one of the greatest was a fighter by the name of Gus Lesnevich. Mr. Lesnevich, who died in 1964, was elected recently to the Boxing Hall of Fame. A lifelong resident of Bergen County, he held the light-heavyweight championship from 1941 to 1948.

The story of Gus Lesnevich is one of a man who never stopped punching. Tough, courageous and resourceful, he brought skills into the ring which still sparkle 10 years after his death. Upon his death in 1964, the Associated Press wrote,

In an era of big-name boxers—the nineteen forties—Gus Lesnevich reigned along-

side such champions in other weight divisions as Joe Louis, Rocky Graziano and Sugar Ray Robinson.

Mr. Speaker, one of boxing's foremost achievements is induction into the Hall of Fame, and this honor is a fitting tribute to the career of Mr. Lesnevich. In his 15-year career, he fought 76 fights, winning 57, 21 by knockouts, and losing 14. He fought five draws and later was a referee in New Jersey and New York.

An excellent article concerning Mr. Lesnevich appeared recently in The Record, a Bergen County daily newspaper. Written by Bob Kurland, the article focused on the achievements of Gus Lesnevich and gives additional insight into what this great fighter meant to the sport of boxing. As a result, I would like to insert this article into the RECORD, along with a summary from Nat Fleischer's Ring Record Book of Mr. Lesnevich's 76 fights:

LESNEVICH ELECTED TO HALL OF FAME

(By Bob Kurland)

CLIFFSIDE PARK.—It began in the Hackensack YMHA gymnasium in 1933 and came to a triumphant conclusion yesterday when the late Gus Lesnevich was elected to the Boxing Hall of Fame.

Lesnevich, who died in 1964 at the age of 49, held the light-heavyweight championship from 1941 until 1948 when he lost a close decision to Freddie Mills in London.

"I thought Gus won that one," reminisced Joe Vella who managed the Cliffside Park battler throughout his career. "Mills backed up for the first nine rounds. But I had warned Gus he would never get a close decision in the guy's backyard."

Lesnevich grew up in Bergen County and lived there all his life. He entered boxing when his brother bought him a pair of gloves. His career got underway when he took the welterweight title in a tourney at the aforementioned Y.

"He was a natural right from the start," Vella said. "And we were a natural. Unlike a lot of managers and fighters who are always fighting over something, he and I were buddies to the end."

After winning the Golden Gloves sub-novice and later inter-city championships, Gus turned pro. And he was tremendous, winning 27 of his first 30 outings with two ending in draws.

By 1936 he had grown into the middleweight division where he took on champion Freddie Steele in a nontitle fight. It's hard to say what the young Lesnevich would have done against the experienced champ because a deep cut ended his hopes in the second round.

Lesnevich kept filling out and in 1939 dropped a 15-round decision to light-heavy king Billy Conn. "We scheduled for a rematch," Vella said, "But four times the fight was put off. Then we were getting ready when Gus hurt his leg. We were afraid to ask for a postponement because we felt we wouldn't get another chance."

So the fight went on in 1940 and again Conn won but this time on a very narrow decision. "Conn told me after the fight Gus hit him the hardest punch he'd ever taken but luckily it was to the chest."

It was the same Conn who the following year challenged Joe Louis for the heavy-weight crown and was leading on all cards going into the 13th round. However, he became cocky and tried to slug Louis only to find himself flat on his back.

Around the same time Conn was getting knocked out, Lesnevich pounded out a decision over Anton Christofordis to win

the National Boxing Association title. He followed it up with two wins over Tami Mauriello.

Lesnevich made it a World title after coming out of the Coast Guard by knocking out Mills in 10 rounds.

Lesnevich's career wound up in 1949 when he was knocked out by Ezzard Charles. "I told him then he would never fight again," Vella said. "And he never did although he was thinking about a comeback. He fought as a pro for 15 years and that was enough."

Joining Lesnevich in the Hall of Fame, which is housed in the offices of The Ring Magazine is former lightweight champion Sammy Angott who posted a 72-23-8 record. Both were elected by boxing writers and sportscasters gaining the 75 per cent of the needed votes.

And entering the Hall via the oldtimers committee are Paddy Ryan, the heavy king during the bareknuckle days of 1880, who lost it to John L. Sullivan, former flyweight champ Frankie Genaro and ex-light heavy king Jack Delaney.

GUS LESNEVICH

Born, Feb. 22, 1915, Cliffside Park, N.J. Nationality, Russian-American. Light-heavyweight. Height, 5 ft. 9 in. Managed by Joe Vella.

1934

Golden Gloves Inter-City Champion

May 5	Justin Hoffman, Brooklyn	KO	2
May 19	Sid Cohen, Brooklyn	KO	3
May 29	Jimmy Calabrese, Ft. Lee	KO	1
June 9	Willie Klein, Brooklyn	W	6
June 23	Roy Frisco, Brooklyn	W	8
July 23	Tony Kalb, Jersey City	KO	2
Sept. 13	Nicky Williams, Jersey City	W	6
Sept. 22	Charlie Weiss, Brooklyn	W	6
Oct. 3	Mark Hough, Brooklyn	W	6
Nov. 3	Tom Chester, Brooklyn	W	6
Nov. 24	Jackie Aldare, Brooklyn	L	6
Dec. 8	San Willard, Brooklyn	W	6
Dec. 29	Jackie Aldare, Brooklyn	W	8

1935

Jan. 12	Bucky Lawless, Brooklyn	KO	2
Feb. 2	Jackie Aldare, Brooklyn	W	8
Mar. 2	John Anderson, Brooklyn	W	8
Mar. 22	John Anderson, N. Y.	D	8
Apr. 12	Mark Hough, Brooklyn	W	8
May 2	Charley Weiss, Brooklyn	W	8
May 25	Tony Celli, Brooklyn	W	8
Dec. 17	Butch Lynch, Newark	W	10

1936

Feb. 4	Eddie Kid Whalen, N. J.	KO	5
Mar. 16	Frankie Caris, Newark	D	10
Apr. 13	Frankie Caris, Newark	W	10
May 12	Sammy Christian, Los Angeles	W	6
May 30	Lou Rogers, Hollywood	KO	1
Aug. 21	Ray Actis, Hollywood	W	10
Oct. 9	Carmen Barth, Hollywood	W	10
Oct. 23	Marth Simmons, Hollywood	D	10
Nov. 4	Young Stubley, San Francisco	KO	9
Nov. 17	Freddie Steele, Los Angeles	KO by 2	

1937

Feb. 20	Tony Celli, N.Y.	W	8
Mar. 12	Young Corbett, San Francisco	KO by 5	
June 22	Young Stubley, Los Angeles	W	10
Aug. 24	Attilio Sabatino, San Francisco	W	10
Sept. 3	Alabama Kid, San Francisco	W	10
Oct. 5	Allan Matthews, Seattle	D	10
Nov. 19	Herbie Katz, N.Y.	W	10

1938

Jan. 7	Joey Perke, St. Louis	D	10
Feb. 8	Ben Brown, Miami Beach	W	11
Feb. 24	Jack Kirkland, Miami Beach	KO	0
Mar. 23	Lou Brouilard, N.Y.C.	W	10
June 1	Buddy Ryan, West N.Y.	W	10
June 16	Stanley Hasrat, West N.Y.	KO	1
Oct. 27	Ron Richards, Sydney, Australia	L	12
Dec. 8	Ambrose Palmer, Sydney, Aust.	W	12

1939

Jan. 19	Alabama Kid, Sydney, Aust.	KO	9
Feb. 2	Bob Olin, Sydney, Aust.	W	12
May 15	Larry Lane, Trenton, N.J.	W	10
June 22	Dave Clark, Nutley, N.J.	KO	1
Nov. 17	Billy Conn, N.Y.C.	L	15

(For World Light-heavyweight Title)

1940				
Jan. 1	Dave Clark, Detroit	W	10	
June 5	Billy Conn, Detroit	L	15	
(For World Light-heavyweight Title)				
July 22	Wally Sears, Garfield, N.J.	W	10	
Sept. 5	Henry Cooper, Garfield, N.J.	KO	5	
Nov. 23	Al Delaney, Brooklyn	L	5	
Dec. 16	Jack Marshall, Newark	KO	4	
1941				
Feb. 27	Nathan Mann, Detroit	W	10	
May 22	Ant. Christoforidis, N.Y.C.	W	15	
(For N.B.A. Light Heavyweight title)				
Aug. 26	Tami Mauriello, N.Y.C.	W	15	
(Won International recognition as world light-heavyweight champion)				
Nov. 14	Tami Mauriello, N.Y.C.	W	15	
(Title bout)				
1942				
Jan. 30	Bob Pastor, N.Y.C.	L	10	
Mar. 1	Jimmy Bivins, Cleveland (in U.S. Coast Guard)	L	10	
1943				
Oct. 22	Joe Thomas, Wilmington Exh.	KO	3	
1946				
Jan. 11	Joe Kahut, Portland	KO	2	
Feb. 15	Paul Crosby, Danbury	Exh.	5	
Feb. 22	Lee Oma, N.Y.C.	KO by 6		
May 14	Freddie Mills, London (world light heavy-weight title)	KO	10	
Sept. 17	Bruce Woodcock, London	KO by 8		
1947				
Feb. 28	Billy Fox, N.Y.C. (world light-heavyweight title)	KO	10	
May 23	Mello Bettina, N.Y.C.	KO	1	
July 30	Tami Mauriello, Brooklyn	W	10	
Oct. 31	Tami Mauriello, N.Y.C.	KO	7	
1948				
Mar. 5	Billy Fox, N.Y.C. (world light heavyweight title)	KO	1	
July 26	Freddie Mills, London (lost world light heavyweight title)	L	15	
1949				
Mar. 3	Eldridge Eatman, Newark	KO	1	
May 23	Joey Maxim, Cincinnati (for vacant American light heavyweight title)	L	15	
Aug. 10	Ezzard Charles, New York (for world heavy-weight title)	KO by 7		
Later became a referee in New York and New Jersey. Died Cliffside Park, N.J., February 28, 1964.				
TB	KO	WD	WF	D
76	21	36	0	5
				9
				0
				5
				0
				0
				0

THE CASE FOR A FEDERAL OIL AND GAS CORPORATION—NO. 24

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on April 22 a noted economist, Professor W. N. Peach of the University of Oklahoma testified before the Senate Commerce Committee on the concept of a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation. Disputing contentions by the major oil firms that the Federal Oil and Gas Corporation would enjoy unfair advantages over private oil companies and would lead to nationalization of the petroleum industry, Professor Peach stated that the public oil company would provide desperately needed competition in the petroleum industry. In addition to increasing our Nation's supply of oil and gas, the Corporation could also perform a useful service in the development of oil shale, geothermal and other energy resources, the Professor maintained. Professor

Peach's statement eloquently underscores the need for a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation, and I would like to insert excerpts of his testimony at this time.

The excerpt follows:

EXCERPTS FROM PROFESSOR PEACH'S TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

In recent years, governments throughout the world have been playing a more important role than formerly in the energy field. This has been true of producing countries and consuming countries, left wing and right wing, or if you prefer, capitalist and socialist countries. Only in the United States is increased government activity opposed as religious heresy. Elsewhere in the world, an increasing role for government in the basic industry seems to be accepted as desirable and necessary. To many groups in the United States, some of them powerful—the prospect of having their government participate directly on a modest scale in the production and other aspects of the energy industry seems to provide an excuse for another round of the crusades.

As I understand it, the Federal Oil and Gas Corporation is not scheduled to take over a single oil well now owned by a private company, nor a single gas well, nor a single geothermal well, nor any shale oil deposit owned by a private company. But the proposed Federal Corporation is designed to develop a fraction of the new wells. Most of these new wells are located on land owned by the federal government.

The arguments advanced in opposition to the proposed Federal Oil and Gas Corporation are almost identical with those advanced four decades ago against the TVA. It would ruin the private electrical industry, lower the profits of private electric companies, would lead to socialism, would be subsidized with tax dollars, would be inefficient, would have overwhelming advantages over private firms, would be exempt from taxes, would be a loser for the tax-paying public, would lose money for the Treasury, would fall in its objectives, would undermine systematically every private electric utility, would discourage investment in the private electric industry, and would have serious negative implications. What were the effects of TVA? Despite all the dire predictions, the TVA had the effect of lowering electric rates throughout the nation and vastly increased the profits of private companies. It has not led to socialism of the electric power industry. It has not discouraged investment. Nor has it had any of the other dire effects that were predicted.

Every responsible person agrees that the United States is abundantly endowed with energy resources. What we need is to develop and use them. One of the most important things the proposed Federal Oil and Gas Corporation could do is to assure that we never again find ourselves in the position of an "energy crisis." That is intolerable in the face of our abundant supplies.

We have the abundant supplies in the offshore areas of the Gulf Coast, the East Coast and the West Coast, in the oil shale deposits in the Green River area of Colorado, Utah and Wyoming where there are trillions of barrels of high quality oil, compared with the 100 or so billion barrels produced in the past century in the United States.

Although production of oil from shale is not specifically included in the operations of the proposed Federal Oil and Gas Corporation, it seems to me this would be an appropriate activity. The Federal government owns most of this land and has been operating prototype plants there for many years.

We have enough coal to last for hundreds—even thousands of years, which can be gasified and liquified. It is not necessary to wait

for another century while additional experiments are conducted. Other countries, including Germany, England, the U.S.S.R., Japan and other countries have the technology now. They are willing to share it with us. We have untold amounts of geothermal energy in the west. There are recent developments which suggest that geothermal heat may be made available in other parts of the nation. There is an unlimited amount of solar energy available. The technology for heating and cooling is already available, although further development is needed to make electricity for large cities available. Helium is available wherever there is water, and can be used for many purposes, now.

Then there are the so called exotic sources of energy which will require decades of further experimental work. But there is no need to wait until the year 2,000 to develop all the energy America needs, as a flood of self-serving propaganda would have us believe. We have the energy resources now. All we need do is develop them. And the proposed Federal Oil and Gas Corporation is a promising way of doing just what is needed.

As has been pointed out elsewhere in these hearings, the federal government now owns most of the land from which our future energy resources will come—offshore, oil shale, geothermal, etc. The federal government, plus state and local governments, are large consumers of energy both in times of peace and war. The federal government spends most of the money on research and development of energy resources.

The proposed Federal Oil and Gas Corporation can perform a useful service in such areas as oil shale, geothermal and other energy resources. Over the next decade it can increase the supply of energy. Second, it can introduce an element of competition in an industry that is not known around the world as one characterized by vigorous competition. It can give preference to cities, states and the federal government, and the independent. Third, in some areas, such as oil shale, it can do some experimenting and set environmental standards and determine their costs. Once the standards and their costs are settled, private industry can take over with the knowledge of these important costs.

POLL IN CHICAGO BACKS PRESIDENT 5 TO 1

HON. HAROLD B. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, a poll taken recently by the Downtown News, a Chicago publication, shows that the overwhelming majority of the people of downtown Chicago and nearby areas retains confidence in President Nixon and believes he should stay on the job. The pro-Nixon vote was 5 to 1.

I herewith submit the Downtown News comments on its poll:

THE NIXON POLL WRAP-UP: SOME ASTONISHING QUESTIONS REMAIN

The final tally of our straw poll of several weeks back regarding the public's confidence in President Nixon is now complete. And the results, we think, are quite astonishing. After careful evaluation we must conclude that the final tally is overwhelmingly in favor of President Nixon remaining in office. Indeed our random poll indicates that he can do so with full public confidence in his ability to lead!

As you may recall, the Downtown News posed two simple questions in a non-biased editorial:

1. Do you still have confidence in President Nixon?
2. Do you think President Nixon should remain in office?

In addition to the hundreds of mailed-in coupons, hundreds more poured in from coupon boxes the Downtown News had distributed in several key downtown and near north locations. Now, after five weeks of careful tabulation and analysis from the thousands of replies the final count indicates that the respondents DO have faith in the president and wish to see him stay in office by a ratio of 5 to 1. There were only two undecided replies.

Our staff was very pleased at the great response the straw poll received and wish to thank everyone who took the time to reply. However, we were, frankly a bit perplexed. When you run an unbiased, random survey to determine the public's temperament on a controversial subject and the result clearly flies in the face of everything you've read and heard previously, it, frankly, gives one cause to wonder. The daily press and all the prestigious polls report that the President's popularity is at an all time low and that public confidence is worn thin. Where, exactly does the contradiction lie? Is it that Chicago is secretly a Republican bastion? Hardly. Could it be that this part of the country, the Loop and near north, just happen to have the complete opposite view as we're told the rest of the country? (In fact, many of our responses were from the far suburbs, many even from out of state!) Or are there larger questions involved?

For example, are we really being given the full story by our news media? How is it possible that a simple grassroots poll can register such an enormously different result than what nearly everyone else is reporting? Are the big-time polls and media really being sensitive to the feelings and the mood of the public?

One wonders! One really wonders!

TAX POLICY AND CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, there has been great concern expressed by many people throughout the country over a bill introduced in the 92d Congress, H.R. 15230, the Tax Review Policy Act. Among the changes proposed in this bill was the removal of major deductions for charitable activities.

The bill was a measure introduced to stimulate a discussion of tax reform measures. It appears that some citizens believe this proposed legislation is about to be enacted by Congress. Let me reassure those concerned that this is not the case.

American citizens can be proud of their record of generosity to private charities. Our tax laws have recognized this commendable impulse by providing certain deductions in our tax laws to encourage private charitable contributions. Tax exemptions are provided for religious and charitable organizations.

It is my opinion that the overwhelming majority of the Congress recognizes the

advantages of this tax policy and would not vote to repeal or change these provisions. Removal of deductions and exemptions would be a serious blow to the outstanding work of private charities. A bill to remove the benefits for charitable organizations would stand little chance of passage. I personally would actively oppose such a measure.

NUTRITION AND PREGNANT WOMEN

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a grave situation. Several scientific studies have pointed to a direct relationship between poor diets on the part of pregnant women and stunted brain development of the fetus. Malnutrition both before and after birth can affect a child's mental development for his entire life.

I would like to recommend to my colleagues an article dealing with this problem which appeared in the September 1973 issue of *Playgirl* magazine, by Stephanie Caruana, entitled "Pregnancy and Nutrition," which is too long to reproduce here, but which contains much important information on this subject.

Attached is an article which appeared in the March 23, 1974, issue of *Saturday Review/World*, which indicates the international need for improved agricultural technologies in order to provide adequate diets for everyone. H.R. 14242, which I introduced earlier this month, would enable this country to share its agricultural technology with others in a more organized and expeditious manner than is presently in operation. The following article demonstrates one area where the need for such assistance would fill an important void:

STARVE THE CHILD, FAMISH THE FUTURE

In the late Sixties two pioneer investigators into the effects of malnutrition on brain development—Myron Winick and Pedro Rosso of The New York Hospital—Cornell Medical Center—came to some important conclusions, based on studies of the brains of Chilean children: A child who is poorly fed during early infancy may never attain his full brain growth, even though he is well fed thereafter. Similarly, a fetus, malnourished in the womb, may never make up for the brain cells and structures that never came properly into being. Malnutrition both before and after birth virtually dooms a child to stunted brain development and therefore to considerably diminished mental capacity for the rest of his life.

At around the same time as Winick and Rosso were carrying out these and related studies, Stephen Zamenhof of UCLA, another pioneer in this area of research, was conducting rat experiments that confirmed these conclusions. But Zamenhof and his colleagues carried the revelations a step further. When an underfed female rat was mated with a well-fed male, the resulting newborns showed distinct signs of brain malnutrition—as expected—even though they were put on an adequate diet starting at birth. The surprise came when the offspring, the second generation of females which had been well

nourished throughout their lives and during their own pregnancies, nevertheless gave birth to newborns with brain growth likewise retarded. The mothers were apparently unable to develop a placenta adequate to the proper nutrition of the fetus. Thus, in the case of these rats at least, the curse of malnutrition was carried into the third generation!

Rats, of course, are not people. Nevertheless, over the past several years many researchers in embryology, pediatrics, neurology, nutrition, and allied disciplines have been learning more and more about the disquietingly long-range effects of malnutrition on brain, behavior, and intellectual ability. Familiarity with this growing body of literature gives one a new outlook on hunger.

Consider the latest outbreak of famine, this time in several drought-stricken nations of Africa. Once more the newspapers carry numbing statistics of the dead and near-dead. Again we see pictures of rickety children with swollen bellies, of old people with hope-empty eyes, the skin clinging to their bones. The human mind does not relate well to statistics, but it does relate—at least fleetingly—to the visible suffering of other human individuals. Those who can do so will undoubtedly respond to the appeals for aid. Food distribution will almost certainly be inadequate and ill organized. But it will begin to bring some nourishment and relief to the victims. The overall situation will gradually improve, the crisis will abate, and the famine will be declared over.

For us, it will all have been a transient, remote episode in the midst of our other preoccupations. When new headlines tell us of another famine somewhere in the world, we will notice again. But hunger is always with us, over vast regions of the planet. Our own continent, and our own country, is certainly not exempt. Though "famine," so labeled, seldom occurs, there exists chronic, widespread malnutrition. During a famine it simply occurs on an accelerated, wholesale scale.

For survivors of a famine, the ordeal is never really over. Its ravages, as studies have now made clear, may be lifelong and irrevocable. In the first few years of life, the brain grows much faster than the rest of the body. If this growth does not occur on schedule, there is no second chance. This is even truer of prenatal brain development. From fertilized egg to embryo to fetus to infant, growth takes place according to a rigidly timed genetic program, with not much give in it. When brain cells need to divide and new structures need to be formed, the materials—all the materials—and the energy to put them together must be at hand right there and then. DNA can provide the instructions, but the nutrients must come through the placenta. A poorly supplied assembly line cannot be expected to turn out a perfect product.

We have all known that physical growth may be stunted by malnutrition, but we have not understood the extent to which brain function and mental capacity can be impaired. (An excellent new book on the subject is *The Malnourished Mind* by Elie Shneour. The author argues convincingly that the nutrition factor has been too lightly considered by those currently debating the comparative IQs of blacks versus whites.) We have certainly recognized that famine and chronic hunger are tragic circumstances, but we have not recognized the true dimensions of the tragedy. When we think of entire populations undergoing a long siege of near-starvation, of children and fetuses by the hundreds of thousands deprived of their basic nutritional needs, we must now understand that these populations may have to function at a considerably diminished intellectual level compared with their genetic potential.

The children who survive will be less able to cope with their ordinary problems, let alone rise to the challenge of situations that require superior intellect or creative ingenuity. The irony is that a nation already afflicted with a plethora of problems, hoping that the new generation will come up with imaginative solutions, may find that the new generation has been sentenced in advance to add to the problems instead—a case of taking away from him that already hath not.

It is patently unfair either for individuals or for nations to be cheated of an equal chance at the future. The human brain, like Mark Antony's crocodile, "lives by that which nourisheth it." If the nourishment is missing, an adult brain can recover; but a developing brain loses forever. This new realization should spur us, through our national and international planning bodies, to renewed vigor in our attack on worldwide malnutrition—with special emphasis on the proper feeding of small children and expectant mothers. Easy answers are not readily at hand. Science and its continuing research effort can point us along the way, but the solutions must ultimately be political—and moral.

FEA CONFERENCE REPORT

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1974

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was pleased to cast an affirmative vote on the conference report of H.R. 11793, the Federal Energy Administration Act of 1974.

While granting its statutory base as an independent energy agency, we in Congress have also charged the FEA with the critical task of formulating a sensible and far-reaching energy policy. There is little doubt but that this Nation is in considerable need of long-range initiatives so as to satisfy the Nation's energy demands in the coming years.

For several months, many persons have expounded on the concept and feasibility of energy independence. Whether or not we attain this status is of course dependent on how quickly we develop every potential source of energy.

One such source is hydroelectric power.

I was especially pleased to see that the conference report took cognizance of hydroelectric power by authorizing the new FEA to transmit to Congress, within 90 days, a thorough report on the generating capability as well as the number of hydro facilities now in operation throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, recent FPC statistics indicate that only 30 percent of this Nation's total conventional hydroelectric capacity has been developed.

Our neighbor to the north has harnessed this abundant, nonpolluting renewable energy source to the extent that it supplies Canada with 75 percent of its electrical demand.

In my own State, there are approximately 65 hydroplants in operation. Ludington, Mich., has the largest pump storage hydroelectric facility in the world. This plant generates enough

CXX—786—Part 9

electricity during peak demand to not only service its surrounding communities, but also to satisfy the partial needs of Chicago and Detroit. Although Michigan has reached its total hydroelectric output, the Northeast as well as the Northwest segments of our country hold great promise as future suppliers of electrical energy.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that when this report is transmitted to Congress in the, hopefully, very near future, it does not find its way into an obscure file. Rather, I hope it will provide Congress with a useful study on the merits of hydroelectric power and will serve as the basis for the continuing development of hydroelectric power resources.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to support this legislation and particularly, the section authorizing the study of this Nation's hydroelectric capabilities.

NATIONAL DAY FOR HUMILIATION, FASTING, AND PRAYER

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the Senate earlier this year passed a joint resolution calling for a Day of National Prayer, Humiliation, and Fasting on April 30, but for technical reasons, the resolution was never reported out of the House Judiciary Committee or passed by the House, and consequently, this proposed day of prayer has no official sanction. However, many mayors and Governors have made proclamations designating this day for this purpose, and many groups around the country have chosen it for a spontaneous response to a felt need in the heart of the American people for such a day.

Even though I had two reservations about the joint resolution, I am still sorry that it did not receive positive action in the House. My reservations were first, that the beautiful wording of the main body of the resolution was taken almost in its entirety from Abraham Lincoln, and I thought he should have been given credit; and second, I feel that "humility" or "humbling" would have been a better word than "humiliation," because the word "humiliation" implies something that is done to one by someone else rather than something that one does on one's own. Humiliation implies an abasement and mortification that is destructive of one's self-respect or dignity, whereas "humility" implies simply the quality or state of being humble, not proud or haughty, not arrogant or assertive.

However, be these reservations as they may, the general thrust of the resolutions—Senate Joint Resolution 183 and House Joint Resolution 947—is most appropriate, because they call our Nation to express gratitude for our blessings and penitence for our shortcomings and failure to do the good that often we should. Surely there is much to be grateful for as we contemplate the blessings

we enjoy in this country, and surely there is much of which we should repent when we contemplate the gap that exists between our ideals and the realities of life around us.

Abraham Lincoln knew all this and part of his legacy to us is his remarkable embodiment of the virtues of gratitude and humility.

Lincoln had a marvelous capacity to be grateful. He showed us the truth of William Wordsworth's observation that "the religion of gratitude can never mislead us." When he issued one of his Thanksgiving proclamations, Lincoln paraphrased a passage from the eighth chapter of Deuteronomy:

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. We have forgotten the gracious Hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us. . . .

Words which are duplicated in the resolution to proclaim April 30, 1974, as a National Day of Humiliation, Fasting, and Prayer.

Lincoln knew how to thank men as well as God. He never took credit for himself. He always gave thanks for the hard work and sacrifice of the people and the soldiers who made the victories in the field possible. He realized that there is no such thing as a self-made man and that we are all indebted to others:

It is hard to say anything has been more bravely and well done, than at Antietam, Murfreesboro, Gettysburg, and on many fields of lesser note. Nor must Uncle Sam's webbed feet be forgotten. At all the watery marshes they have been present. Not only on the deep sea, the broad bay, and the rapid river, but also up the narrow muddy bayou and wherever the ground was a little damp, they have been and made their track. Thanks to all. For the Great Republic, for the principle it lives by and keeps alive, for man's vast future—thanks to all.

The corollary of gratitude is humility, because if we can give thanks to God and others for our blessings it will mean that we will avoid congratulating ourselves. Lincoln was never puffed up. He never pontificated. He eschewed dogmatism. He held strong moral positions, but always with modesty, never with arrogance. Blessedly divested of selfrighteousness, he often mentioned his desire to serve as "a humble instrument in the hands of the Almighty." Constantly visited by people who claimed that the Lord was on this side or that in the Civil War, Lincoln would remark:

I'm not at all concerned about that, for I know the Lord is always on the side of the right. It is my constant anxiety and prayer that I and this Nation should be on the Lord's side.

Lincoln was free of the fanaticism that frequently accompanies and curses the zealous idealism and excessive chest-pounding nationalism. He could see truths in positions other than his own. He appreciated that all human points of view are finite, all human positions tentative, all human achievements partial. He had the humility to submit his own

judgments, as well as the course of his Nation's destiny, to divine judgment. He was deeply sensitive to the "infinite qualitative difference" between God and man. So he spoke of America as "God's almost chosen people." He never fell into the trap of idolatry. He never made a God out of the Nation.

I am confident that Abraham Lincoln's gratitude and humility can serve a useful purpose today, and if we a century or more later can learn from him, we will become better Americans as a result.

Consequently, I am glad to be joining with some of my colleagues today in an informal gathering on the west front of the Capitol for the purpose of silent mediation and prayer in behalf of our Nation and her leaders—and would encourage my fellow Americans to use this occasion as an opportunity, unofficial though it may be, for saying a grateful word of thanks and a humble word of contrition, as we contemplate the opportunities and problems with which we are confronted as a nation, pausing to express appreciation for all the blessings we enjoy in America and penitence for the things we have left undone that we ought to have done, and the things we have done that we would have been better off not doing. For the resolution is right:

It . . . behooves us to humble ourselves before our Almighty God, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness.

CINCINNATI ENQUIRER EDITORIZES ON ASHBROOK DISCLOSURES ON ABORTION POLICIES

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, in the continuing debate on the issue of abortion, it is helpful and refreshing to have the Supreme Court's decision set in the perspective of past and present Federal court rulings.

I have recently read a thoughtful and provoking editorial in the Cincinnati Enquirer which underscores remarks made here in this Chamber by our colleague from Ohio, Mr. ASHBROOK.

It is my belief that Mr. ASHBROOK's comments in regard to the paradox of granting aid to dependent children to mothers of a child conceived but not yet born, contribute significantly to the case for deliberative review of the Supreme Court decision.

Clearly, legal discrepancies such as this must not be allowed to stand.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert the editorial:

OHIO HAS A PARADOX

Ohio's Rep. John M. Ashbrook (R) claimed enough of his colleagues' time on the floor of the House the other day to draw their attention to one of a number of paradoxes to grow out of the Supreme Court's landmark decision on abortion.

Representative Ashbrook noted that, as the result of a recent federal court ruling in Ohio,

the Ohio Department of Public Welfare may pay pregnant mothers as much as \$100 a month in Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) for a child conceived but not yet born.

The Ohio lawmaker quoted Miss Ruth Strong, director of the Richland County (Ohio) Welfare Department, as saying that prior to the decision in Stuart vs. Canary, an expectant mother would not have received any ADC allowance because of her new pregnancy.

The paradox posed by the new ruling is obvious: One arm of the federal judiciary, the Supreme Court, has maintained that a child conceived but not yet born is not a "person" within the scope of the Constitution; yet a federal court in Ohio has maintained that an unborn child is enough of a person to qualify for Aid to Dependent Children.

Ultimately, since the same issue has arisen in other states, the paradox may work its way up to the Supreme Court and require the justices themselves to reconcile the glaring conflict. Such a case would permit the court to take a fresh look at the abortion issue.

IT'S TIME TO BE QUIET

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. George E. Stringfellow and under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an excellent and timely editorial by Howard Fieger. It appeared in the April 22 issue of the U.S. News & World Report.

The article follows:

IT'S TIME TO BE QUIET

(By Howard Fieger)

Now is the time for all members of Congress to stop sounding off for or against the impeachment of the President.

In fact, the time to keep quiet arrived many weeks ago.

Both Senators and Representatives should have silenced themselves on the subject the instant the House Judiciary Committee began studying the matter of impeachment.

This is not being written in defense of Richard M. Nixon.

Rather, it is simply to point out something a lot of people tend to overlook: The President is not now a defendant in anything.

There are no articles of impeachment before the House. As a matter of record, the Judiciary Committee will not begin hearing sworn testimony until May 7, though its staff has been doing preparatory work for weeks.

Nobody who isn't directly involved could possibly know what the evidence will show.

The point to all this: When and if articles of impeachment emerge from the Committee, it will be up to the members of the House of Representatives—every last one of them—to decide whether the accusations are of substance sufficiently serious to be placed before the Senate for trial.

In simpler terms, the members of Congress are the persons who at some point will be required to sit in judgment on Mr. Nixon.

Under the circumstance it is unseemly, to say the very least, for Senators and Representatives to be making guesses now on the number of votes one way or the other, to be publicly discussing the President's guilt or innocence, to engage in head-counts to try to predict the outcome far in advance of the fact.

Several members and their staffs have been doing just this, and talking about it openly—though sometimes anonymously. "Will he be impeached?" has become a commonplace topic of conversation in Washington, and the question too often brings forth a publicized answer.

You'd think anybody could see that this popular guessing game does violence to justice. It is basic in our society that everybody—of high station or low—is presumed innocent of any wrongdoing or misconduct until proved otherwise beyond all reasonable doubt.

So what is all this loose-tongued chatter, verbally batting the grave issue of impeachment back and forth like a badminton bird?

In a way, it is the same as members of a jury pronouncing a defendant guilty or not guilty without waiting to hear the case.

It reminds one of the old, unfunny joke about the vigilantes who collared a suspected horse thief and announced they would "give him a fair trial and hang him."

As Rep. John J. Rhodes of Arizona, the Republican leader in the House, said recently on NBC's "Meet the Press":

"It is necessary for each member to make up his mind after the evidence is in, and not before. If he were to do otherwise—as some have, I think, injudiciously done—it would be similar to the situation in which a judge might mount the bench and say, 'Order in the Court. The plaintiff is going to win.'"

Aside from the blatant injustice, there is a matter of practical politics involved here that no politically sensitive member of Congress can afford to ignore.

According to the polls, this Congress is not held in very high esteem by the voters who elected it. If the idea becomes widespread that it is playing party politics with the fate of a President, a lot of incumbents could be in for a shock, come November.

The following campaign bumper sticker arrived in the mail the other day: "Don't Re-Elect Anybody".

It's just a gag, of course. But in the present atmosphere there is something unnerving about it—like an ominous tap on the shoulder.

THE YOUTHFUL SPIRIT IN TIME OF NATURAL DISASTER

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in the years in which I have served in the House of Representatives, I have seldom placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD poetry written by constituents. But after giving it a good deal of thought, I have come to the conclusion that a long poem by Mr. Wayne Conner, of 3523 Osage, St. Louis, celebrates more than a local event—it speaks eloquently of the courage and dedication of American youth in facing a great challenge, and working tirelessly to hold back a history-making flood, even at the cost of human life. It is a fine tribute to our young citizens.

The events described in Mr. Conner's poem occurred in Missouri in 1973, but undoubtedly have been duplicated many times in many areas of the Nation in time of natural disaster. Those who give of themselves to meet the challenge are a multitude of anonymous individuals joined together in a mutual effort to

translate citizenship into public service. After the crisis has passed, their efforts are often forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the poem "The Youthful Spirit" by Wayne Conner, which tells how our youth responded with such magnificent heroism and hard work to the great flood of 1973, as follows:

THE YOUTHFUL SPIRIT
(By Wayne Conner)

To a confluence. . .
Breathing life from out of the north,
Sprightly southward in pools and rapids,
always rising,
The Mississippi, Father of Waters, coming
in flood . . .
Spring of '73
A drop of rain in the east,
To the west, a crystal of snow,
Young, robust, multiplying
To a confluence with the spirit of youth,
Coming . . .

Like the oulring fingers of a giant fist,
All the tributaries of the upper basin, rushing,
Clutching America's broad chest,
Swift, rapid, quickening
To a confluence with the youthful spirit,
Coming . . .

Turbulent now, amassing all waters, unwavering,
Contankerous, grouchy, teaming
With the spoils of man, transcontinental-
ing,
Hooking in the Missouri, broad and muddy-
ing,
Volatile, pulsating, snappishly speaking
To a confluence with the young spirit
And their waiting hands,
Coming . . .

To a meeting of the converging undertows,
challenging
The St. Louis people with velocity roaming
free,
Cutting, scouring, massing
Flat and relentless to sprawl in wall to wall
deluge
Over portions of Missouri and Illinois, sub-
merging
Communities, farms, highways, tracking
Through Grafton, West Alton, Winfield, Ste.
Genevieve,
Hannibal, Lemay, Crystal City, Festus,
Vest pocket disasters of debris along streets,
trending
Through Germania, Alabama, Broadway,
Riverview, Wharf,
Eroding, warping, twisting,
And always the young spirit, fighting back,
Thousands now, to the confluence,
Coming . . .

Selfless, caring, unassuming,
Passing sandbags, hand to hand to hand
A ninety pound girl, a husky boy, children
heaving,
Showing around the clock their reservoir of
concern, rubbing
Shoulder to shoulder with a Nun, a faceless
adult,
Volunteers all, piling with Guardsmen,
Reservists,
Supplementing the Salvation Army, the Red
Cross,
As helping hands go forth under leaden skies
to the beleaguered people
As still to the confluence the youthful spirit
Coming . . .

With blistered fingers, bent backs, hearts
flowing
To save a hunching lone rabbit, a land, a
home,
A lifetime accumulation of loved things,
Lifting, ever lifting, as the water encroaches,
inundating

Hog Island, Kaskaskia, Chouteau,
Pushes to Old Monroe, Valley Park, Portage
Des Sioux,
Sloshes to the feet of the Tom Sawyer
statue,
Our Lady of the Rivers shrine.
And still to the confluence
The young spirit, and their young hands
Coming . . .

With refreshing attitudes, heroic
With teenage determination, toughness, life
breathing
Enthusiastically, energetically, sometimes
cavallering,
But always knee-deep in the river's washes,
struggling
As the Meramec, the Cuivre, River Des Peres,
Moline Creek
Fills to bridges with unsalvageable rubble,
surging,

Levees seeping, MKT rail tracks breaking.
And with their outstretching hands
To the confluence still, the young spirit
Coming . . .

From the schools, private and public, youth
streaming,
Assembling, assisting, allaying, all shapes and
sizes

As the 200-year history-making flood rolls,
sweeping
Counties of St. Charles, St. Louis, Jefferson,
Lincoln, St. Clair, Madison, and others,
perching

To the grassy slopes of the Gateway Arch,
As the colleges, the churches, all denomina-
tions open doors

As with their wide hearts and supporting
hands
To the confluence, the young spirit keeps
buoyantly
Coming . . .

In tee shirts, frayed shorts, wet flare-legged
denims, a Godsending
The boy next door, the girl down the street,
gathering, distributing
Canned goods, used clothing, the constant
sandbags, love performing

As Mothers collect sandwiches door to door,
helping
The stricken, the vulnerable, the homeless
people.

Furniture to second floors, suitcases hastily
filling,
Trains rerouting, traffic snarling,
And still to the confluence with their loving
hands
The youthful spirit,
Coming . . .

Football numbers on their backs, long-hair-
ing,

For some a gay lark, a day out of school,
But always with hands reaching
As Senators and Reps speak, divers go down,
copters up

With Mayors, newsmen, and a Governor to
Fox school,

A U.S. President overhead, surveying
The water saturated reaches to instant set-
back levees, seeing

Floating roofs, flooding trailer courts, tele-
phone wires
And tops of trees, ribbons going nowhere of
spring leafing,

And the spirit of youth to the confluence,
Their glad hands still
Coming . . .

Some in playful attitudes as at
36.4 feet . . . the Missouri, at 43.3 . . . the
Mississippi crests
And in flood stage flows on to the lower
basin, carrying

Once deposited, lifegiving topsoil
To sweep and slit the Gulf of Mexico.
And so a confluence of water and young spirit
has been,

And youth has stood, mood-glad, knowing no
defeat,

Flushed with idealism, fresh and invigorat-
ing to all

As their tender hands never hesitated,
Their young spirit never quit
Coming . . .

And now back to school slightly boring,
To Chemistry, Chaucer, Cheerleaders,
To books, blackboards, and bellyaching,
Back to authoritative teachers, do-this parents,
Complaining little brothers and sisters,
All who love them, proud and caring
That their very own young adults fought and
labored

In the great watery confluence,
Saddened that two of their number met
death

As in spirit all the young reached out hands
in their
Coming . . .

DEATH TO THE BOLL WEEVIL

HON. EDWARD YOUNG

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, over the years, Progressive Farmer magazine has enlightened and led the agricultural community. I am pleased to see they have editorially endorsed plans to wipe out the boll weevil in this country.

BOLL WEEVIL ERADICATION IS A MUST

No prospect other than 60-cent or higher priced cotton excites producers so much as the hope of eradicating the boll weevil. For more than three quarters of a century, this pest has taken a toll that staggers the imagination. Now a committee of distinguished scientists and producers, after several years of extensive tests, have concluded "it is technically and operationally feasible to eliminate the boll weevil as an economic pest in the United States by the use of techniques that are ecologically acceptable."

Eradication of the boll weevil will be a huge undertaking. It presents a far greater challenge to science than anything of the sort in past agricultural history. In scope and economic impact, it would far exceed the eradication of the cattle fever tick during the early years of the century and more recently of the screwworm.

A number of people, including several eminent entomologists, say "No. We are not ready for so enormous a job." They claim we do not have at this time the basic technology that is the knowhow. They say that if the attempt failed we would waste the huge amount of money required for such a program. Moreover, they conclude that in making the attempt we would hasten weevil resistance to presently used insecticides.

But Progressive Farmer believes the attempt should be made. In our opinion, obvious benefits far outweigh costs and risk of failure.

We perhaps don't now have all the technology needed for the eradication job. But we learn by doing. Once into the eradication effort, we would develop important new techniques and new ways of applying them that can be learned in no other way.

If the eradication attempt is made and it fails to eliminate this pest, we do not believe it will be due to lack of technique. It is much more likely to be a "people's failure"—that is, a failure of growers to give the program the nearly 100% support and compliance required for its success.

Would the \$650 million estimated cost of the program be wasted should the program fail to attain its eradication objective? Not by any means. According to Dr. E. F. Knip-

ling, ARS, U.S. Department of Agriculture: "Perhaps no more than \$100 million to \$150 million would be involved during an initial period of two to three years." By that time we would know with reasonable certainty whether or not we could achieve eradication. Even if the primary objective of eradication seemed out of reach, there would be important benefits such as:

1. Increased yields and reduced cost of weevil control for the one or two years of eradication effort.
2. New information and operational experience that might lead to an effective boll weevil management system without the use of broadspectrum insecticides.
3. Economic and environmental benefits far exceeding costs.

On the other hand, suppose we decided not to undertake an eradication program that would have been successful. What would this mean in losses and effects on our environment?

1. Economic losses to the industry might well climb to tens of billions of dollars in the next 30 years.
2. It could jeopardize a profitable cotton industry on millions of acres with dire economic and social effects.
3. It could result in a continuation of insecticide use on cotton and other crops indirectly affected that would amount to more than one-third of all insecticides used in agriculture. This unnecessary environmental pollution could be as important as the total economic losses.

Finally, the assumption that the proposed eradication program will increase the chances of the weevil's becoming resistant to insecticides doesn't seem reasonable. The eradication program calls for the heavy use of insecticides only one year, followed by cultural controls, traps, and sterile males—few, if any, insecticides.

Compared with the diversified all-out attack proposed in the eradication program, the chances that growers will experience a resistance problem are many times greater if we continue to supply insecticides year after year under present control methods.

All in all, there is too much at stake if we delay the eradication attempt. Let USDA and Congress know that you want their full support. Let's get on with the job.

JOHN H. HAST TOP PARKS SAFETY MAN

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, recently John Hast, a native of Cumberland, Md., was named Director of Safety Management by the U.S. Department of Interior. I commend to you a news article in the Cumberland Sunday Times concerning this energetic and remarkable man to point up the pride we can all share in his appointment to this high position:

JOHN HAST TOP PARKS SAFETY MAN

(By J. Suter Kegg)

Longfellow once wrote that life is the gift of God and therefore divine.

John H. Hast agrees. As a longtime expert on safety, the 46-year-old Cumberland native also regards life as a dream and death as an awakening.

It was his comprehensive report several years ago following a tragedy in Yellowstone National Park that led to an awakening and some sweeping improvements in safety programs throughout the nation's parks. At the

time, Mr. Hast was chief of the Safety Division for the National Park Service.

Four weeks ago (April 1) the 1945 graduate of Allegany High School was elevated by the Department of the Interior to the position of director of safety management.

BOY DIES INSTANTLY

Mr. Hast, involved in the safety field for almost 25 years, was sent to Yellowstone in late summer of 1970 for the purpose of reviewing safety procedures after two youngsters had toppled into thermal pools. One of them died instantly. The other suffered severe burns over 70 per cent of his body.

Thermal pools, Mr. Hast explained, contain boiling water and there are 10,000 such pools in Yellowstone. The water in the one into which nine-year-old Andrew Hecht of Buffalo, N.Y., fell was over 200 degrees. Only his bones and clothing were recovered.

The youngster was in the company of his parents at the time of the tragedy in June of 1970. It was the efforts of his father, Dr. James L. Hecht, a research associate for the E. I. duPont de Nemours and Company, that triggered the safety study made by Mr. Hast. Newspapers across the country, as well as several national magazines, carried the story of Dr. Hecht's pressing demands.

These demands resulted in a confrontation between Dr. Hecht and Mr. Hast. The safety expert, who calls Dr. Hecht "a man with a purpose," said he talked hundreds of hours with the father of the dead boy, both on the telephone and during hearings conducted by House and Senate committees.

FINDS HAST SYMPATHETIC

Dr. Hecht found in Mr. Hast a sympathetic person.

"Being a father, I tried to put myself in his shoes," said Mr. Hast during a telephone conversation from his office in Washington. "There had been some criticism about either the father or mother not holding the hand of the boy as the family was touring the walk from which he fell," Mr. Hast said. "But a nine-year-old doesn't require that much attention, especially in an area where the danger was not properly marked."

At Crested Pool, not too far from the famous Old Faithful Geyser, Mr. Hast found no cautionary signs of any kind. He recommended that the walk at Crested Pool, scene of the fatal accident, as well as some of the other thermal-pool walks, be redesigned.

In his report, Mr. Hast noted that in observing visitors he was alarmed at the lack of parental control along a walkway that had no guard rails. "This indicates all too clearly that we must find a better way to reach people with a message on the hazards of the area," his report pointed out.

The National Park Service lost no time introducing a new safety program at Yellowstone following Mr. Hast's investigation. Warnings were broadcast to car radios in the Old Faithful area, more emphatic warning signs were erected and walkways were installed, as were guard rails and barriers.

SAFETY PERSONNEL EXPANDED

In addition to implementing the more strenuous warning system at a cost of more than \$30,000, the National Park Service, thanks to a sympathetic Congress, began to spread eagle in safety personnel. At the time of the Yellowstone tragedy, Mr. Hast was the only professional safety man in the system available for the entire country. Five other men were stationed in the Washington, D.C. area. Now there are 26 full-time safety men in the field.

Prior to joining the National Park Service, Mr. Hast was employed as a sales engineer with the Mine Safety Appliance Company, Pittsburgh, for 15 years. Son of Mr. and Mrs. Norman R. Hast, Bedford Road, he was graduated from the University of Maryland in 1951 following a two-year tour of Army duty, starting in the latter stages of World

War II. During that time he studied engineering at Virginia Military Institute in an Army specialized training program.

He is a professional member of the American Society of Safety Engineers, the National Safety Management Society, the Veterans of Safety and numerous other professional societies and national committees. He is also a member of the board of directors of the National Safety Council and serves on the executive committee of the National Safety Council Public Safety Conference.

Married to the former Jean Walker of Orlando, Fla., the Hasts are the parents of a son, Steven L., a junior in aeronautical engineering at Penn State University, and a daughter, Catherine. The Hasts reside in Rockville.

SOLIDARITY DAY

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 28, 1974, along with Senator MONDALE and many other public officials, I had the privilege of joining an estimated 100,000 marchers in New York City in voicing solidarity with Soviet Jews. It was heartening to see so many people join in this effort to demonstrate to the Soviet government that people throughout the world recognize and condemn the denial to Soviet Jews and all Soviet citizens of the freedoms which are guaranteed by the constitutions of all civilized countries, including the Soviet Union.

Solidarity Day was a reminder to all that Jews in the Soviet Union are mercilessly denied the means to practice their religion and sustain their ethnic identity, including the basic right to emigrate to the country of their choice. It was a moving call for our Government to press for the end of Soviet persecution of Jews.

Appended herewith is a recent resolution introduced in the New York State Senate expressing the solidarity of that legislative body with the plight of Soviet Jews and urging our Government to use all appropriate diplomatic means to end the persecution of Soviet Jews.

The resolution follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION No. 62

Senate Resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider the plight of Soviet Jews prior to granting favored nation status to the Soviet Union and calling upon the Governor to proclaim April 28, 1974 as Solidarity Day

Whereas, In the Soviet Union men and women are denied freedoms recognized as basic by all civilized countries of the world and indeed by the Soviet Constitution; and

Whereas, Jews and other religious minorities in the Soviet Union are being denied the means to exercise their religion and sustain their identity; and

Whereas, The Government of the Soviet Union is persecuting Jewish citizens by denying them the same rights and privileges accorded other recognized religions in the Soviet Union and by discrimination against Jews in cultural activities and access to higher education; and

Whereas, The right freely to emigrate, which is denied Soviet Jews who seek to maintain their identity by moving else-

where, is a right affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, adopted unanimously by the General Assembly of the United Nations; and

Whereas, These infringements of human rights are an obstacle to the development of better understanding and better relations between the people of the United States and the people of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas, The State of Israel, now celebrating its 26th Independence Day, has expressed its solidarity to freedom-loving people everywhere; and

Whereas, An attempt was made to destroy the State of Israel on October 6, 1973; and

Whereas, The State of Israel continues to remain a symbol of the strength of the democratic system and has earned the respect and admiration of all people who champion the cause of freedom; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of New York express its solidarity in asking that the President and the Congress of the United States consider the plight of Soviet Jews when granting most favored nation status to the Soviet Union, and to call upon the Soviet government to end its persecution of the Jews and other minorities and to permit the free exercise of religion by all its citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of New York, in the interest of justice and humanity, express its solidarity in requesting that the President and the Congress of the United States call upon the Soviet government to permit its citizens to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of New York express its solidarity, in urging that the United States government use all appropriate diplomatic means to engender the fullest support possible among other nations for such a request to the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of New York express its solidarity with the people of Israel on its 26th Independence Day; and be it further

Resolved, That the Honorable Malcolm Wilson, Governor of the State of New York be and he hereby is respectfully requested to issue, publish and declare to the people of the State of New York an appropriate proclamation designating April 28th, 1974 as Solidarity Day; and be it further

Resolved, That in order to effectuate the purposes of this resolution, copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President, Vice President and Secretary of State of the United States, to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Congress of the United States from the State of New York.

UNDERESTIMATING COSTS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Air Force is underestimating the cost of the new A-10 fighter by \$229.6 million by not including the costs of essential electronic equipment needed by the fighters to perform in combat.

According to a General Accounting Office report the Air Force is excluding in its estimate to Congress \$315,000 in

electronic equipment for each of the 729 production A-10 jet fighter aircraft. According to the GAO the Air Force's Tactical Air Command which will operate the A-10's believe that the \$315,000 in electronics will be needed on every A-10 used in combat. An SPO (System Project Office) official told us that all 729 production A-10's could be used in combat if needed.

At the moment, the A-10 is involved in a competitive fly-off with the A-7 to determine which plane is best equipped to provide close air support to U.S. troops.

Mr. Speaker, I am calling upon Air Force Secretary John McLucas to immediately include the cost of these needed electronics in the total estimate for the A-10.

I have no idea whether the A-10 or the A-7 should win this fly-off but believe this competition should be as objective as humanly possible. Since relative cost is an important consideration in any competition the total cost of the A-10 should be realistically calculated to evaluate the relative merits of the two planes.

Currently a group of Air Force pilots is test-flying both the A-7 and the A-10 to determine which weapon is most cost-effective in close air support for troops. The total cost of the A-10 is now \$2.5 billion compared to the original estimate in 1970 of \$1,025.5 million. The cost per plane is approximately \$3.35 million compared to the A-7's cost of \$3.44 million plus inflation.

If this electronic gear which includes radar and computers is needed for combat, then the price estimate should be increased.

Of course, Mr. Speaker the competitive fly-off was forced on the Air Force and it is the worst kept secret in Washington that the Air Force wants the A-10 to win the fly-off.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking the General Accounting Office to evaluate the evenhandedness of the competitive fly-off conducted by the Air Force and report its findings to Congress. In view of the Air Force's underestimation of the cost of the A-10 and the Air Force's well-known preference for the A-10, close monitoring is an absolute necessity.

It is my understanding that GAO does plan some work on the A-10 but I am requesting a detailed report which will be made available to Congress before final action on this year's defense budget.

The Pentagon is seeking \$267.7 million in this year's budget including \$173.8 million to build the first 26 A-10's.

My concern is that a fair and evenhanded competition be held and I think GAO monitoring will help assure the best fly-off possible.

THE COMMITTEE REFORM AMENDMENTS OF 1974

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Select Committee on

Committees should be adopted. The effective functioning of the House is a matter of paramount importance to the whole Nation. The low repute of the Congress can only be corrected if we arrange our own affairs in order to function in the public interest. This proposed reorganization will enable the Congress to be more effective in conducting the Nation's business.

This report is being opposed for a variety of reasons. However, the only valid reason for opposing it is that it will not increase the effectiveness of Congress. To attack it because it inconveniences lobbyists, or causes the loss of a committee chairmanship, or creates committees of a temporarily different ideological complexion, or, worst of all, merely to resist change, does not serve the Nation's interest, or the interest of the vast majority of the Members of Congress who are interested in doing the best job they can for their constituents.

No reorganization is perfect. This one is not perfect. However, the report the Select Committee on Committees has adopted is a good and necessary reform. I would like to insert for the RECORD the editorial from the Washington Post this morning on the same subject.

The article follows:

HOUSECLEANING IN THE HOUSE

If ideas can be measured by the opposition they arouse, the package of House reforms advanced by Rep. Richard Bolling's Select Committee on Committees must be either very good or very bad. The swarm of active opponents of the plan includes Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur D. Mills, Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee Chairman Leonor K. Sullivan, Rep. John D. Dingell, Rep. Philip Burton, the AFL-CIO, the National Association of Manufacturers, transportation lobbies and some environmental groups. When such a formidable array of powers and interests becomes mobilized, something substantial has to be afoot.

What has stirred up all of these forces is an ambitious, bipartisan plan to overhaul the House committee system. Many in and outside Congress have been advocating such a housecleaning for years, in order to enhance the efficiency, capacity and image of the House and to improve members' ability to deal with complex subjects and to ride herd on the executive branch. But now that the select committee, under Rep. Bolling's determined leadership, has finished its year of study and presented a bold blueprint for reform, the predictable howls of protest have begun.

Many of the complaints arise from the select committee's attempts to equalize and rationalize committee workloads and jurisdictions. Rep. Mills, for instance, is mightily displeased because the Ways and Means Committee, which has gradually extended its domain over about 20 per cent of all the measures introduced in the House, would lose most of its authority over health and trade legislation. Others object to splitting the Education and Labor Committee, or to consolidating subjects such as transportation and environmental affairs, which are now fragmented among several groups. Some liberals and labor groups also fear that their influence would be diluted by other proposed reforms which would prohibit proxy voting and limit representatives to service on one of the 15 major committees.

Many of these objections obviously spring from self-interest or a fear that cozy relationships between legislators and lobbyists would be disturbed. Others are based on pessimistic speculation. Some environmental groups, for instance, worry that the proposed committee

on energy and the environment would be industry-dominated, but that seems hard to demonstrate in advance, especially at a time of such extensive turnover in the membership of the House. What does seem clear is that many small baronies would be shaken up and substantial power would be reapportioned among more members of the House. The impact may be hard to predict in terms of issues or ideologies. In institutional terms, however, such a periodic reordering is both healthy and overdue, since House committees were last overhauled in 1946.

Whatever its imperfections, the select committee's plan is the most serious—and promising—attempts in a generation to inject coherence and vitality into a legislative scheme which is now burdened with overlaps, imbalances and incongruities. It would be silly to expect too much; no reorganization, by itself, can restore the effectiveness and public esteem which the Congress has squandered over the years. At minimum, however, the committee's plan seems likely to make the domains of many House committees more rational, to open many panels to new viewpoints and considerations, and to insure that many complicated subjects will receive better scrutiny. All this is highly desirable. Important hurdles are still ahead: the House Democratic caucus, which has promoted many useful changes in the workings of the House, is still stewing over this plan, and action by the Rules Committee has not been scheduled yet. It would be a sad day if either panel put a few selfish concerns ahead of the long-range institutional interests of the House, and failed to advance one of the most provocative and potentially valuable reforms in many years.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, for myself and for the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, a bill to create a National Environmental Policy Institute.

This is an unusual bill, and it was designed to meet an unusual need. I have become concerned, and I know that my concern is shared by a number of my colleagues, that there is little if any capability, inside or outside the Federal Government, to develop national long-term strategies for the future. Accordingly, my Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment held 1 day of hearings last year on the general subject of growth and its implications for the future. In the course of those hearings, we heard from knowledgeable and distinguishable witnesses about some of the problems associated with growth, and what these problems might mean to us in the future.

Clearly the energy crisis was foreseeable long before it happened, and just as clearly other shortages in other important resources are foreseeable today—the prospects of these shortages are creating a great deal of concern throughout the world. The United Nations has devoted considerable attention to this issue in the past few weeks, since it is

beyond question that we are now looking just at the tip of the iceberg.

Economic growth, population growth, resource scarcities, environmental deterioration, increasing social unrest, and other contemporary problems are strongly linked and are issues with which we and other countries must meet and handle on something other than a casual day-to-day basis. The problem is that we have not developed the tools to help us do so. This is the issue to which the proposed National Environmental Policy Institute Act of 1974 is addressed.

The planning horizon of the Government and its constituent elements is incredibly short. The most optimistic assessment of the foresight capabilities of the executive branch is 4 years, while other observers consider that in the best of cases this shrinks to a few weeks. Congress is not free from the same criticisms; short-term considerations play more of an important role in many decisions we make than they should. This is perhaps inevitable given the nature of the issues with which we have to deal on a daily basis, but it is not desirable.

We need to create an institution which is able to stand far enough back from these day-to-day issues to be able to predict the issues coming further down the line. If it had been created in time, the Institute we propose, for example, could, and I am sure would, have told us much about the dimensions of the energy crunch before it happened, and about various strategies which might have been adopted far enough in advance to have drawn much or most of the sting from it when it happened. There is no institution in existence today which fills this need, and none are contemplated. I might paraphrase George Santayana to say "Those who are disposed to ignore the future must be prepared to suffer in it."

The problem in drawing up legislation to meet this need is to create an institution which is independent enough to be credible while being close enough to the decisionmaking process to be relevant. Both of these attributes must, I believe, be present in such an institution or it must founder. It is for this reason that I cannot support the concept of the creation of yet another agency within the executive offices of the President as the primary focus for any such effort. Without any doubt the executive branch needs better planning capabilities and must develop these at the earliest possible date; at the same time, however, I feel that it would be a serious error to make this the sole, or even the principal agency for this purpose within the Government.

The Office of Management and Budget, in theory, concerns itself with policy planning within the Government. I am aware of no one, however, who deludes himself that this policy planning is more than a mechanism by which the President makes his voice known to the rest of the agencies; it is the filter through which the agencies must pass their statements and funding proposals to the Congress.

If a President, of whatever party or philosophy, were to make a decision on national energy policy, it is unlikely that

any agency within the executive branch would release a study which cast doubt upon the wisdom and long-term implications of that decision. It is here that independent voices must be heard, and it is for this reason that I do not believe that a policy planning institute, located within the offices of the President, would be credible, or that its conclusions would be accepted.

The correlative risk, of course, is that an institution without inputs from the Federal agencies would exist so far from the policy decisions which they make as to be inconsequential. This is not to decry ivory towers so much as it is to suggest that we need not create another such at this time and for the purpose. I think it critically important that any such institution have access to any unclassified information in the hands of the agencies, and that the agencies feel free to consult with it on long-term implications of policies which they have under active consideration. The Institute described in our bill was designed with this objective in mind.

To meet these needs, we propose a federally chartered corporation, the Board of which would be chosen in part by the President and in part by the Comptroller General, as head of any agency which is not subject to executive direction. It will have the power to contract with private and public agencies for the performance of studies, and may carry out studies in any areas which seem appropriate and are within its financial capabilities. To a very large extent, it will operate in a goldfish bowl: the results of all its efforts will be made available to the President, the Congress and the public, and unclassified, abstract reports will be furnished on areas which involve national security. The Institute will be publicly audited, and will submit an annual report on its activities for general review.

I expect that the proposal can be significantly improved over its present form, and we have introduced it at this time in the hopes that suggestions for its amendment will be forthcoming. We expect to continue our hearings on the implications of growth in the next few months, and will seek the assistance of participants in those hearings for this purpose.

The text of the bill (H.R. 14468) follows:

H.R. 14468

A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to fund and establish a nonprofit National Environmental Policy Institute, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321-4347) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE III

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the 'National Environmental Policy Institute Act of 1974'.

"ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE

"SEC. 302. (a) The Congress hereby finds that—

"(1) as presently constituted, local, State, and Federal governments do not have an adequate capacity to analyze, integrate, and

evaluate the growing body of environmental research now underway, nor to develop in a systematic and critical manner the alternatives such research presents for the development of new, and the restructuring of existing, governmental policies and programs; and

"(2) there are no existing independent nongovernmental institutions capable of adequately performing these functions in an objective and comprehensive manner and on a full-time basis.

"(b) The Congress further finds that—

"(1) there is a need for objective and impartial strategic policy analysis, including a broad program of research and for the identification and development of alternative solutions to existing and emerging environmental problems, to be conducted by an appropriate institute which is independent of government and private enterprise;

"(2) such an institute should be a center for systematic environmental problem solving and policy-oriented research conducted on a broad, interdisciplinary basis;

"(3) such an institute should be available to local, State, and Federal governmental agencies and the Congress to assist in the assessment, development, and presentation of policy alternatives, but should have the freedom and independence to extend its studies to matters other than those specified by its governmental sponsors; and

"(4) it is a responsibility of the Federal Government, in conjunction with appropriate charitable foundations, to establish, assist, encourage, and assist in the funding of such an independent institute.

"Sec. 303. There is hereby authorized to be created a nonprofit corporation to be named the National Environmental Policy Institute (hereinafter referred to in this title as the 'Institute') which shall not be an agency or establishment of the Federal Government. The Institute shall be subject to the provisions of this title and, to the extent consistent with this title, to the District of Columbia Non-Profit Corporation Act.

"Sec. 304. The incorporators of the Environmental Policy Institute shall consist of the Director of the National Science Foundation, the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Institute of Ecology.

"Sec. 305. (a) The Institute shall have an eleven member Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to in this title as the 'Board') consisting of individuals who are citizens of the United States, of whom one shall be elected annually by the Board to serve as Chairman. Members of the Board shall be—

"(1) the four initial incorporators and their successors;

"(2) two members appointed by the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate, on the basis of their interest in environmental problems and their professional competence in technology assessment or systems analysis; and

"(3) five members appointed by the Comptroller General of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows:

"(A) one on the basis of professional competence and knowledge with respect to the environment;

"(B) one on such basis with respect to consumer affairs;

"(C) one on such basis with respect to labor interests;

"(D) one on such basis with respect to industry interests; and

"(E) one on such basis with respect to technology assessment or systems analysis.

"(b) The term of office for each member appointed pursuant to subsection (a) (2) and (3) shall be five years; except that—

"(1) of the members initially appointed pursuant to subsection (a) (2), the term of office of one member shall be two years; and

"(2) of the members initially appointed

pursuant to subsection (a) (3), the term of office of one member shall be for one year, the term of one member shall be for two years, the term of one member shall be for three years, the term of one member shall be for four years, and the term of one member shall be for five years.

Members appointed pursuant to subsection (a) (2) and (3) are eligible for reappointment. Any member may serve after the expiration of his term until his successor has taken office.

"Sec. 306. The Institute shall have a President who shall be named and selected by the Board and such other officers as may be named and appointed by the Board, at rates of compensation fixed by the Board, and serving at the pleasure of the Board. No officer of the Institute shall receive any salary from any source other than the Institute during his period of employment by the Institute.

"Sec. 307. The duties of the Institute shall include, but are not limited to—

"(1) the development and analysis of policy alternatives for dealing with environmental problems by utilization of a systematic interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of all relevant disciplines;

"(2) the identification and development of methods and procedures, in consultation with the Council on Environmental Quality, whereby presently unquantifiable environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in policy evaluation together with technical and economic considerations in governmental and private decision;

"(3) making available to Congress, to Federal, State, and local agencies, to public or private institutions, and to individuals such advice and information developed by the Institute which is useful in restoring, maintaining, and enhancing the quality of the environment;

"(4) undertaking, after consultation with the Council on Environmental Quality, contract studies for Federal agencies which involve problems of environmental policy analysis of regional or national significance, or which will be of assistance in the performance of the agencies' missions, but the conduct of such studies shall not interfere with the carrying out of the other duties of the Institute which are listed in this section;

"(5) identifying areas where additional environmental research and data collection is needed to deal with emerging and potential problems;

"(6) reviewing on a continuing basis national capability and programs for technology assessment; and

"(7) supporting the laboratory research and the biome modeling and synthesis research programs of the Institute of Ecology within the availability of funds provided under section 310 of this title.

"POWERS OF THE INSTITUTE

"Sec. 308. To carry out the purposes of this title to engage in the activities set forth in section 307 of this title—

"(1) the Institute shall have the usual powers conferred upon a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act; and

"(2) the Institute is authorized—

"(A) to obtain grants from, and make contracts (other than contracts referred to in section 307(4) of this title) with, individuals and with private, State, and Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions, and

"(B) to hire or accept the voluntary services of consultants, experts, advisory boards, and panels to aid the Institute in carrying out the purposes of this title.

"PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

"Sec. 309. Upon the inception of any study or project under the authority of section 307 of this title, the Institute shall make a public announcement of the purpose of the study, the estimated time of completion and

the circumstances under which it is to be carried out. Upon completion of any such study or project, its results shall be published by the Institute; except that the results of any study or project, the disclosure of which would in the opinion of the President of the Institute adversely affect national security, shall be published only in an unclassified, abstract form.

"FINANCING

"Sec. 310. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the Institute for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, and 1978 the sum of \$10,000,000.

"(b) In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a) of this section, there are authorized to be appropriated for payment to the Institute for each fiscal year during the period July 1, 1974, to June 30, 1978, amounts equal to the amount of total grants, donations, bequests, or other contributions (including money and the fair market value of any property) from non-Federal sources received by the Institute under section 307(2)(A) during such fiscal year; except that the amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph for any fiscal year may not exceed \$5,000,000.

"AUDITS OF THE INSTITUTE

"Sec. 311. (a) (1) The accounts of the Institute shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States. The audits shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the Institute are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the Institute and necessary to facilitate the audits shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audits; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositors, fiscal agents and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

"(2) The report of each such independent audit shall be included in the annual report required by section 311 of this Act. The audit report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements as are necessary to present fairly the Institute's assets and liabilities, surplus or deficit, with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, supplemented reasonable detail by a statement of the Institute's income and expenses during the year, and a statement of the sources and application of funds, together with the independent auditor's opinion of those statements.

"(b) (1) The financial transactions of the Institute for any fiscal year during which Federal funds are available to finance any portion of its operations may be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. Any such audit shall be conducted at the place or places where accounts of the Institute are normally kept. The representative of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accountings, records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the Institute pertaining to its financial transactions and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositors, fiscal agents, and custodians. All such books, accounts, records, reports, files, papers and property of the Institute shall remain in possession and custody of the Institute.

"(2) A report of each such audit shall be

made by the Comptroller General to Congress. The report to Congress shall contain such comments and information as the Comptroller General may deem necessary to inform Congress of the financial operations and condition of the Institute, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as he may deem advisable. The report shall also show specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of the audit, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the President and to the Institute at the time the report is submitted to Congress.

"REPORT TO CONGRESS"

"SEC. 312. The Institute shall submit an annual report for the preceding fiscal year ending June 30 to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before the 31st day of December of each year. The report shall include a comprehensive and detailed report of the Institute's operations, activities, financial conditions, and accomplishments under this title and may include such recommendations as the Institute deems appropriate."

LARRY BARTON PLACES SECOND IN AMERICAN LEGION NATIONAL ORATORICAL COMPETITION

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to have the honor of representing Lawrence Barton of Arlington, Mass., in the U.S. House of Representatives. Mr. Barton is a senior at Arlington Catholic High School who participated in the American Legion National Oratorical Contest. Mr. Barton won the Massachusetts championship and went on to win the New England regional championship and sectional.

Mr. Barton has just returned from Sioux Falls, S. Dak., where he placed second in the American Legion National Oratorical Contest for 1974 and was awarded a \$5,000 scholarship. So that the other Members of Congress may have the benefit of reading Mr. Barton's speech entitled "A Nation of Laws and Not of Men," I am now placing it in the RECORD:

A NATION OF LAWS AND NOT OF MEN (By Lawrence Barton)

Consider a President who takes the following actions, a man who ignores the dictates of Congress, who impounds funds illegally, who spends money Congress has not authorized, who uses the Secret Service to spy on citizens, and who flagrantly breaks both state and federal law.

You may see these accusations appearing in our newspapers today. But in actuality, I am speaking of the 16th President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln; for it was Lincoln who in the early days of the Civil War, had to in a sense, learn to bend our Constitution in order to prevent others . . . from breaking it.

Of course it is difficult to defend a President who takes these actions, even a President as great as Abraham Lincoln. We must realize that the United States Constitution is a document that is only as good as the individuals who interpret it—the President, the Supreme Court, and . . . You!

We have gone through two eras in this nation, eras that could be called the age of Constitutional despair. One was during President Lincoln's administration when there was much talk of impeachment. Another, during Andrew Johnson's time when impeachment was attempted and conviction failed by only one vote. Friends, our present age can certainly be described as an age of a Constitutional crisis, for it is indeed an age of despair and dark doubt. Our only hope is that we can return to being a nation of laws and not of men.

Ladies and gentlemen, a President of the United States is a citizen, as you and I are citizens. It is his duty to obey the law—as it is ours.

Recently, when the American people felt that the President had broken his trust by accepting the resignation of the Attorney General, the Assistant Attorney General, and the Special Prosecutor, they raised their voices in a clamor of indignation that shook the walls of Congress and that made a hasty and imperious President reverse his own actions. This was not simply arrogance, this was tyranny—tyranny as odious as that practiced by George III. "The President," said Andrew Jackson, "must be at the bar of public opinion accountable for every act of his Administration."

Friends, Americans have always believed that no man is above the law. This is not just a platitude, but a belief deeply embedded in the American spirit. Most people were shocked at the Watergate scandal, not because a few men acted out of greed, but because the highest men sought to put themselves beyond the reach of our Constitution. As the old saying goes, "Power corrupts; and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

Ladies and gentlemen, to my way of thinking, the serious question today is whether or not we have become so terrified of responsibility in this haphazard and baffling world that we would rather have someone else wield the power and make the decisions. If we want to contain the Presidency, in my opinion in this nation the only effective way is to show the value of our laws, found in the Constitution, and to believe that men, events, and quarrels can shape and re-shape our Constitution, for the Constitution is not merely a frail and crumbling piece of paper, but a document that is deeply embedded in the American spirit.

In the opening lines to Shakespeare's play, "Richard III," it says:

Now is the winter of our discontent,

Made glorious summer by that sun of York.

Friends, was 1973 the winter of our discontent? With Mr. Nixon's mandate dissolved, a Vice-President convicted as a felon, three ex-cabinet officers under indictment, a Middle East crisis aggravated by Presidential inaction and Congressional apathy, and that energy crisis, threatening to wreck our economic stability, and even . . . our way of life?

Many believe so. But I would point to those who are discontented, to those who are cold and thread-bare this winter that it was the very machinery, that same Constitution that in being challenged, brought to light our present problems. Yes, it is the Constitution that keeps us free.

For over two centuries, Americans have been engaged in a self-conscious search for a way to behave. In the process, they have followed the advice of Cotton Mather, and Ann Landers, they have aped the examples of Queen Victoria and . . . the Beatles. They have embraced temperance, and then fought prohibition. They have clung to the Puritan ethic . . . and then . . . they endorsed the pill. But one, one constant factor in the American behavioral pattern is an abiding respect for the Constitution, and a determination to keep our government under that Constitution a nation of laws, and not of men.

The American people now realize that we

must never again let ourselves be deluded by self-indulgence to the point where our way of life hangs on mere promises. Ladies and gentlemen, our Constitution has been neglected and torn apart—the time is now for us to join together as a nation, as a people, pick up the pieces and put them together—by laws, and not by men.

It is only through the Constitution that remedies will come. And once again we shall see that long, glorious summer of the American Constitution shine brightly on our rule of law. Like Woodrow Wilson, I believe that the American people will see the truth, eye to eye, and face to face. For there is one thing that the American people will always rise to, and extend their hand to . . . and that is the truth of justice, of liberty, and of peace.

In closing, I think the words of the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy are very apropos in this present Constitutional crisis:

Neither complacency nor conformity will do. Neither fanatics nor fainthearted are needed. Let us stand together with renewed confidence in our cause . . . This . . . is a time for courage, for challenge.

FACTSHEET ON PARTIAL SUSPENSION OF AUTO EMISSIONS CONTROLS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, as Members consider their vote on the amendment to be offered to the energy bill before the House on Wednesday, May 1, to suspend auto emissions controls requirements for the geographical areas in the United States with no auto emissions-related air pollution, it is helpful to have before them a general factsheet for ready reference. This is particularly important in anticipation of some rather serious misrepresentations that will be predictably made in the course of debate by proponents of continuation of the hugely expensive and totally unnecessary overkill in the present far too stringent standards of the 1970 clean air law as it relates to light-duty automotive vehicles.

The above-mentioned factsheet follows:

GENERAL FACTSHEET

1. The amendment proposes suspension of emissions requirements on light-duty vehicles until September 30, 1977. How many cars will be affected?

Answer: Approximately 70 percent of all new cars manufactured 60 days after passage and a substantial number of older cars already on the road that may legally be modified by dealers to achieve greater mileage and economy.

2. Whose cars are affected?

Answer: Those belonging to persons resident outside of thirteen air quality regions the boundaries of which must be designated by the EPA administrator within 60 days after passage.

3. Will this impair air quality or mess up the clean air of the non-air quality regions?

Answer: Not in the slightest. Most of the United States has no significant air pollution from automobile emissions that adversely affects public health. The winds blow, the air moves, the rains fall. The emissions are not cumulative. They are dispersed and they do not exist in quantities that make

people sick or impair their required air quality except in heavy concentrations and these areas are specified as "air quality regions".

4. Will it save gasoline?

Answer: In the billions of gallons each year.

5. Will it save money?

Answer: Hundreds of millions of dollars in costs to consumers in what they must pay for their cars (approximately \$314 per car) and for their operation thereafter.

6. Can the automobile industry live with what amounts to a two car standard?

Answer: Yes; the industry will make two types of cars, one with emissions controls and the other without. This assembly line technique is not unduly burdensome.

7. Can automobile dealers live with the requirement?

Answer: Yes; persons (customers) will purchase the same number of cars but residents outside of air quality regions will mostly purchase cars without emissions controls because they will cost less and operate more inexpensively.

8. What is to prevent persons who reside in air quality regions from going to dealers with emissions free cars and buying one?

Answer: This is a criminal misdemeanor under the amendment punishable by fine and imprisonment.

9. What will be the effect of the amendment on the gas shortage?

Answer: It will cut it virtually in half (or at present levels eliminate it entirely). Under the amendment persons owning earlier model cars may have them modified by professional experts to increase their gas mileage. This is prohibited by dealers under existing law. Manuals of instruction on this will be prepared and furnished to dealers by manufacturers.

10. What savings in gas mileage is involved in terms of present cars and new cars yet to be manufactured?

Answer: EPA itself estimates the overall fuel penalty under the 1974 standards ranges downward from 18% on larger cars to an overall average exceeding 10 percent. 70% of new cars will have no fuel penalty because they will have no emissions controls. Older cars may be modified at individual owners option. Net gas savings at least one gallon in ten, and in some instances much more.

11. What about the in-and-out traffic into air quality regions of cars without emissions controls?

Answer: It will not significantly adversely affect the air quality in those regions because the traffic in and out is not that heavy, it ranges from 2-6 percent.

12. What about the inequity between persons who live in such regions and those who live outside of them in terms of what they have to pay for their cars?

Answer: Why require the entire nation to bear the hugely energy wasting burden that is a problem only in a small part of the country? When a person moves from an air quality region to an unrestricted area he may acquire an emissions control free vehicle if he desires. Similarly when the reverse applies the additional cost is part of the price of maintaining clean air standards in the controlled region. There is little sense, for example, in requiring all of the residents of the entire State of North Dakota to purchase emissions control equipped cars when the area has no emissions control related air pollution. Multiplied nationwide the energy cost of such a requirement becomes both ridiculous and energy wasteful to a point deserving of the rising public criticism that prevails in the United States on this matter at this hour.

POOR GOLIATH

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, in the last few months, there have been some harsh things said about our top oil companies, and in recent days, angry rhetoric has grown even rougher. People are accusing them of overcharging the public, making tax-exempt fortunes at consumer expense, creating shortages, and driving little competitors out of business. How people can say such nasty things about these fine, public-spirited fellows is beyond me. It is about time we stopped picking on them and understood the truth of the matter. So let us look behind the 60-cent-per-gallon prices at the pump for some truth.

First of all, we have to dismiss out of hand the nasty things revealed in previous months. Forget about the fact that major oil companies, at least the top 22 of them, made \$9.1 billion after paying minimal Federal income taxes last year, an increase of 53 percent over 1972. And forget about predictions that these profits will rise even higher in the coming year. Forget about recent first quarter profit figures released, showing that every day in every way the big oil outfits are making more and more.

We have got to understand that Exxon, for example, had every right to announce earnings for the first quarter of 1974 of \$705 million, a gain of 38.8 percent. And the average person has the right to suffer as a result. Texaco has a right to register an even higher jump in its earnings, showing an increase of 123.2 percent. Gulf, poor downtrodden souls that they are, scored a 76 percent rise in profits. Standard of Indiana, or Amoco, made \$219 million in profits in the first quarter, up 81 percent from last year's matching quarter.

As for any ingrates among America's consumers, you can just swallow hard and keep your complaints to yourself, because all indications point to even faster price hikes for all kinds of energy, whatever its source. And remember that in whatever form you get your power, it is probably controlled by the same companies who put a tiger in your tank.

If coal costs more, remember major coal companies are controlled by major oil companies. If natural gas costs more, remember that oil companies own and operate most natural gas wells and distribution systems. There are a few cruel doubters who even claim they own and operate a few Federal agencies, including the one which sets gas prices. But we do not really believe that; do we? Those nice fellows at the Federal Power Commission just keep trying to raise natural gas rates because they think big oil and gas companies deserve a fair rate of return at consumer expense. After all, what is a price hike of a few pennies per thousand cubic feet of natural gas at the wellhead? A 1-cent raise only means a \$200 million hike in utility bills

for 40 million U.S. homes heated with gas. That is not much; is it?

We know those fellows are honest, because the Federal Energy Office, Mr. Simon and Mr. Sawhill, told us so. So it must be true. Mr. Sawhill, new FEO head, has told us disastrous fuel price levels of today are legitimate and good for us. He says they pay off in increased supplies, even though Government figures show this ain't necessarily so. But once the embargo was called off, all of a sudden the lines were gone. Where did they go? How come the big oil boys found all that gas and oil all of a sudden. Coincidence, I guess. Now Mr. Sawhill says we are going to have to pay at least 5 cents more per gallon of gas. Some people might say he was encouraging big oil to raise prices that high immediately. But we would not say it, because we think he is a nice fellow.

He opposes a Consumer Energy Act, which would among other things create a Federal Energy Corporation, which some unfair oil industry critics claim would create a yardstick against which to measure oil company performance. We are making him feel like a lion in a den of Daniels.

As for the consumer, just drive up to the pump, pay your 60 cents plus per gallon and shut up. Do not you know big oil monopolies need all that extra money to look for more oil? You are thinking they are really just taking it for profits and dividends and huge salaries for their officers. Shame on you. How could you think such a thing. Exxon is only declaring a measly \$3.15 per share dividend on each share of common stock and is paying its top man close to a mere million dollars annually in salary. How can you begrudge those poor fellows these tiny rewards?

Take away their tax preferences like the foreign tax credit and depletion allowance? Sacrilege. Another outrageous proposal like that and we may have to tear up your credit card. Turn around and face the wall. Not another word. Next thing you know you will be blaming Congress for not doing something about oil tax privileges enjoyed by the big oil giants. Or you will even blame the President for vetoing the bill Congress passed rolling back oil prices. Shame.

Nothing is sacred anymore, I am afraid. Why, next they will be telling us that the Tooth Fairy does not exist or that the President's anti-inflation policy is a failure.

HAVERHILL INDEPENDENT ARTICLE
LAUDS JOHN T. SULLIVAN FOR
EXEMPLARY SERVICE TO VETS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the press has been full of stories about the inefficiencies of the Veterans' Administration and its neglect of

the young men who fought in the Vietnamese conflict.

There is ample cause for this criticism. But, fortunately, there are cases where veterans are getting good service. John T. Sullivan, the veterans' service officer in Haverhill, Mass., is but one example of how a good man can do the job well, with compassion and effectiveness.

I hope that the VA can find more John T. Sullivans and it is with commendation for his efforts that I insert into the **RECORD** this article that appeared in the **Haverhill Independent**, on February 28, 1974:

THE NEGLECTED VETERAN
(By W.M.C.)

For many years the veteran of World War I, II, Korea and Vietnam has been sadly neglected in that the Congress has failed to provide the many necessary benefits due to the men who gave their lives freely and served their country honorably. All this was done when they were called up to help the peoples in other various parts of the world.

The writer, a veteran of World War II, is greatly and deeply concerned. It is high time that the many veterans be made aware of how to obtain benefits rightfully due them.

There are veterans' organizations who have done very efficient work in helping members get some benefits due them, through their service officers. While other veteran's groups have failed to provide the information needed on how to obtain benefits.

What is needed is men who have the contacts with the Veteran's Administration. Haverhill, is indeed fortunate in having John T. Sullivan as Veterans Service Officer. Sullivan, a past commander of the V.F.W. and also the guiding light for the reknown Bugle and Drum Corps, is one who for many years has had compassion for the veteran. His small staffed office, 25 Kenoza Ave., has done an outstanding job in giving all and in easing the veteran's plight. He is obtaining what is rightfully due them. The writer's experience with Sullivan has been most fulfilling. His cooperative spirit has culminated many almost impossible cases.

In conclusion, it is the writer's belief that Sullivan's understanding of the plight of the many veterans, has definitely been a deciding factor which has proved beneficial to the "G.I. Joe." All veterans would be wise to contact the Veterans' Service Center regarding their problems. Time will show the public that his office is going all out for all veterans.

This is the beginning of a series having to do with the neglected veteran. The second article will be forthcoming.

SHICK LABORATORIES TREAT ALCOHOL AND NICOTINE ADDICTION

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, a unique and successful treatment of alcohol and nicotine addiction has been introduced by the Shick Laboratories in Los Angeles.

The method used to treat alcoholism is termed "aversion therapy" whereby the patient learns to relate his drinking with unpleasantness. This treatment has proven so successful that an attempt was made to use this same therapy on nicotine addiction. Once again it met with overwhelming success. Since its inception, more than 60,000 people have received help and support from the Shick Centers.

Shick Laboratories has done a tremendous job in its effort to control and eliminate the health problems that are associated with alcohol and nicotine addiction. I commend them for the outstanding results that have come from their associated centers. I am certain that the splendid public service they are providing will continue to expand to other hospitals serving communities throughout the country.

**OLDER AMERICANS MONTH:
WHAT'S IN A NAME?**

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as the American people have learned, there is little substance behind the President's promises and rhetoric. One area where this has become tragically clear is that of senior citizens. As Max Manes, chairman of Seniors for Adequate Social Security and a constituent of mine, pointed out in the following letter, senior citizens should not be duped by the President. Mr. Manes' letter appeared in the **New York Post** on April 24, 1974:

SENIOR CITIZENS

I understand that May, 1974, will be designated by President Nixon as "Older Americans Month" this year, rather than "Senior Citizens Month," as previously.

The change reminds me of a Jules Feiffer cartoon in which the character is first referred to as "poor," then "needy," then "deprived," and finally as "disadvantaged"—ending with the character saying that, although he still doesn't have a dime, he has acquired a rich vocabulary.

I wonder if the change was made because seniority calls for respect and special consideration, and implies a certain dignity. President Nixon may have been fearful that senior citizens could get the wrong idea and feel they're entitled to something.

MAX MANES.

ISRAEL'S 26TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1974

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take the opportunity to congratulate the people of Israel on this, the 26th anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel.

The years that have intervened since May 14, 1948, when the establishment of the State of Israel was proclaimed by the great Israeli statesman, David Ben-Gurion, have been years of progress and years of continued trial and testing.

Desert and swamp have been reclaimed. Cities and universities have been built. A nation and a people have toiled, have moved ever forward, despite the constant struggle to survive in the face of continued opposition, constant harassment and the open belligerence of her Arab neighbors.

Yet, each succeeding anniversary, despite adversity, finds Israel stronger, her people more determined and, hopefully, her future more secure.

I salute Israel and her courageous people on this 26th anniversary. I extend to them my warm best wishes and my fervent hope that the word which is the traditional greeting in Israel—Shalom, or in English—peace, shall become for them a reality.