The Senate met at 11:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. FORD).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may that righteousness which exalts a nation be the code of conduct for all citizens and the pattern of political life for our leaders. Forbid that the lofty standards of the Founding Fathers should ever be discarded or the idealism of youth sour into cynicism. Keep our faith in Thee and in Thy law steadfast and sure.

And now that another day of service in this Chamber has been given to us, we pray for the gifts of self-mastery and self-control, for wisdom beyond our own and for strength which comes from Thee. Make us sensitive to the needs of all the people, careful to hear and evaluate the judgments of our colleagues, heedful of the promptings of conscience, and obedient to the guidance of Thy spirit. In all our acts in this Chamber, may we be true to the very foundation of our system of government and way of life.

That is why the United States was so very apprehensive when Haiti and most of the other Latin American countries sought to wipe out slavery the moment they received their political independence. The consistency of those nations with the principles of the United States on the same question.

That is why the United States failed to recognize the existence of the pioneer republics of Haiti and the others as nations. The American nation was in the throes of a great civil war and sought to "use" these countries for colonization. One of the reasons why the United States implied an equality in the human family that the United States was unwilling to concede.

Perhaps this is the view that seemed to silence the venerable Benjamin Franklin. The most frequent speakers at the Convention, members of the constitutional convention, there is little wonder that South Carolina and Georgia were able to have their own way and that the slave trade could not be prohibited for another twenty years. One need only to look at the slave importation figures between 1788 and 1808 to appreciate how much advantage was taken of this generous reprieve.

The Founding Fathers did no better when it came to counting slaves for purposes of representation. Northerners, who regarded slaves as property, insisted that for the purpose of representation they could not. That would mean the South, with its share of slaveholders, while cheerfully admitting that slaves were property, insisted that they were also people and should be counted as such. It is one of the remarkable ironies of the early history of this democracy that the very men who had shouted "liberty" to their slaves were counted, but would no longer agree on whether or not persons of African descent were men at all.

The irony was compounded when, in the so-called major compromise of the Constitution, the delegates agreed that a slave was three-eighths of a person. This meant the five slaves were to be counted as three persons. The magic of racism can work magic with the human heart such as was witnessed when Catherine Drinker Bowen had this in mind when she called her history of the Constitutional Convention The Miracle of Philadelphia.

If slaveholders feared possible insurrections by their slaves, they were no less apprehensive about the day-to-day fate of the institution caused by slaves running away. They wanted to be certain that the Constitution had recognized slaves as property and that it offered protection to that property, especially runaways. Significantly, there was virtually no opposition to the provision that slave owners might be sold into slavery by their owners. The slaveowners had already won such sweeping constitutional recognition of slavery that the fugitive slave provision may have been more sweeping than the Constitution.

And Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts was one of the remarkable ironies of the early history of this democracy that the very men who had shouted "liberty" to their slaves were no less apprehensive about the day-to-day attrition of slavery. And that it offered protection to that property, especially runaways. Significantly, there was virtually no opposition to the provision that slave owners might be sold into slavery by their owners. The slaveowners had already won such sweeping constitutional recognition of slavery that the fugitive slave provision may have been more sweeping than the Constitution.

We may admire them for many things: their courage and bravery in the military struggle against Britain; their imaginative creativity in forging a new instrument of government; and their matchless service to posterity, the Founding Fathers set the stage which they gave lip service, for speaking it to their black brothers who fought by their side in their darkest hours of peril, in equating five black men with three white men and that it offered protection to that property, especially runaways. Significantly, there was virtually no opposition to the provision that slave owners might be sold into slavery by their owners. The slaveowners had already won such sweeping constitutional recognition of slavery that the fugitive slave provision may have been more sweeping than the Constitution.

We are concerned here not so much for the harm that their moral legacy has done to every generation of their progeny, but for the seizure of something of this in mind that it offered protection to that property, especially runaways. Significantly, there was virtually no opposition to the provision that slave owners might be sold into slavery by their owners. The slaveowners had already won such sweeping constitutional recognition of slavery that the fugitive slave provision may have been more sweeping than the Constitution.

The irony was compounded when, in the so-called major compromise of the Constitution, the delegates agreed that a slave was three-eighths of a person. This meant the five slaves were to be counted as three persons. The magic of racism can work magic with the human heart such as was witnessed when Catherine Drinker Bowen had this in mind when she called her history of the Constitutional Convention The Miracle of Philadelphia.

If slaveholders feared possible insurrections by their slaves, they were no less apprehensive about the day-to-day fate of the institution caused by slaves running away. They wanted to be certain that the Constitution had recognized slaves as property and that it offered protection to that property, especially runaways. Significantly, there was virtually no opposition to the provision that slave owners might be sold into slavery by their owners. The slaveowners had already won such sweeping constitutional recognition of slavery that the fugitive slave provision may have been more sweeping than the Constitution.

And Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts was one of the remarkable ironies of the early history of this democracy that the very men who had shouted "liberty" to their slaves were no less apprehensive about the day-to-day attrition of slavery. And that it offered protection to that property, especially runaways. Significantly, there was virtually no opposition to the provision that slave owners might be sold into slavery by their owners. The slaveowners had already won such sweeping constitutional recognition of slavery that the fugitive slave provision may have been more sweeping than the Constitution.
States Code, to provide more effectively for bilingual proceedings in all district courts of the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments as follows:

On page 5, line 11, strike "118," and insert "119;"

On page 6, line 5, strike "1975." and insert "1976;"

So as to make the bill read as follows:

"SEC. 5. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be known as "the Bilingual Courts Act":

CONDUCT OF BILINGUAL PROCEEDINGS

Sec. 2. (a) Chapter 119 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"(a) (1) In any criminal action, whenever the judge determines, on his own motion or on the motion of a party to the proceedings, that a defendant does not speak and understand the English language with a facility sufficient for him to comprehend either the trial transcript or the testimony, (B) in the course of such proceedings, testimony may be presented by any person who does not speak and understand the English language, the court, in all further proceedings in that action, including arraignments, hearings, and trial, shall order an oral simultaneous translation of the proceedings, or an oral simultaneous translation of that testimony, to be furnished by an interpreter in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

(2) In any civil action, whenever the judge determines, on his own motion or on the motion of a party to the proceedings, that a party does not speak and understand the English language with a facility sufficient for him to comprehend either the proceedings or the testimony, or (B) in the course of such proceedings, testimony may be presented by any person who does not speak and understand the English language, the court, in all further proceedings in that action, including arraignments, hearings, and trial, shall order an oral simultaneous translation of the proceedings, or an oral simultaneous translation of that testimony, to be furnished by an interpreter in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

(3) In any action where the services of an interpreter are required to be utilized under this section, the court shall obtain the services of a certified interpreter from within the jurisdiction, except that, where no certified interpreters are available from a nearby district, the court shall obtain the services of an otherwise competent interpreter.

(b) The amendment made by this Act applies to any action begun before the date of enactment of this Act, and to any proceeding which is then pending.

SEC. 3. Section 604(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (12) as paragraph (13); and

(2) by inserting immediately below paragraph (11) the following new paragraph:

"(12) Under section 1327 of this title, (A) prescribe, determine, and certify the qualifications of persons who may serve as certified interpreters in bilingual proceedings; and (B) prescribe, determine, and certify the qualifications of persons who may serve as interpreters certified by the court, in all civil proceedings in which an interpreter is utilized pursuant to section 1827(a) (2) of this title be apportioned between the parties or as costs in the action;"

APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal judiciary such sums as may be necessary to carry out the amendments made by this Act.

Sec. 5. The amendment made by this Act shall take effect on September 1, 1976.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MULTIYEAR LEASES BY THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The bill (S. 1260) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into multiyear leases through use of the automatic data processing fund without obligating the total anticipated payments to be made under such leases, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 111 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 759) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator is authorized to obligate and disburse funds under this Act for the acquisition of property, and to enter into contracts under this Act, for the purpose of entering into multiyear leases or in order to acquire land or buildings, and any work done under such leases or contracts is hereby authorized to be paid for out of the proceeds of the sale of such property or buildings.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I do not seek further time.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield back my time under the standing order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Colorado is not here, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Utah (Mr. GARR) be recognized in his place, to be followed by the Senator from Colorado.

The Acting President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Utah (Mr. GARR) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

THE IMPORTANCE OF GENERAL REVENUE SHARING TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. GARN. Mr. President, last week in Boulder, at the U.S. Conference of Mayors, we held our annual convention, and once again we heard the plight of the cities. That is my purpose in speaking this morning, as a former mayor—just 6 months ago—and of the National League of Cities: to state that the problems of the cities of this country are very real, and that I have often felt that Congress has not faced up to its responsibilities in helping the local and State levels of governments adequately.

As we all know, there are three levels of government, the local level—cities and towns; the State level, and the national level, known as the Federal or intergovernmental system. Unfortunately, over the past 40 years, we have seen a trend toward centralization of government at the national level, and the taking away of the powers of cities, counties, and States, thereby diminishing the authority of the Governor, mayors, city councilmen, and with good Intent. Certainly Congress hoped to solve some of the problems of the cities, but the trend has resulted in a vast system of categorical grant-in-aid programs almost without number, with overlapping, duplication. It has resulted in a bureaucracy that is very insensitive
to the needs of these local governments, where appointed officials are making decisions; and where local mayors, who are elected and accountable for their constituents, are told by relatively low-ranking appointed officials how to run their cities and States.

And despite this prolifera-
tion of categorical grant-in-aid programs, with all of their rules, regulations, and guidelines, the problems of the cities have become worse. There were many days when, as mayor of Salt Lake City, I did not really feel like mayor, but rather a local为准 for the Federal Government, a puppet at the bottom of some strings being pulled this way and that by officials who were, again, not accountable to the electorate. If I did not do a good job as a mayor, there was a good old-fashioned way to take care of that problem: The people of Salt Lake City could get rid of the mayor at the next election. But they certainly could not get rid of appointed officials whom they did not even know, but who had great influence over the way their cities and counties were run.

These problems were again brought to our attention at the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and we were reminded once more that indeed they do exist. In the last 4 years, there was, in my opinion, one bright spot, and that was general revenue sharing. Those of us in local government, including the former Governor of Kentucky, now presiding over the Senate (Mr. Ford), saw for first time some reversal of this flow of power to Washington, when money was sent back so that we could make decisions at the local level as to priorities in the solution of our own problems.

Some 3 years have passed since the enactment of the General Revenue Sharing Act. This year several bills have been introduced in the Senate of the United States to extend general revenue sharing, but little interest is being shown for first time some reversal of this flow of power to Washington, when money was sent back so that we could make decisions at the local level as to priorities in the solution of our own problems.

Some 3 years have passed since the enactment of the General Revenue Sharing Act. This year several bills have been introduced in the Senate of the United States to extend general revenue sharing, but little interest is being shown for first time some reversal of this flow of power to Washington, when money was sent back so that we could make decisions at the local level as to priorities in the solution of our own problems.

The major point that I would like to make is that the cities are having a difficult time budgeting. They need to look into the future and be able to plan their budgets. Under congressional budgetary procedures now in effect, no action can be taken on a fiscal matter of this sort until the first budget resolution is adopted. Therefore, if revenue sharing is not extended this year, nothing can happen before the 15th of May 1976. This is a very critical action. It must be taken this year because it is early next year that most of the cities of the country will be adopting their budgets. How can they adopt their budgets if they are not certain as to what Congress is going to do? It is important that they know early next year whether they can rely upon revenue sharing for part of their budget money.

There are critics of the present formula. They seem to ignore the fact that there is no formula in the present law, and that the only one was set in the formula. They seem to want the people to believe that it is only based on population and that the big cities are being treated unfairly.

But there certainly is a needs factor in the formula; it is not a straight per capita formula. A study of the American Council on Intergovernmental Relations, published in October 1974, found that revenue sharing tends to equalize the fiscal capabilities in central city and suburban jurisdictions. Far more aid is channeled to central cities than to the rich suburban jurisdictions, and central cities receive three to seven times as much aid as their affluent suburbs.
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Priorities released a study entitled, "Military Maneuvers." The study charges no illegality but found that over a quarter of the 1,400-plus former Pentagon employees went to work for defense contractors between 1969 and 1973 were involved in potential conflicts of interest.

The study cites a number of instances in which former officers took jobs with contractors over which they previously had some form of authority. Existing law requires retired military officers file reports 3 years after leaving the service if they go to work, at a salary of $15,000 or more, for companies with $10 million or more in defense contracts. The system is not working; the CEP found an apparent lack of effort and no qualitative analysis.

The CEP's explanation of this Department of Defense situation sums up the problem with Federal conflict of interest regulation generally:

Since the entire procedure was not initiated by DOD, but was thrust upon it by Congress as a central policy goal of the DOD. By assigning the responsibility to offices with other responsibilities, and by dispersing the responsibility, it was assured that only a minimum of effort would be exerted for evaluating and compiling the reports.

As I began querying various departments and agencies of Government, it became clear this was the pattern throughout the Federal Government.

An Executive order covers ethical conduct in the executive branch, bolstered by a regulation of the Civil Service Commission which also handles such oversight as exists.

I discovered that, although the agencies use the civil service requirements for financial disclosure—with some modifications for individual agency needs—there are no firm criteria for the evaluation of the disclosure forms. Moreover, no one seemed to know who the ethics counselor or who the actual investigator was. Evaluation is done by an indefinite number of people, all of whom have other duties.

Generally, when a question arises on a particular form, it is given to the regional supervisor. If not resolved there, it is forwarded to agency headquarters.

There are no interagency guidelines for statement evaluation and usually only informal intra-agency guidelines.

There are no standard means of investigating suspected conflicts beyond the perceived central policy goal of the DOD. By assigning the responsibility to offices with other responsibilities, and by dispersing the responsibility, it was assured that only a minimum of effort would be exerted for evaluating and compiling the reports.

A job description prepared by the employee's supervisor to help pinpoint possible conflicts is so vague its value is questionable.

Furthermore, listing specific firms and individuals the employee will deal with, only general industries are listed. It is therefore quite conceivable that an employee could be in a conflict situation without his or his supervisor's knowing it.

I was also surprised to learn that many employees had no idea of what to do in case a conflict arose. And several did not even understand what a conflict of interest is—indent, one employee said that a conflict of interest was impossible in her department.

To their credit, many agencies and departments hold conferences and seminars on conflict of interest regulations. But responses to my inquiries indicate they are not communicating effectively. The Civil Service Commission recently began an evaluation of ethical standards in recognition of the problem. A single person has been hired in the General Counsel's office whose full-time responsibility is conflict of interest. This response is nowhere near sufficient.

Effective oversight and enforcement do not exist today, nor can they under the burdens of the present system: Disclosed information is confidential, preceding all but internal oversight; disclosure requirements do not provide the information necessary for effective monitoring of conflicts; departmental guidelines are devoted to reviewing and investigating potential conflicts are limited. Finally, decentralized inhouse authority results in uneven and unequal treatment of individuals, departments, agencies and the agency pursues the matter.

Within the legislative branch, Members and employees of Congress are subject to the same penalties for bribery and conflict of interest as are employees of the executive and judicial branches.

In addition, both the House and Senate have rules and procedures for Federal level employees, though the requirements vary. The disclosure, however, is confidential.

Mr. President, that is the pattern. Regulations lack uniformity; their enforcement ranges from perfunctory to nonexistent. Within this imperfect framework thousands of real and potential conflicts of interest exist—some are unreported, some unknown, long after open disclosure. Others are less innocent.

Several of my colleagues have introduced bills addressing this problem. But the question centers around how to get the conflicts; the problem is not merely one of more disclosure. As I have pointed out, disclosure alone—even thorough disclosure—is inadequate. Witness the situations I have outlined in which employees held significant positions which could cause very real conflict with their duties. But under the loose assortment of regulations and procedures, administered in-house, agency by agency, the conflicts were either not discovered or not acted upon.

The longer I worked on this legislation, Mr. President, the clearer it became that oversight and enforcement of conflict of interest must lie outside the agencies involved.

That is the foundation of the remedy I suggest today. The Federal Conflict of Interest Act calls for detailed public financial disclosure by all elected officials, candidates for Federal office, and supervisory level employees in the executive and legislative branches. To ensure that this information is accurate, it is subject to conflict of interest—and falling that, ferrets it out and eliminates it—my legislation would establish a seven-member Commission on Conduct with oversight authority for both branches.

As I envisage it, the Commission would supervise disclosure, investigate and conduct hearings to ascertain if conflicts of interest exist or are potential. The Commission would have the authority to discipline employees or recommend disciplinary action. It could require divestiture of an official's or employee's conflicts of interest and could prescribe the terms and conditions of such divestiture—to make certain, for example, that a "blind trust" is truly blind, not merely a cosmetic device to conceal conflicts.

The Government staff to evaluate present guidelines, adopt those it considers worthwhile and promulgate, by rules, such additional guidelines as it finds necessary.

The Commission would be full-time with no other responsibility than to monitor and enforce compliance. I would vest in this Commission authority to investigate violations of any and all rules. The full range of due process rights is adequately provided for.

Any such investigations would be kept confidential but individuals would be notified that an alleged violation is under investigation. If the Commission determines the complaint is sufficient, a hearing would follow. The resulting decision would be made public.

The essential part of any anticorruption system and my legislation provides that the Commission may issue advisory opinions with respect to the application of its rules. Since the present system is not working, the act would provide standards in recognition of the problem.

The provisions I have outlined, Mr. President, would apply equally to elected officials of both branches, candidates for Federal office, and employees and appointees at a supervisory level—those with salaries of $25,000 a year or more.

The act includes civil penalties. The act provides civil penalties in the amount of any profit gained as a result of a violation under the act together with interest. The Commission on Conduct, with the Attorney General, would be authorized to bring any legal action in any court of the United States to enforce provisions of this section of the act.

Action may be brought regardless of whether the individual is an officer or employee at the time, so long as the action is brought within 3 years of the violation.

This is a significant difference—and, I believe, a necessary one—between divestiture requirements for appointees and employees and for elected officials.

Conflict of interest would be a requirement of any antitrust act. Antitrust laws prohibit conflicting interests is one such tool.

But how do we, as Members of Con-
Should they until they know with certainty whom they really serve? That question will remain an open one until we take firm steps to remove the influence of private financial interests from public policy decisions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Report of the Federal Conflict of Interest Act of 1975 be printed in the Record.

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

8. 2098

**Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Conflict of Interest Act".**

**CONDUCT OF GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL.**

Sec. 1. (a) It is unlawful for any elected or appointed officer or employee of the executive and legislative branches of the Government—

(1) to engage, directly or indirectly, in any personal business transaction or private arrangement for personal profits which accrues to an officer or employee of the Government's official position or authority, if such position or authority is thereby placed or is likely to be placed in a conflict of interest with the performance of his official duties, or

(2) to violate, knowingly, any standard of ethical conduct promulgated by the Commission on Conduct pursuant to section 5 of this Act.

(b) There is imposed, on any individual who violates subsection (a) (1) of this section, a civil penalty in the amount of any profit gained, as a result of such violation together with interest thereon at the annual rate established under section 6221 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(c) The Commission on Conduct, concurrently with the Attorney General, is authorized to bring any legal action in any court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section. Any such action may be brought without regard to whether an individual is such an officer or employee at the time such action is brought. No action under this section may be brought sooner than six months after the commission of a violation of the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

**FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE.**

Sec. 3. (a) Each individual referred to in subsection (b) of this section shall file annually, with the Commission on Conduct, a report containing a full and complete statement of—

(1) the amount of gross and taxable income, total deductions and tax exclusions, as well as tax paid and credits against taxes otherwise due as reflected on his Federal income tax return for the preceding calendar year;

(2) the amount and source of each item of income, each item of reimbursement for any expenditure, and each gift or aggregate of gifts from one source (other than gifts received from his spouse or any member of his immediate family) received by him during the preceding calendar year which exceeds $100 in amount or value, including any fee or other honorarium received by him for or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals, or the preparation of any article or other communication for publication, and the monetary value of subsistence, entertainment, travel, and other facilities received by him in kind;

(3) the value of each asset held by him which has a value in excess of $1,000, and any transactions in the securities of any business entity exceeds $1,000 during such year;

(4) any transactions in the securities of any business entity by him or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction, during the preceding calendar year if the aggregate amount involved in such transactions exceeds $1,000; and

(5) any purchase or sale, other than the purchase or sale of his personal residence, of real property or any interest therein by him or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction, during the preceding calendar year if the value of property involved in such purchase or sale exceeds $1,000.

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section apply to the President, Vice-President, each Member of Congress, each noncareer employee of the United States (including any member of a uniformed service) who is compensated at a rate in excess of $25,000, any officer or employee of the United States who performs duties of the type generally performed by an individual occupying grade GS-16 of the General Schedule or any higher position authorized to bring any legal action in any court of the United States, and any individual who is an elected or appointed officer or employee occupying a position in schedule C of the excepted service, and each officer or employee of the United States who performs duties of the type generally performed by an individual occupying grade GS-16 of the General Schedule or any higher position authorized to bring any legal action in any court of the United States who is an elected or appointed officer or employee occupying a position in schedule C of the excepted service.

(c) Reports required by this section shall be in such form and contain such information as the Commission on Conduct may prescribe. The Commission may provide for the grouping of items of income, sources of income, assets, liabilities, dealings in securities or commodities and sales of real property, when separate itemization is not feasible or is not necessary for an accurate disclosure by the individual of the value of the dealings in securities and commodities, or purchases and sales of real property of any individual.

(d) All reports filed under this section shall be maintained by the Commission as public records, which, under such reasonable rules as he shall prescribe, shall be available for inspection by members of the public.

(e) For the purposes of any report required by this section, an individual shall be considered to be President, Vice-President, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of the United States, or a member of a uniformed service, during any calendar year if he serves in any such position for more than six months during such calendar year.

(f) Each member of Congress shall certify to the Commission on Conduct, concurrently with the Attorney General, a copy of his financial disclosure statement to be published in a publication of general circulation within his district and shall file within one month after he becomes a candidate for such office.

(g) For the purposes of this Act:—

(1) "income" means gross income as defined in section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

(2) "security" means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b);

(3) "commodity" means commodity as defined in section 1a of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a).

I hope my colleagues will agree with me that we must face the inevitable and external monitoring and enforce­ment—all elements missing from present conflict of interest regulation.
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In section 3 of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2); 
(4) "transactions in securities or commodities, or any portion thereof, withholding, use, transfer, or other disposition involving any security or commodity; 
(5) "Member of Congress" means a Senator, a Representative, a Resident Commissioner, or a Delegate; 
(6) "officer" has the same meaning as in section 2104 of title 5, United States Code; 
(7) "employee" has the same meaning as in section 2105 of such title; 
(8) "immediate family" means any of the Armed Forces, the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service, or the commissioned corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; 
(9) "immediate family" means the child, parent, grandparent, brother, or sister of an individual, and the spouse of such person; and 
(10) "tax" means any Federal, State, or local income tax and any Federal, State, or local property tax.

Establishment of Commission

SEC. 4. (a) There is established as an independent agency within the executive branch of the Government a Commission on Conduct in connection therewith. 
(b) The Commission shall be composed of 7 members as follows: 
(1) Five appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and 
(2) One appointed by the President of the Senate; and 
(3) One appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. 
(c) The members of the Commission appointed under subsections (b) (2) and (3) of this section shall serve for 4 years, except that the members appointed under subsections (b) (1) and (2) of this section shall serve for terms of 3 years. 
(d) Each member of the Commission shall serve for a term of 4 years, except that the members appointed under subsections (b) (1) and (2) of this section shall serve for terms of 3 years, except that the members appointed under subsection (b) (2) shall serve for a term of 3 years, and the member initially appointed under subsection (b) (3) shall serve for a term of 3 years.

(e) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its power but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made but the appointment to fill any vacancy shall be for the remainder of the unexpired term only. 
(f) The Commission shall elect annually, a chairman and a vice-chairman from among its members. The chairman and vice-chairman shall not be affiliated with the same political party. No member of the Commission may serve as chairman of the Commission for more than one year during his term of office. 
(g) The term of the Commission shall consist of 4 members, except that the Commission may establish a lower number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony. 
(h) Members of the Commission shall receive the rate paid for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code. 

(a) The Commission shall conduct in connection with the respect to the exercise of its duties and powers under the provisions of this Act shall be made by a majority vote of the voting members of the Commission. 
(b) The Commission shall meet at least once each month and also at the call of any member. 
(c) The Commission shall prepare written rules for the conduct of its activities, shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed, and shall have its principal office in or near the District of Columbia (but it may meet or exercise any of its powers anywhere in the United States).

Sec. 5. (a) It is the duty of the Commission to develop and, by rule, promulgate uniform standards of ethical conduct for elected and appointed officers and employees of the executive and legislative branches of the Government. In developing such standards, the Commission shall consider the standards of conduct in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and shall consult with appropriate officers and employees of both such branches of the Government. 
(b) The Commission shall implement the financial disclosure requirements of section 3 of this Act. 
(c) The Commission shall perform such other functions as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 6. (a) The Commission is authorized to investigate any alleged violation of any provision of this Act or regulation promulgated pursuant thereto. An investigation may be initiated upon the motion of any member of the Commission or upon the complaint of any person. An investigation conducted under this section shall begin when the investigation commences, the person under investigation shall be notified in writing that an investigation is underway. 
(b) The Commission is authorized to accept from any individual complaints with respect to matters which the Commission has the authority to investigate. Any such complaint shall be signed by the complainant. If so requested, the Commission is authorized to inform the complainant of any action taken with respect to the complaint. Notice of such action shall be given by letter and shall be provided within a reasonable time. Upon dismissal of the Commission of a complaint, the Commission shall notify the complainant of its reasons for such action. 
(c) After conducting an investigation under this section the Commission is authorized— 
(1) to dismiss any complaint before it upon a finding that the complaint is frivolous, unwarranted, insufficient in law or fact, or that the complaint is unsubstantiated by credible evidence; 
(2) refer the complaint to the Attorney General for appropriate action; or 
(3) conduct a hearing on the matter charged in the complaint and take appropriate action in accordance with the provisions of this section. 
(d) (1) Whenever the Commission orders a hearing with respect to any matter charged in a complaint or under investigation, it shall provide notice to the individual charged or under investigation of the date on which any hearing is to be conducted. Any individual who is the subject of such an investigation has the right to appear at such hearing, to be represented by counsel, to confront and cross-examine witnesses, to present evidence in his own behalf, and to subpoena witnesses. The Commission shall maintain a record of any proceedings which may be conducted with respect to any such hearing. 
(2) The Commission in carrying out its duties under this section may sit and act at such times and places, hold such hearings, take such testimony, require by subpoena the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, papers, accounts, and documents, administer such oaths and affirmations, and do all acts and things necessary to the proper conduct of the business of the Commission. Subpoenas and other orders shall be issued under the signature of the Chairman or a majority of the members of the Commission designated by the Chairman. Any member of the Commission or panel may administer oaths or affirmations. 
(e) The individual who is the subject of an inquiry under this section has the right to refuse to attend and testify or to produce or to answer questions put to him by the Commission on the ground that the testimony or material required to be produced or answered would tend to incriminate such person or subject such person to penalty or forfeiture.

In case of disobedience to a subpoena or other order issued under paragraph (2) of this subsection, the Commission may invoke the aid of any district court of the United States in requiring compliance with such subpoena or order. Any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction in which the person is found or transacts business, or in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena or other order issued by the Commission, issue an order to such person to appear and testify, to produce such books, records, papers, accounts, and documents, and any failure to obey the order of the court shall be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

(f) The Commission shall make findings of fact which shall be entered on the record upon finding that an individual has violated the standards of ethical conduct established by the Commission or has violated any other requirement of this Act, the Commission may— 
(A) dismiss any such employee from the civil service or order such other disciplinary action as may tend to incriminate such person or subject such person to penalty or forfeiture. 
(B) recommend to the appropriate House of Congress that disciplinary proceedings be initiated with respect to any member or employee thereof; 
(C) recommend to the House of Representatives that a writ of impeachment be commenced; 
(D) recommend to the President or to the Congress the removal of any civil officer of the United States; 
(E) refer cases to the Attorney General for appropriate civil or criminal action; and 
(F) take other appropriate action with respect to any other employee of the United States.

(g) The courts of appeals of the United States have jurisdiction to hear any appeal from a final decision of the Commission. Appeals of any such decision shall be brought to the same manner, and on the same limitations as appeals from the district courts of the United States under section 1291 of title 28, United States Code.

ADVISORY OPINIONS

Sec. 7. The Commission may issue advisory opinions with respect to matters relating to conduct or financial disclosure. The Commission shall render an opinion upon written request of any person as to whether any specific transaction or activity would constitute a violation of any provision of this Act or any regulation promulgated pursuant thereto. Advisory opinions shall be given not later than the requested time and shall be in writing. An advisory opinion does not have the force of law but shall constitute, for the person.
Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:50 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6950) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the period ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes; agrees to the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. CASEY, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. GIALDIO, Mr. McFALL, Mr. YATES, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. MAHON, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. ARMSTRONG, and Mr. REGULA were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the bill (S. 552) to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, disagreed to by the Senate; agrees to the conference requested by the Senate on the original version of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. BEGALI, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. BALDUS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HIGHPOWER, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. MADSEN, and Mr. KELLY were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4222) to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 in order to extend and revise the special
food service program for children and the school breakfast program, and for other purposes related to strengthening the school lunch and child nutrition programs; agrees to the conference request by the Senate on the disapproving votes of the two Houses therein; and that Mr. Perkins, Mr. Ford of Michigan, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Meeks, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Andrews of North Carolina, Mr. Hatfield of Oregon, Mr. Riisenger, Mr. Simon, Mr. Mott, Mr. Hall, Mr. Broun, Mr. O'Hara, Mr. Zefferetti, Mr. Miller of California, Mr. Quie, Mr. Bell, Mr. Eschleman, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Pressler, Mr. Goings, and Mr. Jeffords were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RANDELL, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments:
S. 301, to extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (together with additional views) (Rept. No. 94-278). By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:
H.R. 7716. An act to amend the National Food Service Act, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.
S. 2103. A bill to require financial disclosure. Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.
H.R. 7731. An act to suspend the duty on open-top hopper cars exported for repairs or alterations on or before June 30, 1978 (Rept. No. 94-279).
H.R. 7731. An act to suspend the duty on open-top hopper cars exported for repairs or alterations on or before June 30, 1978 (Rept. No. 94-280).
S. Con. Res. 35. A concurrent resolution approving a bilateral commercial agreement between the United States and the Socialist Republic of Romania (Rept. No. 94-281).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as indicated:
By Mr. HASKELL (for himself, Mr. Hatfield of Oregon, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Garn, Mr. Leahy, and Mr. Gary W. Hart):
S. 2068. A bill to provide for potential or existent conflicts of interest on the part of elected and appointed officers and employees of the Government, to require financial disclosure, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Government Operations.
By Mr. PROXMIRE:

By Mr. WILLIAMS:
S. 2100. A bill to amend Section 1767 of Title 38, United States Code, relating to the prosecution of a program of education outside the United States. Referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIAS:
S. 2101. A bill to authorize the issuance of two colored coins with the likenesses of Abigail Adams and Susan B. Anthony for their role in the two centuries of America. Referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:
S. 2102. A bill to authorize the establish-

ment of a Water Resources Mitigation Advisory Board. Referred to the Committee on Public Works.
By Mr. MATHIAS (for himself and Mr. STEVENSON):
S. 2103. A bill to require financial disclosure. Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.
By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Hatfield, and Mr. Humphrey):
S. J. Res. 106. A joint resolution to strengthen the foreign relations of the United States by not less than 70 percent of certain food assistance be provide to countries designated by the United Nations as "Most Seriously Affected". Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

STATEMENT ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

A SENSITIVE POST

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is an important bill which requires more congressional oversight than it has been accorded in the past. Here is why.

First, at least 16 of the major monthly economic indicators are prepared by the Department of Commerce and this agency. Next to the unemployment figures and the wholesale and consumer price indices, these are among the most sensitive economic statistics that come out of Washington.

They include the Nation's Income, Expenditure and Savings Accounts; the Gross National Product; Sources of Personal Income; National Income; Distribution of Personal Income; Corporate Profits; Gross Private Domestic Investment; New Plant and Equipment Expenditures; New Residential Construction; New Nonresidential Construction; New Durable Goods, Manufacturing; Housing Starts; Business Sales and Inventories; Manufacturer's Shipments, Inventories and New Orders; Merchandise Exports and Imports; the U.S. Balance of Trade; the U.S. Trade Deficit; the U.S. Overall Balances on International Transfers; and the Federal Sector of National Income Accounts.

SUBORDINATE AT CENSUS BUREAU REQUIRES CONFIRMATION

Second, the Administrator of SESA has under him the Census Bureau whose Director must be confirmed by the Senate. This absurd anomaly should be corrected.

SLS HEAD CONFIRMED

Third, the only statistical position in the Government of comparable or superior importance to the head of SESA is that of the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. He puts out the monthly figures on unemployment and the wholesale and consumer price index.

That position is a 4-year term and requires Senate confirmation. This is all the more reason why SESA's head should also be confirmed.

PROFESSIONALS AND NOT POLITICAL APPOINTEES

Mr. President, if Congress is to insure the credibility of Government statistics, we must see that the men who handle these statistics are professionals and that the interpretation of these figures remain nonpolitical and nonpartisan. We do not need unqualified political partisans in these sensitive positions.

Unfortunately, the previous administration tried to make these agencies a rest home for partisan appointees. For example, the current head of SESA, Mr. Edward Miller, has no professional statistical background whatever. He came to the job directly from CREEP—the infamous Committee to Re-Elect the President. Prior to that he was Chief of the Office of Assessment and Compliance of the Bureau of the Mines, where his stewardship received a stinging rebuke in a General Accounting Office report.

OPENING THE DOOR TO ABUSE

We do not need nonprofessional and unqualified men to head our key statistical agencies, we are opening the door to potentially great abuse. The possibilities are endless as the previous administration demonstrated so well.

Let us review the events of the last few years.

THE NIXON APPROACH

During 1973, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, on orders of the White House, stopped its monthly press conferences by its professional staff. It did this immediately following an interpretation of the unemployment figures by its professional staff which contradicted the optimistic and political interpretation of the Secretary of Labor.

Instead of press conferences by professionals, the White House substituted regular political comment by the Council of Economic Advisers, the head of HUD, the Secretary of Treasury, and others.

That was step No. 1: gagging the professionals.

Next, a number of professionals at the Bureau of Labor Statistics were reorganized out of their jobs.

Then the head of the BLS, Geoffrey Moore, was fired. Dr. Moore was a highly competent professional who was both loyal to the administration and loyal to his professional ethics. Yet, he was fired.

Meanwhile, statistical series which were unreliable to the administration were discontinued.

Let me make one point clear: At no time did they "cook" figures to my knowledge and I am not charging that. What they did was to put gross political interpretations on them and they did stop issuing figures that were embarrassing.

It is a pattern that must not be repeated.

Mr. President, for too long now, Congress has been content with passing legislation that locks the barn door after the horse has escaped. Here is a chance to change that policy.

I want the bill to the desk, ask that it be appropriately referred, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full in the Record.

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

[Followed by the text of the bill as printed in the Record]
By Mr. MATHIAS:

S. 2101. A bill to authorize the issuance of two gold commemorative coins with the likenesses of Abigail Adams and Susan B. Anthony for their role in the first and second centuries of American independence. Referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, the legislation pending today merely symbolizes a task accomplished—it does not tell the story. My bill would authorize the Treasury to produce a two dollar commemorative coin which would depict the role of two very brave women in the first and centuries of American independence, Abigail Adams and Susan B. Anthony. These coins would appear on the quarter, the half dollar, and the dollar—drummer boy, Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell and the Moon. While the facts have long confirmed the equal status through the vote, in the case of the Bicentennial approaches, we have failed too often to give equal time to the strength, warmth, and intelligence of the revolutionary women like Abigail Adams who fought with the Founding Fathers for the same freedoms we in America enjoy today. Furthermore, in parting with our lingering prejudices the canonization of its first Catholic saint—a woman—Mother Elizabeth Seton of New York and Maryland. It is also the attitude harbored by some of the major efforts of Ms. Anthony to secure the vote for women. These are just some of the thoughts which prompt me to offer my bill.

By issuing a gold coin stamped with the likenesses of two women we can recognize in a concrete way that women not only make up half of the population of America, but that they occupy nearly every role that they are allowed to take on. The principal purchasers and consumers in our society, that they are contributors in ever greater numbers to the economic livelihood of their families and in some cases the sole supporters. All these phenomena less than a century old, but grounded in centuries of experience, must sharpen our enlightenment toward and appreciation of the responsibilities held by women but just so recently recognized and rewarded. It would seem appropriate in the coming year to take some action which can symbolize that appreciation.

Abigail Adams, the first American woman to write a letter to the Founding Father John, but surely her faith, her exhortation, her hard work supporting the revolutionary movement have earned her the title of founding mother. Susan B. Anthony faced prejudice, ridicule, and even violence to throw off what she believed were unnatural constraints on her fellow sisters.

Mr. President, as you know, the Federal Reserve System will start distributing the first of the Bicentennial circulating coins on July 7. The U.S. Mint sponsored a competition to select three designs for the quarter, the half dollar and the dollar—drummer boy, Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell and the Moon. While I applaud these choices, I feel a certain deficiency exists in the national recognition of the role of women in our society during the Bicentennial celebration.

My distinguished colleague from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) proposed the issuance of a gold coin which would be legal tender on May 12 of this year. His remarks appear in the Record of that day. I would also ask unanimous consent that the following statement be printed in the Record following my remarks. Mr. Ganz, a respected commentator on coinage matters, discussed the gold coin issue and the reasons why the Treasury can now go ahead with such a project with less reservations than it held just a year ago. I would very much like to see a gold Bicentennial coin issued and I would deeply like to have such coins stamped with the likeness of Mrs. Adams, and Ms. Anthony. I look forward to working these matters out in committee when such legislation comes up for consideration and I shall work toward my goal.

While the facts have long confirmed the equality of responsibility, attitudes have not always been so quick to follow. This legislation which I introduce today cannot obviously change attitudes, nor does it. However, in parting with our lingering prejudices I feel a certain deficiency exists in the national recognition of the role of women in American history.

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

How You Can Help Mint a Gold Bi-Centennial Coin—It's Still Possible If We All Let Congress Know the Reasons Immediately

(By David L. Ganz)

America deserves a gold coin to commemorate the occasion of the 300th anniversary of its birth. Mass coinage presses may already be rolling, but to produce cupro-nickel clad coins complemented with silver-clad issues is merely to go halfway. America enjoys a bicentennial year, but the Treasury, ought to get together and decide to honor America in the manner of its forefathers; with the medium of exchange that they used—gold and silver.

Gold coinage was considered by Congress in the course of creating the bicentennial coinage legislation. It was rejected then for international monetary considerations. Perhaps because the monetary value of gold had not been done in 40 years, and there was the real fear that any striking of a gold piece—even as a commemorative issue—would be viewed as an attempt by this government to return to the gold standard.

Despite all these objections, the United States Senate did in fact pass a gold coin proposal. Dramatic floor debate ensued as Senators O. Hatfield, R-Ore., and Sen. Peter H. Dominitz, R-Colo., led the fight with Sen. James A. McClure, R-Idaho, to get a gold coin for the bicentennial. The Senate twice favored the measure.

The coin would have been a $25 gold piece. But the proposal—along with one that would end the gold ownership ban—died in Conference with the House. As a compromise, the Senate accepted a House proposal to settle for 45 million silver bicentennial coins.

In retrospect, the reasons for the compromise seem all wrong. But this ignores the pure pragmatics of the situation. The bicentennial coinage legislation was essential, the House was not about to accept any proposal with gold in it, and was willing to allow special silver-clad coins for collectors if the Senate withdrew its gold coin and ownership proposals.

Since December 31, 1974, Americans have been able to legally own gold. To say that the gold coin proposal was an understatement, but after the initial price gyrations, the price of the metal has stabilized around $170 per ounce, give or take seven percent.

Immediately, this takes away one of the main arguments offered against the striking of the bicentennial coin. One argument that private gold ownership is illegal. It also removes, effectively, the second argument offered against it, namely the Americans would rush and buy the coins upon thousands of
ounces of the precious metal as a hedge against inflation.

The events of the first half of 1975 prove otherwise. Gold has proved to be stable, but not all gold coins have been remarkable and Americans have not entered the gold market with any degree of fervor.

Treasury Interpretation of the enabling legislation to private gold ownership has been that all contrary provisions of law-dating as far back as 1934-are no longer in force. That would allow, therefore, payments to be made in gold, assuming of course that a gold coin had legal tender status.

The same obviously applies to the silver commemorative coins for the bicentennial. The catch is, of course, that no one is about to spend the silver coins at their face value because (1) they have a bullion worth in excess of face value and (2) costs far more than either their face value or bullion worth.

Mr. BUCKLEY: By Mr. BUCKLEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, a bill to authorize the establishment of a Water Resources Mitigation Advisory Board. Referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. President, I am today introducing legislation creating a Water Resources Mitigation Advisory Board. This is a proposal that is very similar to S. 299, which passed the Senate last October 11 on a unanimous vote.

Because of the Senate’s support for this concept last year, I am hopeful that it can be the subject of early hearings and consideration in the 94th Congress.

The purpose of this legislation is to create a mechanism through which the public, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Congress can obtain an independent evaluation on the merits of the many “mitigation” issues that swarm around projects of the Army Corps of Engineers as bees around honey.

By mitigation, I mean relief for what is described as the unexpected or undesired side effects developing from an authorized project the Corps of Engineers. A mitigation issue may arise from an additional load placed on the plant treating a city’s drinking water, or an argument over the cost-sharing requirements for a particular project, or replacement of the Corps of Engineers with the Congress in the position of spending taxpayers money to the benefit of one locale outside any national policy affecting all other communities.

This is wrong. It is unfair to the other communities. It is unfair to the American taxpayers.

The creation as envisioned in this bill, of an independent agency much like a GAO for mitigation would be valuable to the Congress and prove a sound investment for the American taxpayers.

Specifically, the bill requires that the Board review any request for mitigation referred by any State or local public agency, the Secretary of the Army, or either Public Works Committee of the Congress. It would consider controversies over mitigation programs and encourage federal-local cost sharing. The Board would be expected to recommend solutions, and to do it expeditiously.

Too often, mitigation is undertaken with different motives, and for ineffective manner for solving a challenge, or the effect that such mitigation would have on the cost-benefit ratio of a project, its viability, or its environmental safety. While these effects may be nominal in most cases, there are times when the effect can prove substantial. It is for this reason that the bill requires the Board to relate any recommendation to its effect on costs and benefits.

The Board would consist of three members. One would be a Federal employee, selected by the President. Two would represent the public, selected for their expertise and understanding of the economic, public policy, and engineering issues raised by mitigation requests.

The Board would also have a small staff, since many issues require on-site, legal, historical, and engineering reviews as the basis for the legal and equity arguments confronting the part-time Board members.

As drafted, the language of the bill requires that the two public members be unrelated by background to the Army Corps of Engineers. Such an exclusion is necessary, I believe, for the Board to have the appearance, as well as the reality, of making an independent assessment. Any Board chock full of ex-corpsmen could be susceptible to the charge of cronyism. That would be damaging to their credibility with the public and Congress.

The question of mitigation was raised during hearings by the Committee on Public Works last year. In response to questions I posed, Brig. Gen. James L. Harper, Deputy Chief of GL Works of the corps, stated:

Our problem is that we feel charged to set in a proper manner and cannot dispense funds until we feel they are justified under the law. So we make our best evaluation, we meet with the folks and discuss this, presenting our views, but certainly we are not going to be able to resolve them in all
cases. It might well be that you could reduce, one, the direct impacts on Congress and perhaps reduce the court actions if there were some group which would arbitrate. We certainly would have no problem.

In conclusion, I would note that this bill grants no power to the Board to direct the conduct of any institution. Its role would be purely advisory. But I anticipate that the Board's recommendations will be most useful to the corps and to the Congress in weighing the equities and ramifications for the mitigation proposed.

Such a Board would relieve neither the Corps nor the Congress of their responsibilities. The Board will merely provide some expert guidance, and it will be the Congress in weighing the equities and ramifications for the mitigation proposed.

By Mr. MATHIAS (for himself and Mr. STEVENSON):

S. 2103. A bill to require financial disclosure. Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

COMPLETE FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, since my first year as a Member of the House of Representatives in 1961, I have believed that every Member of Congress and every candidate for the Congress should make a full public disclosure of his or her personal financial situation. I have introduced bills to make such disclosure mandatory, and every one of these has been defeated by the fact that each year more and more Members and Congressmen volunteer to disclose personal financial assets and liabilities.

I am especially pleased today to be joined by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Mr. STEVENSON, in submitting legislation to require full financial disclosure by Members of Congress and candidates for Congress.

In the past, leading public officials have often repeated the argument that financial disclosure can improve the credibility of the political process. While Thomas Jefferson was President he wrote, "While testifying before the committee on his bill, S. 343, Senator CAMP stated clearly the argument for full disclosure. He said:

The judgment of the people, I think, will be a real and effective sanction . . . disclosure will help people to elect whom they believe have full knowledge of the personal financial interests of those who present themselves as candidates for election.

Additional evidence of the urgency of the credibility problem can be found by examining some recent polls. In 1967 a Harris poll reported that 6 out of 10 Americans believed that shady conduct among Congressmen was fairly common. A Harris poll conducted during the same period went further to reveal that over half these citizens felt that at least some Congressmen receive money to vote a certain way.

In November of 1971 it was revealed that both President Nixon and President Johnson. The issue is whether such activities of lobbies and money from special interests of more than $22,000 annually and candidates for Congress.

An alarming number of people think that the members of Congress are working for their personal gain rather than for the public good.

Mr. President, this bill calls for no more than what I and many other members of the Senate voluntarily do every year. It provides for the disclosure of the amount of income and its sources, assets and liabilities of more than $5,000, gifts of more than $100, and income taxes paid.

We can no longer say that people are rapidly losing confidence in the ability of the Government to lead. They have already lost it. Moreover, it is now clear that this disillusionment is not limited to the young, but pervades our entire society. This loss of confidence in Congress, the representative body of the people, is the most dangerous and pressing problem facing this institution today.

I believe that for the most part this attitude of distrust is unfounded. The overwhelming majority of the American people are hard-working men and women of impeccable integrity and unfortunately these people are being stereotyped by the publicized activities of a few. The importance of rectifying the situation demands action immediately.

We are witnessing a continuing dropout, isolation, and detachment of the electorate. This isolation is a threat to the representative system because it reduces the development and participation of the people. The most difficult challenge to this Congress is to restore confidence in our Government and reverse this trend to isolation and nonparticipation.

There are many methods that can be employed to achieve this goal. We can become more candid and open in our legislative activities. We can be more responsive to our constituents.

We also have the ability to do something much more tangible to dispel the attitude of mistrust. That action would be the enactment of the bill which Senator STEVENSON and I offer today.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STEVENSON

Mr. President, this is not the first time I have introduced such legislation. It is one of many proposals which grew out of Ad Hoc
hearings conducted by Senator Mathias and myself. The reason for this was the then unusual willingness of witnesses to those hearings—ten men who had served in the Senate—expressed divergent opinions on many subjects, but on one thing they all agreed: on this one. Every witness who addressed the Committee on December 16, 1973, endorsed the issue called for early passage of full disclosure legislation. That was more than three years ago; I believe it is time to move forward. The need has not declined.

S. 2103
A bill to require financial disclosure
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:
"SEC. 225. DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEES"
"(a) Each Member of Congress, each employee of the Congress, and each candidate, shall file with the Comptroller General not later than the end of the calendar year a report containing a full and complete statement of:
"(1) the amount and source of each item of income, each item of reimbursement for any expenditure, and each gift or aggregate of gifts from one source (other than gifts received from the Member's, employee's, candidate's, or candidate's immediate family) received by the Member, employee, or candidate or by the Member, employee, or candidate and the Member's, employee's, or candidate's spouse jointly during the preceding calendar year which exceeds $100 in amount or value, including any fee or other compensation received by the Member, employee, or candidate for or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals, or the preparation of any article or other composition for publication, and the monetary value of subsistence, entertainment, travel, and other facilities received by him or her in kind;
"(2) the value of each asset held by the Member, employee, or candidate, or by the Member, employee, or candidate and the Member's, employee's, or candidate's spouse jointly, which has a value in excess of $5,000, and the amount of each liability owed by the Member, employee, or candidate, or by the Member, employee, or candidate and the Member's, employee's, or candidate's spouse jointly, which is in excess of $5,000 as of the close of the preceding calendar year;
"(3) any business transaction, including the sale, purchase, or transfer of securities of any business entity, commodity, real property or any other asset or any interest therein, by the Member, employee, or candidate, or by the Member, employee, or candidate and the Member's, employee's, or candidate's spouse jointly, or by anyone acting on the Member's, employee's, or candidate's behalf, for the benefit of the Member's, employee's, or candidate's spouse jointly, or by any person acting on the Member's, employee's, or candidate's behalf, for the benefit of the Member's, employee's, or candidate's spouse jointly, in excess of $5,000 during such year; and
"(4) the amount of local, state, and Federal income taxes, and the amount of local, state and property taxes paid by the Member, employee, or candidate and the Member's, employee's, or candidate's spouse for the most recent tax year;
"(b) Reports required by this section shall be filed not later than May 15 of each year. In the event a person ceases to hold such office or position the occupancy of which imposes upon the member the reporting requirements contained in subsection (a) shall file such report before such date. If the Member, employee, or candidate occupies such office or position, or on such later date, not more than three days after such date, as the Comptroller General may prescribe. In the case of a candidate who is not a Member of Congress, the report shall be filed not later than one month after the date on which the candidate becomes a candidate.
"(c) Reports required by this section shall be in such form and detail as the Comptroller General may prescribe. The Comptroller General may provide for the grouping of items of income, sources of income, assets, liabilities, business transactions, gifts, expenditures, or purchases and sales of real property of any individual.
"(d) Whoever willfully fails to file a report required by this section, or knowingly and willfully files a false report under this section, shall be fined $2,000, or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

"(e) All reports filed under this section shall be maintained by the Comptroller General as public records which, under such reasonable regulations as he shall prescribe, shall be available for inspection by members, employees, and candidates of the Congress, and shall be open to public inspection at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General may prescribe.

"(f) For the purposes of any report required by this section, an individual shall be considered to have been a Member of Congress, or an employee of the Congress, or an employee of the United States, during any calendar year if that person served in such position for more than six months during the calendar year.

"(g) As used in this section the term—
"(1) 'income' means income from whatever source derived;
"(2) 'security' means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (7 U.S.C. 18);
"(3) 'commodity' means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 2);
"(4) 'Member' means a Senator, a Representative, a Delegate, or a Delegation;
"(5) 'candidate' means an individual who seeks, or in any manner supports, nomination for election, or election, to the Congress or an employee of the Congress during such individual's service;
"(6) 'immediate family' means the child, parent, grandparent, or sibling of an individual, and the spouse of such persons; and
"(7) 'candidate' means an individual who seeks nomination or election as Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States. An individual shall be deemed to seek nomination for election, or election, to Federal office if he—
"(a) taken the action necessary under the law of a State to qualify himself for nomination for election, or election; or
"(b) received contributions or made expenditures, or has given his consent for any other person to receive contributions or make expenditures, with a view to bringing about his nomination for election, or election, to such office.

"(h) The table of sections for each chapter 11 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following item:
"11. Bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Hatfield, and Mr. Humphrey): S.J. Res. 105. A joint resolution to strengthen the foreign relations of the United States by requiring that not less than 70 percent of certain food assistance be provided to countries designated by the United Nations as "Most Seriously Affected." Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President. As the agricultural surpluses of the 1960's have disappeared, significant changes have taken place in the aid which the United States has given under the food for peace program, Public Law 480. Not only have overall levels of aid declined, but U.S. food aid has been allocated more and more on the basis of political expediency rather than the needs of the hungry.

In fiscal year 1974, over 66 percent of title I shipments—almost half of the commodities shipped under Public Law 480—went to Cambodia and Vietnam, mostly as thinly disguised military aid. In fiscal year 1975, the administration had planned to send up to two-thirds of Public Law 480 shipments to Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and countries such as Cuba, which it had a "special" relationship. As we know, the prevented this from happening by amending the Foreign Assistance Act to require that during fiscal year 1975, 70 percent of commodity aid be allocated to countries designated by the United Nations as "most seriously affected" by the world economic crisis.

One might have hoped that with the end of the war in Indochina, food aid would once again be allocated on large humanitarian grounds and that such allocation restrictions would no longer be needed. Unfortunately, the congressional presentation of the Agency for International Development for fiscal year 1976 contains some disturbing projections, which indicate a continued need for these restrictions.

For example, $150 million worth of the Congressional sales are projected for South Korea—double the fiscal year 1975 title I shipments to that country. This would mean that nearly 20 percent of all the resources available under title I would go to this one relatively prosperous nation. The amount programmed for Chile represents 85 percent of the title I resources allocated for Latin America and over 6 percent of all title I resources.

At the same time, projected title I shipments to countries which continue to suffer from serious hunger problems—including Bangladesh, India, Sri Lanka, and a number of African countries—are sharply reduced. It is quite possible that some of the reductions are justified by improved local conditions, but the overall trend in Public Law 480 allocations appears to be disturbing. The administration seems to be planning...
rather heavy political use of our food aid.

Before this year is out, I hope that Congress will enact legislation which thoroughly overhauls our food for peace program and insures, on a more permanent basis, that the bulk of our food aid will be used for humanitarian purposes. Several of us have introduced legislation which attempts to do just that. It is obvious, however, that legislation of this type cannot be enacted for some months yet. And in the meantime, the administration will be free to dispose of food aid as it pleases—unless we act now.

The joint resolution I am introducing today is designed as a stopgap measure to assure humanitarian use of our food aid until more permanent legislation can be enacted. It would require that 70 percent of all U.S. government-to-government food aid in fiscal year 1976 be allocated to countries designated by the United Nations as "most seriously affected." In order to provide flexibility, however, the resolution would allow the President to deviate from this guideline with the consent of the appropriate committees in Congress. It would also direct that priority in distribution be given to those for which the FAO's Early Warning System identifies as facing food shortages.

The resolution I am introducing is not a long-term solution to the problems of our food for peace program. It will, however, keep food going to those who are most in need. I hope we can act quickly to meet that need.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

At the request of Mr. Brooke, the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Ror) was added as a cosponsor of S. 408, a bill to repeal exemptions in the antitrust laws relating to fair trade laws.

S. 1216

At the request of Mr. Talmadge, the Senators from Arizona (Mr. Fannin and Mr. Goldwater) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Eagleton) were added as cosponsors of S. 1216, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

S. 1260

At the request of Mr. Chiles, the Senator from Nevada (Mr. Laxalt) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1260, a bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into multiyear leases through use of the automatic data processing fund without obligating the total anticipated payments to be made under such leases.

S. 1479

At the request of Mr. Williams, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Case) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood) were added as cosponsors of S. 1479, a bill to protect the economic rights and opportunities for the building and construction industry by providing for equal treatment of craft and industrial workers.
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S. 1532

At the request of Mr. Clarke, the Senator from Nevada (Mr. Laxalt) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1532, a bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to require reasonable and equitable conditions from packers in connection with their livestock purchasing operations, and for other purposes.

S. 1525

At the request of Mr. Hathaway, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Morale) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Clark) were added as cosponsors of S. 1525, a bill to extend and revise the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972.

S. 1592

At the request of Mr. Kennedy, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Bumpers), the Senator from California (Mr. Cranston), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Culver), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Leahy), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond) were added as cosponsors of S. 1592, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

S. 1906

At the request of Mr. church, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Case), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GORT), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Huddleston), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Humphrey), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Schuwerk), and the Senator from California (Mr. Tunney) were added as cosponsors of S. 1906, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the continued application of the nursing salary cost differential which is presently allowed in determining the reasonable cost of reimbursement to providers under the medicare program.

S. 1928

At the request of Mr. Packwood, the Senator from Nevada (Mr. Laxalt) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. STONE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1928, the Alien Employment Act, a bill to prohibit the employment of those not lawfully entitled thereto.

S. 1992

At the request of Mr. STONE, the Senator from California (Mr. Tunney) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Stevenson) were added as cosponsors of S. 1992, a bill to direct the preparation and submission of information to assist in negotiations with oil-producing countries.

S. 1992

At the request of Mr. Churchill, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Humphrey) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1992, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to revise the provisions relating to automatic cost-of-living increases in benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 2015

At the request of Mr. Eagleton, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Pearson) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2015, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to assure that certain publications of institutions of higher education continue to qualify as second-class mail.

S. 2018

At the request of Mr. Williams, the Senator from California (Mr. Cranston) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2018, a bill to strengthen State workers' compensation programs.

S. 2040

At the request of Mr. Abourezk, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Laxalt) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2040, the Judicial Salary Act of 1975.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED FOR PRINTING

NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION ACT—S. 692

AMENDMENTS NO. 685 AND 686, AND 684

(Ordred to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. Glenn submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 692) to regulate commerce to assure increased supplies of natural gas at reasonable prices for the consumer, and for other purposes.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION IMPROVEMENTS ACT—S. 644

AMENDMENT NO. 685

(Ordred to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. Church submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 644) to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act, to authorize new appropriations, and for other purposes.

AUTOMOBILE ECONOMY AND FUEL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1975—S. 1883

AMENDMENTS NO. 686 AND 687

(Ordred to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. Griffin submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1883) to conserve gasoline by directing the Secretary of Transportation to establish and enforce mandatory fuel economy performance standards for new automobiles and new light duty trucks, to establish a research and development program leading to advanced automobile prototypes, and for other purposes.

DUTY-FREE TREATMENT ON WATCHES—H.R. 7710

AMENDMENT NO. 688

(Ordred to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. Eagleton submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 7710) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide duty-free treatment to watches and watch movements manufactured in any
The Congress has done nothing about the oil tariff, which at $2 a barrel, is estimated to be costing the American consumer $6.8 billion a year in direct price increases and as much as $18 billion a year when indirect costs are added. The administration has not even wiped out the economic stimulus of this year’s $8 billion tax rebate.

Even more distressing is the lack of any evidence the tariff is reducing our imports. The Department of Commerce, in its report to Congress on December 1, 1975, are approved except as otherwise directed in the order of that Court on April 22, 1974, are approved except as otherwise provided in this Act and shall take effect on December 1, 1975. The amendments made by the President’s authority to execute it.

The Senate is working diligently to pass legislation implementing the congressional energy plan adopted in principle early this year. However, in failing to address the key question of advancing oil prices and in effect allowing the administration to proceed through executive action with its own energy program, Congress has been open to justifiable criticism.

Briefly, this amendment would rescind the existing $3 oil tariff and prohibit the President from imposing any new tariff on imported oil or oil products. The bill leaves undisturbed the President’s authority under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to limit imports in the interest of national security when such action is necessary. Any reduction in imports, however, should be consistent with efforts to end the recession and with programs to deal with resulting supply cutbacks through conservation and allocation.

I believe it is essential that Congress meet this challenge. It must do more than continue the painstaking work on the component bills of its long-range comprehensive energy program. It must, at the same time, deal with the economic chaos threatened by the administration’s conflicting energy policies.

FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE AMENDMENTS—H.R. 6799

The amendments are to be printed and will be on the table.

Mr. EAGLETON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 7728) to suspend until the close of October 31, 1975, the duty on catalysts of platinum and carbon used in producing caprolactam.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I send to the desk identical ademnmental amendments to H.R. 7710 and H.R. 7728 and ask that they lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. EAGLETON. On February 5, 1976, the House voted to the House to H.R. 114 to rescind for 90 days the President’s authority to impose a tariff on oil imports.

On February 19, 1975, the Senate passed the identical bill by a vote of 68 to 28.

On March 3, President Ford vetoed the bill.

Since then, the Congress has done nothing about the oil tariff, which at $2 a barrel, is estimated to be costing the American consumer $6.8 billion a year in direct price increases and as much as $18 billion a year when indirect costs are added. The administration has not even wiped out the economic stimulus of this year’s $8 billion tax rebate.

Even more distressing is the lack of any evidence the tariff is reducing our imports. The Department of Commerce, in its report to Congress on December 1, 1975, are approved except as otherwise directed in the order of that Court on April 22, 1974, are approved except as otherwise provided in this Act and shall take effect on December 1, 1975. The amendments made by the President’s authority to execute it.

The Senate is working diligently to pass legislation implementing the congressional energy plan adopted in principle early this year. However, in failing to address the key question of advancing oil prices and in effect allowing the administration to proceed through executive action with its own energy program, Congress has been open to justifiable criticism.

Briefly, this amendment would rescind the existing $3 oil tariff and prohibit the President from imposing any new tariff on imported oil or oil products. The bill leaves undisturbed the President’s authority under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to limit imports in the interest of national security when such action is necessary. Any reduction in imports, however, should be consistent with efforts to end the recession and with programs to deal with resulting supply cutbacks through conservation and allocation.

I believe it is essential that Congress meet this challenge. It must do more than continue the painstaking work on the component bills of its long-range comprehensive energy program. It must, at the same time, deal with the economic chaos threatened by the administration’s conflicting energy policies.
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(11) Rule 12(e) is amended to read as follows:

“(e) RULING ON A MOTION.—A motion made before trial shall be determined before trial unless the court directs that it be deferred for determination at the trial of the general issue or until after verdict, but no such determination shall affect the rights of appeal. Where factual issues are involved in the motion, the court shall state its conclusions of law and the reasons therefor, but no such determination shall be reviewed on appeal unless a request for a transcript is made therefor. If a party’s right to appeal is adversely affected, where factual issues are involved in determining a motion, the court shall state its conclusions of law and the reasons therefor, but no such determination shall be reviewed on appeal unless a request for a transcript is made therefor.

(12) Rule 12(h) is amended to read as follows:

“(h) EFFECT OF DETERMINATION.—If the grant of a motion based on a defect in the institution of the prosecution or in the indictment or information, it may also or—

(13) Rule 12(i) is amended to read as follows:

“(i) DETERMINATION—If the grant of a motion based on a defect in the institution of the prosecution or in the indictment or information. Nothing in this rule shall be deemed to affect the provisions of any Act of Congress relating to periods of limitation.

(15) Rule 15(b) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) NOTICE OF TAKING.—The party at whose instance a deposition is to be taken shall give to every person, and to the witness if a party, a written notice of the time and place for taking the deposition. The notice shall state the name and address of each person to be examined. On motion of a party upon whom the notice is served, the court for cause shown may extend or shorten the time or change the place for taking the deposition. The officer having custody of a defendant shall be notified of the time and place for the taking of the deposition. The officer shall make him available for the taking of the deposition and give him the opportunity to be present during the examination, unless after being warned by the court that disruptive conduct will cause him to be removed from the place of deposition. If the defendant waives the right to be present at the examination, conduct which is as such to justify his being excluded from that place. A defendant not in custody shall have the right to be present at the examination upon request subject to such terms as the court may fix by the court, but his failure, absent good cause shown, to appear at the examination at the time set therefor shall be deemed to render him unavailable and the defendant shall be deemed deposed. In accordance with subdivision (c) of this rule shall constitute a waiver of that right and of any objection to the taking and use of the deposition based upon that right.

(Rule 16(c) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) PAYMENT OF EXPENSES.—Whenever a deposition is taken at the instance of the government, or whenever a deposition is taken at the instance of a defendant who is unable to bear the expenses of the taking of the deposition, the court may direct that the defendant or the government or both shall pay the expenses of deposition, in any amount the court shall fix by the court, the court, but his failure, absent good cause shown, to appear at the examination at the time set therefor shall be deemed to render him unavailable and the defendant shall be deemed deposed. In accordance with subdivision (c) of this rule shall constitute a waiver of that right and of any objection to the taking and use of the deposition based upon that right.

(17) Rule 16(a)(1)(A) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) STANDARDS OF DISCLOSURE.—On request of a defendant the government shall permit the defendant to inspect and copy or photograph any records or reports of physical or mental examination, as defined in subdivision (f), and of all documents, photographs, or copies thereof, which are within the possession, custody, or control of the government, which exist at the time of the taking of the deposition, which, by the exercise of due diligence may become known, to the attorney for the government.

(20) Rule 16(a)(1)(B) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) REPORTS OF EXAMINATIONS AND TESTS.—On request of the defendant the government shall permit the defendant to inspect and copy or photograph any records or reports of physical or mental examination, as defined in subdivision (f), and of all documents, photographs, or copies thereof, which are within the possession, custody, or control of the government, which exist at the time of the taking of the deposition, which, by the exercise of due diligence may become known, to the attorney for the government.
"(1) IMPOSITION OF SENTENCE.—Sentence shall be imposed without unreasonable delay. Before imposing sentence the court shall afford counsel an opportunity to speak on behalf of the defendant and shall address the defendant personally and ask him if he wishes to exercise his right to trial by jury or to confess to and be sentenced for the crime charged. In the event of a jury trial, the court shall address the jury in its own behalf and to present any information in mitigation of punishment. The attorney for the government shall have an equivalent opportunity to speak to the court."

(27) Rule 32(c) (1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) WHEN MADE.—The probation service of the court shall make a presentence investigation and report to the court before the imposition of sentence or the granting of probation unless, with the permission of the court, the defendant waives a presentence investigation and report, or the court finds that there is in the record information sufficient to enable the meaningful exercise of sentencing discretion, and the court explains this finding on the record.

"The report shall not be submitted to the court or its contents disclosed to anyone unless the defendant has waived his right to nolo contendere or has been found guilty, except that in a felony case the report may be shown to the grand jury.

"The court may, with the written consent of the defendant or his counsel, with the condition that the report contains no information obtained upon a promise of confidentiality, or any other information which, if disclosed, might result in harm, physical or otherwise, to the defendant or other persons; and the court shall afford the defendant or his counsel an opportunity to comment thereon and, at the discretion of the court, to introduce testimony or other information relating to any alleged factual inaccuracy contained in the presentence report."

(28) Rule 32(c) (3) (A) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) Any copies of the presentence investigation report made available to the defendant or his counsel and the attorney for the government shall be returned to the probation service of the court, either before the imposition of sentence or the granting of probation, unless, in the discretion of the court, such service is excluded from the courtroom."
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probability of victory while at the same time
minimizing the consequences of defeat. General
the Army Douglas MacArthur's statement
that there is no substitute for victory should
also apply to our forces. In my many visits to Vietnam, it was always a
thrilling experience to see the fantastic mo­
rone, dedication, ingenuity and resolve of the
men up front. Of course there were isolated
instances of cowardice, of abuse of power, of
lack of resolve. They occur in everyone's daily
lives. They were not as one might judge from
the portrayal by Cronkite and Company, the
norm by a factor of 1,000 to one.

Mr. President, the nations in the hands of its President. His tools,
the final analysis, are his Armed Forces and their morale, will, and resolve. I cannot al­
say back a national policy of "let's forget the past." No one, least of all
our enemies, will do so consciously or un­
cognizably. The failures of our forces, the failures of our people at home, com­
fortable and secure because of a lack of understanding of the
political motive. The least we can do is to
sincerely. Let us admit failure or
resolve. They occur in everyone's daily
lives. They were not as one might judge from
the portrayal by Cronkite and Company, the
norm by a factor of 1,000 to one.

Mr. President, the nations in the hands of its President. His tools,
the final analysis, are his Armed Forces and their morale, will, and resolve. I cannot al­
say back a national policy of "let's forget the past." No one, least of all
our enemies, will do so consciously or un­
cognizably. The failures of our forces, the failures of our people at home, com­
rone, dedication, ingenuity and resolve of the
men up front. Of course there were isolated
instances of cowardice, of abuse of power, of
lack of resolve. They occur in everyone's daily
lives. They were not as one might judge from
the portrayal by Cronkite and Company, the
norm by a factor of 1,000 to one.

A New Crises are bound to occur.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con­
statement be
printed in the Record.

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

Sincerely, [Signature]

On behalf of the organizations which I am
representing, I would like to thank you for
the ongoing support which this committee
has shown for funding health care services, health manpower development and
health research. My name is Nathan Stark. I am Vice Chancellor of the Schools of the
Health Professions at the University of Pitts­
burg and President of the University Health
Center of Pittsburgh. In addition to my ad­
mis­

cept that care, and cutting back on research
would: (1) reduce funding for federal grant
programs, on the assumption that this sup­
port could or would be made up by state or
local governments; (2) reduce support for
health research and the training of research­
ers; (3) reduce funding for medical schools in order to concentrate funds on
improved geographic distribution of primary
care providers that could not be provided by
which could improve care, reduce costs, and
bring us closer to controlling our worst disasters.

As we see it, there are four major issues
in the proposed budget which would adver­
sely affect academic health centers, and, in
shrinking the range of essential services
power development and research. We simply
cannot separate quality health care from its
supporting components: training of health
professionals and research. Funding cuts that
undermine the excellence of our institutions
of health education and research also threat­
en the quality and availability of direct
health services to our citizens. The principle
that health care is a right of all the people
and not the privilege of the few continues to
be translated into fact. As this national pol­
cy policy leads to cuts in funding for health
manpower training and health research, it will not
necessarily reduce health care costs but will
grow dramatically.

Both as a businessman and as a citizen I have long recognized the need to control spending, and to contain rapidly escalating costs in all areas of the economy. I think I know that the entire health care com­
ment in health-related institutions.

For ten years I served as chairman of the

Sincerely yours,

P. J. CHESAREK,
General, U.S. Army, retired.
The second major effect of the proposed administration budget would be to hold down health research and the training of researchers, except in a few selected areas. The excellence of our health system in America results from a three-pronged approach: services, education, and research. To weaken any one of the three upsets the balance and hence weakens the whole. Although organizational reform of our institutions of higher education may be necessary, we must retain strong funding support for our programs of research, both basic and applied, in all areas of biomedical and health inquiry, and for the training of future research manpower. To do otherwise would be to condemn ourselves to using costly, cumbersome methods, and applied, in all areas. Infantile paralysis is a case in point. Just compare the cost of a dose of polio vaccine—which incidentally was developed at the University of Pittsburgh—versus the cost of maintaining a polio victim in an iron lung. Or consider the cost-effectiveness of our ability to prevent and to detect, such as typhoid, diphtheria, german measles and yellow fever through inexpensive immunization. In light of evidence such as this, we know that cutting funding for research and the training of research personnel is not an economy. In the long run we will spend thousands-fold more treating diseases we have not learned to prevent or control, and using outmoded methods of treatment. I declare that the proposed budget did not devote research dollars to discovering better methodologies.

The third major concern we would like to raise is how we can best allocate and accomplish our goals if existing programs are undermined by the proposed funding cutbacks.

The first of these funding proposals which I enumerated above would reduce federal support for the research grants on which the excellence of our health system in America rests. Although all government agencies are being called upon to apply these resources to health needs—indeed such a mechanism would be contrary to the principle of revenue sharing. In the absence of such a mechanism it is incorrect to assume that local governments will allocate these funds in a way to provide services such as law enforcement and housing are viewed as first priorities. A sad example of this is the recent cut in funds for the Community Mental Health/Mental Retardation Centers. With the federal funds cut back, these centers are not being supported by local community agencies being left to bear the brunt of the unemploy. Let us hope that we do not return to the high human and financial costs of long-term institutionalization of mentally handicapped individuals.

We have for many years conducted a summer preceptorship program which sends our medical students into outpatient communities to work with physicians there and learn the day-to-day life of the primary care practitioner. We have taken steps to establish links with rural health care centers, and have already been successful in several instances. We have expanded the outreach activities of our continuing education programs so that practitioners in all parts of our state will have access to the latest abreast of the latest in medical knowledge.

And we recently submitted to the legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania a proposal for a primary care initiative which would (1) revise our undergraduate curriculum to expand required and elective educational opportunities for academic health centers and expand internship and residency training programs in primary care; (2) expand and improve our continuing education program so that primary care practitioners in the most remote areas of our state would always have access to the highest standards of evaluatory medicine; and (4) develop model primary care practices in rural areas. The model rural practices would use modifications of the latest modes of health care delivery such as group practices, expanded health care teams including nurse practitioners and physicians' assistants, and guarantees of parity physician replacements so that rural practitioners can return to the university health center for periods of up to six weeks to update their knowledge and skills. These and related elements are designed to overcome the most unattractive aspects of rural practice, such as being on call 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, and being out of touch with the latest trends as they are being tested, developed and applied at the academic health centers.

I cite the details of this program to underscore the point that we cannot solve the problem of lack of primary care services by cutting funding to the health professions schools, but must, instead, increase that funding. Because it is in these schools that the needed practitioners are being trained and the new models for primary care practices are being developed.

We must also be careful not to focus on primary care to the detriment of the training of all other kinds of health professionals such as dentists, health administrators, nurses, nurse practitioners, pharmacists, technicians, etc. Must, instead, increase that support, because it is in these schools that the needed practitioners are being trained and the new models for primary care practices are being developed.

We must continue to support research that will continue to rise, and as it does, all kinds of health professionals will be needed to meet the demand. The public's level of expectation will continue to rise, and as it does, all kinds of health professionals will be needed to meet the demand. The public's level of expectation will continue to rise, and as it does, all kinds of health professionals will be needed to meet the demand.

I repeat that we cannot separate the need for health manpower development from the need for health manpower development.

The fourth major concern we would like to raise is that we are not sure what the administration's proposal to continue modest increases for programs aimed at monitoring medical care and quality assurance is. We fail to see the necessary concomitant support for training professionals to carry on these quality control programs. In our health care system, quality control programs are expected to set the standards for excellence in health care and the evaluation and quality assurance in our health care system. It is appropriate that within this setting health professionals sharpen their skills to conduct the community program of review and evaluation, and learn the highest standards against which to evaluate these programs.

These then are the four major areas in which we think the administration's proposed budget would adversely affect the academic health education and service centers. We are concerned that we cannot separate quality health care service from its supporting components: training of health professionals and research. If we cut back the funding for our institutions of health education and research we undermine the foundation on which quality health care is based.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the Yuma County Board of County Commissioners has distributed a fact sheet which describes yet another project that has incorporated solar energy. The project is a roadside telephone and radio callbox which is designed to reduce the elapsed time between occurrence of an emergency and proper response. The callbox will be continuously charged by solar panels mounted on the callbox itself.

To continue my series on the readiness of solar energy for immediate application, I wish to share this information with my colleagues. These facts again illustrate Arizona's readiness and ability to accept and utilize one of our most clean and abundant fuel sources.

I ask unanimous consent that the attached fact sheet was ordered to be printed in the Record.
FACT SHEET—YUMA HIGHWAY EMERGENCY
NOTIFICATION SYSTEM

Contact: Leslie H. Harter, Project Director, 726-0000, Yuma Regional Medical Program, 240-4040, Phoenix.

Project description: The project is a roadside telephone notification system installed along 185 miles of two major highways in southern Yuma County and is designed to reduce the elapsed time between occurrence of an emergency and proper response. An emergency notification center located in the Yuma County Sheriff's Office, will dispatch a patrol car to check the radio callbox on the highway. The callbox batteries will be continuously recharged by solar panels mounted high on the callbox post.

The radio callboxes, 18 altogether, are mounted on concrete posts, each with a microphone, speaker and a radio callbox "backbone" or relay located atop Telegraph Puss Mountain, 20 miles east of Yuma. The microwave relay provides signal and voice communication between the microphone and the central control console in the Sheriff's Office in Yuma. The console is a mini-computer, mounted in the sheriff's car, able to monitor all callboxes and also handling additional callboxes in the future. Upon receipt of a call, the console automatically provides: a visual display of the callbox identity number on the console control panel; a visual display of the status of all vital functions of the system; a tape printer record of the above information, together with the date and time of the call. Following the nature of the situation and type of help needed, all other callboxes. Savesdropping from another callbox is not possible and other callers can neither see nor hear the dispatcher upon request. In addition to the callboxes, the Yuma system will use standard telephones. The telephone operator will connect the caller with the dispatcher.

How to use the system: If an emergency is reported by radio callbox, the caller pulls a handle opening the box, removes the receiver with the microphone and talks directly to the dispatcher at the Sheriff's Office. There are no buttons or dials to confuse an excited driver. More the caller even begins talking, the Sheriff's Office already has received the location of the call and the callbox on the console display. In addition to the display information, the data is also printed on a read-out sheet and serves as a permanent record. The dispatcher determines the nature of the situation and type of help needed. All calls, including nonmedical emergencies such as fire and rescue, are reported to the response agency which sends a patrol car, tow truck, ambulance or such other vehicles as are required. If the call is using a normal pay telephone along the highway, he inserts a dime, dials "O," reports the call as an emergency and is connected to the Sheriff's Office dispatcher, from which point the procedure is similar to radio calls.

Completion date: Equipment will be installed during the first part of April with the system scheduled to be operational by mid-April.

Public Information Program: An important part of the project is a bilingual (English-Spanish) public information program to acquaint the residents of the area of the system and how to use it. Materials include brochures, posters and news media information. Highway travelers' attention is being directed by radio callboxes along the highway routes, by information displays and by the Sheriff's Office dispatcher, from which point the procedure is similar to radio calls.

MINERAL COMPLACENCY

Mr. METCalf, Mr. President, a recent news release from the U.S. Geological Survey indicates that half of our mineral resources are in the executive branch of our Government is looking ahead, for a change.

The release reminds us that the United States is dependent on foreign sources for nearly all of some minerals basic to our economy.

At the same time, many of these minerals are available to us on the seabed. We can discover and recover them under existing international law. Our industrial spokesmen tell us they can do so with due regard to other uses of the ocean space.

I sincerely hope that the report of the USGS about-minerals complacency before we get into the bind that we are with oil, and those who would get together to increase their economic and political clout at our expense.

Mr. President, I will note this press release in hearings of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials and Fuels on S. 713, the Deep Seabed Hard Minerals Act.

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

[News release from the Department of the Interior]

REPORT WARNS OF MINERALS COMPLACENCY

A sense of national urgency and public attention similar to that given to the energy situation should be directed to the mineral situation, the U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior, warns.

A new USGS report, summarizing the status of mineral resources and mineral exploration in the United States, emphasizes that the entire U.S. economy is based on minerals as well as energy, and that the Nation does not have an adequate domestic supply of all the minerals needed to maintain our society for the foreseeable future.

Underlining the economic importance of minerals, the report says that in 1972, the United States imported oil embargo, domestic raw materials valued at $32 billion were converted into energy and processed materials, the value of which ex-
ceded $1.50 billion and formed the basis of the Gross National Product of $1.1 trillion.

The report notes that although the Nation has never had all of the minerals it needed, most of the materials needed could be obtained from abroad in the past. Today, however, a decreasing percentage of our needs is met from foreign sources and minerals from overseas are increasingly costly, and in some cases, of uncertain availability. Nationalization of mineral fields, increased participation by American mining companies, cartel agreements among major producing nations, and technological factors have contributed to these difficulties.

Minerals are not a simple as it might be to mobilize within the country. The report says: "The country's military power is reflected in the overwhelming preponderance of power in its armed forces. Its defense is adequate when it possesses the power necessary to protect its vital interests, and to fulfill its foreign commitments. But a singular weakness—its inability to formulate, support and conduct a coherent foreign policy—is offset by a singular strength—its enormous flexibility. This gives a Democracy the stunning capacity to get back on the right track almost overnight, the minute people understand that the country is on the wrong track."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mrs. Luce's remarks, entitled "A Reappraisal of U.S. Foreign Policy," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A REAPPRAISAL OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

By the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce

The late Walter Lippmann, the most respected writer on Foreign Affairs that journalism has produced in this century, called U.S. Foreign Policy the "Shield of the Republic." A country that has everything it took to bring a sense of peace to the suffering world.

Mr. GOLDBERG. Mr. President, for many years now I have been deeply concerned over the decline of our military strength in a divided and uncertain world.

That this declining strength has had an enormous impact upon our ability to conduct foreign affairs and to sustain our strategic objectives in Southeast Asia is abundantly evident.

Recently, Mr. President, I received an address by the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce, a former Member of Congress and U.S. Ambassador to Italy, on the question of U.S. foreign policy as it stands today. Mrs. Luce, one of the most respected and knowledgeable experts on foreign policy, said this country has ever produced, spoke to the Association of the U.S. Army in Honolulu, Hawaii, on June 18. The main thrust of her address was that a declining military power means that the United States of America has an opportunity to bring a century of peace to the suffering world.

As she pointed out, America, through the accident of war, and generated an overwhelming preponderance of power in 4 short years.

Mrs. Luce declared:

In that extraordinary and unexpected hour of our elevation to the pinnacle of world power—nationalized, but maintained at one exception—the U.S.S.R.—looked to America for political guidance and economic aid. The Philippines was considered a bridge and the country had everything it took to bring a century of peace to the suffering world.

That is, until the one thing necessary—a firm grasp on the basic principles of a solvent foreign policy, that is, that a balance between power and commitments must be maintained.

Mrs. Luce says that America's declining military power is reflected in almost all of our foreign affairs, ranging from the dismal defeat of U.S. arms and aims in Vietnam to the disarray in the NATO alliance and approaching Communist political victories in Portugal and Italy.

Despite the stark picture painted by the former Ambassador to Italy she urged her audience not to be downcast.

She added:

Democracy, is, as Churchill once said the worst form of government in the world—except for all the others. The Nation has produced in this century, called U.S. Foreign Policy, the "Shield of the Republic." A country that has everything it took to bring a sense of peace to the suffering world.
and increasing prosperity. And if such a nation was really a general nation, the one that is in the happy position to help weaker and poorer nations to travel that road with it. It is the super-power, the only super-power, the affluent, which has forgotten or ignored the relationship of power to peace and prosperity has ever enjoyed these blessings for more than a century.

For nowhere else on earth, and never before in all history, has any people been able to"..."
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With the awakened resolve of the American people, and the courage and splendid example of our country will celebrate its tri-centennial in peace and prosperity.

PROPOSED ARMS SALE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Foreign Military Sales Act requires that Congress receive advance notification of proposed arms sales under that act in excess of $25 million. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be prohibited by means of a concurrent resolution. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sale shall be sent to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with my intention to see that such information is immediately available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the notification I have just received. A portion of the notification, which is classified information, has been deleted for this publication, but is available to Senators in the Foreign Relations Committee, report 118-416 in the Capitol.

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

Hon. John J. Sparkman,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. Chairman: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b) of the Foreign Military Sales Act, as amended, we are forwarding under separate cover Transmittal No. 75-33, concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter of Offer to Iran for services and technical assistance to Improved Hawk air defense batteries estimated to be in excess of $25 million.

Sincerely,

H. M. Fisk,
Lieutenant General, USAF,
Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, Washington, D.C.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 75-33

(Notice of proposed issuance of letter of offer pursuant to section 36(b) of the Foreign Military Sales Act, as amended.)

a. Prospective Purchaser: Iran
b. Total Estimated Value: (Deleted)
c. Description of Articles or Services Offered: Services of contractor (Raytheon Co.) personnel to provide technical assistance in the operation and maintenance of deployed Improved Hawk air defense batteries.
d. Military Department: Army
e. Date Report Delivered to Congress:

THE CIA INQUIRY

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, when the investigation of the Central Intelligence Agency began it was with the very legitimate objective of determining whether the CIA had exceeded its charter in its activities within the United States. The commission headed by Vice President Rockefeller carried out an investigation and issued a report citing some excesses and misdeeds by the CIA.

It appears now that concern over CIA activity has become an obsession, and the situation could be very detrimental for the future of America.

On July 3, 1975, the Douglas Daily Dispatch ran an editorial which I believe put the current mania into perspective.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Record.

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

CIA INQUIRY

Whatever the Central Intelligence Agency may do in the five to ten years ago or earlier, many Americans have the feeling that an inordinate amount of time is being devoted to the past and not enough to the very urgent questions of the present. Most people have been fully aware that as Iran espionage methodologies. We have all along that some CIA espionage methods can be the man of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The provision stipulates that such information is immediately available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have an acceptable solution to the problem. The Commission also surveys the analytic resources available to support the operation and maintenance of deployed Improved Hawk air defense batteries estimated to be in excess of $25 million. Sincerely,

H. M. Fisk,
Lieutenant General, USAF,
Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, Secretary (USA), Security Assistance.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 75-33

(Notice of proposed issuance of letter of offer pursuant to section 36(b) of the Foreign Military Sales Act, as amended.)
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c. Description of Articles or Services Offered: Services of contractor (Raytheon Co.) personnel to provide technical assistance in the operation and maintenance of deployed Improved Hawk air defense batteries.
d. Military Department: Army
e. Date Report Delivered to Congress:
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States would save almost twice as much money in 1 day through the delivery of Alaska oil as the whole Alaska territory cost 108 years ago.

That statement by an Exxon Corp. official adds up to strong words of praise for Senator Wadsworth, the bill's sponsor. Exxon engineers the $7.2 million real estate deal with the oil-rich territory.

At the time, Sarah's critics dubbed the land buy "Seward's folly" and Alaska itself "Seward's Ice Box."

Yet, only 48 years from now—based on today's oil prices—the U.S. stands to benefit from Seward's financial astuteness to the tune of $1 billion a day.

That's when the petroleum-rich fields Alaskan's frozen North Slope at Prudhoe Bay start gushing 1.2 million barrels of black gold each day into the storage tanks at the ice-free port of Valdez, where it will be transferred to American oil tankers.

"At the present price of $1 a barrel for the foreign oil, that'll be $13.2 million a day that won't be leaving the country for foreign oil purchases," observed Hug Jencks of Exxon's public affairs department.

The Alaskan North Slope alone is a reservoir of 9.6 billion barrels of precious fluid.

Ultimately, those fields every 24 hours will produce 2 million barrels of the vital fuel—12 percent of U.S. yearly needs.

But that's a mere drop in the bucket when you consider the total amount of oil under the frozen tundra and icy offshore waters of America's 49th state—a whopping 85 billion barrels.

And that's not all.

The T.B. Simmons' Mine is quick to point out that in addition to oil Alaska holds approximately 40 million tons of coal and more than 46 billion cubic feet of natural gas.

So "Seward's Ice Box" continues to pay off for this country.

First, it was with gold, lumber and fish. Now it's with energy.

But Seward's bargain—base deal with Czar Alexander II of Russia for $7.2 million.

Secretary Seward's deal was one of the most important and far-reaching in our Nation's history.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this spring the National Enquirer published an article by Mr. Bernard D. A. Scott concerning the decision by then Secretary of State William H. Seward to purchase the Alaska territory from Czar Alexander II of Russia for $7.2 million.

Secretary Seward's decision was one of the most important and far-reaching in our Nation's history.

Mr. Scott's article points out that based on the present price of oil the United States stands to benefit from Secretary Seward's decision at an average of $13.2 million a day when the trans-Alaska pipeline is completed. This is $13.2 million that will stay in the United States and not find its way to the coffers of the Arab oil-producing countries.

Mr. Scott points out that the United States was one of the many reasons he emulated Indira Gandhi.

Mrs. Gandhi, who represents what she has often told us is the world's purest democracy, has not been willing to take her chances with the system. The loss of her seat in parliament, the gloating of her enemies, have sent her back to the British Raj or India's early emperors for her inspiration—and of her admiration for her institutions.

One does not like to make comparisons, of course. As the Washington Post said, "but when one sees the responses of other leaders to situations they don't like, one appreciates even more what has happened here."

One of the delicate references was to the extraordinary conduct of India's prime minister, Indira Gandhi, who, faced with the loss of her great power, set about rounding up her critics and clapping them into jail.

She has sent Washington's mind racing back to a comparable crisis of a year ago. Ortona was particularly grieved at his imper­\clement because two Italo-Americans, John Sirica and Peter Rodino, had been in the forefront of the dramatization of the senator's speeches rang with the proud claim that two sons of Italy held America's constitutional rights in their hands.
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filling the obligations of common, ordinary citizenship he had resisted so long. For the first time, he was giving testimony on Watergate.

Mrs. Gandhi’s precipitating troubles were on no scale comparable to his. She was brought to court this year wayward of the use of several government employees in her campaign—that they would have been laughed out of court in this country. It is her reaction that is shocking. She is like someone who is stopped for speeding and slams on the brakes.

Mrs. Gandhi, the haughty Brahmin, and Richard Nixon, the bourgeois politician, have caused each other no end of grief. It must go that she told him about it, that she has occasioned the first stirrings of rehabilitation for him. The revelations about his “tilt” toward Pakistan during the 1971 Bangladesh war provided him with the most embarrassing foreign policy episode of his first term.

A few things up only reinforced the mutual antipathy. Nixon was so put off at her presence that he could hardly founder through the greeting. He made a withering reference to “Indian summer” and offered sympathy for India’s floods. She in her turn, her black eyes blazing, glared at him with the haughty Brahmin, and reminded him that her country’s troubles were “man-made.”

The tenure of Daniel P. Moynihan as ambassador to India wasclouded by Mrs. Gandhi’s dark suspicions that Richard Nixon did not mean government to his “allies” and plotted its overthrow. She taxed Moynihan about CIA involvement in the downfall of the Marxist government of Chile. Moynihan said that his government was not involved, there was none. Weeks later, he was undone by contrary disclosures.

The thing is that if the CIA were involved in her present catastrophe—and for once had got it all together—it could not have done half the job of discrediting Mrs. Gandhi that she has done on herself.

She who gave moral precepts to the world about freedom and independence has imposed as harsh censorship on the press. It is not only all inclusive, it is retroactive. Lewis Simon of the Washington Post was expelled for a dispatch written before censorship was invoked.

Here is Mrs. Gandhi on the subject of freedom of the press, in New Delhi in 1973:

"When whatever is hindering the freedom to gather and to publish news and express views. This freedom is an essential requisite in any free society. It is the sighted to armed rebellion to a call for independence. Now, they had cast their yoke of dependence, Americans free to be free and independent. Oh, yes, they risked their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor but they left us a heritage."

Out of the next fourteen years of struggle, frustration and suffering came the Constitution, the greatest document on government ever struck off at a given time by the hands of man. As someone has put it, “It was not a set of laws. It was a moral heritage.” A moral heritage is the best of all laws which govern the people. The belief that man should be free arises from our spiritual idea that each individual human being possesses his own soul and is entitled to his own dignity, under the laws of nature and nature’s God. This is the heritage that we are dedicated to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

There are times in the history of persons and people when a rediscovery of yesterday opens a new pathway to tomorrow; when the awakening of a sense of heritage becomes a powerful factor in deterring a great destiny. There has never been a time in the history of our Republic when we need to awaken a sense of heritage than the day in which we live. We are fast selling our birthright of freedom and liberty for a mess of pottage. Either the leadership of our country is unworthy of our heritage or the people who think they owe nothing to the past. They think that what they have and are is theirs because of their own abilities. Nothing could be further from the truth. Everything we have—every concept of novelty and progress of mankind has been given to us as an inheritance out of the past.

Ours is a sacred heritage because it was won at the blood and tears of those who have lived before us. Our fathers were men fired by a world-wide purpose which came from the very heart of God. Guided and sustained by this purpose they took possession of this land for us, and left us as the stewards of their principles in the nation. No President, Congress or Court has a right to take from us these principles, or this reliance upon God.

This obligation groups the most part men who saw the opportunity and seized the chance to build for themselves the kind of life in which they could live by right, should live. It might be said that they were seeking security—the only kind of security they could find that must be won by work, courage, daring and faith in God. It never occurred to them to think about it, but it was a faith that would shut out every hazard of life from the cradle to the grave. To them that would have been a prison and an insufferable retribution upon their rights as individuals. They were not the type to surrender their individual rights in exchange for the pottage of a state of social and political connection among those who came from many different walks of life. They came to build a nation in which men of all religions, creeds and nationalities could live in peace and harmony and work together for the common good. Faith in fundamental human rights and in the dignity and value of the human person is a heritage they passed on to us.

Their’s was a passionate belief in human freedom. They believed in political freedom—the right of every American to think his own thoughts and to speak them; to formulate his own opinions on them; to use every avenue of human knowledge wherever it might lead. They made it crystal clear that the freedom of the greatest of all human rights—and all other rights and privileges of man, it carries with it grave responsibilities and obligations. Furthermore, among these is the privilege to use our freedom for the good of our fellow man. No freedom we have given us the right to destroy the freedom of others. The only peoples in the world today giving trouble are those who seek to destroy the freedom of others.

Let me say right here that the greatest contribution the celebration of this bicentennial makes is to make them recognize their responsibilities as citizens.

America is in danger today, not so much from conflicting ideologies without as it is from within. We have just lost our first war—not because of the superiority of the enemy but because of the vacillating indecisiveness and political bickerings of those who make up our government.

Even though Communism may be a threat to the American way of life, it is becoming more and more evident that our greatest danger lies not only in the political muscle of Moscow. It lies in the failure of our leadership and of our citizens to recognize our heritage and their responsibilities. One
danger confronting our country today is that of a government by a manipulated minority. The same danger to democracy and human rights prevails when the minority deprives its rights to the people it governs. The majority deprives the minority of those same rights. The Declaration of Independence is not only a document of American heritage, it will live on as a warning to all the world. In it are the principles that have made America unique among the nations of the world.

Another danger confronting our country is our failure to teach our youth of recent generations aware of our heritage. Believing in Aristotle's theory that "all who have mediated on the art of governing mankind have been convinced that the fate of empires depends on the education of youth," the early settlers set forth to establish public schools. With the Holy Bible as their chief text book, the generations that followed brought forth a new and noble individual, the American. This because the children in those schools were taught the value of self-discipline; they were taught where and why they came, and why they were here; they were taught their family lore and the accomplishments of the people. This brought a love of country, things are different. No longer is the child being adjusted to the spiritual heritage of our people, our Nation.

It is no question but that we have a heritage of education that realized people must be educated if they are to successfully govern themselves. To preserve this heritage we must increase our efforts to restore the teaching of patriotism, the teaching of moral and spiritual values which brought our Nation to the peak of its greatness. During the celebration of this bicentennial we must be brought to realize that the most significant part of our heritage as Americans is our spiritual heritage, our religious heritage. We have little appreciated the glorious legacy of spiritual attainment, which under God, bequeathed us freedom. Can that be the heritage we have, in recent times, by means of our own devising, all but precluded the supernal glories of Him whose creative and sustaining power we have tried to build a stigma of hatred. No longer is the child being adjusted to the spiritual heritage of our people, our Nation.

AMENDING THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT TO ENCOURAGE SOLAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MCDONALD. The amendments to the Small Business Act to encourage solar energy development, S. 2087, should provide a needed impetus to develop the solar equipment that is commercially available today. Under the provisions of the bill, homeowners in my State of New Hampshire, where heating costs are now running over $1,000 per year for the average home of 2,000 square feet, will be able to install solar home heating equipment that could cut their costs by half. This is possible: In one specially designed home that was recently constructed in Bedford, N.H., just outside Manchester, the cost of heat was cut to virtually nothing by the installation of solar home heating equipment. In other areas of my State, I am told that solar home heating equipment, with a small back-up for those nights when the sun does not shine, would mean major savings, not only for consumers, but in oil imports as well.

Since this legislation would provide $900 million in loan granting authority to the Small Business Administration, the failure of Congress which has raised the price of oil. For the period from September 1 through September 30, the Senate and House both voted to increase the price at its present exorbitant level, which is 500 per cent higher than it was on October 1, 1973, hardly 18 months ago. We are being charged more than twice the cost of the oil we burn. We have not been given a price increase that is commensurate with the substantial further price rise in the range of $2 to $4 per barrel which can be expected in late September of this year. What is at issue is thus a political power play by the OPEC cartel led by Iran and Saudi Arabia. An increase in the gasoline tax does not have the slightest effect on the projected September OPEC price increase.

OIL AND CONFRONTATION

By Frank Church

The national energy debate has missed the mark. It has ignored the fact that Congress has failed to conduct proper public interest control over domestic energy. This bill will provide a quick way for them to develop their manufacturing capability.

OIL AND CONFRONTATION

Mr. GARY W. HART. Mr. President, in the Sunday, July 13, issue of the Washington Post, my very able colleague, the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), set out a persuasive and reasonable approach to Middle East oil politics.

In an article entitled "Oil and Confrontation," Senator Church argues for a U.S. stand which would effectively eliminate the nagging threat of oil embargo blackmail.

It is not, my respected colleague rightly states, the failure of Congress which has led to high prices. It is the failure of the administration to use the bargaining levers on oil producing nations available to it and its failure to exercise proper public interest control over domestic energy. As candid, giant international oil companies.

Mr. President, I urge my Senate colleagues and the American people to carefully consider the wise suggestions contained in this excellent article.

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

OIL AND CONFRONTATION

(By Frank Church)

The national energy debate has missed the mark. It has ignored the fact that Congress has failed to conduct proper public interest control over domestic energy. This bill will provide a quick way for them to develop their manufacturing capability.
TRIBUTE TO A. J. FLETCHER AND NATIONAL OPERA COMPANY

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, this year marks the 25th anniversary of a remarkable project launched in September 1950 by a remarkable citizen of my State.

The project is the National Opera Company, which has taken opera—in English to far more than a million schoolchildren, who, for the most part, would never have been able to attend a single opera performance. The citizen is Mr. A. J. Fletcher, who has funded the National Opera Company out of his own pocket from the very beginning, simply because he wanted to encourage the talents of schoolchildren, and thereby promote an interest in good music.

Mr. Fletcher is a man of many careers. He has been a successful attorney and business executive. But his greatest interest now largely devoted to the operation of WRAL-TV in Raleigh, which is recognized as one of the leading television stations in the country. Mr. Fletcher is chief executive officer of Capitol Broadcasting, WRAL-TV, WRAL Radio, the North Carolina Network, and the Woody Hayes Background Music Co.

It was Mr. A. J. Fletcher’s dedication to excellence that was largely responsible for the success of WRAL-TV’s success in public service. The same is true in the instance of the National Opera Company.

Mr. President, a few weeks ago, the distinguished author, commentator, and cultural historian, Jeffrey H. Levy, wrote one of his syndicated newspaper columns to Mr. Fletcher and the National Opera Company. Mr. St. John is associated with Copley News Service.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the column by Mr. St. John, entitled “Is the South a Cultural Sahara?” be printed in the Record, as follows:

Is the South a Cultural Sahara?

(By Jeffrey St. John)

RALEIGH, N.C.—“For all of its size and all of its political power,” wrote the late H. L. Mencken in the 1920’s of the American South, “it is almost as sterile artistically, intellectually, culturally as the Sahara Desert.”

The form of protest the South was unleashed when the above, contained in an essay titled, “The Sahara of the Bozart,” was published.

Most Americans under forty don’t remember Mencken; although among today’s college students he is revered almost as the model of the roving, quirky, aggressively independent and opinionated culture critic. He was the last of his kind. But still widely held belief that South of England is Mr. A. J. Fletcher is erect, clear-eyed and as cultured a southern gentleman as you will ever want to meet at the Sigma Chi不失 Radcliffe, he had the idea that the South, cultural and intellectual wasteland persists as a myth. The South, to the non-southerner, is either an amusing mystery or a world populated by “Rednecks” who, for recreation, drink home-made whiskey, chew tobacco and Lynch blacks.

A. J. Fletcher is erect, clear-eyed and as cultured a southern gentleman as you will ever want to meet at the Sigma Chi不死 Radcliffe, he had the idea that the South, cultural and intellectual wasteland persists as a myth. The South, to the non-southerner, is either an amusing mystery or a world populated by “Rednecks” who, for recreation, drink home-made whiskey, chew tobacco and Lynch blacks.

A. J. Fletcher is erect, clear-eyed and as cultured a southern gentleman as you will ever want to meet at the Sigma Chi不死 Radcliffe, he had the idea that the South, cultural and intellectual wasteland persists as a myth. The South, to the non-southerner, is either an amusing mystery or a world populated by “Rednecks” who, for recreation, drink home-made whiskey, chew tobacco and Lynch blacks.

A. J. Fletcher is erect, clear-eyed and as cultured a southern gentleman as you will ever want to meet at the Sigma Chi不死 Radcliffe, he had the idea that the South, cultural and intellectual wasteland persists as a myth. The South, to the non-southerner, is either an amusing mystery or a world populated by “Rednecks” who, for recreation, drink home-made whiskey, chew tobacco and Lynch blacks.
acey are a cultural Sahara that Mencken deemed. Then in clear and lucid language, with a soft violet southern voice, the story of the National Opera Company he founded and finances privately here in Raleigh unfurls.

Mr. Fletcher, who grew up in this state's mountainous Ashe County, was taken by the operas early. It was his belief that Americans in general and Southerners in particular found opera a big bore. Who could understand it, he marveled, not usually sung in Italian, French, and other foreign tongues? So A.J., at 61 years old, decided to remedy the problem. His A.J., is that there was little or no opera in English in the United States when we started the movement back in 1946. Up to that time opera was pronounced words which they but dimly understood, and bored audiences were going through the motion of applauding a performance, a message which was only dimly perceived.

This September the National Opera Company will open its 22nd season, launched to bring opera to school children. With this record of achievement it is not surprising that A.J. Fletcher looks back with pride. Fletcher, who grew up in this state as a soft velvet southern voice, the story or message which was only dimly perceived.

Pre was probably the all-time Oregon track favorite in crowd appeal. Oregon has always been called the most knowledgeable in the country by athletes from across the nation who have competed there. These fans cheer not merely a local winner, or even all winners, but they have cheered on a third- or fourth-place finisher who they realized was making an extraordinary effort toward a personal best effort. The individual competition against the clock, or the tape, or the track itself was as much as any interest in local favorites.

As a track fan, I have helped officiate at various meets in Eugene, and I know the unique spirit that fills the University of Oregon track stadium, Hayward Field. The last time that I helped officiate in Eugene was during the 1972 Olympic trials, and the atmosphere was alive with emotions, not only from the athletes themselves, as one might expect, but from the supercharged track audience.

Pre was the favorite of this knowledgeable track crowd in a way few athletes could ever understand. Pre was the type of athlete that the track crowd was able to relate to. The athlete that the track crowd was able to relate to. The athlete that the track crowd was able to relate to. The athlete that the track crowd was able to relate to. The athlete that the track crowd was able to relate to. The athlete that the track crowd was able to relate to. The athlete that the track crowd was able to relate to. The athlete that the track crowd was able to relate to.
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As a track fan, I have helped officiate at various meets in Eugene, and I know the unique spirit that fills the University of Oregon track stadium, Hayward Field. The last time that I helped officiate in Eugene was during the 1972 Olympic trials, and the atmosphere was alive with emotions, not only from the athletes themselves, as one might expect, but from the supercharged track audience.
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Pre never was the type of athlete that the Amateur Athletic Union, or the Olympic fathers, or even the NCAA brass wanted to parade around as an All-American athlete. Pre had little interest in pretensions of any kind, and pretensions that affected his support he tolerated not at all. Because Oregon fans are so knowledgeable, they had known long before Pre that track athletes were not always treated as well as they should be. Oregon track fans knew that the brass of the various squabbling factions over track rights cared more for their own bureaucrats and petty concerns than they did about the rights and benefits of the athletes.

As a result, Pre's willingness to stand up for what he believed in and to ignore
the pettiness of the track hierarchy did not cause any loss of his popularity in Oregon. It increased it. Pre represented everyone who wanted to stand up against pettiness, but perhaps did not. Pre was each of us fighting against a bureaucracy, being only about its own preservation. Pre stood high in life without being hypocritical. His deeds mirrored his words. What more could anyone ask.

A second reason Pre was so loved in Oregon is that everyone knew he had turned down one of the largest, if not the largest, offers to compete in professional track. His answer, as pointed out in one article following his death, was this: "Only Eugene Oregon, for "his people." And they were his people.

Pre was an iconoclast, an individual, one of a kind. His willingness to go against the grain, to swim against the current, to stand up for what he believed in, set him apart from the crowd. Perhaps people saw in him a spirit they felt they had within themselves. In a State such as ours still proud of our strong traditions of individualism, he stood as a true native son.

The shock everyone felt when Pre was killed reflects more than just the loss of an outstanding athlete. It also respects the loss of someone who fought and retained, his individuality. We will not see another Steve Prefontaine. Someone eventually will break his records, but they will be hard pressed to match his spirit.

A poem comments perhaps better than anyone could about the untimely death of Steve Prefontaine. I ask unanimous consent that the text of A. E. Housman’s "To an Athlete Dying Young" might appear at this point in the Record.

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

TO AN ATHLETE DYING YOUNG

(From A. E. Housman)

The time you won your town the race
We chaired you through the market-place;
There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A FINAL DRIVE TO THE FINISH

(By Kenny Moore)

(Hours after winning yet another race with a surging kick, distance runner Steve Prefontaine was killed in a car crash. The author, a fellow Olympian, looks back at track’s angry man.)

Steve Prefontaine tried to sleep on the plane from Mexico to Oregon. He had missed the medal ceremony, and he was getting ready to make his first couple of weeks ago, squirming in his seat, closing the window shade with a snap, cracking his knuckles, and pulling at his hair. An apparent try at dashing a hollow there.

He closed his eyes for perhaps 30 seconds and then he was squirming again. He had not been feeling well since he decided to stay in Modesto the night before, although he had won in 8:56:

"I went through the mile in 4:13," he said, "and then I just didn’t seem to want to run very hard any more. I was lethargic. I still am. I feel like quitting training. Maybe I want to devote my energies to something positive, something I can see bearing fruit."

Prefontaine seldom spoke of his motives, and when he did he always included that "maybe"—as if, he, like the rest of us, could only observe himself and wonder at this strangely engaging, obstreperous, fidgety creature.

"I talked with a lot of other athletes at Modesto about the A.U. ’s damn moratorium rule," he said. A few days before, the A.U. had announced a policy for forcing the country’s best athletes to compete in international meets against the Soviet Union, against Poland and Czecho-slovakia, against West Germany and Africa. An athlete who declines to run on the national team or who did not run in the national A.U. meet would be suspended for one year if he or she completed any international distance running during certain moratorium periods before the A.U. championships and the international meets.

"In July there are only about 10 days when the moratorium is not in effect," said Prefontaine. "That screws up my whole competitive schedule."

More to touch on his celebrated fulminations on the subject than for any enlightenment, I asked him blandly what was wrong with competing on the national team against the Russians and others. He looked at me as if I were a traitor to my class.

"There are a few that I can’t seem to put up with," he said, coldly. "Emilio Puttemans is Belgian. Brendan Foster is English. Rod Dixon is a Kiwi. Knut and Arne Kvalheim are Norwegian. Lasle Viren is from Finland. Does the A.U. have any of them on their wonderful tele­

"I hate running against the Poles and Czecho-slovakia. It’s like running against high school kids. And I hate all these gung-ho, run-for-the-red-white-and-blue-outrages. It’s that important to some people, fine, more power to ‘em. But, damn it, I wish they’d leave me alone to do what I want to do—run against the best."

As he spoke, frustration rose in him. He seemed to think, when he rationalized a month-long visit to the Northwest by eight Poles, and then had experienced a series of withering defeats by athletes. The crowning blow had been a telegram from Finland saying Viren, the Olympic 5,000- and 10,000-meter champion, would race Prefontaine in Eugene, was injured and would not come. "I’m not so competitive as before," Prefontaine said. "It’s wearing me down, thinking that. Maybe the negativity stems from not being able to count on big races. One disappeared with them."

With the A.U. rule others aren’t likely.

In the week leading up to the meet last Thursday in Eugene, no Prefontaine would go against. Frank Shorter at 5,000 meters, I happened to talk with several men who knew Prefontaine well. Anderson, an Olympian and the 1976 Boston Marathon champion, said, "He’s not like other distance runners. He’s not quiet, not introspective. He can’t relax. A 15-mile run in the woods makes him feel like mellow and satisfied. All it does for Pre is make him mad. Most distance runners who was usually given, because hosts of the national team, that they were his people."

Prefontaine never recovered.

Anderson felt Prefontaine could not be understood without reference to the demanding, elemental life of Coos Bay, Ore., the town where he grew up. There are codes there governing social acceptance among the stevedores and lumberjacks; there is the need for comfort in that kind of personal experience. Pre’s kind of running is always hard and strange and much like to be able to go out to dinner once in a while. I like to be able to drive my MG
up the McKenzie River on a weekday afternoon. I like to be able to pay my bills on time. The river is more picturesque than droll, he relished low tavern life ("Envision a satyr," said Shorter). He delighted in the runnings of the recreative establishment in Coos Bay establishments. "I know places you better speak low if you find yourself in there," he advisedly, "Men will come across the room and cold-deck you if you hold your glass wrong."

Two years before he died, Prefontaine ran a brief workout under the eye of Oregon Track Coach Bill Dellinger, himself a former national and bronze medalist in the Tokyo 5,000 meters. While he held a watch during Prefontaine's 330-yard interval runs Dellinger said, "That man has something no runner in my time has."

We used to warm up out of sight behind the bleachers. "How do you have a gaurd?" I asked. "Is there someone you would go to if you found yourself in a situation like this?" Dellinger asked. "You don't have anybody like that," he snapped, and he was jogging off, shaking out his arms.

I told him that sounding down off how strong he was was a mistake," said Bill Bowerman, the coach whose La Salle and later his Olympic coach. "He runs an American-record 2,000 meters in Coos Bay. Viren cables that he's hurt. By the way, said Prefontaine would drive him home to Eugene and later his Olympic coach. "At eight o'clock, the day was still, a satyr," said Shorter). He thrives on life."

"Before the race Prefontaine broke in. "Where is the talent that I competed with when I started in 1969?" he cried, seling on the first injustice that came to mind. "The shortage is of guys who are out of school and can still figure ways to train and find competition. I'm 24 years old and Frank is 27, and we're Returners. That's the shame. That's what's wrong with the American system."

"If you want to express the deep sorrow that everyone in Oregon felt when they heard Pre had been killed. Track fans across the Nation may mourn the athlete; we mourn the man. I also know that Pre would have disliked the attention his death has caused."

"As I mentioned at the beginning of these remarks, several publications did mention that Prefontaine's parents and his high school coach were there. As the beer flowed and sand­bags were describing the life, the records, and the spirit of one of America's great track athletes."

"So let's go over that tomorrow, when our source of observation of ritual, something that had to be done. We could not have run a step anywhere that Prefontaine had not run. As I have seen Prefontaine crouched behind a tripod and movie camera, waving at a tired runner to sprint toward him out of the cottenwoods, yelling, "Do I have to do everything myself?"

"We avoided the road of the accident, coming up the hill to my house another way, because the police had a sort of observation of ritual, something that had to be done. We could not have run a step anywhere that Prefontaine had not run. As I have seen Prefontaine crouched behind a tripod and movie camera, waving at a tired runner to sprint toward him out of the cottenwoods, yelling, "Do I have to do everything myself?"

"Frank Shorter, who was staying at the hotel, had been called by Prefontaine and had as­sembled his American record—to be done. We could not have run a step anywhere that Prefontaine had not run. As I have seen Prefontaine crouched behind a tripod and movie camera, waving at a tired runner to sprint toward him out of the cottenwoods, yelling, "Do I have to do everything myself?"

"Frank Shorter, who was staying at the hotel, had been called by Prefontaine and had assembled his American record—to be done. We could not have run a step anywhere that Prefontaine had not run. As I have seen Prefontaine crouched behind a tripod and movie camera, waving at a tired runner to sprint toward him out of the cottenwoods, yelling, "Do I have to do everything myself?"

"Frank Shorter, who was staying at the hotel, had been called by Prefontaine and had assembled his American record—to be done. We could not have run a step anywhere that Prefontaine had not run. As I have seen Prefontaine crouched behind a tripod and movie camera, waving at a tired runner to sprint toward him out of the cottenwoods, yelling, "Do I have to do everything myself?"
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spokesman with victories. He grew up in the logging town of Coos Bay, Oregon, where as in similar towns along the coast and waterways of the Pacific Northwest, hard work and the spirit of adventure were hallmarks. One had to prove himself, and Steve Prefontaine proved himself in sport.

His exploits are legendary: a national high school record of 4:04 for 1,500 meters, 3:54 for 3,000 meters, and 8:14.4 for 5,000 meters; an NCAA champion in the 3-mile championship and three cross-country titles; and the American champion in the 5,000-meter race in the 1972 Olympic Games in Munich, and to defeat—soundly thrash as he would have put it—every other great distance runner in the world along the way, had another goal in mind. In the words of his first track coach at the University of Oregon: "Steve Prefontaine, America's greatest distance runner, is dead."

Prefontaine died before he was able to realize that goal, but we can help. In the last session of Congress the Senate passed legislation designed to modernize the archaic amateur system and to end the feud that was hurting those—the American athletes who compete and live within the most narrow, selfish athletic system. While other athletes in other nations are able to compete, to reach their fullest potential, the American amateur athlete is relegated to a world of poverty. Once out of college there is no source of assistance, or encouragement. He is never able to realize his or her aspirations. As a result, the American athlete is rapidly losing the chance to be the best.

One result of this legislation, was the creation of the President's Commission on track and field, to study the state of amateur sport in America and that recommended changes; unfortunately, the President has not yet signed it into law. Today, the United States is blessed with thousands of gifted, dedicated amateur athletes and its leaders and live within a most narrow, selfish athletic system. While other athletes in other nations are able to compete, to reach their fullest potential, the American amateur athlete is relegated to a world of poverty. Once out of college there is no source of assistance, or encouragement. He is never able to realize his or her aspirations. As a result, the American athlete is rapidly losing the chance to be the best.
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"He said, 'God, it was slow . . . I felt terrible, you should have beaten me.' And I said that wasn't particularly slow ... I would have run faster but I'd just come down from altitude."

'That's a little game we played,' Shorter said. 'I'd always say how out of shape he was and all this nonsense."

Slightly more than four hours later, Shorter and Pre talked more about track—about Pre, a University of Oregon Problems surrounding the forthcoming national AAAU meet.

They were sitting in Pre's MG, parked outside Ken and Bobbie Moore's house on Prospect Drive, located atop the Judkins Point hill in east Eugene. Shorter was staying with the Moore's, and Pre had driven him home from a going-away party for the Finnish athletes Pre had brought to Oregon. Some athletes had been talking about "sandbagging" the AAAU meet because of complaints over the handling of overseas competition. But Pre and Shorter decided there, sitting in the open-topped sports car, they wouldn't follow that tactic.

"When it comes to deciding we would run as hard as we could in the race," Shorter recalled, "we have to get the AAAU to be more flexible, but we want to do it legally rather than reputationally.

"They didn't believe that "sandbagging" the AAAU meet—running poorly or competing in events of lowest interest in the best events. It's kind of like an edge to the right approach to use in getting changes made.

"If you go in as a suppliant somehow, you want to go in looking as good as you can rather than shlocky," said Shorter, who has just opened a law practice in Denver.

"We talked for two or three minutes and then he took off and drove down the road. . . ."

Shorter was the last person known to have seen Steve Prefontaine alive.

Minutes later, there was a "thud" a short way down the hill on Skyline Boulevard, and the life of America's most brilliant distant runner was ended.

"I was terrified," said Moore, like Shorter, an Olympic marathoner and now a writer for Sports Illustrated, who had created a profile of Prefontaine. Moore had been awakened by a call from a Sports Illustrated photographer to come over to the scene of the accident to which Shorter had informed him.

"At the instant of death in an auto accident only hours after Moore had interviewed him some more."

"He built the sauna himself last fall and he was the only one there said. "Jaakko Tuominen (Finnish team leader) said he had it up to 225 degrees, and from a Finn the race was a compliment.""

"Anytime you party with New Zealanders or Finns there is drinking," Shorter said. He declined to speculate about whether Prefontaine had had it up to 225 degrees, and from a Finn that's a compliment.

"As Pre had to drink but said he thought it was "enough to affect his driving.""

"I'm going to look as good as I can when Moore would interview him some more."

"He was a good friend. . . I drove from Boulder, Colo., to New Mexico with him and was at ease all the time," Shorter said.

"The Moors left the party early. Pre, Shorter and Nancy Allman left about 12:15 a.m., Shorter recalls.

"We all three got into the MG and drove down to the UO ticket office where Nancy had left her car and let her off, he continued. "Then he drove me home. . . ."

"As Shorter and the Moors sat in their living room this morning, they talked about the impact Prefontaine's victory had on track. He was the most widely known American trackman of all time.

"A short time after the accident that occurred when he was working out in a Denver park. An onlooker asked Shorter's companion, "Hey, is that Steve Prefontaine?"

"Even at home, where I'm not known, he is," Shorter said.

"What of Ken Moore's profile on Pre for Sports Illustrated? He had already called the magazine and he intends to keep on writing. "Not an obituary, but a valedictory," he said.

Most Popular Track Athlete
(John Conrad)

Bill Dellinger and Norv Ritchie seemed to sum up the feeling of most people early today as they learned of Steve Prefontaine's death in an auto accident only hours after winning a 5,000-meter race at Hayward Field.

"I think the fact people thought of him as superhuman makes it a lot tougher to accept," said Dellinger the UO track coach who had supervised Pre's workouts. "I don't race the way people believe Prefontaine an ordinary run.""

Added Ritchie; the UO athletic director: "The kind of death we had was the sort of thing that is over the whole nation, not just Eugene or Coos Bay."

"That seemed to be the case as most of those associated with Prefontaine learned of his death sometime after a party Thursday night in honor of the Finnish athletes Pre had brought to Oregon.

"Only a couple of hours before, he had come within a second of his American record in 5,000 meters at Mayward Field.

Two of the people involved in Prefontaine's development were unavailable for comment. Walt McClure, the former Marshfield High track coach who was Pre's first coach, was not home. He reportedly was in Eugene early this morning with a Finnish friend. The group had returned to Coos Bay following the meet Thursday night. Bill Bowerman, the former Oregon track coach, could not be reached.

People who were available and had gotten the news had received it in every manner imaginable, some from people on the East Coast, or other points, who had heard the news and wanted to confirm it.

"I've had calls from Los Angeles and Seattle," Dellinger said. "But I'm still in shock, it's a shame to see his promising career cut off just when he was reaching his peak."

Mark Fieg, the Oregon miler, considers himself the Oregon runner probably closest to Prefontaine.

"It was hard to get to know him," Fieg said. "He was an idol of mine even though I was just chattering with him. It was his encouragement that picked me up and kept me going when things were really discouraging."

"I was at his place with some guys playing cards yesterday before the meet."

The ironic thing about Prefontaine's death was that it came after the work he had done to bring the Finnish meets for Pre, was at the Holusters' Thursday night and had barely arrived home before he formed the news by a call from Pendleton.

"Last night my little boy was playing around with Pre," Gauthier said, "How do I wake him up and tell him this? Pre was going to come to my house Monday. He was interested in building an A-frame house in this area so he could work out for the Olympics at altitude. I remember before we left, they begged me at least three times not to drive all the way home because he was afraid I was too tired. How do you explain it?"

"Bobbie Moore, a Coos Bay insurance man whose son ran with Pre in high school, was another who visited with Pre at the Holusters Thursday night before returning home. Huggins, a Coos Bay insurance man whose son ran with Pre in high school, was another who visited with Pre at the Holusters Thursday night before returning home."

"I'm just chattering with him briefly and told him to stop by the house next time he was home," Huggins said. "I'm just sick and . . . and I beg him not to drive all the way home because people are numb. I'm just sick and . . ."

Kenny Moore, the marathon runner who was doing a piece on Prefontaine for Sports Illustrated was also quoted.

"My emotional reaction is so strong because I know how impatient he would be with us over our inability to handle this situation."
Moore said, "Something a lot of people didn't know was that he had all kinds of lucrative offers in and out of the country. But he stayed here and sort of scrambled out his existence because these are his people and where his roots are,"

"He's as over the country. But he stayed here and killed in record his image of being these are his people and where his roots years except maybe Jim just couldn't understand why people (AAU) course—yet he fastest distance from college and 24 years old, Prefontaine was July 14, 1975 three-mile mark in 12:58.8 to Shorter. He took 5,000 13:06.4, outstanding meet in several cuss record with American Army's Bob Wallis, who had looked to be the in 13:30.6 go under four minutes in the mile
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"As soon as he came in here he was my kind of guy," said former Oregon track coach Bill Bellinger. "I dug into Prefontaine and Shorter seemed to be on record pace after the first mile, as they were paced by Gels and Williams for three laps and clocked the mile in 4:17 after an opening 63-second lap. Prefontaine held off the pair to 66-second pace in the second mile and when Shorter began to fade in the third mile, Prefontaine was riding a coat of confidence,"

"I just need a couple of weeks before I'm ready to really turn one on," he said. "I'll get a couple of weeks in the AAU Classic, then if I run in the AAU that could be good. But, if the AAU doesn't give me permission to run where I want in Europe this summer, I won't run in their meet."

Wilkins and Kahma had a very impressive battle in the distance run. Kahma was over 200 feet on all six of his throws, Wilkins hit his winning toss on his first try. Then he had two fouls, a 209-5, another foul and a final 207-7.

In the mile, Barger attained a goal he established in high school days by breaking the four-minute barrier. "I wanted to run under four minutes and I knew this would be a good chance," he said, "I just needed a little confidence," he said. "I had a real good workout last Saturday and today I just went out and ran as hard as I could all the way."

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, May 31, 1975]

He was Bill Bowerman's "kind of guy." (By Dave Frei)

Up front and talented.

I met him before Prefontaine. It was hard to tell which meant the most to him as he made it a point never to separate his athletic identities.

Consequently, many accused him of running with his mouth. For those of weak faith, he produced seven American records.

The higher-ups in the governing bodies of amateur sport didn’t appreciate his ongoing campaign on behalf of athletes and their rights.

But those who knew him best appreciated Steve Prefontaine. A coach’s dream ... an athlete’s athlete. His own man. All of these, he was.
ONE TO S. ROLAND

You came out hot and flashing
Like a Spanish fighting bull,
Your chest went stretching forward
Straight ahead on every skull.

Your knees came high, the arms they swung,
You sneered around the bend.
Leaping, diving, barling all
Exhausted in the end.

You called the fouls and formed the words
That told it as it was.
A warrior running rampant, wild
In pain you never paused.

For six short years we followed you;
You shone and shone.
And now it's over, just like that.
The game is gone.

The garland briefer than
The still-defended challenge cup.
Will flock to gaze the strengthless
And the name died before the man.

Of Eyes the shady night has shut
It withers quicker than the rose.
From fields where glory does not stay
And home we brought you shoulder-high.
Shoulder-high we bring you home,
The time you won your town the grandstand,
The return of Pre to Hayward Field.
You called the fouls and formed the words
To make the tempo sweet.

Crush in pain you never paused.
In my mind, his greatest race was his
To keep it open.

At the finish, he was spent. He couldn't hang on for third and an Olympic medal. But that, to me, was Pre.

"He never ran for second or third," said Bill Bowerman, "he never even considered it."

I remember the Olympics at Mexico City. And Jim Ryun's failure to chase Riep Keino in the 1,500 meters after Keino stole the race with a final surge.
"If I'd have gone with Keino," said Ryun, "I might not have gotten second."

Just as Ryun and other American runners stood still from the dictatorial policies of the U.S. Olympic Committee and the Amateur Athletic Union, Pre forced the pace.

He was of the race.

He was so awesome competitive that he was rude to those who would stand in the way of people trying to break new ground.

He fought for a national sports program.
He fought against aUO's policy to limit the naked professionalism of the great European runners.

He never had burning desire but he had burning desire and determination to try to beat him, giving the best of himself.

Pre told that to a class at Roosevelt Junior High School. He never once mentioned his work with kids to the press, which quoted him liberally on about every other subject.

"Pre wanted the image of a swashbuckling pirate," said Bowerman. "He never wanted people to think of him as a do-gooder. And, yet, he had a deep feeling for the kids."

Pre lived hard, and he died hard. But what a legacy!

"The goals he set for himself drove others to strive to beat him, giving the United States what is now the best fleet of distance runners it has ever had," said Dick Buerkle, one of Pre's strongest competitors.

But is there a man to step forward and challenge his place?

What will become of national track and field meets in Eugene? Pre never ran a bad race at Hayward Field. To arrange a good meet, all you needed to do was find some competition for Pre. Pre is gone.

I jogged slowly down Hilyard as I drove to work Friday morning, the news of Pre's death ringing in my ears.

I had often seen Pre jog the very same route on cold, rainy winter mornings. I always smiled, juxtaposing Pre on Hilyard Street with Pre in Munich, a neighbor and an Olympian.

Pre loved Eugene. He would hope that the full spectrum of track and field in this community would continue as he left it. From jogs to great all-cou prayed relay records at South, to an NCAA championship for the U of O, to a return of the international meet to Hayward Field.
Run for first. Don't even think about second or third.

STEVE PREFONTAINE

(By Blaine Newham)

Bill Bowerman looked out from the new west grandstand at Hayward Field. Across Stevenson Track, out into the verdant hills of Eugene. To where Steve Prefontaine was killed.

The American flag at the south end of Hayward Field stood at halfmast Saturday during the state AAA track and field championships.

I think Pre would have wanted it right up at the top," Bowerman said softly. "That's where Pre always wanted to be."

It is impressive to summarize the career of Steve Prefontaine as he turned 22. It is impressive to recall that he set American records 14 different times, that he broke the four-minute mile nine times, that he was the first person in history to break 4 minutes for the 1,500 meters, 3 minutes for the mile, and 2 minutes for the 800 meters. He was the first person in history to break 2 minutes for the miles and 10 races faster than 13:30 for 5,000 meters.

But there was more to the man than races won and records set, and nobody knew it better than Bill Bowerman, Eugene's living legend.

"Pre never had burning speed," said Bowerman, "but he had burning desire and more determination than anyone I've ever been associated with in track and field, or any other sport."

"Pre wasn't necessarily born to run, but he was born to compete."

Bill Bowerman first saw Pre run at a cross country meet at North Eugene High School. Pre was a freshman at Marshfield High.

"I met Pre in cross country," said Bowerman. "I had already told me about this little guy who was a good one. Pre was a 14-year-old freshman, ran about as well as any freshman could."

It was destiny that Pre would enroll at Oregon, and run for Bowerman's AAU, and live to be 31. He was a great one. He was the man.

"Pre was an athlete who would excel in any sport," said Bowerman. "Pre was a man who would excel at anything he did."

"Pre told that to a class at Roosevelt Junior High School. He never once mentioned his work with kids to the press, which
he had as much talent as anyone in the world."

"It was in his first year at the university, as a freshman on the last Oregon team to win the NCAA championship, that Pre ran what Bowerman considers his most memorable race.

It was in Des Moines, Iowa. Six days before the NCAA three-mile final, Pre gashed his foot on an exposed metal bolt at the swimming pool fence. It took six stitches to close the wound."

"A doctor took one look at it," said Bowerman, "and wouldn't want him in three weeks. Pre said he needed to work out so he'd be ready for the race."

"Pre" called Donald Slocum in Eugene. Slocum recommended another doctor in Des Moines. Meanwhile, Pre soaked his foot every hour for the remaining five days. He couldn't do anything else because Bowerman told him not to run.

The coaches met to decide whether a prerun was needed in the three-mile.

"I told them to go ahead and have a prerun," said Bowerman, "but I didn't give a damn. My gut was telling me to go -- in the following week.

Apparently, the bluff worked. The coaches told him to go ahead and have a prerun.

PREVONTAINE TRIBUTES CONTINUE

Tributes continue to mount for Steve Roland Prefontaine, who will be buried this afternoon in Coos Bay.

The House Rules Committee of the Oregon Legislature introduced a memorial to Prefontaine, who was killed early Friday morning in a one-car automobile accident in Eugene.

The Oregon Track Club, meanwhile, announced a memorial service for Pre at 8 p.m. Tuesday at Hayward Field.

Friends and fellow athletes of the great runner will stage a brief ceremony in Eugene at the site of many of his greatest achievements.

"This service is for those who could not be in Coos Bay Monday," said Jim Putney, president of the Oregon Track Club. Those involved in Tuesday's service include Kenny Moore, the writer and marathon runner from Eugene.

Bill Bowerman and Walt McClure, Pre's coaches at the University of Oregon and Marshfield High in Coos Bay respectively, will deliver eulogies at today's 3 o'clock service in the Marshfield High Stadium in Coos Bay.

Private burial will follow at Sunset Memorial Park in Coos Bay. Pallbearers for the service are Frank Shorter, Jon Anderson, Jim Seymour, Brett Williams, Bob Williams and Cliff Holister, all runners or former runners.

American distance star Dick Buerkle of the Rochester, N.Y., track team, who would never have run had Pre not died, and called it "Ode to Steve Roland." Other poems by fans in Eugene have come to light.

Contributions to the memorial fund honoring Pre should be sent in care of the Western Bank of Coos Bay, 383 S. Fourth St., Coos Bay, 97420.

IN MEMORY

I am saddened by our loss of Pre. Only knowing him slightly, rarely having the opportunity to talk with him, I admired him."

I need only see him run to admire his talent, his determination, his strength, his spirit.

Countless hours of preparation, the thousands of miles he ran alone in the early mornings and in the evenings.

Alone in the Oregon rain, alone in the Oregon hills, alone, in the streets of Eugene, alone, at his home on Stevenson Track."

His dedication to himself, his country and his sport were one.

To see him run, his fluid stride, his legs kicking high behind, his chest expanded, his arms in gentle motion by his side.

To see the pain expressed in his face, the sweat on his forehead, the conviction within to run even faster.

To see his beauty, the beauty of what it represented; every part of it.

His beauty, his pleasure; the beauty he expressed so well, the pleasure he gave so unsailfly to us all.

Pre's running now; he'll always be running, running to win and winning.

His fans are watching, they'll always be watching.

Watching him run out front, carrying the load, that determined look in his eyes, that glance at the scoreboard clock, always looking ahead, never looking over his shoulder.

To those who say he has died, I ask what has died?

His Memory? His Spirit? His Cause?

Keep on running, running to win and winning.

Keep on running, don't stop to think.

'cause that's the urge all the others lacked.

Keep on running.

Don't stop to look behind.

'cause just around the corner, you're going to get the crown.

Keep on running.

Your era will never end.

Keep on running.

And there's fans around every bend.

MELANY MOORE, 16, Junction City.

EXCITINGLY RIDING THE NIGHT

I dreamt I was a car to keep my pace.

High on wind and stars and victory and into the stone wall full tilt.

Fling with godlike force whirling lights and sizzling heat.

Earth smashed the crush of pressure beyond pain warmth of blood filling my hands.

Hills turned to the overflow spilling into the earth around me.

With inestimable sorrow and regret.

JANE HARRISON, Eugene.
SENATE

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE
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[From the Oregonian, May 31, 1975]

TRACK WORLD Mourns DEATH

(By Leo Davis)

When there are few, as there are in Eugene, Moore will write about Steve Prefontaine—the man and the athlete.

Moore writes as well as Pre ran, with little pretension, with intense feeling, with telling effect. And best of all with compassion, the bond between distance runners.

But when he's not an expert to accept the news of Prefontaine's death in an early morning auto accident, words avoided him. Kenny Moore, who has never struggled with an Olympic marathon.

"My emotional feelings on this are very strong. It's so hard to have accepted this sort of thing better than I." Moore was at Hayward Field Thursday night to do a Sports Illustrated profile on Pre and Lasse Viren, Finland's double gold medal winner in the 1972 Olympics in Munich. "When Viren canceled, the story turned out to be a profile on Pre."

In theallenge of a news conference, Moore reached for words. "I would say that this is extremely tragic. To lose the efforts of the rest of us toward restructuring American sports where it is lacking. His contributions to track and field were enormous."

His impact on Eugene was even greater. "Pre didn't go out to be a hero. He dressed as much as they paid back. He had great sense of his own roots—he had chances to go into business but wouldn't consider them just because they could leave his people."

At that moment Moore couldn't accurately measure the loss, nor could countless other Prefontaine friends, enemies and admirers.

Dick Brukette, a long-time rival, heard the news on the phone. He was with Pre during a trip to China. "I could cry," he said softly. "It leaves me numb."

Dr. Leroy Walker, who will coach the U.S. men's track and field team at Montreal in 1976, spoke in the hush that followed the news. "It was a great tragedy and a great loss to our team. He was one of the finest men's track and field team at Montreal in 1974, in a bus-auto collision in Munich, the gold medal was never out of his mind, according to Dellinger."

"Steve Prefontaine was one of the fiercest competitors I ever knew. He never ran less than 10.75. He was one of the fiercest competitors I ever knew. He never ran less than 10.75."

"He was one of the fiercest competitors I ever knew. He never ran less than 10.75."

For example, Moore ran for words. "It turned out to be a profile on Prefontaine."

Bill Deller, who was his coach and confidante, explained why. "We lost a personal loss and a loss for all fans of track and field."

"He thought he was the best in the world and he was aiming for 1976," Deller said when asked if Prefontaine planned to try for a medal at the 1976 Olympic Games in Montreal. Prefontaine turned down an offer which Deller believed was the highest ever made by the professional National Track Athletic Association for himself or he would have accepted (the pre offer)," Deller said.

"Steve Prefontaine was the "ideal" athlete. He was talented, dedicated and very, very coachable. He asked for and followed the rules of the game in running and just last night he felt he was beginning to run well again."

In July 1971 at Berkeley, Calif., Prefontaine set American record for 5,000 meters with a time of 13:30.4. He would better by more than six seconds. He tied the collegiate two-mile mark at 8:38.1 in Eugene in March 1971. Later he would trim 15 seconds off that time.

"Prefontaine was a critic of the Amateur Athletic Union, which he charged exploited American athletes. As late as Thursday night he still hadn't decided whether he could live with AAU regulations and was still hedging on his plans for a summer tour of Europe."

"Despite that and the bitter taste of the 1972 Munich Olympics, was killed in a bus-auto collision in Munich in 1972. In a bus-auto collision in Munich in 1972."

"We mourn the American team to China, and Don Buttermark said, "He was one of the fiercest competitors I ever knew. He never ran less than 10.75.""

"That's why we said we would go back and try a little harder next time," Buttermark said.

Bill Deller, who succeeded Buttermark as Oregon coach and was a distance runner at UO himself, was responsible for much of Prefontaine's training while he was an assistant coach at UO.

"He was probably the most dedicated runner I ever knew. In the last two years at Oregon he never missed a workout."

Nrv Ritchey, UO athletic director, said, "We are still in a period of shock ... the news is just unbelievable."

Ritchey said, "He was a young man who was just obviously reaching his potential and the news of his death is a shock. He have it snuffed out this way and so sudden is a complete shock and a tragic, tragic thing for all of us."

"Of those who have been watching his steady improvement the last three years were reeling. Everyone and everyone knew that Steve was one of our top prospects for a place on the 1976 Olympic team and the Olympic team next year. Track and Field has lost a truly dedicated runner."
He did not own any world records, but his American marks were close and they were improving as he neared the age at which distance runners hit their peak.

Perhaps the most unexpected accomplishment was the American tour he arranged for the six Finns, whom he had met and lived with last summer in Europe.

They and about 25 other persons, including Prefontaine's parents and his high school coach, met at the track and field establishment, died early yesterday morning in an automobile accident in Eugene, Ore.

24-year-old Prefontaine had won a 5,000-meter race about four hours before at Hayward Field in Eugene, his favorite track.

In a recent poll by Track & Field News, the six Finns, whom he had met and lived with last summer in Europe, were considered the finest distance runners in the world and cost America its strongest hope for a gold medal in the distance events at the 1972 Olympics.

One observer called it, "To hell with love of country, or the American Olympic spirit."

On May 31, 1975, Prefontaine was killed in an auto accident in Eugene, Ore.

"No." Prefontaine's parents and his high school coach, who was one of the six Finns at the Eugene party in honor of six Finnish athletes he had brought to America to compete, Prefontaine had taken his girl friend home, making it almost a decade since he had last run a race.

"I can only say that we share with the world of track the tragic loss of Steve Prefontaine."

"He's life burned bright on and off the field and today we all experience a little darkness of the loss."

Jim Putney, president of the Oregon Track Club, which is headquartered half of the Oregon Track Club.

One former Wlllamette athlete and present Salem Track Club coordinator Ron Jenson had heard the news from WU basketball coach Jim Boutilin at school Friday morning.

Jim said, "Did you hear what happened to Pre?" and Ron said, "He ran yesterday."

Former North Salem sprinner James Holway was also helping run events Friday.

"It was a little weird to think he was here last night and now that same man isn't around anymore."

Steve Prefontaine, for almost a decade one of this country's best and most controversial athletes, was one of the six Finns, whom he had met and lived with last summer in Europe.

He had taken his girl friend home, making it almost a decade since he had last run a race.

"I have been good friends for a long time," said Ron Jenson, "and the loss is going to hit hard."
"I'm not afraid of losing," he once said. "But if I do, I want it to be a good race. I'm an artist, a performer. I want people to appreciate the way I run." 

"On his 21st birthday, he had sought to break his American record in the 5,000.

"I felt really sluggish," he said afterward. "After a mile, I quit thinking about a record."

In 1975, Prefontaine had planned to open a tavern and was going to name it the "Sub Four."

"Those who knew him said that despite his talent and his successes, it's possible he probably would have run for America in the 1976 Olympics in Montreal."

Survivors include his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Prefontaine, and a sister, Linda, 21, of Coos Bay."

Prefontaine was killed in a single-car accident in Eugene Friday morning just hours after he raced for the last time before his adoring fans in Hayward Field.

"I'm stunned," said the retired coach in a subdued voice. "He was the greatest athlete I ever coached. And he was a fine person. He really lived life."
Olympic Committee, said, "This country has lost a true champ." Krumm continued, "We all remember his splendid effort in going all out to win the 5,000-meter race in Munich in 1972. Those of us who had been watching his steady improvement the last three years were counting on Steve as one of our top prospects for the Pan-American team and the Olympic team next year."

Prefontaine was 21 years old when he finished fourth in the 5,000-meter race at Munich. "I just found out and this whole town is going to be in shock for a long time," said Walt McClure, Prefontaine's high school coach at Coos Bay.

Prefontaine was a three-time state two-mile champ and still holds the national two-mile high school record. He is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Prefontaine, and a sister, Linda, 21, of Coos Bay.

Tentative funeral plans are set for Monday in the Marshfield High football stadium. "It all started there," said Mrs. Prefontaine of the Marshfield track. "That seems like the only place to go."

Jim Putney, president of the Oregon Track Club which Pre ran for, said, "On behalf of the Oregon Track Club and everyone that can in any way share with the world of track the tragic loss of Steve Prefontaine, Steve's life burned bright on and off the field, and today we all experience a little darkness because of the loss."

Oregon President Robert Clark said, "The stunning news of Steve Prefontaine's death has crushed those of us who knew and admired this outstanding young athlete. I was personally acquainted with him often in recent years. We mourn for him, for his family and for the days of his glory which shall come no other."

[From the Oregon Journal, May 31, 1975]

THE WORLD LOSES A GREAT ATHLETE

In the death of Steve Prefontaine, not only Oregon but the world lost one of its great athletes who, at the same time, was a fine individual.

Rarely in the history of sport in Oregon has an athlete won the hearts of the fans to the degree that Prefontaine did, while also winning friendship and respect as a man.

Prefontaine in some sense died in an automobile accident as he was nearing the peak of his already amazing career.

He was his best on the longer distances and in the various categories between two miles and six miles he had set no less than 10 major records.

Among his best friends were those against whom he raced. It was he who promoted the visit of the Finnish runners who were in Eugene on his last night of racing.

One of the things upon which he insisted was that the visitors stay in the homes of local people. You knew the people, that was his idea of what international sport is all about.

Some persons who covered his career say he never ran a "bad" race, that he was always in condition and that he always gave everything he had.

That is why the fans stood up and applauded even when Prefontaine was just warming up. He was a true amateur sport the world over have lost a great man.

PASSAGE EATS:

(By George Pasero)

Oregon's world of track and field has never known anyone like Steve Prefontaine. And that's why the loss is so great.

He was, of course, America's premier distance runner—talented, tough, fierce competitor. His accomplishments earned him hearing and gave him standing... for improvement of the American amateur sport programs.

His tongue often got him as much space as his feet. He had a scant regard for the American athletic establishment.

And sometimes the quotes didn't come out the way he intended. It was good back on April 24 to give him voice in rebuttal of a wire service story that said he was fed up with what he termed "athletes that would change citizenship tomorrow." There was the headline: "To Hell With Love of Country."

He cringed, "I'm embarrassed," he said. And people have a right to be upset about what I said. I don't want to have to justify something that was taken out of context.

The "context" was that Pre wasn't un-American. He was probably a pro. And the quote as a Denver writer had prefaced: "Steve Prefontaine isn't a Communist. He hasn't burned his draft card. Probably loves apple pie."

That wasn't "picked up" by the wire service.

So Pre felt constrained to say flat out: "I do love apple pie. I would have gone into the Army had I been drafted. I do like apple pie. I wasn't an anti-war demonstrator either. When I was drafted, I wasn't a hell-raiser. I've got a diploma."

I hope Pre didn't see some of the reaction in the "Mailbag along with Bill Walton, Jack Scott and others."

He did see one attack on him by a woman literature person. "She wrote in the "Mailbag," when I was drafted, I wasn't a hell-raiser. I've got a diploma."

Pre's story began with a recitation of the accomplishments of gal miler Larieu. It fit— a little, I like Norv Ritchey's description of him: "Pre was a Steve Prefontaine."

We're living in a microcosmic sense what is happening in the women's sports movement on every level... the United States is behind in action, and, more sadly, in attitude."

"A schizophrenic reaction too often occurs when a woman's world-record performance is accepted by the crowd... while an athlete like Prefontaine, who should know better and whose ego should never be so threatened, feels it necessary to try to put a woman's performance down..."

"Pre?" Pre fairly snarled. "Me, Gee, I've helped coach four or five girls runners. I guess I just will quit talking to anybody." He didn't, though. Later, he thanked me for the coverage. "You're helping track and field," he said.

The Northwest tour of the Finns was his special project, his idea and his creation. It took him home to Coos Bay... and that gave his hometown people a memory they can always treasure, as told by one by A. B. Carroll and recorded in the Coos Bay World.

"Hundred of Bay Area youngsters reacted to his presence by yelling 'Pre, Pre' each time he passed them in the foreground prior to the race, and they really went crazy after his record-setting performance."

"They tagged him as he jogged a 'victory lap' and then surrounded him for 30 minutes as he patiently signed one program after another."

In Eugene, of course, the shouts of "Pre, Pre" spilled above Hayward Field meet after meet. It seems much longer than six years that Pre came out of Coos Bay to begin rewriting the national record book for distances from two miles to 10,000 meters.

Sports illustrated termed him "precocious."

But it's a little hard to appreciate Heyer's description of him better: "He was absolutely effervescent, outgoing, and when he came here from Coos Bay, he was the most open, un-bashed youngster you ever saw in your life."

Steve was a fun-loving young man; ingenuous, too. He had a good sense of humor, which he used in his death.

He became intense, however, in his crusade... which, he believed, was for the greatness of all track people and for his country. He saw no way America could compete internationally when the AAU had archaic codes of amateurism.

When Monday night, he took issue with the latest AAU dictum against an athlete running a race so many days before an AAU event.

"If they don't let me go and run where I want to this summer," he said, "then I just may not compete in the National AAU event here."

He had said that being the best distance runner in America was one thing, but to be the best in the world was a "fulltime job."

"That's impossible," he said. "I've got bills to pay. I'm just like any other American. If I don't pay my electric bill, they turn off my lights."

"I'm just facing facts. After college, our athletes are turned out to pasture. We have no plan in this country. It's as simple as that. No sports medicine, no camps, no nothing. I'm not talking about subsidizing us. I'm just talking about a national plan. I want to see some interest from somebody. In the past, we've sat back and let our natural talent do it. Well, the rest of the world has caught up."

Steve also said recently that the Olympics were not the big dream they were before he died.

Steve says a lot there he didn't like. Still, I can be counted as one who believed it was still a mighty important dream. He turned down the biggest pro contract yet offered... one he said was very fair. Now, Pre was keeping the lights on—but working to pay the bills.

And I believe, because of Montreal. In retrospect, it seems there was always the remotest hope it was happening in Steve's breast, calming, rising fitfully and then gusting with awesome power.

Perhaps that was the heritage of his coastal home.

There was an unpredictability about him, too. He could make you wait long after a race for an interview and then say, side up next to you at a pub and engage you in conversa­tion about any old subject... from running to newspapering.

His coach said it best: "He hoped the things he said and did would help those who followed him."

That's a lot more, and then you get back to three words: He was special.

BOWERRMAN, SHORTER HALL. PASERO'S HONESTY

(By Carl Cluff)

Bill Bowerman, the retired coach of the University of Oregon track team and head mentor of the Olympic team at the Munich Olympics, is a keen listener in some part.

He knew he had a rare one when he discovered Steve Prefontaine out of Marshfield High.

"Steve was an artist," said Bowerman sadly, following the untimely death of the
first four-time winner of an NCAA gold medal. "He enjoyed performing before people." 

And it was a mutual thing, especially in Eugene where "Pre's People" responded loud and long for the little distance star's world class performances.

Once a reported asked Bowerman what Prefontaine thought about a controversy in which he was mixed up. He never sidestepped an issue. He met it head-on, just as he met rivals on the tracks of the world.

"Give him a call," snorted Bowerman. "He'll tell you what's on his mind."

That's the way it was with Pre. He never suggested an issue. He met it head-on, just as he met the other runners of the world.

"He helped those who followed him," explained Bowerman. "He would not let people dictate to him."

"But nothing says he was very American."

A fourth place finish in the Munich Olympics was a big disappointment to Steve but Bowerman felt he was not too upset, finishing behind three veteran runners.

"He recognized he was a kid running among men and the longer distance races are men's races. I don't know of any distance performer who is not better at 25 than he was when aged between 19 and 22. He recognized his time was not Pre's."

Pre's close friend, Frank Shorter, the U.S. marathon second medalist at Munich, ran second in Pre's final race hours before the fatal accident.

"He had to be ranked among the top three distance runners in the world during the last three years," Shorter said. "With the right timing, he would have been the best on any particular day. He lived from week to week. He was not a long term planner like most of us."

Prefontaine will be remembered best by Shorter for "his total honesty. If he liked you, he liked you. I liked him. He was my friend. He had a lot of charisma."

"I try to be a diplomat," continued Shorter, "but Steve did not think this was necessary. He said what was on his mind."

"What impressed me most about Steve was that he gave of his best every time he ran. He always ran like crazy. Not many top class runners do that."

PRE'S RECORDS

AMERICAN OUTDOOR

2 Miles—8:18.4 (Stockholm, Sweden, July 18, 1974.)

3 Miles—12:51.4 (Eugene, Ore., June 8, 1974.)

6 Miles—26:31.8 (Eugene, Ore., April 27, 1974.)

2,000 Meters—5:01.4 (Coos Bay, May 8, 1975.)

3,000 Meters—7:44.2 (Oslo, Norway, Aug. 3, 1972.)

5,000 Meters—13:22.4 (Helsinki, Finland, June 27, 1974.)

10,000 Meters—27:43.6 (Eugene, Ore., April 27, 1974.)

AMERICAN INDOOR

2 Miles—8:30.4 (San Diego, Calif., Feb. 17, 1974.)

3,000 Meters—7:50.0 (San Diego, Calif., Feb. 17, 1974.)

U.S. SENIOR OUTDOOR

3 Miles—12:53.4 (Bakersfield, Calif., June 16, 1974.)

"SHATTERED," SAYS STEWART

LONDON—Ian Stewart, the Briton who outstripped Prefontaine to rob him of an Olympic medal three years ago in Munich, said he was "absolutely shattered" by the American's recent death.

"This is a terrible blow. He was a tremendous athlete," said Stewart.

PALS TO BE BURIED MONDAY IN HIS HOME TOWN OF COOS BAY

Steve Prefontaine, America's greatest distance runner who was killed in an automobile accident early Friday morning in Eugene, will be buried in his home town of Coos Bay Monday.

The funeral service will be conducted at the Marshfield High stadium where he performed as a prep star. The service is scheduled for 3 p.m.

Prefontaine's death was caused by a form of cancer discovered to Dr. Edward Wilson, assistant Lane County medical examiner, who conducted the autopsy.

Dr. Wilson said the runner's chest was compressed by the weight of the car making it impossible for him to breathe.

"He couldn't have lived for more than a minute under those circumstances, and he suffered no other injuries that would have caused his death themselves," the examiner revealed.

Dr. Wilson further revealed that Prefontaine, a colorful and controversial figure who was alone in his foreign country, died at a level of .16 of one per cent. Under Oregon law, a person with a level of .10 of one percent is regarded as intoxicated.

The meet at Eugene's Hayward Field several hours preceding Prefontaine's death also featured Gelsinki Finland, whom Prefontaine had persuaded to visit the Pacific Northwest for a series of meets designed to provide cultural exchange values.

It was the final meet of the Finnish tour and a group, including Prefontaine, gathered afterwards to celebrate the departure of the Finnish runners.

It was not inconsistent with "Pre," as the Oregon star was known, to meet in good fellowship after a meet and drink a few beers with his fellow competitors.

Prefontaine's death created shock reverberations throughout the sports world. He was, beyond any doubt, the most widely known celebrity from the state of Oregon.

He had competed on the tracks of the world against him at Munich in 1972 expressed the state's sympathy over the death of the distance runner and said the tragedy leaves the Oregonian with a "great sense of loss."

Austin, Ore., Sen. Mark Hatfield today.

"There is something about Steve Prefontaine that will always make us think of the great American distance runner who has ever had."

Many persons in official quarters paid tribute to Prefontaine Friday.

"It is tragic when any one person dies and the potential for a full productive life is snuffed out. Steve Prefontaine was an Oregon tiger in the finest tradition—ferociously competitive, confident and outgoing," stated U.S. Sen. Mark Hatfield today.

A memorial resolution honoring the achievements of the American record holder was introduced today in Salem to the Oregon House Rules Committee by Rep. Bill Orange, D-North Bend.

The memorial resolution honoring the achievements of Prefontaine was introduced in the Oregon House Rules Committee by Rep. Bill Orange, D-North Bend.

"The Oregon Senate and House is expected to consider the joint resolution Monday to express the state's sympathy over the death of Oregon's brilliant track star and pay tribute to his accomplishments."

EXPRESSIONS OF SYMPATHY

Gannell expressed stunned shock over the death of the distance runner and said government officials at the state's capital joined him in a deep feeling of loss.

Senator Jack Ripple, D-North Bend, said the tragedy leaves a vacuum in the sports field. He expressed sympathy to the Prefontaine family and said the athlete's untimely death is a great loss to the entire nation.

Rep. Ed Stevenson, D-Coquille, paid tribute to the runner's dedication and initiative both as an outstanding individual and an athlete. "All of the people in the state join in expressing sympathy to his parents," he said.

"He was a young man, who could have been successful in any field of endeavor."

Steve was not only an outstanding athlete, but an exemplary individual, who represented the qualities which we in Oregon have always admired," stated Sen. Jason Boe, D-Reedsport.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register General, June 3, 1975]

PRE'S LAST LAP BACK WHERE IT BEGAN

(Blaine Meinhardt)

Coos Bay.—The six athlets sagged under the weight of the bronze casket as the body of Steve Prefontaine was carried onto the field at Marshfield High school here Monday.

The sun had broken through the morning overcast. The wind off the bay whipped the tall infielid grass. Rather than dwelling on the agonizingly slow procession of the casket, it was easier to watch the sun glint off the right field grass.

In it, you could see Pre's full head of hair. That moment he fired down the backstretch the hair blowing briskly away from his skull.

The roar of the crowd.

As the light blue hearse drove onto the track, the track was still. The crowd was still. More than 2,500 friends, relatives, townspeople and track fans gathered here to pay their final respects.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register General, June 3, 1975]
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There was no attempt in the memorial service to elicit emotion out of those who knew Pre. You were left, basically, to reflect on your own remembrances of the great young runner.

"Let all men be grateful that we have been a part of what Steve Prefontaine, the champ, stood for . . . what he enjoyed and what he achieved," Bill Bowerman, Pre's coach at the University of Oregon.

Pre was eulogized by his two former coaches, Bowerman and Walt McClure, his coach at Marshfield High School.

Six friends, and fellow runners, wearing track warmups—Jon Anderson, Bill Bowerman, Walt McClure, Jim Seyler, Bob Williams, and Brett Williams—carried the casket.

Shorter, and Anderson wore the uniform of the U.S. Olympic team. A short distance away, runners for the Marshfield High team were dressed in their track suits, thus the beginning and the end of Pre's 10-year running career.

It was difficult, I think, for anyone who saw the 5,000 meter race last Thursday night at Hayward Field to come to grips with Pre's body leaving Pirate Stadium in a casket, the hearse moving slowly around the final turn.

"He was always in a hurry. His destiny could not allow for a wasted effort," spoke McClure. "Greatness is for only a few. The accomplishment of an individual is often recognized years after the deed, the act."

Steve Prefontaine achieved this level during his brief lifetime. I would not say that Pre was the last to leave the gym after a workout. Many might believe, but rather he was generally the first, so intense was his concentration in a workout, so great his effort, and so valuable his time.

McClure said at the podium a few feet away from the casket which was covered with yellow chrysanthemums and forest green ferns, what made Pre more than just a good runner.

"To me, the characteristic that separated Pre from the rest of the field was his pride. It was so keen and intense with him, that it was frightening.

"Man imposes his own limitations. Limitation was not in Steve's frame of reference."

The Prefontaine family asked that a letter from Neal Bowerman, former University of Oregon president, be read.

In it, Bowerman told the family of the day in a U of O fraternity house that Pre "left like a hero."

"I firmly believe God will take care of Steve," wrote Bowerman.

Jan Prefontaine, a cousin from Washington, D.C., who had written a song about Pre during his visit to the East Coast in early 1974, arrived midway through the service, the airline baggage tag dangling from her guitar.

She sang the song, and urged the crowd to join in the singing. The crowd couldn't respond.

The final verse of the song said:

"To be a strong but gentle man not afraid to speak the truth,

To stand against a raging storm and try to right the tide of wrongs.

You're a free man, full of wonder here to stay,

You've touched our hearts in a peaceful loving way. One Pre."

Miss Prefontaine said news reports in the East constantly referred to the love people in Oregon had for Pre.

"Well," she said slowly, "he loved you too." And she told of suggestions by other runners that he join the Olympics.

"I could never leave my people," was his answer, she said.

A representation of the flag of Finland, a blue cross on a white field, was presented to Prefontaine's family on behalf of the Finnish athletes who came to the United States after vigorous efforts by Pre to cut through the red tape and permitateur athletes.

As the hearse left the stadium for a private burial at Sunset Memorial Park in Coos Bay a couple in their twenties got up from seats under the scoreboard. The woman was crying.

The man put his arm around her as they walked slowly in the track and off across a grass field. A few moments later, as the stands emptied, four young Coos Bay kids sprinted around the track in a race.

Running, like life, will go on in Coos Bay, but they'll never forget Pre.

The Prefontaine family asked that a letter be read from Neal Bowerman, former Oregon governor, expressing the love Pre had shown for you.

"We followed you through high school,

Your training in the dunes.

Victories came in handfulls,

Headlines followed soon.

We followed you to Hayward Field,

The college and beyond.

Your fans became an army,

Cheers echoed through the stands.

We followed you to Europe

And Munich made us proud.

You always ran your heart out

And electrified the crowd.

Your candor was refreshing.

The establishment would frown."

But victory laps more so.

Still, you keep on winning, Pre.

Our debt is overdue.

For past and future victories

We owe a lot to you.

Thank you for the boys and girls who jog

The whole year round.

Thank you for your loyalty to a dedicated town.

Thanks for the example; discipline and sacrifice, high prices paid.

Thanks for all the memories that time will never fade.

The Track Fans of Oregon.

Goodbye, Pre.

Young man not yet reached his prime,

Fastest in the land,

Ran across the finish line

Wearing to the stands.

His people were all there to see him.

Little did they know

He would take his final bow.

This was his last show.

Later on that evening

The one who'd come so far

Lost his young life on the road

Alone beneath the stars.

But wherever he may be

In spite of his lost pain

In hearts of those whom he

Inspired

The runner will remain.

It seems the same and season

For each of us to die

What's the rhyme or reason

When young dreams are sailing away?

Unless it's true, as they say,

The best of us die young.

So let us simply hope and pray

His victory, by far, was won.

Goodbye, Pre.

Your best was always ours to see.

Now the race is over

May you rest in peace.

Paul Halpern, Eugene.

Coos Bay Pays Last Respects to 'Pre'

Coos Bay, Ore.—Flags hung limp at half staff today as this shipping and fishing community prepared to lay Steve Prefontaine, it's most famous citizen and America's best distance runner.

Prefontaine, 24, died in an auto accident early Friday in Eugene after running the second fastest 5,000 meters by an American runner in just four hours earlier.

He set the American record in the two-mile here recently at Marshfield High School's Pirate Stadium, where he became a prep distance running sensation and where 2,000 people were expected to gather later today to pay their last respects.

A private burial service was to follow.

Schools let out at noon today in Coos Bay and in the adjacent community of North Bend.

The shock that accompanied the news of Prefontaine's death has eased by today, but a few residents who had considered him their own showed signs of bitterness.

"If it were my boy, it would be private and not out at that stadium," a hotel waltz said from the stadium services.

"They've had their headlines—so why don't they leave us alone?"

Raymond Prefontaine said the decision to have his son's funeral at the stadium was because "that's where it all began and that's where it ended."

At another coffee shop today, a dock worker who would not give his name stared at the cup and said slowly: "When you consider him your own, and people who never talked to you before start noshing around after he's gone, you get kinda resentful. The whole town does."

It was like that today in Coos Bay.

[From the Oregonian, June 3, 1975]

Friends of Pre

(By Kenn Hess)

Coos Bay.—Time stood still here Monday. It waited for an hour while a sorrowing community and a host of disbelieving friends, admirers and rivals paid final respects to Steve Roland Prefontaine.

Prefontaine, 24, America's premier distance runner and considered by most in the track and field world as three or four years away from the peak of an ultra-brilliant career, died in an automobile accident last Friday.

More than 2,500 persons assembled at Marshfield High School's athletic stadium where Prefontaine, a little more than a decade ago, began his running career. He was eulogized by Bill Bowerman, former University of Oregon track and field coach, and Walt McClure, his coach at Marshfield High.

"Let us all be grateful that we have been a part of what Steve Prefontaine, the champ, stood for what he enjoyed and what he achieved," Bowerman said. Bowerman went on:

"If I knew Pre through Walt McClure. Pre was 14 years old. Said Walt: 'Watch this freshman—he's tough and will be a good one."

"Four years later, when he was a frosh, there was the early fall rain. Pre, dressed in sweats, was walking to class at the old downtown Court. He had just finished his orientation lecture. Another was going on in the Court's vast hall. The unrest of the 1970s could be
heard—rude questions, foot shuffling, even catcalls. Pre turned to me and said, "I don’t believe we can say anything to the press," then turned for the door. He stiffness to the stage. He asked: ‘May I speak?’ He was handed the mike: ‘I am a freshman. . . . I chose, clearly, to orient myself. I came here to get an education and to run. Listen, all of you, you will learn something—thanks. I’m glad I came to Oregon.’

“His great races are all told by the press and other media. His desire burned to be the best. I mean to be the best. His goal was to run through six miles and bring foreign athletes or a team to Oregon and the Northwest for a series of meets.

“Tens of thousands of dollars matured, he reached his goals. In high school he was the state champion and national record-holding student. When he was selected every American record from 2,000 meters through six miles and 10,000 meters. His 1976 goal was to be an Olympic champion and to become an international door which was closed for more than a half century.

“I pledge to Pre, I know close friends will join me, and we invite all true sportsmen to join us, to fulfill his great dream—to keep that door open—to preserve and further that freedom. We must EVER keep our doors open to international sports and friendship.”

In the sun-baked stadium where it all began, McGuire was shaken.

“I am not here to mourn Steve Prefontaine, but rather to pay final tribute to an outstanding young American. This is the most doleful event of my lifetime. I have been charged to perform, to express the love that I have for this man, to fulfill the secret of Pre’s rela­tion to ‘his people.’

“The love that exists between two people who have an ability to share in ideas and communicate with each other,” explained McGuire, “is the love that I have for this man.”

“I think that many of you share this feeling.”

McGuire's casket was borne to the center of the field near the west goal post by six of his friends and running companions, all dressed in the uniform of their teams or clubs. They included8:40 AM, 22502 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD- SENATE

South America and, most recently in September, a letter from England stating his plans to arrange a race with friends from Oregon and the Northwest for a series of meets.

“He never forgot the people, we will never forget him.”

Representing the Finnish athletes whom Pre befriended when the athlete was named Stennus followed, he said during the 35-minute memorial that “Steve Prefontaine symbolizes the friendship accumulated with Finnish and British athletes. He allowed us to see America and will forever shine in our hearts.”

The pallbearers, dressed in track warmup uniforms, were Frank Shorter, Jon Anderson, Jim Seymour, Brett Williams, Bob William and Geoff Hollister.

STEVEN C. STENNUS

Prefontaine, the state of Oregon’s most famous and honored athlete, was a prodigy, who at least in this coastal community became a legend in his own time. Here, as a pint-sized youth, the seed of determination germinated to run himself into immortality—not for himself, but for what, ultimately, he could do for the sport which had become an integral part of his life.

“Pre” was the state of Oregon’s most famous and honored athlete. He was “Pre,” the front-runner, always the finish line.

As he matured, he became a colorful and sometimes controversial figure. He became colorful because he was talented, tough and fiercely competitive. He believed in himself; he believed he could win every race, every battle. He adopted the words that adored him: particularly in Eugene, the nation’s collegiate track capital.

Steve's frame of reference. He was his own color bearer. He was Marshfield’s ROTC color bearer. He was at every school in the city of Eugene, his adopted city.

McGuire went on to say, “To me the characteristic that separated Pre from the rest of the field was his pride. It was so keen and intense within him that it was frightening. To be the best was his only goal. His drive was to push harder in group workouts or on his own individual workouts. His goals were constantly changing. He had to push harder to impose his own limitations. Limitation was not in Steve’s frame of reference. He was continuously extending the boundaries of his ability to share his love for this sport.”

McGuire unlocked the secret of Pre’s relation to “his people.”

The love that exists between two people who have an ability to share in ideas and communicate with each other,” explained McGuire, “is the love that I have for this man.”

“Tearful farewell to charismatic leader here Monday afternoon.”

Steve Bowerman Prefontaine, America’s greatest runner of distance races, had, of course, released them from their fanatic adulation and obedience. It was a new generation of civic and political leaders, not only because of his running achievements, but also because he never hesitated to “step on” the establishment that governed his sport.

“Pre’s legacy to us,” eulogized Bill Bowerman, the retired University of Oregon coach who also was Pre’s U.S. Olympic Track for the ’72 Olympics at Munich, “is that the good things of track and other sports may be shared by the best athletes, or in the words of Pre’s friend and companion, won by truth, honesty and hard work.

“With his characteristic courage and persistence, through discrimination, Pre opened that door. He was able to get that final step in athlete emancipation through our national organization. Pre, as Bowerman pointed out, was the first person in the history of track and field who had been permitted to arrange and bring foreign athletes or a team to Eugene, the nation’s collegiate track capital. Pre’s People Pay Tearful Tribute (By Carl Clift)
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a wreath of Finland's national emblem as a token of friendship for Prefontaine who worked tirelessly for many months to bring a Finnish delegation of track athletes to this country for a series of meets.

The tribute was conducted throughout the ceremony but many townspeople viewed Prefontaine's body in repose at Mills-Bryan-Sherwood Chapel. He wore the blue blazer designating Prefontaine an Olympic alternate-U.S. Olympic with the five intertwined rings embroidered on the breast pocket.

The Olympic route of the short, 39-minute service was that of Pre's talented cousin, Jan Prefontaine, of Washington, D.C. Jan sang a tribute to Pre, with guitar accompaniment. Jan first told of Pre's dedication to "his people"—how she had asked why he didn't leave Oregon for bigger and better things.

"I can't leave my people," he answered.

And thus the Prefontaine mystique with "his people" came to an end on the grassy slope of Sunset Memorial Park overlooking Illusmus Slough near the Millington area south of Coos Bay.

Three American flags fly from various vantage points—the nearest is just 47 paces from where a flat headstone will mark the final resting place of America's greatest distance runner of all time.

"PRE DUE FINAL TRIBUTE TODAY"

To spend a day or two in the warmth of your smiling eyes,

To give your heart away but for a moment's delight,

I've known you for so long in my mind,

Like the world spinning smiles upon a rhyme

He's got a rhythm in his walk an artist as he runs.

A smiling face he gives each separately,

Win or lose, he reaches out lovingly and stays a humble man, my Pre.

You offer words of tenderness—I dreamed of you,

Your running free enhances all the charms of aging wine

You offer a strong reflection of what can be,

A man who shares the sun of eternity

To be a strong but gentle man not afraid to speak the truth,

To stand against a raging storm and try to right the tide of wrongs,

You're a free man full of wonder here to stay

You've had a mind in a peaceful loving way...

JAN PREFONTAINE, Washington, D.C.

[From the New-Review, June 3, 1975]

"Pale Due Final Tribute Today"

EUGENE—A final tribute was scheduled in Hayward Field on the University of Oregon campus to Steve Prefontaine, who rose to stardom and was virtually unbeatable as a college record-setter.

A memorial service is scheduled in the track facility, where "Pre" ran his last race and won in 5,000 meters over friend, rival and fellow Olympian, Frank Shorter last Thursday evening, only a few hours before Prefontaine died in the smashup of his sports car on a Eugene street.

Prefontaine, who held seven American records in distances ranging from 2,000 meters to 10,000 meters, and who often ran sub-four-minute miles, was buried just outside his home town of Coos Bay on the Oregon Coast. Monday afternoon following memorial tribute to him by his town and his thousands of friends and mourners.

The memorial was conducted in mid-afternoon at Marshfield High School's Pirates Stadium, where "Pre" began his fabulous career as a prep star.

Schools were dismissed at noon and most of the community's businesses closed down for the final tribute.

In the stadium ceremony, the Rev. Thomas Murdock of the Coos Bay Emmanuel Episcopal Church, who was named eulogist, delivered the two speeches which most influenced Prefontaine's career—Marshfield High School Coach Walsh Mclnernie, who wrote a career tribute in "Pre" and University of Oregon Coach Bill Bowerman, who choseched the 1972 U.S. Olympic team of which Prefontaine was a member.

Prefontaine was buried like at the Mills-Bryan-Sherwood Chapel several blocks from the family home. A steady procession of friends visited the mortuary until noon Monday.

Prefontaine was dressed in his Olympic tunic, with the five Olympic rings embroidered on the breast pocket, that he wore during the opening ceremonies in Munich three years ago.

A picture of Steve with his mother and father and two sisters, and one of his favorite dogs, adorned the open casket.

The pallbearers were Frank Shorter, Jon Anderson, Jim Seymour, Brett Williams, Bob Williams and Geoff Hollister, competitors and friends in the sport of track.
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[From the New-York Times, June 8, 1975]

PREFONTAINE: WHAT HE WAS REALLY LIKE

Nine days ago, only a few hours after he had won a 5,000-meter race, Steve Prefontaine was killed in an automobile accident at the age of 24. He was America's leading distance runner, the American record-holder at all seven distances from 2,000 to 10,000 meters and an outspoken critic of inefficient amateur sports officials. He was popular; with fellow runners, and four of them have written tributes for this page. Marty Liquori has been one of his ranking middle distance runners. Frank Shorter was the 1972 Olympic marathon champion, Kenny Moore ran forth in the race and Jere Van Dyk, like Prefontaine, was an outstanding runner at the University of Oregon.

(By Marty Liquori)

There are two things that set Steve Prefontaine apart from other runners—his dedication to track and field and his spirit toward life.

During an indoor meet one year in Los Angeles, Pre and I roomed together. He came in at 8:30 A.M. the morning after he had been named the outstanding performer in the meet and had won the two-mile in 8 minutes and 28 seconds.

I saw him lying dead around 6:30 because I checked my watch. Whenever I room with somebody, I usually can't sleep until they get down, even if they're a casual friend.

Pre slept for an hour. I had to get up at 7:30 to catch my plane, but he turned over and said, "O'mon, I'll help you with your bags."

With only an hour's sleep, he helped me take my bags down to the lobby. Then he went out and said, "I'll be right back and I'll do it."

(By Kenny Moore)

Pre never had much confidence until he found running. He called himself a "slow runner," but he was the first to admit it.

"You're a free man full of wonder here to stay," he used to tell inmates he was tutoring in a maximum-security prison. He used to talk to inmates and help to organize sports activities in the prison.

Pre was always nice to everybody, but he had a calculated surprise, the way it is with some people who want to impress you. He did it, it was private, and he kept it to himself. He didn't really want anybody else to know it.

(By Jere Van Dyk)

I first heard about Steve Prefontaine during my junior year at the University of Oregon. Arne Kvalheim had just set a National College record and he and Steve were training for the Olympic trials. I spent some time training with Steve and we went to the Olympic trials together.

Prefontaine was an outstanding runner at the University of Oregon.

By Frank Shorter

While Pre was staying at our house one time, he convinced several inmates at an Idaho State Penitentiary to leave for an inmate race in Australia. He had been out of prison only one year and many of the inmates were skeptical.

"You're a free man full of wonder here to stay," he used to tell inmates he was tutoring in a maximum-security prison. He used to talk to inmates and help to organize sports activities in the prison.

Pre was always nice to everybody, but he had a calculated surprise, the way it is with some people who want to impress you. He did it, it was private, and he kept it to himself. He didn't really want anybody else to know it.

They didn't believe it until they saw it. Pre was a natural leader and he always surprised you. It wasn't a surprise when someone crossed the finish line first by a minute, but it was a surprise when someone crossed the finish line first by a minute after they had been paroled. I was always surprised by this inmate for several years.

"You're a free man full of wonder here to stay," he used to tell inmates he was tutoring in a maximum-security prison. He used to talk to inmates and help to organize sports activities in the prison.

Pre was always nice to everybody, but he had a calculated surprise, the way it is with some people who want to impress you. He did it, it was private, and he kept it to himself. He didn't really want anybody else to know it.
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**PRE NEVER A MAN TO RUN WITH CROWD**

(By Robert Fachet)

Steve Prefontaine is his own man. He ran hard and he played hard and he gave short shrift to critics of either pursuit.

A discussion with Pre was not an exchange of conventional wisdom like it was, or at least how he thought it was; and if you didn’t like it, well, talk to somebody else.

He hated selfish people and phonies. He worked hard in pursuit of excellence and he had no patience with bureaucrats who heaped obstacles in his path and those of other athletes.

When he debated running in the 1976 Olympics, and was beset by patriots, he said, “People say I should be running for a gold medal for the red, white and blue and all the bull, but I’m the one who has made the sacrifices. These are my American records, not the country’s."

When the NCAA scheduled its 1973 outdoor championships in steamy Baton Rouge, La., he said, “It appears to me the members of the selecting committee pick these sites because they are thinking about a vacation rather than track. It’s too hot there.”

When the AAU tried to block him from competing in Europe, because he refused to run in the AAU meet, he shot back, “The AAU just uses athletes. I’ve had enough of that. I want to have some fun as well as good competition.”

He had fun, too. He liked his beer and had plans to open a bar in Eugene, Ore., to be called “Co-Op”.

On Dec. 31, 1973, he was the bartender at a wild party in Los Angeles. The next day he swam and then went to the Sunkist float and joined other athletes on the Sunkist float in the Tournament of Roses Parade.

“The Burbank float was in front of us,” he reported later, “and I was directing our float by walkie-talkie and I guess I didn’t do too well because we rammed them and put a big dent in their float.”

At the 1972 Olympic Trials in Eugene, the “Go Pre” buttons and sweatshirts of his rabid supporters were mocked slightly by some detractors who showed up wearing “Stop Pre” shirts. Prefontaine had the last laugh. After he won the 5,000 meters, setting one of his many American records, he obtained one of the “Stop Pre” shirts and wore it on a victory lap.

In Eugene, where he observed that “the crowd gives you a reserve of power. It’s a strange sensation. If you’re down, you’re down to a ragged nothing, the crowd can carry you.”

Less successful in Europe, he nevertheless was backed by many of his fastest races in a losing cause there. He enjoyed the sharing of pace-setting duties with other Americans who “suck along on the back of me.”

Despite being outwardly self-confident he was anxious before races. Prior to the NCAA cross-country meet his freshman year, he...
"was on the toilet for three days." It was the only leg of the race he lost.

After his Olympic Trials success, he said he "felt like there is a big, big gummy sack of bouncy rubber in my stomach."

At Munich, he set the 5,000 pace, was overhauled and finished fourth. He offered neither alibi nor regret.

Prefontaine came out of Coos Bay, Ore., a fishing town where a youngster fought the James timber fire. It used to be said, up in Coos Bay, that "We would not believe some of the nice things people are saying about him today."

He was barely four hours later, after leaving a 24-mile run in the woods. Let us be plain: there is nothing noble about the death last month of Avery Brunage, the obstructionist who could run like an acocious young man who could run like an Olympic medallist. "But that did not shock me," Prefontaine said of the Olympic loss, the only time his name entered in the last two years.

After enrolling at the University of Oregon in 1976, Prefontaine quickly emerged as the finest distance runner in America under the tutelage of Bill Bowerman.

"It is at about this time that he began to express bitterness about what he believed to be the shabby treatment of athletes in this country. But that did not affect his performances."

In the 1972 Olympics, he ran the 5,000 in 13:37. With four laps to go, Prefontaine held a slim lead, and at that point observers believed if he had started his kick, he would have captured the gold medal.

But he still was new to international competition and apparently feared that he would burn out in the race before the finish. He kept his pace and then, with only 10 meters to go, he took him the last overtaking him about 10 meters before the tape.

His Olympic loss may have been the reason he turned down what was described as the largest offer ever made by pro track so he could take another Olympic shot in 1976.

[From the New Times, June 27, 1975]

MAN ON THE RUN: FINAL TRIBUTE

(From The New Times, June 27, 1975)

RUNNER PREFONTAINE KILLED IN AUTO CRASH: 24-YEAR-OLD HELD MARKS IN DISTANCES

EUGENE, Ore., May 30 — Steve Prefontaine, for almost a decade one of this country's best and most controversial athletes and the owner of every American running record over 2,000 meters, is dead at 24, the victim of an automobile accident here early today.

The 6-foot-0, 155-pound distance runner, whose dedication to running was matched by his bitterness over the treatment of amateur athletes in America, had come within 1.2 second of a world record at a meet in Eugene Thursday night.

Barely four hours later, after leaving a party at the local state campus police said his small foreign car crossed the center line, skidded about 40 feet, struck a rock embankment and flipped over, pinning him beneath it.

Assistant Lane County medical examiner Edward Wilson said an autopsy showed the alcohol level measure in Prefontaine's blood stream was .16 of 1 per cent.

Oregon law says a person with a level of .10 per cent is regarded as intoxicated, and a level of .18 per cent or higher is considered a criminal offense.

The time of death was placed at about 12:30, and physicians sent shock waves through the track world.

"He told me last night he felt he was just starting, and I know he felt the season that he had just begun," said Bill Dellinger, Prefontaine's coach. "He thought he was the best in the world and was aiming for 1976.

A native athlete in Coos Bay, Ore., Prefontaine had a brilliant career at the University of Oregon, turning in some remarkable performances despite the pressure and burden thrust into the spotlight as a teen-ager in 1966.

He did not own any world records, but his American mark of 2:08.20, set in 1975, is dead at 24, the victim of an automobile accident here early today.

The 6-foot-0, 155-pound distance runner, whose dedication to running was matched by his bitterness over the treatment of amateur athletes in America, had come within 1.2 second of a world record at a meet in Eugene Thursday night.

Barely four hours later, after leaving a party at the local state campus police said his small foreign car crossed the center line, skidded about 40 feet, struck a rock embankment and flipped over, pinning him beneath it.

Assistant Lane County medical examiner Edward Wilson said an autopsy showed the alcohol level measure in Prefontaine's blood stream was .16 of 1 per cent.

Oregon law says a person with a level of .10 per cent is regarded as intoxicated, and a level of .18 per cent or higher is considered a criminal offense.

The time of death was placed at about 12:30, and physicians sent shock waves through the track world.

"He told me last night he felt he was just starting, and I know he felt the season that he had just begun," said Bill Dellinger, Prefontaine's coach. "He thought he was the best in the world and was aiming for 1976.

A native athlete in Coos Bay, Ore., Prefontaine had a brilliant career at the University of Oregon, turning in some remarkable performances despite the pressure and burden thrust into the spotlight as a teen-ager in 1966.

He did not own any world records, but his American mark of 2:08.20, set in 1975, is dead at 24, the victim of an automobile accident here early today.

The 6-foot-0, 155-pound distance runner, whose dedication to running was matched by his bitterness over the treatment of amateur athletes in America, had come within 1.2 second of a world record at a meet in Eugene Thursday night.

Barely four hours later, after leaving a party at the local state campus police said his small foreign car crossed the center line, skidded about 40 feet, struck a rock embankment and flipped over, pinning him beneath it.

Assistant Lane County medical examiner Edward Wilson said an autopsy showed the alcohol level measure in Prefontaine's blood stream was .16 of 1 per cent.

Oregon law says a person with a level of .10 per cent is regarded as intoxicated, and a level of .18 per cent or higher is considered a criminal offense.

The time of death was placed at about 12:30, and physicians sent shock waves through the track world.

"He told me last night he felt he was just starting, and I know he felt the season that he had just begun," said Bill Dellinger, Prefontaine's coach. "He thought he was the best in the world and was aiming for 1976.

A native athlete in Coos Bay, Ore., Prefontaine had a brilliant career at the University of Oregon, turning in some remarkable performances despite the pressure and burden thrust into the spotlight as a teen-ager in 1966.

He did not own any world records, but his American mark of 2:08.20, set in 1975, is dead at 24, the victim of an automobile accident here early today.

The 6-foot-0, 155-pound distance runner, whose dedication to running was matched by his bitterness over the treatment of amateur athletes in America, had come within 1.2 second of a world record at a meet in Eugene Thursday night.

Barely four hours later, after leaving a party at the local state campus police said his small foreign car crossed the center line, skidded about 40 feet, struck a rock embankment and flipped over, pinning him beneath it.

Assistant Lane County medical examiner Edward Wilson said an autopsy showed the alcohol level measure in Prefontaine's blood stream was .16 of 1 per cent.

Oregon law says a person with a level of .10 per cent is regarded as intoxicated, and a level of .18 per cent or higher is considered a criminal offense.

The time of death was placed at about 12:30, and physicians sent shock waves through the track world.

"He told me last night he felt he was just starting, and I know he felt the season that he had just begun," said Bill Dellinger, Prefontaine's coach. "He thought he was the best in the world and was aiming for 1976.

A native athlete in Coos Bay, Ore., Prefontaine had a brilliant career at the University of Oregon, turning in some remarkable performances despite the pressure and burden thrust into the spotlight as a teen-ager in 1966.

He did not own any world records, but his American mark of 2:08.20, set in 1975, is dead at 24, the victim of an automobile accident here early today.
Police report Prefontaine's vehicle crossed the center line on a slick curb—hit a rock embankment and flipped over.

Prefontaine was pinned under the wreckage—and shortly thereafter was pronounced dead on arrival at a local hospital:

Earlier last night—the 1973 Olympian from Coos Bay became the first medallist in the history of the Olympics to die in an automobile accident. He was found by his people.

Prefontaine was four in the five-thousand-meter race at the Olympic Games in Munich in 1972. He held six American distance records—at 3,000 meters, two in three miles, 5,000 meters, six miles and 10,000 meters. He was called by many the United States' most dedicated and outstanding runner.

The President of the U.S. Olympic Committee—Philip Crum claimed today—America has lost the most outstanding distance runner ever to wear an American jersey.

He added the Committee has counted on Prefontaine as one of the top prospects for a vindication of American track's Olympic program, to gain recognition as a collegiate... good enough to set six American records... and good enough to win the admission to the country's great track coaches, Bill Bowerman.

Film.

A tremendous loss... to the University of Oregon... to the State... to American track, and to current Oregon track coach, Bill Delling, who recruited Pref from Coos Bay, and who coached him till his last race.

Film.

It's going to be very difficult to remember this man, by many, six American records... to lose a person of the peak of his athletic ability... Pointing towards the 1976 Olympic games.... Pointing towards a world's record... a potential Olympic gold medal encounter.

Prefontaine was colorful and controversial—said to needle the track coaches, Bill Bowerman. Here are the words that Bowerman used to describe Prefontaine, without numbers, just a man:

"He liked to call "Pre" his people. He preferred Bill over his last name. Both Prefontaine and 'Pre' are terminated words.

The Prefontaine family—Bill Bowerman and Bill Delling—called Prefontaine "as fierce a competitor as Oregon ever had."

Steve Prefontaine, above anything else, loved to run. He approached his work as hard work... work that he didn't feel he and other athletes were very well paid.

It was this outspoken candidness, that often got "Pre" in trouble... He was perfectly willing to take on athletic officials, if he thought they were wrong... and, he often thought they were wrong... and, he got away with it, because he was good... good enough for a collegiate... a college man... good enough to set six American records... and good enough to win the admiration of one of the country's great track coaches, Bill Bowerman.

Film.

The program handed to every person when they arrived at the high school field stated simply—"In Memory of Pre."

The former University of Oregon track star was buried in Eugene, Oregon today. He died this morning in a single car accident in Eugene.

Death in this town has yet to be comprehended fully.

One of his closest friends—Olympic marathon champion Frank Shorter led a field of track athletes at Pre's funeral in Eugene.

It was Shorter—you may recall—who placed second in Prefontaine's final race last Thursday in the 5,000 meter event—the future Olympic star missed his own American record by only a second and a half.

There were several speakers who eulogized Prefontaine this day.

They included a representative of Finland's track team—Reiner Stinian.

He called Pre a winner.

Former Oregon Track coach Bill Bowerman said he was a true amateur who never really gave professional track a thought.

He called Pre—the most fierce competitor he ever coached.

His High School coach—Walt McClure led track at Pre's days from grades nine through 12.

McClure stated that he always knew Pre was going to be a star.

Prefontaine was a true champion—a person who wasn't afraid to speak out—a person who will be remembered in amateur track circles.

Denny Shiebler—channel six news—Coos Bay, Oregon.

After a service at Marshfield High School this afternoon, Steve Prefontaine, has been buried in Coos Bay. The service, which was held at the Marshfield football field was attended by about a thousand friends and relatives of the great runner, who was killed last Friday, in a high-speed automobile accident.

Prefontaine was remembered fondly by two former coaches, Walt McClure, who guided his career through high school, and Bill Bowerman, the man responsible for making Pre a household word during his days at the University of Oregon. The runner, whose greatest achievement was an Olympic Gold Medal, was buried in his Olympic sports coat, with the five rings on the breast pocket.

Pre missed an Olympic medal, in 1972, when he placed fourth in the 5,000 meters. He was also offered a medal for competing in the pentathlon. Pre also missed a medal in the 1972 Olympics when he was burned himself up trying to win, and had to settle for fourth. Setting was never one of Pre's long suits... he loved to win... he lived to be number one.

After the race, he took it for a drive up into Hendrick's Park. Where he spent many hours training, and looking towards the Olympics of Oregon days... coming over a hill, he lost control, crossed the road, went over the curb, and hit full speed into a rock wall. The car flipped, and crushed the driver. Prefontaine..."
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plans, Frank Shorter, and Jon Anderson, as well as several Oregon teammates, on hand.

[From Sports Illustrated, Feb. 21, 1972]

IT JUST WAS NOT IN THE STARS

Steve Prefontaine arrived in Los Angeles from Eugene, Ore., last week with a worry. And a Death Wish. He was the planet's No. 1 distance runner, and he was going to have to visit the planet's No. 1 medical center.

"It's all part of the price I have to pay," he said, "that somebody else will have to pay it for me." That somebody else was Dr. Benjamin W. Schmitt, the medical director of Oregon's only major hospital.

Prefontaine arrived in Los Angeles for an operation. His right leg, which had been aching for a month, was diagnosed as suffering from a stress fracture in the tibia. The operation was to be an emergency procedure, and it was scheduled for the following day.

"I'm glad I came to Los Angeles," Prefontaine said. "I'm glad Dr. Schmitt is here. He's the best." And he's the only one that matters.

Prefontaine's operation was successful, and he was released from the hospital the following day. He began running again two weeks later, and he was back in action within a month. He won the 1972 Olympic Games in the 5,000-meter race, and he set a world record in the 3,000-meter race.

"I'm just glad I came here," Prefontaine said. "I'm glad Dr. Schmitt is here. He's the best." And he's the only one that matters.
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"It's all part of the price I have to pay," he said, "that somebody else will have to pay it for me." That somebody else was Dr. Benjamin W. Schmitt, the medical director of Oregon's only major hospital.

Prefontaine arrived in Los Angeles for an operation. His right leg, which had been aching for a month, was diagnosed as suffering from a stress fracture in the tibia. The operation was to be an emergency procedure, and it was scheduled for the following day.

"I'm glad I came to Los Angeles," Prefontaine said. "I'm glad Dr. Schmitt is here. He's the best." And he's the only one that matters.
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"I'm just glad I came here," Prefontaine said. "I'm glad Dr. Schmitt is here. He's the best." And he's the only one that matters.
race in so long that most of his performances seem predetermined.
He earns too much money to lose. National Collegiate outdoor championships on his home track with victories in his last 19 races. His dominance in the three-mile (5,000 meters), which he already has won in this meet the last two years—Pre has not lost since August, 1970.

Such performances almost seem too weighty for a 5-foot-9-inch 145-pounder from the tiny Oregon seacoast town of Coos Bay. Yes, in terms of personal candor and competitive fortitude, Prefontaine is the Marty Liquori of the West Coast, one of the few Americans almost assured of a berth on the Olympic team if he remains fit, and a definite gold-medal threat for Munich.

As far as this three-day competition is concerned, Prefontaine is the only American in the men's 5,000 meters (three-mile or 5,000 meters, which he has already won in this meet the last two years—Pre has not lost since August, 1970.

Such performances almost seem too weighty for a 5-foot-9-inch 145-pounder from the tiny Oregon seacoast town of Coos Bay. Yes, in terms of personal candor and competitive fortitude, Prefontaine is the Marty Liquori of the West Coast, one of the few Americans almost assured of a berth on the Olympic team if he remains fit, and a definite gold-medal threat for Munich.

As far as this three-day competition is concerned, Prefontaine is the only American in the men's 5,000 meters (three-mile or 5,000 meters, which he has already won in this meet the last two years—Pre has not lost since August, 1970.

Such performances almost seem too weighty for a 5-foot-9-inch 145-pounder from the tiny Oregon seacoast town of Coos Bay. Yes, in terms of personal candor and competitive fortitude, Prefontaine is the Marty Liquori of the West Coast, one of the few Americans almost assured of a berth on the Olympic team if he remains fit, and a definite gold-medal threat for Munich.

As far as this three-day competition is concerned, Prefontaine is the only American in the men's 5,000 meters (three-mile or 5,000 meters, which he has already won in this meet the last two years—Pre has not lost since August, 1970.

Such performances almost seem too weighty for a 5-foot-9-inch 145-pounder from the tiny Oregon seacoast town of Coos Bay. Yes, in terms of personal candor and competitive fortitude, Prefontaine is the Marty Liquori of the West Coast, one of the few Americans almost assured of a berth on the Olympic team if he remains fit, and a definite gold-medal threat for Munich.

As far as this three-day competition is concerned, Prefontaine is the only American in the men's 5,000 meters (three-mile or 5,000 meters, which he has already won in this meet the last two years—Pre has not lost since August, 1970.

Such performances almost seem too weighty for a 5-foot-9-inch 145-pounder from the tiny Oregon seacoast town of Coos Bay. Yes, in terms of personal candor and competitive fortitude, Prefontaine is the Marty Liquori of the West Coast, one of the few Americans almost assured of a berth on the Olympic team if he remains fit, and a definite gold-medal threat for Munich.

As far as this three-day competition is concerned, Prefontaine is the only American in the men's 5,000 meters (three-mile or 5,000 meters, which he has already won in this meet the last two years—Pre has not lost since August, 1970.

Such performances almost seem too weighty for a 5-foot-9-inch 145-pounder from the tiny Oregon seacoast town of Coos Bay. Yes, in terms of personal candor and competitive fortitude, Prefontaine is the Marty Liquori of the West Coast, one of the few Americans almost assured of a berth on the Olympic team if he remains fit, and a definite gold-medal threat for Munich.
the Olympic Games to overcome the blisters, burning lungs, fatigue and fatuous 17th-century rule enforces. Then that dream turned nightmarish, and track and field questions about what it all meant was a unanimous, "What am I doing this for?"

For sustained soul-searching it is possible that no one of young Steve Prefontaine, the super-distance runner from the University of Oregon whose performances leading to his near々e of something better than his fourth-place finish there in the 5,000-meter run. Prefontaine ran twice after Monday London Olympic Games, both times in races where the Killer instinct that had cut down countless rivals in the stretch totally had gapped out. He couldn't afford to be slow.

The day he didn't have to run was the Saturday, May 12, 1973, that he ran 20 miles a day. Prefontaine, however, was consolded by Leo Bjorg, a former Finnish Olympic medalist. "I've had him over to the house and my wife gave him good Finnish blueberry soup. That will fix up his stomach. It was the first time I've run in this condition. It's the motivational factor I've

"I felt weak from the beginning," Viren said. "Already at a mile I felt that I was back in last in this condition. It was my first competition this year indoors and I couldn't find the right rhythm. I only ran 1:10 miles and probably run 20 miles a day," Viren, however, was consolded by Leo Bjorg, a former Finnish Olympic medalist. "I've had him over to the house and my wife gave him good Finnish blueberry soup. That will fix up his stomach. It was the first time I've run in this condition. It's the motivational factor I've
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But for all their irritables and travail, a lot of track people started realizing better things about things in Los Angeles on Saturday."

[Fran from Sports Illustrated, May 28, 1973]

"Pre"s Last Duck-Waddle

(By Ron Reid)

(UCLA won the Pac-8 meet and Steve Prefontaine ended his college career at Eugene, which was the home folks cheering and a love affair intact.)

There have been more sentimental mo-ments in sport, but few performances have been more worth louder raves, but what the fans in Eugene, Ore, got last Saturday was just about right: a suitably happy ending to a long competitive period. The Trans-Pacific-8 Conference track and field championship in which Prefontaine ran his last major collegiate race in front of his hometown fans.

On the scoreboard UCLA continued its domination, winning the meet with a con­ference-record total of 156 points. Prefontain's, laboring with a pinched sciatic nerve that made him feel as if his gluteus maximus had been worked over by a sadistic field-goal marker, ran in the last four years in succession, and the 11,000 faithful re­sponded with lusty affection. The mutual admiration between Pre and his Eugene fans is a longtime thing at Ore­gon's Hayward Field, where he has never lost to anyone but a teammate. "You have to recognize that track is a way of life here in Eugene," says Mayor Les Anderson, whose son won the Boston Marathon last month. "Pre's presence puts life and soul into the crowd. Some athletes win a race and afterward they're poker-faced. Pre's expres­sion never changes." Such a demonstration followed his victory over John Nengo, a Washington State in­ternational, 17 4/5ths to 17 1/5ths in the six-mile run the day before. Heading down the stretch, ahead by 50 yards, Prefontaine acknowledged the stands with a triumphant arm salute as a "Go Pre!" chorus greeted his sprint to the tape. Moments later track an­nouncer Wendy Ray said, "Thanks for the good times, Pre."

By Prefontaine's standards, however, his 13:10.4 victory did not qualify as such, even though the mark shattered the old meet rec­ord of 13:12.8 set by Gerry Lindgren in 1966. Healthier, Prefontaine might have ended his career with another record or something better. If that seems more specu­lation, consider what wonders he has worked already in his senior season.

At Berkeley, almost on a whim, Prefontaine ran the six miles for the second time in his career. Unfamiliarity may explain the three miles in 19:06. But pace that probably left a contrail. When the race ended, he had a new American and collegiate record 13:01.4, the fastest four-mile time in the world for 1973. Back home he re­corded his best mile, 3:56, again on his home track. This season has also produced an
Brutus' fourth in the last five years, was ensured by an 86-point performance in the field events. USC, scoring 73 points in the meet, eked out 111, while Oregon scored 100 for third.

In the long jump, however, USC's Randy Williams, with the aid of a good luck teddy bear which宛如 stuffed animal, avenged his loss earlier in the season to UCLA's James McAllister. McAllister opened the meet with a leap of 26' 9". Then Williams, the Olympic champion, did the same without a breeze for a new meet record of 26' 11".

As for the fans, he said, "I know how to do something good for the fans. But right now I'm not as fit as I was a couple weeks ago and I wanted to double, but it's going to be hard enough just to run the three mile run. I can't relax, and relax is the key to relaxation is the key to it." 2250
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Smith discussed this issue, he did not admit that it was true. Mr. Smith did say that FEA would do its own study of the regional impact of the program. He attached a copy of the FEA study, The Oil and Gas Journal article was correct; the figures are very close to the ones developed by the authors of the GWU study.

The letter also enclosed a detailed analysis of the technique the George Washington research group used in their second approximation. The major problem with the technique used was that it assumed that the costs and benefits of the program to small refiners could be determined on a state-by-state basis in a manner identical to the costs and benefits of the largest refiners. The effect of this error was to greatly overstate the costs of the program to the Northern Tier states. If one corrects for this bias, it turns out that the entitlement program subsidies not just New England but the Northern Tier as well.

Mr. Smith makes an interesting argument about whether the benefits of the program are being passed through to consumers. He says that since the refiners now benefitting from the program were unable earlier last year to pass through increased costs (since they were using new oil and competing against refiners using old oil), they should be allowed to use the program to make up for their earlier losses. And he says, "If one corrects for this bias, it turns out that New England but the Northern Tier as well."

First of all, I should note that many of the properly chosen issues, such as mentioned in your letter are also mentioned in the GWU study itself. (A more recent version of the second approximation of the GWU study recognizes that a number of simplifying assumptions are necessary. They also state that they have been limited by the data that is available."

Because of the importance of this issue to my State, and to other states which, it would be of interest to determine whether the program has actually impacted on various regions of the country. Your critique of the GWU study focuses on the "first approximation." Most of my questions actually centered around the "second approximation," which estimates the state-by-state impact of the entitlements program on gasoline costs. The "second approximation" is far less restrictive in its assumptions. For example, you state that all oil refined in the region is sold within that region. Rather, it assumes that the costs (and benefits) of the entitlements program will be distributed among the states according to the companies' actual gasoline sales in each state. I would appreciate your approach, but I don't agree with your methodology and conclusions, your providing a corrected version to me in the future.

Finally, I have received a complaint from a jobber in my State for one of the largest beneficaries of the entitlement program. According to this jobber, his supplier is not passing on receipts from the sale of entitlements in the form of lower prices, but is pocketing these receipts as higher profits. I think that FEA should not reuire the pass-through of the benefits of the entitlements program to consumers. Is this correct? FEA is giving greater weight to the GWU study than to other studies which I have requested, you undertake an audit of the largest sellers of entitlements. Are they or are they not passing on the benefits to consumers? It seems to me that your jobbers and their customers have benefited and by how much.

This is a large order, and I want to thank you for your advance for your cooperation. You continue to do a remarkable job under the most difficult of circumstances. Perhaps the information I seek will enable me to ease your path. I hope so.

Very truly yours,

BILL BROOKS

FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., July 11, 1975.

Hon. BILL BROOKS.
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.
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The important consideration is not whether we are passing through entitlement benefits immediately, but whether the marketplace has become more competitive since the entitlements program was instigated. Consequently, we believe it has served its main purpose.

I have previously undertaken an audit of the largest sellers of entitlements to determine whether they or their customers have benefitted. I have been told by many an insider that will not tell who has benefited. The customer benefits from increased competition. It is impossible for the consumer to know whether some companies are now banking costs at an increased rate and others at a reduced rate or are reducing banked costs. The consumer is only interested in the price in the marketplace.

GWU STUDY—SECOND APPROXIMATION

I have attached, as you requested, a special appendix presenting a brief critique of the second approximation. To illustrate the major errors inherent in this study, I have recalculated the estimates for the entire U.S., using techniques appreciably more accurate than those used by the authors of the study. Results are

### Increased cost of gasoline first 5 months

**GWU, our analysis, and difference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[In millions]</th>
<th>Tennessee</th>
<th>14.59</th>
<th>4.76</th>
<th>9.83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>250.65</td>
<td>37.17</td>
<td>213.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When errors of the above magnitude are apparent we question whether the study has validity. It is more apt to be misleading than meaningless.

We have not provided a corrected version of the study, since we feel the consumer is only interested in the price in the marketplace. The gasoline "tilt" is only a part of the cost or benefit of the entitlements program to a state, as I will discuss in more detail in the next section. It has no meaning when viewed in isolation.

CONCERNS EXPRESSED IN YOUR MAY 9 COMMUNICATION

Your letter was prompted by a George Washington University Energy Policy Research Center report that some refiners were short-changing the consumer and that Congress would not agree to such a program. There were a few refiners who might have been interested in their profit margin, but we recognize that such a study is meaningless.

The authors never mention the reasons for the entitlements program, or the alternatives to not adopting such a program. They never mention, for instance, that the entitlements program was designed to correct a gross inequity that clearly was not the intent of the EPAA. It is not just the refiners who would benefit. It would be the average consumer. The program would still meet the intent of the EPAA—fuel importers and marketers were crude oil price decontrol.

As you are probably aware, there are many people within the industry who favored such an option. However, the general feeling was that Congress would not agree to such an alternative and the administration opted for the entitlements program as an interim solution.

At the time the entitlements program was adopted the two-tier price system had created an impossible competitive situation for many independent refiners who could purchase crude oil at a higher price and had to purchase products on a competitive basis.
Congressional Record — Senate

July 14, 1975

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22513

can provide in moving back to a free market and eventual decontrol.

I hope this letter is more responsive to your concerns. If there are still unanswered questions, I would be happy to try once again. We recognize that occasionally our programs will have unintended results. We rely on concerned individuals, such as you, to help us improve the quality and effectiveness of our programs. We feel that such dialogue is important and that the issues are worth discussing. Perhaps we can improve understanding of our programs.

In any regulatory program it is difficult to treat everyone equally as distinct from fairly.
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Of concerned individuals, such as you, to help us improve the quality and effectiveness of our programs. We feel that such dialogue is important and that the issues are worth discussing. Perhaps we can improve understanding of our programs.

FEA's record has been good over a considerable fraction of our national electric power needs. Modern engineering stands ready to design and build full-scale units now that would provide the newly demonstrated operating experience and the data for dependable economic analysis on the basis of which the deployment of large numbers of similar machines could proceed promptly.

THE BASIS OF PAST EXPERIENCE

The picturesque windmills of past centuries were examples of a primitive technology contributing to a large part of the power used by a primitive industry. The value of that experience has now lies mainly in its history. There has since been more modern and more valuable experience. Aside from wind-electric machines developed for an experimental program on U.S. farms in the nineteen thirties and now, in the present energy crisis, being moved towards large-scale wind-generated electric power to supply both the conceptual design and preliminary, first-appraisal stress and fatigue calculations of Putnam, the S. Morgan Smith Company first became interested in the pos­

sertion of one of its engineers, Percy Smith, in a 2.5 megawatt turbine. This is the economic range of power ratings was found to be between 1.25 megawatts and twice that and the curve is so flat that there is only about a 2% variation of power cost over this range. For economic reasons it is important that the machine be large, in this range, but it doesn't matter much how large. For example black and white are about the same and the machine with the largest power output was not any more expensive than a 200 hundred feet, although English studies, indicate that cost per kilowatt continues to grow with size. It is significant for our purposes that this hard-headed industrial company, which had already decided on producing a good new product soon, decided not to fool around with small-scale pilot stages but to go directly to a practical size machine in the large economic range. As Putnam relates it:

"The question of a small test unit, 25 feet or so in diameter, was felt to be important because of the smooth regulation lay in high inertia, which might not be provided by a small-scale unit, the design, fabrication, and testing of which would in any case cost nearly as much as would the full-scale unit. To eliminate the risk of poor regulation and other scale effects, the full-scale test unit was decided upon. In the smallest size and on the shortest tower thought to be conducive to the range of economical sizes. Accordingly, the S. Morgan Smith Company selected a rating of 1250 kilowatts, a diameter of 75 feet, a height of 400 r.p.m. and a hub height of 125 feet."

That is the way private enterprise went to work to try to get something promptly before the commercial energy picture were distorted by government promotion and heavy subsidy of just one source of energy —

The slow pace for the redevelopment of wind energy proposed until recently by NSF and now by the successor government agency ERDA stands in sharp contrast with this. In spite of the fact that the practica­

lity of a large wind machine had already been demonstrated the decision was made this time to start with a small model and gradually progress in the course of about five to ten years to windmills almost as large as the Grandpa's Knob ma­

chine. Stated so baldly, this can be made to seem like a deliberate attempt to de­

lay the large-scale deployment of wind power until the commitment to all-out nuclear energy is firmly established, while a small but growing wind power base is being developed. However, the motivation is doubtless not as simple, and is to be viewed mainly as a recognition that the two are in a matter having no external promotion with sufficient clout. NSF when start funding wind research about ten years ago, it was planned to take longer for the comparatively simple matter of getting wind power under control than for a few years ago, with wind power tested on full-scale and

Footnotes at end of article.
ready for commercial deployment, than it took after the discovery of fission to invent and develop and use the atomic bomb!

One reason for the different pace in wind power research than is that it is easier in Congress to drift into a decision, starting with a small appropriation and increasing it each year, rather than to fund a project for wind power to develop a fund of development promptly. This was especially true in the funding of alternate energy, for it was early evident that the small start was made before the energy crunch was dramatized by the Arabs. Once the schedule for slow growth was set, it seems hard to depart from.

The slow growth of the funding is not the whole story. For fiscal 1976, with recognition of the energy crisis, the NSF budget for wind power was greatly increased to $7 million but in the process of shifting the funds from one general appropriation for wind power, that is, power con­version was funded, the NSF has been provided with and limited by river flow, the reservoir provides an ideal storage system for the wind power without extra pumping of water, the flow being stored while the wind is more efficient than the transmission storage now used in connection with some nuclear plants for peaking power. Such storage is of course available only to the extent that hydroelectric power is needed as well.

Wind power can thus make a very substantial contribution to our needed commercial availability of energy sources and the urgent development of wind power systems to alleviate the present energy crisis should not await development of a 100 MW scale system for wind power. If wind power systems are to supply the major part of electric power needs in the future, it will be necessary to develop it with adequate storage facilities. Of these the electrolytic generation of hydrogen for use in a hydrogen economy appears to us, to have a high potential and to be ready for commercial deployment, than it took after the discovery of fission to invent and develop and use the atomic bomb!

Some of the alternative concepts being explored may have advantages such as high stationary energy density, and advantages such as greater vulnerability to storms. One of the interesting alternatives has many blunders that they can be used to support the spokes of a bicycle wheel, driving a general with a belt around the rim, and may be advantageous in small sizes for domestic use. It seems unlikely at present that any of these concepts will displace the high-speed rotor with two or three blades that has already been demonstrated on the NASA Lewis research near Cleveland.

The technical advantage of the high-speed design is that, with a tip speed about six times that of the earth, it effectively covers a large projected area and makes use of kinetic energy from the wind as possible, without covering that large area with metal and becoming burdensome. It is one that seems to need no wait for other developments before going ahead with construction of full-scale demonstration units in the mid-1970s, with a target of approximately 1-MW machine is being completed in late 1977 to be followed by one or two such machines in 1980. The phrase "in a user environment" implies that these may be four rather similar machines operated by four utility companies, as will be the case, it appears, with several 100-kilowatt-size machines following the test model now being built. A more forthcoming demonstration contract now for the prompt design and construction of the four 2-MW scale units with experimentation with a variety of control systems and on the user environment. Valuable diversification of experience would be provided by two or three such units, one being low and one very tall, and two floating offshore units, one with a single rotor and one with two or three. The present program contemplates no offshore experiment at all, neglecting for several years what may turn out to be the most favorable environment and the one that is in most need of vigorous exploration because there has been no past experience with it.

FULL-SCALE DEMONSTRATION UNITS

However, in the present power crunch and with further decisions on nuclear power pending, there is a rush. Actual experimentation with construction of large-scale units should be accelerated so as to be able to provide a variety of experience that may improve later generations of large machines.

The Smith-Putnam accomplishment does provide quite a jump in development of a large machine, but being in the musty past it does not convey the force of conviction or the dynamic of the establishment that actual construction and operation of the machines in present circumstances would have. There would be nothing so effective as seeing a giant wind turbine in operation and studying their costs to convince a utility
company to buy wind power or Congress to build wind-power plants. Their enemies were not the best possible and there should thus remain room for improvement in the next model.

The success of the S. Morgan Smith Company in completing its large wind turbine in the short span of two years was possible partly because the company benefited by the early cooperation of the Senate.

Hughes and Bergery in Oklahoma, has received a combination of government funds required to provide such an opportunity. The credibility of the proposal may have been enhanced by the fact that in the short span of two years was possible for deployment in large numbers. The immediate need, then, is an extra appropriation of something of the order of twenty million dollars over the next two or three years, with perhaps five to eight million available in the first year, and the decision to stand by and do nothing is unlikely to be at all likely that such prompt success can be expected. For to get prompt results now, it seems desirable for each project again to achieve effective experience with the first of the present-day wind power enthusiasts and an organization with adequate engineering staff and construction capabilities. A good approach would be for the funding agency to seek and favor, for design and construction of large demonstration units, proposals involving this sort of cooperation.

There are quite a few technical men, mostly engineers, who have been developing wind power from whom a great deal could be learned, and who would be small indeed compared with other energy expenditures, a few tens of millions of dollars.

When the funding agency in recent years has received a proposal from one of these enthusiasts for the construction of a full-scale prototype, it may have seemed attractive to turn down partly out of reluctance to make a large commitment to one proposal when there are so many but perhaps partly because of questioning the credibility of the proponent as an advocate of large-scale wind power. This uncertainty of credibility should not longer be questioned, for the credibility of large-scale wind power has been established by the Smith-Putnam experience and their subsequent developments, as reported in Putnam's book.1 In particular, their cost estimates based on their experience are apt to be as reliable as any until similar experience will have been obtained with the construction of large wind turbines. These estimates seem to establish that electric power produced by large wind turbines is economically very attractive and distinctly competitive with present-day energy sources. If this is so, this era of high fuel costs and nuclear cost overruns is over.

WIND POWER AS A STIMULANT TO INDUSTRY

Once the decision is made through a combination of government and private efforts to go ahead with a large wind power program, there will undoubtedly be a strong tendency to evolve to build large wind machines and associated equipment. A very rough idea of the size of the industry may be obtained by considering the amount of material involved, mainly metal and epoxy materials. The pre-production wind turbine designed by Smith- Putnam and installed at Key West experiment station but never built was to weigh 350 tons. It was rated at 1.6 megawatts which with the size of this present-day turbine can be scaled up to about 1/2 MW steady power. This means 700 tons per megawatt. By way of comparison, the electric steel consumption to build one of these wind machines was 2 tons per kilowatt per year for a year, using about 2 x 10^6 tons of metal per year. A wind power system made of this much material, with a generous amount of ancillary equipment, would probably have been something on the order of 200 MW. The U.S. electric power consumption at about 2 KW per capita, is about 400,000 MW. If the performance of these wind machines is increased (and hopefully improved) use of coal will apparently be required for that.

With conservation in prospect and the accelerated pace of change in the energy price structure, the new artificial and educational facilities having various industrial skills and capabilities, it should be possible to build up a large industry over a period of five years that could be the site of many large wind machines rather than big cars. This possibility of reconversion, already begun, is essential to society, by not too drastic conversion of skills and facilities. Workers left unemployed by a slack automotive industry and the trend to smaller cars don't want to collect garbage but would be happy to have jobs much like their former ones, well paid with a high wind is more easily designed for small mountains and would be strong and steady as possible. The power structure is on the average more productive than in this rough estimate because a wind turbine with its support structure is a large piece of machinery than an automobile.

The degree to which wind power thus deployed may be considered an option completely separate and perhaps even largely replacing its further expansion depends mainly on how rapidly such an industry can be established and made capable of meeting the special needs of the next decade brought about by the oil situation and construction of new systems. For if the oil situation were to deteriorate, the cost of oil would probably be somewhat increased (and hopefully improved) use of coal will apparently be required for that.

With conservation in prospect and the accelerated pace of change in the energy price structure, the new artificial and educational facilities having various industrial skills and capabilities, it should be possible to build up a large industry over a period of five years that could be the site of many large wind machines rather than big cars. This possibility of reconversion, already begun, is essential to society, by not too drastic conversion of skills and facilities. Workers left unemployed by a slack automotive industry and the trend to smaller cars don't want to collect garbage but would be happy to have jobs much like their former ones, well paid with a high wind is more easily designed for small mountains and would be strong and steady as possible. The power structure is on the average more productive than in this rough estimate because a wind turbine with its support structure is a large piece of machinery than an automobile.

The degree to which wind power thus deployed may be considered an option completely separate and perhaps even largely replacing its further expansion depends mainly on how rapidly such an industry can be established and made capable of meeting the special needs of the next decade brought about by the oil situation and construction of new systems. For if the oil situation were to deteriorate, the cost of oil would probably be somewhat increased (and hopefully improved) use of coal will apparently be required for that.

One of the possible advantages of wind power is that the wind moves to and fro, and no particular type of wind machine is required, so that wind may be used for a variety of purposes, including the generation of electricity. It is therefore important that new authorizations and funding be provided for the construction and operation of at least one full-size unit and its deployment in a favorable location at sea as soon as possible, without awaiting refinements from further R&D.

For supplying electricity and its products to the Northeast, the most favorable winds are over Georges Banks, off the New England coast. The ultimate system contemplated in that area will consist of something like a thousand floating multi-megawatt wind machines and associated submerged units for generating hydrogen, storing it under pressure and delivering it over the continental shelf. A small offshore wind farm along the middle Atlantic coast, as far south as Hatteras could support equally productive similarly large installations.

One of the possible advantages of wind power is that the wind moves to and fro, and no particular type of wind machine is required, so that wind may be used for a variety of purposes, including the generation of electricity. It is therefore important that new authorizations and funding be provided for the construction and operation of at least one full-size unit and its deployment in a favorable location at sea as soon as possible, without awaiting refinements from further R&D.

For supplying electricity and its products to the Northeast, the most favorable winds are over Georges Banks, off the New England coast. The ultimate system contemplated in that area will consist of something like a thousand floating multi-megawatt wind machines and associated submerged units for generating hydrogen, storing it under pressure and delivering it over the continental shelf. A small offshore wind farm along the middle Atlantic coast, as far south as Hatteras could support equally productive similarly large installations.

If a concept proposed by Heronemus is adopted, this would be a six-megawatt floating unit consisting of three two-megawatt...
wind turbines, generation with epoxy blades supported about 300 feet above the surface of an aluminum frame above reinforced concrete hull and ballast spheres, as shown in the figure. To give some idea of costs, Heronemus in 1972 made a carefully studied estimate for a specific offshore wind power system consisting of 18,600 floating wind machines of six megawatts each clustered about 82 submerged hydrogen-generating stations, each connected by fuel pipelines feeding into a deep-water storage facility and all connected by pipeline to fuel-cell stations ashore. The installed generating capacity would be 82,000 megawatts and the estimated total cost $22 billion in 1972 dollars or $26 billion in 2014 dollars. If we compare the capacity factor, the average delivered power as compared with rated capacity, as 35% for wind and rather generously 55% for nuclear, the installed generating capacity of wind power must be 60/35 or 1.7 times as great as the equivalent nuclear capacity. 82,000 megawatts of wind power in the offshore system are thus roughly equivalent to about 46,000 megawatts of nuclear generating capacity. If we use the large 1100 megawatt nuclear power station. The $26 billion estimate for the complete wind power system thus represents about six hundred million 1976 dollars for the wind equivalent of a large nuclear plant or about $650 per installed nuclear kilowatt capacity. Quoting capabilities of nuclear clear plants are running considerably higher than that figure, and if due allowance were made for government-subsidized facilities they would perhaps be close to twice that high. This margin by nearly a factor two makes not one beyond the capacity of industry, even as was the case with nuclear, power that would preclude its generating as an increase.

This margin by nearly a factor two makes not one beyond the capacity of industry, even as was the case with nuclear, power that would preclude its generating as an increase. If we use the light of this possibility, it must be concluded that wind power is a real alternative to nuclear power. But no matter whether it is viewed as a start toward reducing the need for additional nuclear power or eliminating it completely, the first full-scale demonstration wind-power units should be built in Hawaii.
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M. ABOUZEIK, Mr. President, Professor Inglis began work in nuclear physics in 1935. From 1949 to 1969 he was employed by the AEC at its Los Alamos and Argonne laboratories.

In this paper, Professor Inglis presents a clear and convincing case for speeding development of wind power generating electricity. His statement is a concise review of the past experience with wind generators. That experience, he contends, is promising, and lends confidence and optimism. He notes that "there is no question but that wind power can be real alternative to nuclear power. But no matter whether it is viewed as a start toward reducing the need for additional nuclear power or eliminating it completely, the first full-scale demonstration wind-power units should be built immediately." I concur. Professor Inglis, a distinguished scientist, has made a valuable contribution to the national need for developing nuclear power electrically. But no matter whether it is viewed as a start toward reducing the need for additional nuclear power or eliminating it completely, the first full-scale demonstration wind-power units should be built immediately.

References included are that wind power with financial backing "much less than that devoted to the civilian nuclear effort, would be capable of supplanting nuclear completely. This would involve not only the system described for the Grand Banks and capable of supplying electricity to the east coast of this country, for, in the long run, our most effective contribution to the cause of human rights is by the force of our own continued example.

Our foreign policy's emphasis on the relaxation of international tensions is usually justified in terms of our interest in world peace; it should also be viewed as an opportunity to further the cause of human rights abroad. I believe we should take maximum advantage of the opportunities which international contacts provide for promoting the free-market economy and free society. At the same time, we must continue to send the message of freedom directly to those who have no access to uncensored news. By supporting the work of Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, the Voice of America, and Newsweek, we can let those people know that our concern for their rights has not waned.

Finally, let us remember that American's reputation as a spokesman for human rights and as a symbol of individual freedom remains one of our strongest assets in the world arena. Even at a time when so many millions of people are threatened with even the most basic freedoms, we should remember that we are responsible for our actions.

FDA AGREES TO STUDY HERMETIC SEALING OF CARDIAC PACE-MAKERS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Alexander M. Schmidt, M.D., a distinguished scientist in the field of nuclear medicine, informing me that he has accepted my proposal to have the Food and Drug Administration—FDA—examine the need for developing standards for the hermetic sealing of cardiac pacemakers.

I have strongly urged the development of hermetic seal standards for the pacemaker industry following a report of the Commissioner General in March which was critical of the FDA's handling of the recall of 23,000 pacemakers for moisture-related defects.

At this point, which I released in March, the General Accounting Office investigators noted that the FDA had not developed standards to deal with the problem of moisture penetrating the myocardial pacemaker and causing short circuiting. The Government Operations Committee subsequently learned that the U.S. Navy had developed a standard for hermetically sealing high-reliability electronic components. On April 23, I obtained an opinion from the National Bureau of Standards—NBS—that the FDA should adopt such a standard for pacemakers in conjunction with other high-quality standards.

Dr. Schmidt, in his letter to me, stated that...
that the FDA would deal with the hermetic seal question at a special workshop being planned with the NBS to review pacemaker problems with representatives of the pacemaker industry. I am today sending a letter to Dr. Schmidt asking for a report from him following the workshop as to what course of action the FDA intends to follow with respect to the hermetic seal question.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Schmidt’s letter to me and my letter of response to him be printed in the Record.

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

URGE SENEATE,
COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, WASHINGTON, D.C., June 10, 1975.
ALEXANDER M. SCHMIDT, M.D.,
Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Food and Drug Administration, Rockville, Md.

Dr. Weinberger: As you are aware, in your letter of June 19, informing me that the FDA will deal with the question of hermatically sealing pacemakers in a special workshop being planned with the National Bureau of Standards to review pacemaker problems with representatives of the pacemaker industry.

I agree that this workshop will be useful in fully exploring the desirability of requiring that all pacemakers be manufactured using the hermetic-seal approach. I am sure that the workshop will fully consider the characteristics and experience with hermetic sealing of NBS/FDA pacemakers and will give full assurance to the United States and Israel. Since the generally accepted prognosis for the immediate future is the same, it is worth recalling what went wrong.

From 1967 to 1973, Israel pursued a simple but fundamentally flawed policy. Her strategy, articulated over and again by former Premier Golda Meir, was to hold on to every inch of occupied territory until the Arab states were ready to negotiate—on Israel’s terms. Israel’s aim was to demonstrate to the Arabs that they had no feasible military option, therefore, no real choice but to conclude a peace agreement. This was the rationale behind the deep-penetration Israeli air raids against Baghdad and the intensive workshop against the guerrilla organizations in Jordan before that and the periodic forays against the Syrian Air Force. The aim was to stand fast until the Arabs came around.

CLOSING THE ESCAPE HATCH

Parallel to this strategy, Israel had to beat back various diplomatic initiatives that she felt would give the Arabs an escape hatch. Then included the still-born efforts of Gun­nar V. Jarring, the Swedish diplomat who served thanklessly as a special United Nations mediator for Israel from 1967–1969, and the 1971 initiative of former Secretary of State Boggs. Israel resisted these initiatives and the Arabs may have been displaying their own brand of intransigence. Had the Arabs challenged Israel to an open and unconditional direct negotiation in that period, the Israelis would have faced a rending political crisis at home.

The United States was content to let the deadlock continue until the 1973 war. The Middle East was a problem, but not a priority. The October, 1973, war demonstrated the futility of trying to improve its standing in the Arab world, to open new channels of communication with Egypt, and to reduce Soviet influence. So today, eight years and one month after her greatest victory, Israel is on the diplomatic defensive. She is being pushed by the Arabs, the United States and Europe to give up her territorial bargaining cards sooner rather than later.

M. Rabin’s strategy today differs from his predecessor’s only in nuance. His hope is that a new interim agreement with Egypt will buy several years of relative relaxation in the area and avoid a break with the United States. If the United States’ energy sources may be developed and Arab economic and political power may decline. Then Israel will be in a better bargaining position than the Arab bottom line? How far can an Israeli Government withdraw, short of peace, and still survive? Must the Arabs lose, or can there be a serious political quid pro quo for the relinquished real estate?

A QUESTION ABOUT PEACE? Will a new interim agreement between Israel and Egypt reduce the tension on the Golan Heights? If it does not, will the Syrians launch a new war of aggression or a frontal attack in concert with Jordan and Iraq?

WHATEVER THE SETTLEMENT, IT IS A COMEDOWN FOR ISRAEL

Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. President, we are all aware of the gravity of the current Middle East situation and of the sensitivity of the on-going negotiations. It is of utmost importance—to our national interest and to the interest of world peace—that a settlement be reached.

Terence Smith, in an article in the New York Times of Sunday, July 13, 1975, presents an excellent discussion of Israel’s past and present negotiating strategy—buying time. Included in this discussion is the history of how this policy went wrong and how it just might be wrong also for the present and the future.

During this period of negotiations, it would benefit all of us to carefully read Mr. Smith’s article. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHATEVER THE SETTLEMENT, IT’S A COMEDOWN FOR ISRAEL

(By Terence Smith)

BONN.—Complete with meat and drawing-bridge, set in a deep wood northwest of Bonn, the 800-year-old Gymnich Castle is the West German Government’s most elegantly appointed guest house. Last week’s tenant was Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel, and he used the baroque setting for a meeting with Secretary of State Kissinger on the same day that the Arab minister, Mohamed El Fawaz, arrived for four days of talks. How much of the Arab land Israel seized in 1967 is she prepared to return in exchange for another interim agreement with Egypt? That question is part of the larger one that has confounded America and the rest of the world. How can Israel convert the military victory she scored in 1967 into a comparable political gain and—henceforth—Israel’s bleak diplomatic situation today is a dramatic come-down from the euphoric days, just eight years ago, when everything seemed possible in the wake of that one-sided military victory in modern warfare.

There was a general assumption in Israel in those days that if the Arabs recoiled from the Six-Day War, they would have no choice but to negotiate a peace agreement with Israel.

But there has been another war, an oil embargo, the growth of Arab economic power, Israel’s deepening diplomatic isolation, and the slow tightening of the United States and Israel. Since the generally accepted prognosis for the immediate future is the same, it is worth recalling what went wrong.

From 1967 to 1973, Israel pursued a simple but fundamentally flawed policy. Her strategy, articulated over and again by former Premier Golda Meir, was to hold on to every inch of occupied territory until the Arab states were ready to negotiate—on Israel’s terms. Israel’s aim was to demonstrate to the Arabs that they had no feasible military option, therefore, no real choice but to conclude a peace agreement. This was the rationale behind the deep-penetration Israeli air raids against Baghdad and the intensive workshop against the guerrilla organizations in Jordan before that and the periodic forays against the Syrian Air Force. The aim was to stand fast until the Arabs came around.

CLOSING THE ESCAPE HATCH

Parallel to this strategy, Israel had to beat back various diplomatic initiatives that she felt would give the Arabs an escape hatch. Then included the still-born efforts of Gun­nar V. Jarring, the Swedish diplomat who served thanklessly as a special United Nations mediator for Israel from 1967–1969, and the 1971 initiative of former Secretary of State Boggs. Israel resisted these initiatives and the Arabs may have been displaying their own brand of intransigence. Had the Arabs challenged Israel to an open and unconditional direct negotiation in that period, the Israelis would have faced a rending political crisis at home.

The United States was content to let the deadlock continue until the 1973 war. The Middle East was a problem, but not a priority. The October, 1973, war demonstrated the futility of trying to improve its standing in the Arab world, to open new channels of communication with Egypt, and to reduce Soviet influence. So today, eight years and one month after her greatest victory, Israel is on the diplomatic defensive. She is being pushed by the Arabs, the United States and Europe to give up her territorial bargaining cards sooner rather than later.

M. Rabin’s strategy today differs from his predecessor’s only in nuance. His hope is that a new interim agreement with Egypt will buy several years of relative relaxation in the area and avoid a break with the United States. If the United States’ energy sources may be developed and Arab economic and political power may decline. Then Israel will be in a better bargaining position than the Arab bottom line? How far can an Israeli Government withdraw, short of peace, and still survive? Must the Arabs lose, or can there be a serious political quid pro quo for the relinquished real estate?

A QUESTION ABOUT PEACE? Will a new interim agreement between Israel and Egypt reduce the tension on the Golan Heights? If it does not, will the Syrians launch a new war of aggression or a frontal attack in concert with Jordan and Iraq?
Unanswered as they are, these questions raise serious doubts about the wisdom of trying to buy time. From Israel’s point of view, the history of the past eight years is not an encouraging omen.

THE FARM ECONOMY

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Friday, July 11, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry met with Secretary of Agriculture, Earl Butz, in the first of the quarterly oversight hearings in regard to the condition and outlook of our farm economy that I announced in May.

In preparation for this oversight hearing, we had the committee staff prepare extensive background materials on our farm economy. These materials relate to farm production, commodity utilization, farm income, agricultural prices, and agricultural exports.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these materials be printed in the Record for the use of Members and those persons who have an interest in agriculture.

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

5-YEAR PROFILE OF SELECTED CROPS AND 1975 PROJECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corn Planted</th>
<th>Export Use</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970-74</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>4.152</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-79</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>4.151</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-80</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>4.152</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5-Year Profile of Selected Crops and 1975 Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soybeans Acres planted (mil/A)</th>
<th>Export Use</th>
<th>Domestic Export</th>
<th>Total (bu/A)</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970-74</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>4.152</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-79</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>4.151</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-80</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>4.152</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Estimated.

TRENDS IN SELECTED CROPS (ANNUAL AVERAGES FOR PERIODS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corn Acres planted (mil/A)</th>
<th>Yield (bu/A)</th>
<th>Total Production (mil/bu)</th>
<th>Carry-over as share of total use</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950-54</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>1.5 793 796</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-59</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>1.5 353 360</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-64</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>1.5 773 782</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-69</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1.5 454 463</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-74</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>1.5 144 141</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.63.5

1 Pounds.

2 Bales.

SHARE OF FEED CONSUMPTION BY LIVESTOCK TYPE FOR THE PERIOD 1960-71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corn</th>
<th>Other grains</th>
<th>All grain</th>
<th>High protein</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Total use (million tons) | 325.6      | 135.4     | 461.0        | 62.8
| Dairy (percent) | 2.7          | 56.1       | 55.1         | 11.8 |
| Beef (percent) | 2.7          | 56.1       | 55.1         | 11.8 |
| On feed (percent) | 1.7          | 56.1       | 55.1         | 11.8 |

U.S. AVERAGE PRICES, MONTHLY AND MARKETING YEAR, FOR SELECTED AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity and year</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>Season average</th>
<th>Percent change from peak to latest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corn (dollars per bushel)</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat (dollars per bushel)</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>-71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland cotton (cents per pound)</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>-32.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5

Includes barley, oats, sorghum, wheat, and rye.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity and year</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>Season average from peak to low</th>
<th>Percent change from peak to low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soybeans (dollars per bushel)</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>-31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>-31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef, C &amp; H (dollars per hundredweight)</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>45.40</td>
<td>53.90</td>
<td>58.90</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>45.40</td>
<td>53.90</td>
<td>58.90</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>-54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>45.40</td>
<td>53.90</td>
<td>58.90</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>-54.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**FARM INCOME AND CASH RECEIPTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity and year</th>
<th>Cash receipts from sales to farm</th>
<th>Production expenses</th>
<th>Net income</th>
<th>Return to equity (current year, percent)</th>
<th>Cash receipts from sales to farm</th>
<th>Production expenses</th>
<th>Net income</th>
<th>Return to equity (current year, percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soybeans (dollars per bushel)</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef, C &amp; H (dollars per hundredweight)</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle and calves (dollars per hundredweight)</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**CASH RECEIPTS FOR SELECTED ENTERPRISES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity and year</th>
<th>Livestock</th>
<th>Cattle and calves</th>
<th>Hogs</th>
<th>Dairy produce</th>
<th>Poultry</th>
<th>Crops</th>
<th>Wheat</th>
<th>Corn</th>
<th>Soybeans</th>
<th>Cotton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soybeans (dollars per bushel)</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**TOTAL VALUE AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS AND INDEXES OF THE QUANTITY AND VALUE OF SHIPMENTS (1967 = 100)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total value (millions)</th>
<th>Indexes (1967 = 100)</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>6,278</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>5,156</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>7,259</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>7,093</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>9,401</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>17,688</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>21,994</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Preliminary.

2 Estimated.
FINANCIAL HOLDINGS AND INCOME TAX RETURN OF SENATOR WILLIAM PROXMIRE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in 1963, 1965, 1967, 1970, 1972, and 1974 I submitted for the Record a history of my financial holdings from the time I was first elected to the Senate in August of 1957 until April of 1974. In order to bring the full record up to date I submit herewith the history of my financial holdings since April of 1974.

The bulk of the securities I hold are now in State and municipal bonds, totaling $62,000.

My other assets include ownership of my home and furnishings in Washington, D.C., on which I owe a mortgage to the Perpetual Building Association of Washington, D.C.; ownership of my home and furnishings in Madison, Wis., from which home I received $200 per month in rent during 1974 and because of substantial improvements, effective June 1, 1975, I now receive $350 per month in rent; ownership of one 1970 automobile and 1972 automobile; ownership of two checking accounts in Washington banks, one checking account in a Madison, Wis., bank and one savings account in a Madison bank. The combined balance as of this date, in these accounts is $125,500.

I also hold a note on my former residence in Washington at 3220 Ordway in the amount of $10,000.

Trust custody of stock in my children's names has been turned over to them directly as they are over 21.

I estimate my net worth to be about $312,000.

The increase in my net worth since 1974 is the result of the realized capital gains from the sale of two houses in Washington this year 1975, and the increase in value of my Madison house and my civil service retirement fund.

To the best of my knowledge, this is an accurate record of my financial holdings and obligations.

In addition, I herewith submit a balance sheet showing my net worth and how it was arrived at, with a copy of my 1974 Federal tax return and a list of all honoraria received during 1974 in the amount of $300 or more. Additional income was received from book royalties, newspaper articles, TV appearances, and a series of speeches for the Brookings Institution here in Washington for which I receive $150 per speech.

In addition to the $35,680 paid to the Federal Government in taxes on 1974 income, I also paid taxes to the State of Wisconsin in the amount of $9,243 for total income tax payments of $44,953.

I ask unanimous consent that the balance sheet, copy of 1974 Federal tax return, and list of all honoraria received in 1974 in the amount of $300 or more be printed in the Record.

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

Net worth of Senator William Proxmire as of June 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Corn</th>
<th>Wheat</th>
<th>Rice</th>
<th>Soybeans</th>
<th>Feed grains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3097 Ordway St., NW, Washing­
ton, D.C.: Market value $190,000—mort­gage value ($65,000) 125,500.00
Furnishings 10,000.00.
Note on 3220 Ordway St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 10,000.00.
Cash deposit in civil service re­tirement as of June 30, 1975 41,299.46

Total 311,645.16

Honorariums—Date, payer, description of service, and amount
1-16-74—Cleveland State Univ., speech, $1,000.00.
1-16-74—Canisius College, Buffalo, New York, speech, $1,000.00.
1-17-74—College of Lake County, Gray­shill, Ill., speech, $1,000.00.
1-17-74—Project Health, Los Angeles, Calif., speech, $1,500.00.
1-17-74—College of Lake County, Rock­ford, Ill., speech, $1,000.00.
1-17-74—Schoolman Foundation, Wash­ington, D.C., speech, $1,000.00.
2-11-74—Univ. of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa, speech, $1,000.00.
2-12-74—Northern State College, Aber­deen, S. Dak., speech, $600.00.
2-23-74—University of Maryland, College Park, Md., speech, $1,000.00.
2-12-74—University of South Dakota, Brookings, S. Dak., speech, $1,000.00.
3-8-74—Brown University, Providence, R.I., speech, $1,000.00.
3-14-74—University of Delaware, Newark, Del., speech, $1,500.00.
3-15-74—Project Health, New York City, speech, $1,500.00.
3-24-74—Univ. of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y., speech, $1,000.00.
4-17-74—Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa., speech, $1,050.00.
4-18-74—Case Western Reserve Univ., Cleveland, Ohio, speech, $1,500.00.
4-26-74—Rosenberg College, Philadelphia, Pa., speech, $1,050.00.
4-27-74—Global Energy Conf. of S. Cook County, World Affairs Conf., Harvey, Ill., speech, $1,000.00.

3097 Ordway St., NW, Washing­ton, D.C.: Market value $190,000—mort­gage value ($65,000) 125,500.00
Furnishings 10,000.00.
Note on 3220 Ordway St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 10,000.00.
Cash deposit in civil service re­tirement as of June 30, 1975 41,299.46

Total 311,645.16

Honorariums—Date, payer, description of service, and amount
1-16-74—Cleveland State Univ., speech, $1,000.00.
1-16-74—Canisius College, Buffalo, New York, speech, $1,000.00.
1-16-74—College of Lake County, Gray­shill, Ill., speech, $1,000.00.
1-17-74—Project Health, Los Angeles, Calif., speech, $1,500.00.
1-17-74—College of Lake County, Rock­ford, Ill., speech, $1,000.00.
1-17-74—Schoolman Foundation, Wash­ington, D.C., speech, $1,000.00.
2-11-74—Univ. of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa, speech, $1,000.00.
2-12-74—Northern State College, Aber­deen, S. Dak., speech, $600.00.
2-23-74—University of Maryland, College Park, Md., speech, $1,000.00.
2-12-74—University of South Dakota, Brookings, S. Dak., speech, $1,000.00.
3-8-74—Brown University, Providence, R.I., speech, $1,000.00.
3-14-74—University of Delaware, Newark, Del., speech, $1,500.00.
3-15-74—Project Health, New York City, speech, $1,500.00.
3-24-74—Univ. of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y., speech, $1,000.00.
4-17-74—Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa., speech, $1,050.00.
4-18-74—Case Western Reserve Univ., Cleveland, Ohio, speech, $1,500.00.
4-26-74—Rosenberg College, Philadelphia, Pa., speech, $1,050.00.
4-27-74—Global Energy Conf. of S. Cook County, World Affairs Conf., Harvey, Ill., speech, $1,000.00.
TAXES, PAYMENTS AND CREDITS
16. Tax, check if from: Form 4720, $34,512.
18. Income tax: $34,512.
19. Other taxes: $1,168.
22. Total: $24,978.

RECEIVED:

23. If line 21 is larger than line 22, enter balance due IRS: $10,702.

SEIDMAN & SEIDMAN,

310 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y.

Hon. William Proxmire,
U.S. Senate.

WAGE AND TAX STATEMENT—1974: The
Tonight Show Company, INC.
Federal Identification No.: 95-2794374.
State Identification No.: 194-2940-4.
2. Wages, tips and other compensation: $306,000.

SOCIAL SECURITY INFORMATION
3. FICA employee tax withheld: $17,920.

STATE OR LOCAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION
5. Tax withheld: $14,850.
7. State or locality: CA.

WAGE AND TAX STATEMENT—1974:
Washington Wheel-Around of D.C. INC.
Employer’s State identifying number: 08468.

FEDERAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION
1. Federal income tax withheld: $400,100.
2. Wages, tips and other compensation: $3,500,000.

SOCIAL SECURITY INFORMATION
3. FICA employee tax withheld: $188,500.
4. Total FICA wages: $3,500,000.

STATE OR LOCAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION
5. Tax withheld: $111,977.
6. Total FICA wages: $3,500,000.
7. Wages paid: $3,500,000.
8. State or locality: D.C.

EMPLOYEE’S SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER:

WAGE AND TAX STATEMENT—1974: Wonderful Weddings
of Metropolitan Area, Inc.
Employer’s State identifying number: 08468.

FEDERAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION
1. Federal income tax withheld: $30,600.
2. Wages, tips, and other compensation: $500,000.

SOCIAL SECURITY INFORMATION
3. FICA employee tax withheld: $29,246.
4. Total FICA wages: $500,000.

STATE OR LOCAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION
6. Wages paid: $300,000.
7. State or locality: D.C.
8. Employee’s Social Security number:

ELLEN H. PROXMIRE.

WAGE AND TAX STATEMENT—1974: St. Lawrence
Univ., Canton, N.Y.
Employer’s State identifying number: 08468.

FEDERAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION
1. Federal income tax withheld: $30,600.
2. Wages, tips, and other compensation: $500,000.

SOCIAL SECURITY INFORMATION
3. FICA employee tax withheld: $29,246.
4. Total FICA wages: $500,000.

STATE OR LOCAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION
6. Wages paid: $300,000.
7. State or locality: D.C.
8. Employee’s Social Security number:

ELLEN H. PROXMIRE.

WAGE AND TAX STATEMENT—1974: E. C. Bildt
& Co.
Employer’s State identifying number: 08468.

FEDERAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION
1. Federal income tax withheld: $400,100.
2. Wages, tips and other compensation: $3,500,000.

SOCIAL SECURITY INFORMATION
3. FICA employee tax withheld: $188,500.
4. Total FICA wages: $3,500,000.

STATE OR LOCAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION
5. Tax withheld: $111,977.
6. Total FICA wages: $3,500,000.
7. Wages paid: $3,500,000.
8. State or locality: D.C.

EMPLOYEE’S SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER:

WAGE AND TAX STATEMENT—1974: Wonder
ful Weddings of Metropolitan Area, Inc.
Employer’s State identifying number: 08468.

FEDERAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION
1. Federal income tax withheld: $30,600.
2. Wages, tips, and other compensation: $500,000.

SOCIAL SECURITY INFORMATION
3. FICA employee tax withheld: $29,246.
4. Total FICA wages: $500,000.

STATE OR LOCAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION
6. Wages paid: $300,000.
7. State or locality: D.C.
8. Employee’s Social Security number:

ELLEN H. PROXMIRE.

WAGE AND TAX STATEMENT—1974: Wisconsin
State Employers Group,
Employer’s State identifying number: 08468.

FEDERAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION
1. Federal income tax withheld: $30,600.
2. Wages, tips, and other compensation: $500,000.

SOCIAL SECURITY INFORMATION
3. FICA employee tax withheld: $29,246.
4. Total FICA wages: $500,000.

STATE OR LOCAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION
6. Wages paid: $300,000.
7. State or locality: D.C.
8. Employee’s Social Security number:

ELLEN H. PROXMIRE.

WAGE AND TAX STATEMENT—1974: William
& Judson Co.
Employer’s State identifying number: 08468.

FEDERAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION
1. Federal income tax withheld: $30,600.
2. Wages, tips, and other compensation: $500,000.

SOCIAL SECURITY INFORMATION
3. FICA employee tax withheld: $29,246.
4. Total FICA wages: $500,000.

STATE OR LOCAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION
6. Wages paid: $300,000.
7. State or locality: D.C.
8. Employee’s Social Security number:

ELLEN H. PROXMIRE.

WAGE AND TAX STATEMENT—1974: Wonder
ful Weddings of Metropolitan Area, Inc.
Employer’s State identifying number: 08468.

FEDERAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION
1. Federal income tax withheld: $30,600.
2. Wages, tips, and other compensation: $500,000.

SOCIAL SECURITY INFORMATION
3. FICA employee tax withheld: $29,246.
4. Total FICA wages: $500,000.

STATE OR LOCAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION
6. Wages paid: $300,000.
7. State or locality: D.C.
8. Employee’s Social Security number:

ELLEN H. PROXMIRE.

WAGE AND TAX STATEMENT—1974: Wisconsin
State Employers Group,
Employer’s State identifying number: 08468.

FEDERAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION
1. Federal income tax withheld: $30,600.
2. Wages, tips, and other compensation: $500,000.

SOCIAL SECURITY INFORMATION
3. FICA employee tax withheld: $29,246.
4. Total FICA wages: $500,000.

STATE OR LOCAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION
6. Wages paid: $300,000.
7. State or locality: D.C.
8. Employee’s Social Security number:

ELLEN H. PROXMIRE.
COMPUTATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY SELF-EMPLOYMENT TAX


Nontaxable amount of self-employment earnings: $6,097.90.

Nonfarm self-employment earnings: $12,300.

12. Net earnings (or losses): (b) From nonfarm employment...

COMPUTATION OF NET EARNINGS FROM NONFARM SELF-EMPLOYMENT

(a) Schedule C, line 21. (Enter combined amount if more than one business.) $1,883.

6. Total: $1,883.

14. The largest amount of combined wages and self-employment earnings subject to social security tax for 1974 is $13,200.

15. Total "FICA" wages as indicated on forms W-2: $4,000.


18. If line 17 is $13,200, enter $1,042.80; if less, multiply the amount on line 17 by .079: $1,019.


MAXIMUM TAX ON EARNED INCOME

Name(s): William and Ellen H. Proxmire.

Identifying number: 88-02-9036.

2. Deductions: $4,326.


5. Enter your adjusted gross income: $104,490.

6. Divide the amount on line 3 by the amount on line 4. Enter percentage result here, but not more than 100%: 100.00 percent.

6. Enter your taxable income: $84,904.

7. Enter the amount on line 5 by the percentage on line 6: $84,904.

8b. Less: $30,000.


10. If: on Form 1040, you checked line 1 or line 4, enter $80,000; on Form 1040, you checked line 2 or 5, enter $62,000; Estate or Trust, enter $30,000; $62,000.

11. Subtract line 10 from line 9: $2,904.

12. Enter 50% of line 11: $1,452.


15. If the amount on line 10 is $2,904, enter $15,000; $6,000.

17. Add lines 12, 15, and 16. This is your maximum tax: $34,512.

CAPITAL GAINS AND LOSSES

Name(s): William and Ellen H. Proxmire.

Identifying number: 88-02-9036.

2. Deductions: $4,326.


5. Enter your adjusted gross income: $104,490.

6. Divide the amount on line 3 by the amount on line 4. Enter percentage result here, but not more than 100%: 100.00 percent.

6. Enter your taxable income: $84,904.

7. Enter the amount on line 5 by the percentage on line 6: $84,904.

8b. Less: $30,000.


10. If: on Form 1040, you checked line 1 or line 4, enter $80,000; on Form 1040, you checked line 2 or 5, enter $62,000; Estate or Trust, enter $30,000; $62,000.

11. Subtract line 10 from line 9: $2,904.

12. Enter 50% of line 11: $1,452.


15. If the amount on line 10 is $2,904, enter $15,000; $6,000.

17. Add lines 12, 15, and 16. This is your maximum tax: $34,512.

CAPITAL LOSS CARRYOVER

Name(s): William and Ellen H. Proxmire.

Identifying number: 88-02-9036.

2. Deductions: $4,326.


5. Enter your adjusted gross income: $104,490.

6. Divide the amount on line 3 by the amount on line 4. Enter percentage result here, but not more than 100%: 100.00 percent.

6. Enter your taxable income: $84,904.

7. Enter the amount on line 5 by the percentage on line 6: $84,904.

8b. Less: $30,000.


10. If: on Form 1040, you checked line 1 or line 4, enter $80,000; on Form 1040, you checked line 2 or 5, enter $62,000; Estate or Trust, enter $30,000; $62,000.

11. Subtract line 10 from line 9: $2,904.

12. Enter 50% of line 11: $1,452.


15. If the amount on line 10 is $2,904, enter $15,000; $6,000.

17. Add lines 12, 15, and 16. This is your maximum tax: $34,512.
### Statement 1—Wages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Address</th>
<th>Inc. tax withheld</th>
<th>Wages etc.</th>
<th>FICA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>14,393</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Whirl-around</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonight Show</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonderful Weddings</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total wages</strong></td>
<td>14,698</td>
<td>46,806</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statement 3—Other business income

**Business Name:** William Proxmire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount (W)</th>
<th>Dep. Life method years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appliances</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total business income</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statement 4—Rent and royalty income

**Business Name:** William Proxmire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount (W)</th>
<th>Dep. Life method years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royalties-book</td>
<td>$815</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total income</td>
<td>3,011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statement 5—Itemized miscellaneous deductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount (W)</th>
<th>Dep. Life method years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business expense:</td>
<td>$1,025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statement 7—Interest income

**Amount** | **2,037**
---|---
**Total interest income** | **2,037**
**Statement 6—Receipted cash contributions**

**Charities qualifying for 50 percent limitations:**
- Cancer fund: $300
- Heart fund: $200
- Landon School: $415
- Yale: $220
- United Way: $200
- Multiple sclerosis: $200
- Hill school: $200
- Harvard: $200
- Lake Forest Cem. Comm.: $55
- Washington tennis patrois: $55
- Washington tennis: $12
- SOME: $50
- Miscellaneous organized charities: $50

**Total receipted cash contributions to charities qualifying for 50 percent limitation**: $2,037

### FOOD STAMP REFORM

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, increasingly, the news media are full of articles about abuse of the food stamp program. Increasingly, hard working, taxpaying Americans all over the country are getting fed up and disgusted with the abuse that is rampant in the program. Everytime that I go home to Georgia I hear frequent complaints about abuses that citizens have noticed.

I believe the reform of the food stamp program should be one of the No. 1 priorities of the Congress. Therefore, I have directed the staff of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to prepare alternative reform proposals and I plan to have full and thorough hearings on this problem at the earliest possible date.

Senator Buckley and others recently introduced a very thorough, carefully considered reform bill, S. 1993, which is pending before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I applaud Senator Buckley for his efforts and I have promised him that this bill will have the full and complete attention of the committee.
CAUSE FOR CONCERN

Explosive growth triggered by loose eligibility standards; administrative complexity that buries caseworkers under an avalanche of paper and reports; a history of cheating that cries out for investigation; taxpayer subsidies for labor walkouts—these are among the more serious ills of the food-stamp program. "We're giving away food stamps like wildfire," said U.S. Commissioner of Welfare Carl Williams, "There are virtually no controls. The taxpay­ers are subsidizing food for labor strikes."

Under the terms of the Subsistence Stamps Act of 1964, the federal government provides stamps for needy families, to raise their nutritional levels. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) said, "We'll provide $162 to provide that family a nutritious diet." A family of four with an adjusted monthly net income of $265 would pay $71 for $162 in stamps.

During the last three years, the food-stamp program has helped millions of Americans achieve a decent diet—often meaning the difference between health and illness. No one wants to deny stamps to the needy, especially in the midst of today's economic problems. But loose eligibility standards have alarmed the administering agencies and caused the public to question the program's accountability. Initially, in 1964, the food-stamp program cost $50.3 million and served 307,000 aid recipients. By last March, there were 1.9 million recipients, and the cost was running at an annual rate of $5 billion. By 1976, says the Senate Finance Committee, the food-stamp program would cost $2 billion per year.

If the food-stamp program is so effective, why is it not in greater demand? The answer is that the food-stamp program is not as effective as it could be. It is not as effective as it should be. It is not as effective as it needs to be.

The income exemptions for a food-stamp applicant are far more liberal than those of any other food-stamp program. The income exemptions for a food-stamp applicant are far more liberal than those of any other food-stamp program.

As a result of this uncontrolled complexity, last year Los Angeles County required 1,000 employees and more than $25 million in funds. In addition, many administrators are finding that the food-stamp program is not as effective as they thought it would be.

In Denver, Colo., a welfare worker explains, "we might not be able to sustain the strike. They give us a nice cushion at a time like this.

Recipients and Caseworker Fraud

People who use the food-stamp program to their advantage are making trouble. People who use the food-stamp program to their advantage are making trouble.

The food-stamp program is an "administrative nightmare," says a Census Bureau official. The food-stamp program is an "administrative nightmare," says a Census Bureau official.

The food-stamp program is an "administrative nightmare," says a Census Bureau official.

The food-stamp program is an "administrative nightmare," says a Census Bureau official.
outreach efforts to ensure that the truly needy can apply for and receive resources and personnel to cut down on fraud, and can require stamp recipients to carry identification cards. But food stamps are a federal program and only Congress can get to the heart of the problem. Congress should:

- Repeal the regulations from USDA and place it in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz complains plausibly that 34 percent of his budget goes into such programs as food stamps and school lunches. The food-stamp complaint-justifiably-that 64 percent of the federal-budget deficit-the Ford administration has shown a frightening insensitivity toward the health of infants, handicapped children, and the elderly. The president's proposal, which is dedicated leader in blind programs of the visually handicapped, through the Pittsburgh office which is supported with federal funds.

- Tighten eligibility standards. A family's eligibility should be determined by its gross income and not its "adjusted net income." Itemized deductions, which favor the well-off, should be barred from receiving stamps. Strikers should be barred from receiving stamps. If the provisions of the law which exempt students from having to register for work were removed, non-needy students wouldn't be so tempted to apply. Finally, welfare recipients whose income is below the poverty level should not be eligible to get stamps.

- Make the federal government responsible for investigating and prosecuting food-stamp-program abusers. Under existing law, county and state governments are supposed to perform such tasks. The states have been shown to be incapable of doing so.

- Create a national council to register for work were removed, non-needy students wouldn't be so tempted to apply. Finally, welfare recipients whose income is below the poverty level should not be eligible to get stamps.
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and years of dependency for those denied help under these programs far outweigh any possible savings that could result from the reduction of services now offered. In New Jersey, the total amount spent last year for screening thousands of children for PKU roughly equals the annual cost of caring for one child who suffers from that disease. Of course, the cost of the potentially severe handicapping conditions, and the increase in human suffering and anguish are costs that cannot be measured.

In recent action, the House approved a $31 million increase over the fiscal year 1975 appropriation, which is certainly an important step in the right direction. However, an increase of $45 million would better equip these programs to respond to the medical needs of our children.

The real issue before us is whether this country is committed enough to the health of its children to continue funding urgently needed health services. I believe that America could make no more important a commitment. I am also convinced that we could make no better investment.

Dr. Joanne E. Finley, State Commissioner of Health for New Jersey recently wrote me to express her deep concern over the President’s recommendation for the MCH and crippled children’s program. Her letter clearly illustrates the serious impact that the President’s proposal could have on a great many child health services in the State of New Jersey. I must say that Dr. Finley’s letter be printed in the RECORD.

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


HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.,
Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: The New Jersey State Department of Health strongly supports funding for Maternal and Child Health and Crippled Children Programs to $340 million. Adequate funding for these vital programs is crucial so that gains made in maternal and child mortality are not lost and that preventive health services that are needed are extended.

The needs for Maternal and Child Health Programs in New Jersey are still unmet as there are cities and rural areas of the State which do not have adequate prenatal clinics, have inadequate nurseries, and have diminishing pediatric services. Medical care to prevent handicapping conditions is the primary purpose of the Crippled Children Program. Inadequate funding of this Program has led to a deterioration on the part of the medically indigent families and financial losses to hospitals who can little afford to absorb these costs.

A recent report on Maternal and Child Health and Crippled Children Program funding to New Jersey would mean a reduction of services. We are informed that New Jersey infants could not be provided with prenatal care. These women would be in the highest medical risk category. As many as 1,820 New Jersey mothers each year suffer from deformities and diseases of the newborn. Approximately 500 infants needing neonatal intensive care services could not be accommodated. Without the benefits of these services, these infants may die or have a lifetime disability of cerebral palsy or mental retardation.

The proposed cut of $375,000 to the New Jersey Crippled Children Program will deprive handicapped children of approximately 8,500 days of acute hospital or convalescent hospital stays. The stay of a handicapped child at one of these institutions is 60 days, this will mean hospitals cannot be reimbursed for care of over 180 children. Sincerely yours,

JOANNE E. FINLEY, M.D.,
State Commissioner of Health.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN CAMBODIA AND ELSEWHERE

Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. President, last Thursday our new colleague from North Carolina Robert Morgan, gave a speech during the morning hour that deserved the serious attention of all of us. He was able to put the spotlight on a tragedy taking place in Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge Government. The forced marching of masses of people from the city to the countryside has apparently resulted in the brutal death of tens of thousands—according to reports coming out of the American Embassy in Bangkok. It is now the duty of all of us, as the Senator from North Carolina, to make the silence and speak out against these cruelties. Having been very critical of the role our own Government played in bringing death and destruction to Cambodia, I renew my request that the people of that nation are suffering tyranny from within.

At the same time, Mr. President, I think we must be sensitive to the suppression of human liberty wherever it occurs, whether in right-wing dictatorship or in left-wing dictatorship. Alexandr Solzhentitsyn apparently has been reminding us of the repressive practices of the Soviet Government in a number of cases in point: The President of the U.S.S.R.—practices which often had been denounced on the floor of the Senate. I would hope that my colleagues could get equally aroused about reports of human rights violations in cases which are not all and/or to which we extend military aid and other assistance.

Some cases in point: The President of Indonesia was recently in town seeking additional military aid and other assistance. Indonesia still incarcerates political prisoners in the tens of thousands left over from a civil war many years ago. The Government of Chile, which will be seeking re-election this year, is still incarcerating political prisoners in its prison camps.

The article notes that this year, for the first time, the number of food stamp beneficiaries not receiving other forms of public assistance exceeds the number who do. I believe this article helps to focus attention on some of the inequities of the food stamp program, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM ABUSED

Mr. HANSEN, Mr. President, as a co-sponsor of S. 1993, Senator Buckley's Food Stamp Reform Act of 1975, I am deeply concerned about the alarming increases in costs and numbers of participants in the food stamp program.

Since Wyoming taxpayers who are outraged by the fact that indigent persons are able to receive food stamps have been endeavoring to put the spotlight on a tragedy taking place in Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge Government, the President of the United States commisioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service has pointed out some of the problems that are suffering tyranny from within.

The article notes that this year, for the first time, the number of food stamp beneficiaries not receiving other forms of public assistance exceeds the number who do. I believe this article helps to focus attention on some of the inequities of the food stamp program, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

FOOD STAMPS: "OUT OF CONTROL"?

(By Mark R. Arnold)

A commercial mail-order house, hawking its latest brochure, is running ads in mass-circulation magazines offering—for $8.50 to $16,000 a year—"5-billon-a-year program to stretch food dollars from its original purpose.

I have not mentioned the disappointing turn events have taken in India in recent weeks. It is especially saddening to see a vibrant democratic tradition go up in smoke across a subcontinent. All in all, Mr. President, these are not good times for the progress of human freedom and political liberty, as the signers of the Declaration of Independence understood the terms. It is, therefore, even more necessary that we continue to hold the torch high in the most powerful democratic legislature in the world.
Says Art Quin, who is co-ordinating a new interagency study for the White House Domestic Council, that the study is to make a program available to people without regard to whether they're disabled, blind, fatherless, elderly, or whatever. "To Buckley, that's precisely the problem we face in the full light of public view, and recommended that the tax-paying citizens should get municipal report cards from the Mayors which would be most honest, open and revealing, and that the people who manage the city's affairs, and among those invited to address the Mayors to become more responsible executive who is rewarded or suffers the failures of his company.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con­ sent that the transcripts of Mr. Hur­ leigh's broadcasts of July 8 and 9, 1975, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the trans­ cripts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LIVING-COST INCREASES

On the other hand are those who view food stamps as a praiseworthy, major income-supplement program—a kind of backdoor substitute for the Family Assistance Plan which survived the long and bitter struggle of the early 1970s between Congress and former President Nixon. They want to see further expansion.
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a new Chairman and Chief Executive Officer. Chrysler—as well as the other big auto makers—has suffered the combined blows of the depressed auto market, the general recession and inflation as well as government ordered environmental and safety controls. The company's problems are severe. In Boston, we were presented with a suggestion that the cities of our country should consider measuring the decisions of their mayors—their administrators in the harsh, full light of public view as do big corporations and business generally.

The citizens of Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, Houston and New York should have an equally open view of where their own cities stand and should know how the cost of their services compare and whether the people who manage their cities are delivering results. The suggested Municipal report cards would show the per capita cost of each service rendered to the citizens and how the costs of one city's services compare to another. This information should be considered in the criteria in order to obtain fairness in the reporting. The publishing of performance reports should inspire efficiencies, Innovations and effectiveness in the management of our cities and give the hard-pressed taxpayer an opportunity to see how his own city is managing his money. The state of the art today.

CIA REPORT ON APOLLO-SOYUZ MISSION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is well known that I have been deeply concerned about the impending Apollo-Soyuz mission. For over a year, I have reviewed this subject as Chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee. The Senate committee received testimony from the Central Intelligence Agency on the safety of the joint flight. In response to numerous requests, today I am releasing a summary of the CIA's report to the Senate committee. Although this is not a comprehensive CIA report, there being disagreement over the seriousness of the safety hazard and certain other factors, this report summarizes the threat to the United States by making some comments about the Soviet system which 

In view of these facts, I again urge NASA to request that the current Soviet mission involving the Soyuz and Soyuz 4 spacecraft be deorbited prior to the launch of the ASTP.

Although the odds are in favor of a successful flight, the risks remain too high in my opinion for manned flight only for the sake of a questionable rationale for detection. We have been used to solve Earth problems such as crop management, fishery resources, communications, pollution control, and mineral and oil exploration. It is foolish to take undue chances for a program that costs so much—all with little return. The summary report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SUMMARY OF CIA REPORT ON SOVIET MISSION PREREQUISITE TO PARTICIPATE IN ASTP

The 5 April launch of the first manned Soyuz spacecraft renewed interest in the question of Soviet readiness to participate in the Apollo-Soyuz mission scheduled for July 15, 1975. Similar interest has been focused on this subject several other times during the past two years as a result of failures of other Soviet space missions. For example, in-flight malfunctions occurred aboard two unmanned Salyut space stations (ASTP) in 1974 and 1975. Earlier history of the Soyuz Program includes two events that threaten the safety of the United States. The CIA was a logical source for this evaluation in view of the fact they have studied the Soviet space program since its inception in the late 1960s.

As a result, CIA was requested to provide an overall evaluation of the Soyuz spacecraft and its ability to dock with the ASTP spacecraft. The CIA report indicated the prospects for successful completion of the Apollo-Soyuz Test Program (ASTP) mission are uncertain, the Soyuz spacecraft is capable of being operated in July without the ASTP, but the Soyuz spacecraft is not ready.

Furthermore, many of the problems the Soviet have had on past missions occurred at missions which if repeated on the ASTP mission would have no effect on the U.S. crew. For example, the 5 April launch failure, if repeated in July, could well affect mission completion, but would have no effect on the U.S. crew. Overall, the CIA pointed out that Soviet propulsion systems, including the Soyuz spacecraft, are inadequate and not sufficient to provide the Soyuz spacecraft with a rendezvous capability. Moreover, they are not ready to be used.

In summary, the United States has a potential technological lead over the U.S.S.R. in the following areas: communications, management and quality control, handling of emergency situations, launch coordination and procedures, control, navigation, and crew training. The Soviet Soyuz 14 launch was a success, and it has been determined that the Soviet Soyuz spacecraft will be used to rendezvous, approach and dock with the ASTP spacecraft. This mission will be no dependence upon the Soyuz system, which has failed for them almost half the time.

The CIA report reviewed the performance of each of the primary systems. Their review was based on information obtained on more than two dozen manned and unmanned Soyuz missions conducted since 1969. Each subsystem was evaluated in terms of its critical impact on mission success and on U.S. astronaut safety.

In spite of the many subsystem problems and relatively poor reliability of the Soyuz over the years, very few subsystems individually

any comparison. Their technology is far below that of the United States.

Therefore, we are actually providing them technical assistance while we learn nothing in return.

True, it will be a grand show. The world will be captivated for a few minutes as Soviet cosmonauts and American astronauts clasp hands and exchange words in each other's language far above the earth. The television networks will play it big, once again showing a fascination with space programs that may not be mirrored in the American public. Progress and not politics is the note of the situation. Already there is talk of future joint ventures. Millions more in tax dollars are being planned away for some future date. The present flight will cost $226 million alone. How many millions ahead for such grand gestures? I hesitate to guess.

Mr. President, having shared my personal feelings, I will now turn to the summary report.

SUMMARY REPORT

The summary indicates the CIA report that although the Soviets have experienced many space problems, the prospects for a successful mission are good.

The Soviet's preparations for this flight are more extensive and thorough than previous efforts. Furthermore, past failures have not been a phase that will not jeopardize U.S. astronauts should there be a reoccurrence.

Suggesting caution in this assessment is considerable additional evidence supplied by the CIA that the Soviets have encountered severe problems in space and their technology is inferior to that of the United States in almost every category.

The Soyuz rendezvous and docking system has failed almost half the time.

The current level of Soviet preparation is not below that of the United States.

The threat of a minor fire poses a moderate risk to the ASTP while a major fire is much less likely.

Soviet communications are not up to the quality of U.S. communications.

Consequently, flight, training and ground crew control prowess are inferior to that of U.S. counterparts.

There has been some technology flow to the Soviet Union as a result of the ASTP. Future joint missions would pose more of a potential for technology drain.

The primary advantage to the U.S.S.R. from the ASTP has been in observing U.S. management and program operational techniques.

The Soviet lunar program has produced a string of failures.

In summary, the United States has a significant technological lead over the U.S.S.R. in the following areas: communications, management and quality control, handling of emergency situations, launch coordination and procedures, computerized functions, capability for in-flight mission changes, space medicine, and crew training.

The two countries are about equal in tracking capability, environmental safety, backup systems and life monitoring systems.
have any real potential effect on astronaut safety.

A number of failures could affect the Soviet crew, like a reentry malfunction as on Soyuz or Soyuz-Soyuz-11, but few are likely to affect the safety of the astronauts. If a Soviet spacecraft problem does occur, based on the flight performance over the years, it will be the result of a design or manufacturing defect — not any previous flight, several additional aspects of the Soyuz manned space program should be noted.

The current level of Soviet preparation still is below that of the U.S. Although unlikely to create a hazard, the Soviet experience with rendezvous and docking has been poor.

The threat of a minor fire poses a moderate risk to the ASTP while a major fire is much less likely.

Soviet communications are not up to the quality systems and ground crew proficiency is inferior to that of the U.S. communications.

There has been some technology flow to the Soviets as a result of the ASTP. Future joint projects would pose more of a potential for technology drain.

The primary advantage to the USSR from the ASTP has been in observing U.S. management and program operational techniques.

The Soyuz life support system has produced a strong lineup of candidates.

In summary, the U.S. has a significant technological lead over the USSR in the following areas: communications, management and quality control; handling emergency situations; launch coordinations and procedures; computerized functions; capability for inflight maintenance; space medicine; and crew training. The two countries are about equal in tracking capability; environmental safety; back-up systems; and life monitoring systems.

Mr. President, as a result of Soviet technical deficiencies I have strongly recommended the current mission involving the Soyuz and Salut 4 be decontaminated prior to the ASTP launch.

Mr. Carl Dukett, Deputy Director of the CIA for Science and Technology, reported, among other statements: "I think the USR (the USSR) are in good shape to handle two missions at once from the command point of view."

This warning should not go unheeded.

THE MIDDLE EAST—1980

Mr. McCLURE, Mr. President, peace in the Middle East continues to be an elusive goal, despite the efforts of President Ford and his administration. I know that my colleagues join with me in support of this goal, and I believe that we should continue to maintain a sharp focus on perceived consequences of the consequences of failure.

Justice and security for Israel and her Arab neighbors are more than just nice words. Achievement of these ideals may become a serious policy consideration.

I, however, do not believe that the American people will allow this to occur.

I know with certainly that it is not necessary. We can achieve a peace in the Middle East based on U.N. Resolution 242 will provide Israel, the Arab nations, and the United States with the advantage that each is seeking.

Mr. President, one of our distinguished American Senators, Mr. Fulbright, has written a scenario, based on his wide experience and knowledge, which offers insight to this critical issue. I call particular attention to his scenario for the following reason: At first glance, one example of how time may not work to any one country's best interest.

In addition, his disturbing picture of the use of American troops in the Middle East should sharpen the understanding of many of us, as to the possible consequences of an unbalanced or unjust Middle East policy.

I ask unanimous consent that former Senator Fulbright's scenario be printed in the Record, together with another article which he wrote earlier entitled "American Interests in the Middle East."

The Senate requested that the articles be ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, July 13, 1975]

FULBRIGHT'S 1980 MIDDLE EAST SCENARIO

(By J. William Fulbright)

One morning in the early summer of 1980 I sat at my desk contemplating an invitation: "Dear Mr. Fulbright: The Young Americans for Peace and Justice in the Middle East invite you to be a featured speaker at their forthcoming rally on the Washington Monument grounds. As you may know, this rally is expected to be the climactic event in the anti-war movement's American military involvement in the Middle East. An attendance of at least half a million concerned Americans is anticipated."

"In addition to popular folk singers and one of the nation's top rock bands, the program will feature five of the leading candidates for the presidential nomination at next month's Democratic Convention. All five were also candidates in 1976, and each will offer a stump speech."

Mr. Fulbright is one of the leading supporters of Israel, will lead a movement in West Germany reached a peak of 50 percent, but the United States government for technology drain. I believe it is necessary to the previous emergency oil-sharing agreements with its allies.

On the first day of the fifth month of the embargo, the President of the United States went on national television to announce that the embargo was to be continued.

And here is why. The embargo is an all-out supporter of Israel, will lead an anti-war movement's American military involvement in the Middle East. An attendance of at least half a million concerned Americans is anticipated.

"In addition to popular folk singers and one of the nation's top rock bands, the program will feature five of the leading candidates for the presidential nomination at next month's Democratic Convention. All five were also candidates in 1976, and each will offer a stump speech."

Mr. Fulbright is one of the leading supporters of Israel, will lead a movement in West Germany reached a peak of 50 percent, but the United States government for technology drain. I believe it is necessary to the previous emergency oil-sharing agreements with its allies.

On the first day of the fifth month of the embargo, the President of the United States went on national television to announce that the embargo was to be continued.

And here is why. The embargo is an all-out supporter of Israel, will lead an anti-war movement's American military involvement in the Middle East. An attendance of at least half a million concerned Americans is anticipated.

"In addition to popular folk singers and one of the nation's top rock bands, the program will feature five of the leading candidates for the presidential nomination at next month's Democratic Convention. All five were also candidates in 1976, and each will offer a stump speech."

Mr. Fulbright is one of the leading supporters of Israel, will lead a movement in West Germany reached a peak of 50 percent, but the United States government for technology drain. I believe it is necessary to the previous emergency oil-sharing agreements with its allies.

On the first day of the fifth month of the embargo, the President of the United States went on national television to announce that the embargo was to be continued.

And here is why. The embargo is an all-out supporter of Israel, will lead an anti-war movement's American military involvement in the Middle East. An attendance of at least half a million concerned Americans is anticipated.

"In addition to popular folk singers and one of the nation's top rock bands, the program will feature five of the leading candidates for the presidential nomination at next month's Democratic Convention. All five were also candidates in 1976, and each will offer a stump speech."

Mr. Fulbright is one of the leading supporters of Israel, will lead a movement in West Germany reached a peak of 50 percent, but the United States government for technology drain. I believe it is necessary to the previous emergency oil-sharing agreements with its allies.

On the first day of the fifth month of the embargo, the President of the United States went on national television to announce that the embargo was to be continued.

And here is why. The embargo is an all-out supporter of Israel, will lead an anti-war movement's American military involvement in the Middle East. An attendance of at least half a million concerned Americans is anticipated.

"In addition to popular folk singers and one of the nation's top rock bands, the program will feature five of the leading candidates for the presidential nomination at next month's Democratic Convention. All five were also candidates in 1976, and each will offer a stump speech."

Mr. Fulbright is one of the leading supporters of Israel, will lead a movement in West Germany reached a peak of 50 percent, but the United States government for technology drain. I believe it is necessary to the previous emergency oil-sharing agreements with its allies.

On the first day of the fifth month of the embargo, the President of the United States went on national television to announce that the embargo was to be continued.

And here is why. The embargo is an all-out supporter of Israel, will lead an anti-war movement's American military involvement in the Middle East. An attendance of at least half a million concerned Americans is anticipated.

"In addition to popular folk singers and one of the nation's top rock bands, the program will feature five of the leading candidates for the presidential nomination at next month's Democratic Convention. All five were also candidates in 1976, and each will offer a stump speech."

Mr. Fulbright is one of the leading supporters of Israel, will lead a movement in West Germany reached a peak of 50 percent, but the United States government for technology drain. I believe it is necessary to the previous emergency oil-sharing agreements with its allies.

On the first day of the fifth month of the embargo, the President of the United States went on national television to announce that the embargo was to be continued.

And here is why. The embargo is an all-out supporter of Israel, will lead an anti-war movement's American military involvement in the Middle East. An attendance of at least half a million concerned Americans is anticipated.

"In addition to popular folk singers and one of the nation's top rock bands, the program will feature five of the leading candidates for the presidential nomination at next month's Democratic Convention. All five were also candidates in 1976, and each will offer a stump speech."

Mr. Fulbright is one of the leading supporters of Israel, will lead a movement in West Germany reached a peak of 50 percent, but the United States government for technology drain. I believe it is necessary to the previous emergency oil-sharing agreements with its allies.

On the first day of the fifth month of the embargo, the President of the United States went on national television to announce that the embargo was to be continued.

And here is why. The embargo is an all-out supporter of Israel, will lead an anti-war movement's American military involvement in the Middle East. An attendance of at least half a million concerned Americans is anticipated.

"In addition to popular folk singers and one of the nation's top rock bands, the program will feature five of the leading candidates for the presidential nomination at next month's Democratic Convention. All five were also candidates in 1976, and each will offer a stump speech."

Mr. Fulbright is one of the leading supporters of Israel, will lead a movement in West Germany reached a peak of 50 percent, but the United States government for technology drain. I believe it is necessary to the previous emergency oil-sharing agreements with its allies.

On the first day of the fifth month of the embargo, the President of the United States went on national television to announce that the embargo was to be continued.

And here is why. The embargo is an all-out supporter of Israel, will lead an anti-war movement's American military involvement in the Middle East. An attendance of at least half a million concerned Americans is anticipated.
ever, was only a temporary measure, it was announced, and the President pledged that by its charter, would continue to treat the oil it extracted and sold as an "international public trust."

An Arab summit conference held at Khartoum in the winter of 1978 resulted in a declaration of "jehad"—or holy war—against America and the West. The American people were shocked, and the Arab press accused of that 1967, insisting instead on the original United Nations partition plan of 1947.

In the months that followed, a series of terrorist acts against American passengers on domestic flights would be required check in two hours from their arrival to the United States, and additional naval units were sent to patrol the Strait of Hormuz.

With the passage of time, domestic life, and the clandestine radio of the terrorist groups, the United States government responded to this provocation in several ways. It announced an extended, acrimonious debate, the Congress by a narrow majority authorized the President to send 50,000 additional troops to bolster our positions in the Persian Gulf, and additional naval units were sent to patrol the Strait of Hormuz.

New measures also were taken to deal with terrorism. Acting on the report of a special mission study which had been sent to Israel to study airport security, the Congress of July 7, 1975 announced that all passengers on domestic flights would be required to check in two hours ahead of flight time for further pre-flight checks. Congress also adopted legislation imposing a mandatory death penalty for all persons convicted of acts of terrorism.

Throughout the years 1978 and 1979, despite repeated pleas by the President for "patience" and "fortitude," public support for the administration's Middle East policy waned steadily. In the trail of public opinion, congressional opinion followed. The President's request for an additional 30,000 men for the Middle East security force encountered rough sledding in Congress. In April 1979, the "Young Democrats for Justice and Freedom" announced another march on Washington. In the summer, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted on a bill to repeal the "Persian Gulf Resolution."

By the end of the year the polls showed the President's popularity at a new low of 27 percent, while support for Israel stood only slightly higher at 29 percent. A special caucus of liberal Democrats in the House and Senate adopted a cautiously worded resolution calling on Israel—"for the sake of world peace"—to "consider" whether it could withdraw to the 1947 partition line in exchange for an American guarantee. The Middle East became the dominant issue in the 1980 presidential primaries. In an obvious effort to influence the election, the Arab Liberation Organization announced in February a new worldwide campaign of "a new low of 23 percent. By the time of the California primary in June, all of the Arab candidates had called upon Israel to withdraw to the 1947 partition line. "It is no more than morality requires," said the Washington Post.

So matters stood as I penned my reply to the Young Americans for Peace and Justice in the Middle East. At this time, the President was about to leave on a trip to the Middle East. The Middle East is to me a special place. I believe that what I have to say to you is true, and that I can retire from politics and I think it best to leave crusades to the young and to others still actively involved. Furthermore, I must confess that I do not understand the stated aims of your organization. Although I favor a prompt and orderly American military involvement in the Middle East, I still do not adhere to my long-standing conviction that Israel is entitled to a secure national existence, and that this view is generally considered outmoded, but I adhere to it in the belief that the United States must honor its solemn commitments.

"Finally, at a time when the executive branch of our government has been greatly weakened by the cumulative effects of Vietnam, Watergate and the Middle East crisis, it seems to me that some of us ought to stand by the President. Sincerely yours, J. W. Fulbright."

(From the Washington Post, July 7, 1975)

AMERICAN INTERESTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Edward G. Mead)

In his speech at Atlanta on June 24, Secretary of State Kissinger pointed to the range of vital American interests in the Middle East—the access to Arab oil, the strain on the Western alliance posed by each successive crisis, the threat to the world economy of the Middle East, and the chronic danger of confrontation with the Soviet Union. The Secretary emphasized that the United States must do what is most prudent to protect all its interests in the Middle East. Having recently returned from an extended tour of the Middle East, I am filled with a sense of the serious, complex, and uncertain urgency of the Secretary's observations. Time is working against us, and against our interests.

To see why, it is necessary to consider all of our interests in the Middle East. The Arab-Israeli conflict and the oil problem are not only related but inseparable. Israel is largely a creation of the conscience of the West, particularly that of the United States; for that reason alone, her survival qualifies as an American national interest. At the same time we have a most vital interest in access to Arab oil—all the more so as the Gulf States account for the bulk of our energy imports and they show little inclination to enact measures for meaningful energy conservation. Furthermore, we are committed to give all-out support to current Israeli policy, should it be more forthcoming. The stakes are high, either for disaster or for great good. If there is another war, it may well bring on difficulties with the Soviet Union, for which we have no U.S. embargo, which in turn could precipitate the disintegration of our alliances with Europe and Japan.

On the other hand, Saudi Arabia, with one fourth of the world's oil reserves, has offered the United States a degree of cooperation and has shown a willingness to mobilize the enmity of all other industrialized countries. The Saudis do not propose, nor would we desire, privileged or discriminatory access to their oil, but they do offer us—and it is entirely proper that we should accept—a unique relationship based upon assured oil supply, large-scale investment of oil revenues in the United States, and primary reliance upon American technology for the development of Saudi Arabia. A Saudi-American association of this kind could also serve as an economic nucleus that would be highly beneficial to the United States, for the relations of one country to all others is largely determined by the relations of that country to oil-producing countries. Also of great importance is the fact that almost all of Saudi Arabia's vast oil revenues are reinvested in a highly efficient American company with excellent relations with the Saudi government. It is staffed primarily by Americans, is American in its orientation, and qualifies thereby as a solid asset to the national interest.

There are two basic problems with respect to our reliance on Arab oil: supply and price. The problem of supply—which is to say, the threat of embargo—is wholly a function of the Arab-Israeli conflict. If that is resolved, there is no further threat of embargo. The problem of price is also related to the embargo threat. The question could not be expected to result in an immediate, sizable price rollback, nor would it detach Saudi Arabia from American policy; it would, however, eliminate the only outstanding issue between the United States and Saudi Arabia—essentially if provision were made for Saudi Arabia to send us more oil under one form or another of Arab sovereignty. Under these circumstances, Saudi Arabia would stand closer to the United States and become more amenable to our influence, making the problem of oil prices far less significant.

Except from Israel herself, there is a virtual consensus among all the signatories of a Middle East settlement: an Israeli with
drawal to the borders of 1967 with insubstantial variations; a Palestinian state comprising the Gaza Strip, Jericho and parts of the West Bank; and an indefinite, limited, and defined zone of security on the Jordanian Heights, of much or all of Sinai including Sharm el-Sheikh, and of much or all of the West Bank; and in the area defined zones of U.N. Forces which could not be removed except with the consent of both sides; and great power guarantees of the settlement, preferably under the aegis of the United Nations Security Council, supplemented if necessary by a solid and explicit American guarantee and a belt of firmness around Israel.

A settlement along these lines has been endorsed by the principal Arab parties and also by the Soviet Union. The Arab consensus for the acceptance of Israel has been repeatedly signaled by the Arab leaders. King Khalid put it this way: "The Arabs have learned to be much more reasonable. Gone are the days of Nasser's period when the Arabs threatened to exterminate the Israelis." No less significant is the Soviet declaration of willingness to guarantee Israel.

As Foreign Minister Gromyko put it at a dinner in Moscow on April 29 for Arab Foreign Ministers: "Israel may get, if it so wishes, the strictest guarantees with the participation—under an appropriate agreement with the United Nations—of the Arab states. The Arab guarantees will not survive indefinitely if it brings no rewards; nor can we expect any genuine confidence from the Soviet Union if we do not hold them to it now."

The settlement would not need to be implemented at once. President Sadat and other Egyptian leaders have been prepared to have it implemented over a period of years, step-by-step—provided it were understood: (1) This is a settlement and nothing less, were the agreed objective. As noted, the Arab consensus would not survive indefinitely if it brings no rewards; nor can we expect any genuine confidence from the Soviet Union if we do not hold them to it now.

A settlement of the kind described would redound to the benefit of the American economy at stake and, I feel certain, is in the best interests of Israel as well. Israel will be secure only when she gains acceptance as a normal state in the Middle East. In which event she would almost certainly become the scientific and technological leader of the region. The fact that Israel is transient—a population far more advanced than those of her neighbors in both military and technological combat power—is an advantage of Israel is transient: a population far more advanced than those of her neighbors in both military and technological combat power. The advent of Israel in scientific and technological leader of the region. The Arab leaders are advancing rapidly in education and technological skills, and when these are added to their vastly greater numbers and the balance of power will swing in their favor. In that eventuality, Israel will become less and less secure despite the retention of "defensible borders" and will of course be thrown into steadily greater dependence upon the United States.

As matters now stand, our commitment to Israel is open-ended: We are providing the material means for an Israeli policy that is beyond our control—a policy that, by all indications, is bringing Israel toward a confrontation with the United States toward a major new crisis. An American guarantee of an agreed settlement, on the other hand, would clarify an existing commitment, bringing it clearly within the scope of our national interest, and at the same time would provide for the greatest possible security under the circumstances that exist in the area. As one thoughtful observer remarked: "The only secure borders are those which are accepted by one's neighbors."

Setting the Record Straight on Social Security

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, alarmist accounts have surfaced in recent months about the financial condition of the social security trust funds.

"Unfortunately, these articles have only caused needless anxiety and concern for millions of retirees and workers—instead of contributing to any meaningful dialog concerning the future of the social security program."

In the past, critics of social security have raised similar charges. They were discredited then, and they will be now.

Persons who claim that social security is on the verge of collapse are really doing a disservice to our Nation.

Social security is sound, and it is serving all Americans well.

The program can, of course, be improved. The fact is that social security was implemented at once. President Eisenhower's statement that the program is "defensible borders," is continuing, is carrying both Israel and the Arabs beyond our control—a policy that, by all indications, is bringing Israel toward a confrontation with the United States toward a major new crisis.

The Arab leaders indicate that they would be prepared to have it implemented over a period of years, step-by-step—provided it were understood: (1) This is a settlement and nothing less, were the agreed objective. As noted, the Arab consensus would not survive indefinitely if it brings no rewards; nor can we expect any genuine confidence from the Soviet Union if we do not hold them to it now.

A settlement of the kind described would redound to the benefit of the American economy at stake and, I feel certain, is in the best interests of Israel as well. Israel will be secure only when she gains acceptance as a normal state in the Middle East. In which event she would almost certainly become the scientific and technological leader of the region. The fact that Israel is transient—a population far more advanced than those of her neighbors in both military and technological combat power—is an advantage of Israel is transient: a population far more advanced than those of her neighbors in both military and technological combat power. The advent of Israel in scientific and technological leader of the region. The Arab leaders are advancing rapidly in education and technological skills, and when these are added to their vastly greater numbers and the balance of power will swing in their favor. In that eventuality, Israel will become less and less secure despite the retention of "defensible borders" and will of course be thrown into steadily greater dependence upon the United States.

As matters now stand, our commitment to Israel is open-ended: We are providing the material means for an Israeli policy that is beyond our control—a policy that, by all indications, is bringing Israel toward a confrontation with the United States toward a major new crisis. An American guarantee of an agreed settlement, on the other hand, would clarify an existing commitment, bringing it clearly within the scope of our national interest, and at the same time would provide for the greatest possible security under the circumstances that exist in the area. As one thoughtful observer remarked: "The only secure borders are those which are accepted by one's neighbors."

In some ways, that is what the trust fund is there for—the fund is only meant to act as a buffer to keep the flow of benefits steady. The relatively small fund—about $46 billion—collects excess payments in good years and pays the difference in poor years to assure this flow.

A number of factors in our recent economic history, the past few years have been poor ones—high unemployment, increasing inflation, and rising cost of living forces higher benefits. The result is a projected deficit—to come out of this trust fund—of $10 billion in 1976. If this deficit continues and payments in good years, the trust fund will be exhausted by the early 1980's.

Even if the trust fund is allowed to be totally depleted (which is most unlikely—the prediction of one year of deficit has spawned 100 times as many headlines), the rest of the system could continue without it, and the bulk of social security payments would still be made. At worst, the long range deficit is projected to be 3%. This means that with no trust fund at all, the system could still meet 95% of its obligations.

But nobody is proposing that the system be run that way, and the Congress and Administration are not proposing a financing system for the program. While witnesses at hearings before the Social Security Subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee—including the Social Security Commissioner, the Social Security Advisory Council, the Secretary of HEW and a panel of independent economists and actuaries did not agree on the precise action necessary, they all agreed that the system is sound and would continue to pay the benefits it is expected to.

Most of the experts also agreed on the causes of the deficit. The primary one seems to be the continuing rapid rise in earnings. This is almost 2% of the 5.5% deficit. Their estimates are based on a 6% increase in average earnings and a 4% increase in the Consumer Price Index (CPI).

Automatic Escalator Clause

The general state of the economy also increases the benefits paid, since the social security law now has an automatic escalator clause in it so that the benefits increase as the CPI increases. This "indexing" system was enacted in 1972. Prior to that, the law had to be amended each time it was necessary to upgrade the benefits. The delays proved to be a great hardship on many of the recipients of social security.

The system also makes the system very politically vulnerable—large increases in election years could be used to influence the senior citizen's vote.

The indexing scheme that was enacted in 1972 was heavily criticized by most of the experts because it results in automatic increases, but because the formula chosen to do this is incorrect. The complicated formula that was chosen is sort of like a home improvement good, because it not only increases the benefits but also increases the wage base upon which those benefits are based. The result is that by the beginning of the next century if the wage and price increases continue as projected, a worker might be able to retire with a social security payment higher than her or his income immediately before retirement.
FUTURE PROJECTIONS DIFFICULT

Aside from the obvious burdens of financing such a system, the funding is so sensitive to price increases that it is almost unpredictable. Having so many economic variables that are impossible to accurately study, the future is always uncertain, and the future needs and responsibilities of the system very difficult to estimate. These variables consist mainly of payroll tax increases, so that workers 75 years in the future will be paying as much as 33% of their income to support the retirees.

Another factor which is contributing to the deficit is the birth rate, which has dropped in the last ten years. During the postwar "baby boom" of 1946 to 1965, the average fertility rate rose to 3.7 children per woman. That rate has dropped by a half, down to 1.5, due mostly to changed lifestyles and improved birth control methods. Demographic projections for the future suggest that the fertility rate is only expected to stabilize at about 2.1, which is the rate required to maintain a stable population size. The trustees are counting on an immediate upswing but the advisory panel to the Senate Finance Committee thinks the fertility rate will decline even further to 1.5 in 1980 before starting a slow increase up to 2.1.

LONG RANGE PROBLEMS

What all that means for social security is that when the baby boomers are ready to retire, there will be a lot fewer workers to support them. Right now there are 1.5 workers contributing to Social Security for every 30 people receiving social security. With the combined effects of more old and fewer young people, that will change to more than 45 retirees to be supported by every 100 workers. That would mean the payroll tax would have to increase by half again just to maintain the growth in the retirement population.

All of these are weighty problems without simple solutions. A variety of answers have been proposed, and many more are being studied now, but it seems unlikely that anything will be done soon. The quick answers—raising taxes or benefits—would be politically impossible during the current recession and the upcoming election year. And the long-range questions take long-range consideration.

FUNDING LEVELS FOR ALCOHOLISM AND NARCOTICS PROJECTS

Mr. HATHWAY. Mr. President, a few day ago I was privileged to testify before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare on the subject of funding levels for alcoholism and narcotics projects. During that testimony, I stated that now was not the time to cut back funding for these programs, as the Nation has established programs which are indeed having an effect on alcohol and drug abuse.

There is every evidence that we are at a point where expanded treatment facilities in inner cities and the corner on these problems, and begin our way back to the millions of Americans now sick from alcoholism and drug addiction.

As a result of the progress we have made, and the potential that exists if we do continue our work in this field, I submit for printing in the Record an article that appeared in the Maine Sunday Telegram on the alcohol safety action program. Funds for this program were dropped when the program was first begun, and the tremendous improvements made during the life of this organization are well worth noting.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

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

[From the Maine Sunday Tribune, July 6, 1975]

ASAP ENDS LIFE WITH RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENT
(By John Lovell)

For three years a federal program known as Alcoholics Anonymous Program has occupied a crowded, small suite of offices in Portland's Congress Square. This weekend, Dr. Dwight Dogerty Jr. was cleaning out the files.

The lawyers who had worked there prosecuting drunken drivers, the education specialists who trained program workers to help police catch them, the people who had run rehabilitative classes to straighten them out, all were gone.

Dogerty, 37, the program's director since its inception, listened to a police radio scan as he emptied his desk. He had no more ASAP police patrol cars out looking exclusively for drunken drivers, but Dogerty had the radio on anyway, listening for the dispatcher's phone call that或许 another statistic the EPA effort had sought to prevent.

The two per cent of all highway fatalities in York and Cumberland counties in the past three years, he observed, "were involved with alcohol.

"We estimate that only one out of every 200 instances of OUI (operating under the influence) is detected, based on roadside samples and police reports."

Dogerty continued as he emptied his desk. "This is an upside down operation. Nobody arrests a drunk and the program was going well and arrest him.

"We made a point of emphasizing that this was a provincially educative role. The lawyer who worked there pointed out that it would be a Province-wide, nationwide operation if we went on.

Dogerty, 37, the program's director since its inception, listened to a police radio scan as he sorted papers. There were no more ASAP police patrol cars out looking exclusively for drunken drivers, but Dogerty had the radio on anyway, listening for the dispatcher's phone call that perhaps another statistic the EPA effort had sought to prevent.

The two per cent of all highway fatalities in York and Cumberland counties in the past three years, he observed, "were involved with alcohol.

"We estimate that only one out of every 200 instances of OUI (operating under the influence) is detected, based on roadside samples and police reports."

Dogerty continued as he emptied his desk. "This is an upside down operation. Nobody arrests a drunk and the program was going well and arrest him."

"We made a point of emphasizing that this was a provincially educative role. The lawyer who worked there pointed out that it would be a Province-wide, nationwide operation if we went on."

"Either the program was going well and accomplished what it was intended to do, or it was getting to the hard-core drinking driver."

But one thing we can say now: Of the 1,150 who attended rehabilitation classes, five became repeat offenders. Of the 1,150 remaining drivers who didn't attend the classes, 81 became second offenders.

"This indicates one of two things," Wyman said. "Either the program was going well and accomplished what it was intended to do, or it was getting to the hard-core drinking driver."

But one thing we can say now: Of the 1,150 who attended rehabilitation classes, five became repeat offenders. Of the 1,150 remaining drivers who didn't attend the classes, 81 became second offenders.

"This indicates one of two things," Wyman said. "Either the program was going well and accomplished what it was intended to do, or it was getting to the hard-core drinking driver."

But one thing we can say now: Of the 1,150 who attended rehabilitation classes, five became repeat offenders. Of the 1,150 remaining drivers who didn't attend the classes, 81 became second offenders.
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DEATH OF DR. LILLIE MAY JACKSON

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on Friday, July 11, 1975, I attended funeral services for one of Baltimore's most distinguished leaders, Dr. Lillie May Jackson. Dr. Jackson, in partnership with her husband, established the Baltimore City NAACP in 1935, an era when overt discrimination against black Americans was widely practiced and accepted in our society. Long before the civil rights movement gained national prominence, Dr. Jackson was crusading to make life better for black people. Under her leadership, Maryland restaurants, theaters, and commercial outlets allowed blacks to eat, drink, and shop in previously segregated facilities. Economic opportunities were opened to blacks in ever increasing numbers.

Through the efforts of Dr. Jackson, and those like her, there was 1975 and 1976. There being no objection, the obituary and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LILLIE JACKSON, HEADED NAACP

Funeral services for Dr. Lillie May Jackson, president of the Maryland Chapter of the National Assn. for the Advancement of Colored People, were held yesterday.

Mr. Jackson, who died Tuesday at the age of 86, was a tireless worker for the civil rights movement and a tireless worker for the civil rights movement.

The couple returned to Baltimore, where they made a home for their three daughters and son. After her children were grown, Mrs. Jackson began a new life as she was taking courses at the Baltimore City Community College in the summer of 1975.

Mr. Jackson's husband died in 1970 after 60 years of service. She was active in the church for several years after his death.

Interment will be in Mt. Auburn Cemetery in Mt. Wise.

Mrs. Jackson was survived by three daughters: Mrs. Virginia Kahl, Mrs. Juanita Mitchell and Mrs. Marian Smith; a son, Bowen Jackson; a sister, Mrs. Florence Snowden; two nephews, 10 grandchildren and 9 great-grandchildren.

GRATEFUL PEOPLE GATHER AT SHARP STREET CHURCH IN A FINAL, MOVING TRIBUTE TO LILLIE M. JACKSON

(By DeWayne Wickham)

Dr. Lillie M. Jackson returned yesterday to the church where 30 years ago she raised her voice in protest against the social and racial injustices of that day.

In 1945, Mrs. Jackson came to the Sharp Street Memorial United Methodist Church to lead a rally in support of striking Pennsylvania avenue counter girls and clerks who were protesting low salaries and the lack of paid vacations. Friends say that it was the shrewdness of her voice, urging the strikers to "stick to their guns," which carried the day.

Today she was silent, but her message was echoed by the many persons who spoke in her stead.

Mrs. Jackson, 86, the matriarch of the city's most prominent black family and long-time head of both city and state chapters of the NAACP, died yesterday. Funeral services were held yesterday.

While many of the top officials of the city, state and federal government were at the funeral services, there were also many others who attended.

On July 14, 1975
announced his intention to seek a Fourth district congressional seat in this September's primary.

And Representative Mitchell, brother of Clarence, Jr., is the state's first black to be elected to a seat in Congress. Mr. Mitchell launched a centennial appeal for mayor this spring, but dropped out last month.

As the three-hour service drew to a close, the preachers thrust into the church's arbor a 15-foot tall bellowing, side to side as a soloist bellowed out the words of a traditional black gospel hymn—in final tribute to Mrs. Jackson's life.

May the work I've done speak for me.

May the service I gave speak for me.

May the life I lived speak for me.

And while I'm in my grave and there's nothing more to be said, May the work I've done speak for me.

PORTUGAL

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. President, recent developments in Portuguese force one to the conclusion that the leftists and Communists now in control of that country are determined to eradicate all vestiges of democracy and individual liberty.

Their reaction to that country's last free Socialist leaders after the defeat of the Socialists and Communist socialist parties that outpolled them and move against the labor unions that represented a strong countervailing sway from side to side as a soloist bellowed out the words of a traditional black gospel hymn—in final tribute to Mrs. Jackson's life.

The only mystery he makes concerns his own person: He refuses to state whether he has any family or where he lived after his arrest. He was interned until 1960, for 14 years in all. (It is, however, believed that he lived in Moscow in his youth. He is anarchistic, basically, one is attracted to him. He is friendly, gay, impetuous, apt at repartee and able to make one laugh even while he is uttering the most unacceptant principles. Moreover, his intelligence is lively and sharp despite his blind faith and a hint of naiveté that cannot but make him seem simple. But in the counterrevolutionary danger, of course, in many ways the takeover in Portugal is following the classic pattern that left much of Europe in Communist hands after World War II.

Mr. President, Sunday's New York Times magazine contained an interview with Mr. Alvaro Cunhal, the leader of the Portuguese Communist Party, conducted by Oriana Fallaci. In that interview Mr. Cunhal reveals himself to be as power hungry and cynical as any Communist revolutionary anywhere. It should be read by anyone who thinks the situation in Portugal is going to improve so long as the Communists are in a major position within the regime.

Mr. President. I ask that Miss Fallaci's interview with Mr. Cunhal be printed in the Record.

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

A TALK WITH THE COMMUNIST LEADER

(From Oriana Fallaci)

The man who counts most in present-day Portugal, the man who influences the army's power machine, the man, in one sense, who has emerged the winner, although he was beaten at the elections, is Alvaro Cunhal, the leader of the Portuguese Communist Party. It isn't too easy to obtain an interview with him. If one succeeds, however, one has only to listen to him in order to grasp what is happening in that country, to obtain a clear picture.

Cunhal ignores diplomacy's nebulous paths. When he opens his mouth, he says what he thinks, with blunt sincerity. And among the things he thinks, he thinks that he wants, that he has already partially obtained, we find a total refusal of democratic liberties, of democracy itself. That is the substance of his utterances: Either the dictatorship of the proletariat or else Fascism, Socialism by means of an extensive stabilization of the armed forces.

If you say to him that you were able to prevent only the regional elections, he says that he is engaged in a revolution together with the army. They insist on holding the one for the Constituent Assembly and nothing more. They want to impose a completely new framework, well-conditioned by the agreement signed with the M.F.A. by the force that the regime is using to democratize Portugal.

The conclusion that the leftists and Communists now in control of that country are determined to eradicate all vestiges of democracy and individual liberty.

What you're saying is that the people are immature, Cunhal. It's always an excuse for dictatorships. And it's exactly what the Fascists say.

Well. It doesn't mean that the people are immature. It means that the electoral method isn't the only one.

I'm telling you that elections have nothing wrong, or very little, to do with the dynamics of revolution. Like you like it or not, whether the Socialists like it or not, I'm telling you that the election process is but a marginal complement of said dynamics. Beyond all. Any political thinking, its representation in this country, is a political force. An independent force, with its own political thinking, its own popular support, such as is represented in the election results. Yes, I know what you're wishing to retort: that the Army doesn't want to deal with the Communist Party. That's the Army. The effect is one of the various political parties: The Armed Forces Movement wasn't competing as such. And if you believe the Constituent Assembly can meet without the M.F.A., you're making a big mistake. If you believe the Constituent Assembly will be transformed into a Revolutionary Council, you're making a ridiculous mistake. No, indeed! The Constituent Assembly will certainly not form a legitimate body. It will be a Chamber of deputies. I promise you. It will be a Constituent Assembly and nothing more, with a limited importance, nothing more. It will be the last leg of the political framework, well-conditioned by the agreement signed with the M.F.A. by the force that the regime is using to democratize Portugal.

You did say there'd be no parliament in Portugal?

You're wrong. I promise you there'll be no parliament in Portugal.

In other words, the only reaction is of the one I've mentioned. It isn't that the regime is seeking to democratize Portugal.

One of the thermometers. Only one. And I say this just to prove you wrong, better, because if I answered "no thermometer," we'd go on for ever: yes, no, yes. No. But how can you speak of elections when there are districts where people can't even read and write? Districts where propaganda is carried out by whispering: "If you vote for the Fascists, the sickle and hammer will come and give you an injection behind your ear."

What you're saying is that the people are immature, Cunhal. It's always an excuse for dictatorships. And it's exactly what the Fascists say.

Well. It doesn't mean that the people are immature. It means that the electoral method isn't the only one.

I'm telling you that elections have nothing wrong, or very little, to do with the dynamics of revolution. Like you like it or not, whether the Socialists like it or not, I'm telling you that the election process is but a marginal complement of said dynamics. Beyond all. Any political thinking, its representation in this country, is a political force. An independent force, with its own political thinking, its own popular support, such as is represented in the election results. Yes, I know what you're wishing to retort: that the Army doesn't want to deal with the Communist Party. That's the Army. The effect is one of the various political parties: The Armed Forces Movement wasn't competing as such. And if you believe the Constituent Assembly can meet without the M.F.A., you're making a big mistake. If you believe the Constituent Assembly will be transformed into a Revolutionary Council, you're making a ridiculous mistake. No, indeed! The Constituent Assembly will certainly not form a legitimate body. It will be a Chamber of deputies. I promise you. It will be a Constituent Assembly and nothing more, with a limited importance, nothing more. It will be the last leg of the political framework, well-conditioned by the agreement signed with the M.F.A. by the force that the regime is using to democratize Portugal.

You did say there'd be no parliament in Portugal?

You're wrong. I promise you there'll be no parliament in Portugal.

In other words, the only reaction is of the one I've mentioned. It isn't that the regime is seeking to democratize Portugal.

One of the thermometers. Only one. And I say this just to prove you wrong, better, because if I answered "no thermometer," we'd go on for ever: yes, no, yes. No. But how can you speak of elections when there are districts where people can't even read and write? Districts where propaganda is carried out by whispering: "If you vote for the Fascists, the sickle and hammer will come and give you an injection behind your ear."

What you're saying is that the people are immature, Cunhal. It's always an excuse for dictatorships. And it's exactly what the Fascists say.

Well. It doesn't mean that the people are immature. It means that the electoral method isn't the only one.

I'm telling you that elections have nothing wrong, or very little, to do with the dynamics of revolution. Like you like it or not, whether the Socialists like it or not, I'm telling you that the election process is but a marginal complement of said dynamics. Beyond all. Any political thinking, its representation in this country, is a political force. An independent force, with its own political thinking, its own popular support, such as is represented in the election results. Yes, I know what you're wishing to retort: that the Army doesn't want to deal with the Communist Party. That's the Army. The effect is one of the various political parties: The Armed Forces Movement wasn't competing as such. And if you believe the Constituent Assembly can meet without the M.F.A., you're making a big mistake. If you believe the Constituent Assembly will be transformed into a Revolutionary Council, you're making a ridiculous mistake. No, indeed! The Constituent Assembly will certainly not form a legitimate body. It will be a Chamber of deputies. I promise you. It will be a Constituent Assembly and nothing more, with a limited importance, nothing more. It will be the last leg of the political framework, well-conditioned by the agreement signed with the M.F.A. by the force that the regime is using to democratize Portugal.

You did say there'd be no parliament in Portugal?

You're wrong. I promise you there'll be no parliament in Portugal.

In other words, the only reaction is of the one I've mentioned. It isn't that the regime is seeking to democratize Portugal.

One of the thermometers. Only one. And I say this just to prove you wrong, better, because if I answered "no thermometer," we'd go on for ever: yes, no, yes. No. But how can you speak of elections when there are districts where people can't even read and write? Districts where propaganda is carried out by whispering: "If you vote for the Fascists, the sickle and hammer will come and give you an injection behind your ear."

What you're saying is that the people are immature, Cunhal. It's always an excuse for dictatorships. And it's exactly what the Fascists say.

Well. It doesn't mean that the people are immature. It means that the electoral method isn't the only one.

I'm telling you that elections have nothing wrong, or very little, to do with the dynamics of revolution. Like you like it or not, whether the Socialists like it or not, I'm telling you that the election process is but a marginal complement of said dynamics. Beyond all. Any political thinking, its representation in this country, is a political force. An independent force, with its own political thinking, its own popular support, such as is represented in the election results. Yes, I know what you're wishing to retort: that the Army doesn't want to deal with the Communist Party. That's the Army. The effect is one of the various political parties: The Armed Forces Movement wasn't competing as such. And if you believe the Constituent Assembly can meet without the M.F.A., you're making a big mistake. If you believe the Constituent Assembly will be transformed into a Revolutionary Council, you're making a ridiculous mistake. No, indeed! The Constituent Assembly will certainly not form a legitimate body. It will be a Chamber of deputies. I promise you. It will be a Constituent Assembly and nothing more, with a limited importance, nothing more. It will be the last leg of the political framework, well-conditioned by the agreement signed with the M.F.A. by the force that the regime is using to democratize Portugal.
Socioism, nationalization situation, in fact. Don't believe that the nationalization those of other European workers, immediate way just at present. What you see now in between their salaries of our workers and in our capitalism has a rellef!

That's your opinion. It's by no means mine. So I perceive. But then, what on earth do you mean when you use the word democracy? In Portugal, as things now stand, is moving toward Socioism. The only thing I can't say is to express an opinion: I'm saying it to state a fact. I'm not saying it to imply criticism of the revolution. They are about to be destroyed. And all this is irreversible. Irreversible! So my answer to the Communists in Western countries, to the new Socialists, is never to await the results of elections to change things and destroy the past. Our way is a revolution and has nothing in common with your systems. Do you believe Portugal will go Communist?

Indeed I do! It's my aspiration, since I'm a Communist myself. And it is indisputable that Portugal, as things now stand, is moving toward Socioism. The only thing I can't say is to express an opinion: I'm saying it to state a fact. I'm not saying it to imply criticism of the revolution. They are about to be destroyed. And all this is irreversible. Irreversible! So my answer to the Communists in Western countries, to the new Socialists, is never to await the results of elections to change things and destroy the past. Our way is a revolution and has nothing in common with your systems. Do you believe Portugal will go Communist?

Indeed I do! It's my aspiration, since I'm a Communist myself. And it is indisputable that Portugal, as things now stand, is moving toward Socioism. The only thing I can't say is to express an opinion: I'm saying it to state a fact. I'm not saying it to imply criticism of the revolution. They are about to be destroyed. And all this is irreversible. Irreversible! So my answer to the Communists in Western countries, to the new Socialists, is never to await the results of elections to change things and destroy the past. Our way is a revolution and has nothing in common with your systems. Do you believe Portugal will go Communist?

Indeed I do! It's my aspiration, since I'm a Communist myself. And it is indisputable that Portugal, as things now stand, is moving toward Socioism. The only thing I can't say is to express an opinion: I'm saying it to state a fact. I'm not saying it to imply criticism of the revolution. They are about to be destroyed. And all this is irreversible. Irreversible! So my answer to the Communists in Western countries, to the new Socialists, is never to await the results of elections to change things and destroy the past. Our way is a revolution and has nothing in common with your systems. Do you believe Portugal will go Communist?
occur when the people participate. April 25 was a coup d’état, not a revolution.

By no means! If you consider the M.F.A. just a group of conspirators who meet one day to engage in a plot, it shows you how small this regime is. It was a movement of democratic forces within the army with meetings of 400 officers at a time discussing ways and means of changing the regime. I shouldn’t even call it a coup d’état, not a revolution. It was a movement of democratic forces.

The progressive officers. An element, we must admit, not ideological. The other day, I met the United States Ambassador who was here before Carlotto. He was with some English people and they all asked me: "But how is this? You Portuguese Communists have been heard to want to stay in it?" My answer: “Who told you we support it, that we want to stay in it? We have merely stated that we don’t wish to discuss the problem for the time being. It needs to be considered in a broader context: World peace, the Warsaw Pact, the cooperation of countries with different political régimes. Some day, we’ll tackle it. We’re in no hurry. For the time being, belonging to NATO is a problem.

The second question concerns the Warsaw Pact. Is it or isn’t it true that you voiced approval for Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia, the so-called tanks in Prague. And there’s no shame in admitting it; at most, and sometimes, it’s unreasonable. But such was my, our, choice, and we’ll hold on to it. For the time being, belonging to NATO is a problem.

You want to end on that note, do you? I’m sorry to appear brutal. But such was my, our, choice, and we’ll hold on to it. For the time being, belonging to NATO is a problem.

THE ROY JEFFERSON INNER CITY LEARNING CENTER

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on May 27 I had the pleasure of visiting the Roy Jefferson Inner City Learning Center, Roy Jefferson, as my colleagues know, is the outstanding wide receiver of the Washington Redskins. Roy Jefferson is concerned over the fact that there are a large number of youngsters who are getting caught up in the Welfare Damen, in the social and cultural life of the inner city and I want to ask you some questions. If you should not find the answer to your question please feel free to contact the Registrar.

1. What is the Roy Jefferson Inner City Learning Center?

The Roy Jefferson Inner City Learning Center is an educational learning center concentrating on helping individuals with reading problems. It has been established with the Right to Read Program within the United States Office of Education.

2. What is the primary goal of the program?

The primary goal is to increase the reading level of each student substantially to the emerging national attack on reading problems. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter I wrote to Commissioner Rozelle be printed in the Record.

M. BEALL. This shows once again that citizens are likely to help when called. While the good work done by business and civil-minded citizens is often overlooked, I want to commend those who contributed to the launching of the learning center.

As a member of the Education Subcommittee, reading in an area of deep concern to me. I have labeled reading as the “Achilles’ Heel of American Education.”

Recently I appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee urging funding of the national reading improvement program, which I authored along with Senator Eagleton. I recommended $25 million for the program and the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate approved $22 million. In the final House-Senate conference, the amount was reduced to $17 million. I ask unanimous consent that this testimony be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXHIBIT 1

ROY JEFFERSON INNER CITY LEARNING CENTER

DEAR APPLICANT: Thank you for your interest in the Roy Jefferson Inner City Learning Centers. Here are a few questions to help us determine whether you are a good candidate.

1. What is the Roy Jefferson Inner City Learning Center?

2. What is the primary goal of the program?

Dear Applicant: Thank you for your interest in the Roy Jefferson Inner City Learning Centers. Here are a few questions to help us determine whether you are a good candidate.

1. What is the Roy Jefferson Inner City Learning Center?

2. What is the primary goal of the program?
3. Who is eligible to participate in the center activities? Any individual who is at least one year behind in reading level and does not have a physical or mental problem which would prohibit participation.

4. Where are the centers located? At the present time only one center is open at 1411 K St., N.W., Washington, D.C. Other centers will be opened in the Washington Metropolitan area as funds and citizen interest increase.

5. What are the costs involved in participating in the center activities? Instruction and basic material costs are provided free. There will be some minor costs involved if the participants for activities included in the program. We do not anticipate these costs being greater than $1 per week.

6. What type of education materials are used in the program? The program is customized completely according to the individual student's need. The management instructional system is entitled Saturation Approach to Learning and provides for the rules and how the rules will protect your child regarding his activities. We would punish them from danger and help them learn. Behavior problems are often the result of poor teaching and the lack of a stimulating atmosphere. These points can be applied to prizes ranging from small tokens to exciting trips, events, and values.

7. What times are the activities? Instruction is scheduled on an appointment basis with one hour sessions twice a week. Appointments remain constant once established. During the months of September through May the staff will be scheduling activities for the following times: (Mondays-Thursdays): 1:00-Children. 2:00-Children. 3:00-Children. 4:00-Children. 5:00-Children. 6:00-Special Conferences. 7:00-Children. 8:00-Open to all ages.

14. During the summer months the staff will modify the schedule with the following increased times: 10:00-Morning. 12:00-Noon. 2:00-Early Afternoon. 3:00-Late Afternoon. 5:00-Evening. 6:00-Open to all ages. 7:00-Open to all ages. 8:00-Adults.

Saturday Program schedules will vary according to the activity. In general all students will participate either during the morning or afternoon session. Morning sessions will begin at 9:00 and end at 12:00. Afternoon activities will begin at 1:00 and end at 4:00. In general students will attend two sessions weekly and participate in one of the Saturday sessions.

8. What kind of activities will occur at the center? To comply with the general philosophy of the program, the activities will center around motivating participants to want to read and accept an expanded interest in them. Professional athletes and other well known celebrities will meet with the participants and provide motivation and assistance. Enthusiasm with students who have normally had a bad experience with teachers or formal instruction. These individuals may assist in one or more of the following activities:

a. Tutors (We will train you on a regular basis.

9. How will this program cooperate with the school system? Information regarding the program, its goals and procedures will be discussed with the area school officials, parents, and teachers.

10. Will each participant be tested? Yes. All participants will be given a diagnostic reading test as part of their enrollment. This test will be given periodically to measure progress and program completion. These test will be reviewed with the student's parent or guardian and the areas of weakness will be discussed.

11. Will progress reports be given to the student and his/her parents? Yes. Parent conferences will be scheduled on a monthly basis to discuss the participant's program. The participant will receive a weekly review of his/her progress.

12. What happens if a student is dropped? Each activity will be assigned a point value. Students who complete an activity will be to some extent, and value.

13. What about discipline? Although the rules will be few, those which are made will be strictly enforced. Parent's cooperation is essential. Students will be dropped from the program if they continue to violate the rules. Students with behavior problems will be referred to special teachers and encouraged to modify their behavior. No corporal punishment will be administered by any instructor. When a student is in gross violation of the rules his/her parent or guardian will be contacted and permission to continued in the program will be granted only with an accompanying parent in the center during the student's appointment times.

14. Should I threaten my child with punishment? Please do not initially threaten or scare your child regarding his activities. We would prefer that the child understand the purpose for the rules and how the rules will protect him. If you caution him, you may close one ear. Behavior problems are often the result of poor teaching and the lack of a stimulating atmosphere. These points can be applied to prizes ranging from small tokens to exciting trips, events, and values.

15. Can more than one member of a family participate in the program? Yes. Selection however will be based upon need.

16. What is the policy regarding acceptance or rejection of a student? There will be no discrimination with regard to race, color, or creed. There will be a committee composed of staff members and consultants who will select participants based upon the urgency of need and order of application. Students will be accepted only with an accompanying parent in the center during the student's appointment times.

17. When will I be notified of acceptance or rejection? The review committee will meet on Saturday, April 30, 1976, to determine the initial population. Parents will be notified of acceptance or rejection by mail no later than Friday, April 23, 1976. The registrant will have a list of accepted participants by April 21, 1975 and interested parents may inquire by calling the center.

18. Will there be any open enrollment? The official opening ceremony will be May 1, 1975. Student activities will begin on May 12, 1975. The starting date for each student will be designated in the acceptance letter.

19. Can the participants borrow books or materials for home or school use? Yes. A special library will be located in the center and materials will be loaned to the participants. A one day lending limitation will be imposed and strictly enforced.

20. Will the participants be given work he/she will do at home? Yes. This work should not interfere with normal school work. Parents will be given instructions on how to assist the child in these activities.

21. Failure to do the assignment will result in loss of points leading to awards and prizes offered by the center.

22. Will there be any home visitsations? Yes. Athletes and staff members will visit each home to meet with parents and students. They will discuss the program and answer any questions.

23. Will the participants be required to purchase any supplies? Yes. Each participant will be required to bring to the center the following supplies at his/her expense: 3 pencils, 3 band-aids, 1 spoon of heavy thread, and 1 old shirt for art activities.

24. Will parents or guardians be required to participate in any activities or meetings? Yes. It is mandatory that at least one parent participate in the following activities:

a. Initial Enrollment.

b. Parent Orientation at 7:00 P.M., April 25, 1975 or at 10:30 A.M. April 26, 1975. Call the center to designate your time preference or discuss any scheduling difficulties. (1/2-hour meeting.)

25. What is the policy regarding failure of a parent to attend these meetings? If parents refuse to attend these meetings their child will be dropped from the program.

26. Will the center accept private donations? Yes. We are a non profit tax exempt institution and would appreciate any donations. Donations will not influence in any way the acceptance of a participant.

27. Groups wishing to sponsor children or outreach centers should contact the center director.

28. What type of donations are you interested in?

Businesses and individuals are encouraged to give school supplies, camera equipment, film, rugs, furniture, snack foods, games, toys, new clothing, drapes, paint, wood for furniture, books, art pieces, personal services, office equipment, and money.

29. Who can volunteer their services to the program? Any individual of good moral character who is willing to work with patience and enthusiasm with students who have normally had a bad experience with teachers or formal instruction. These individuals may assist in one or more of the following activities:

a. Tutors (We will train you on a regular basis.
b. Arts & Crafts (both experienced and inexperienced).

c. Business men and women who can aid in World of Work Annotation.

d. Craftsmen i.e., electrical, woodworking, etc who will aid the staff in center activities and demonstrate to students.

e. Field Trip aids (Saturdays).

29. What are your medical policies?

We will make all purchases by check and will have little if any emergencies. Be sure that you list allergies and drugs being taken. We will not administer any drugs or treat any illnesses.

If an emergency should occur we will notify the Rescue squad, family doctor, and parent/guardian. A staff member will go with the child to the hospital.

30. Will there be a formal graduation ceremony?

Yes. A formal graduation ceremony will occur three times each year in September, January, and April. Graduates will be those individuals who have completed their programs of study.

Thank you for your time to learn about the center and for your interest. We want to know problems so that we can be ready for any emergencies. Be sure that you list allergies and drugs being taken. We will not administer any drugs or treat any illnesses.

The National Reading Improvement Program is essentially preventive in nature. It is based on the premise that it is much easier to prevent learning difficulties than to remedy such difficulties once they occur. The program has essentially three parts:

(a) Reading Improvement Projects, under which grants are made to states and local educational agencies for projects designed to overcome reading problems.

(b) Special Emphasis Projects, which seek to determine the effectiveness of intensive instruction by reading specialists and the regular elementary teacher. Projects under this part would (a) provide for the teaching of all children in grades one and two by reading specialists, (b) the teaching of children in grades three through six who have reading problems by a reading specialist, and (c) a Reading Improvement Program for elementary children who are found to be reading below the appropriate grade level.

3) Reading Academies, which provide assistance to youths and adults who otherwise would not receive assistance and instruction.

Mr. Chairman, the reading program we are asking the Committee to support is the result of considerable study and two volumes of hearings. In addition, we conducted a fifty-state survey of the training required for teachers in the elementary area. While the National Reading Improvement Program will not be a panacea for all the reading problems, I believe that there is considerable evidence that it can make an important contribution and will make a substantial difference. A society, where technology and education are so important and where only approximately 6 percent of the public are unskilled, cannot allow the dangerous conditions, of mass illiteracy. These conditions are often the ability to read which affects both their capability to learn and to earn, to continue.

As a member of the Budget Committee, I am aware of the severe problems facing this country and the need for spending restraint.

Some 7 million elementary and secondary children are in severe need of special reading assistance.

In large urban areas, 40 to 50 percent of the children are reading below grade level. A 1968 Office of Education survey indicated 22 percent of the urban schools had 70 to 100 percent of their pupils reading a year or more below grade level. These massive reading difficulties have been confirmed by surveys of teachers and pupils alike. Over and over again, parents, the general public, and educators throughout the nation have expressed concern with the poor pupil performance in the fundamental reading area. For example, a 1968 survey in Maryland State found that "the people of Maryland believe that the mastering of reading skills is the most important educational goal for the schools of the State."

Mr. President, after I had introduced the reading proposal, I received a letter from an individual, a copy of which I will distribute shortly. I have asked his permission to follow the guidelines I had been given to say that this program to suffer a similar fate and instead provide the modest funds in view of the magnitude and importance of the problem and the rationale for this program, be printed in the hearing record.

[EXHIBIT 3]


Mr. PETE ROZELLE, Commissioner, The National Football League 419 Park Avenue New York, New York

Dear Commissioner Rozelle: Roy Jefferson, the outstanding Washington Redskins wide receiver, has written the following statement endorses this program. It is as challenging and as difficult as any Superbowl, and for those involved, the efforts are even higher—is done both in school and in the lives of the players.

I am proud and the National Football League should be proud of what Roy Jefferson Inner City Learning Center. I have visited this Center and it is amazing the problems that are faced in our society.

Washington, D.C. is one of the twenty-six cities in which the National Football League teams are located. For the most part, these teams are situated in cities which have the problems that afflict our society. One of the most serious problems confronting American cities and their school systems is the reading problem, which I have called the "Achilles' Heel of American Education". The following facts and statistics indicate the magnitude of the problem and the need for action.

Approximately 18% million adults are functional illiterates.

Some 7 million elementary and secondary children are in severe need of special reading assistance.

In urban areas, 40 to 50 percent of the children are reading below grade level. An Office of Education survey indicated 22 percent of the urban schools had 70 to 100 percent of their pupils reading a year or more below grade level.

I now and strongly applaud the public service activities undertaken in the last years by the National Football League. The National Football League players are idolized throughout the width and breadth of this Nation. Therefore, I urge the National Football League to make reading one of their public service activities for the community. I urge the NFL to make its Program, and its effect would be an inspiration to the youngsters with reading difficulties if the National Football League would encourage other players and not read, and in view of the burdens that such individuals often become to society, this program is one we must afford even in this difficult budget year.

Mr. Chairman, as a company, we have had the privilege of being involved in a project under the National Reading Improvement Program. The Committee to allocate $25 million for this major national reading effort.

The National Reading Improvement Program was enacted as part of the Education Amendments of 1974 and is designed to deal with what I have labeled the "Achilles' Heel" of American education—the large number and high concentrations of children in some of our schools with severe reading difficulties. I am pleased that the Administration in their FY '76 budget contemplated funding this new program; however, I am disappointed that the Administration elected to discontinue in effect the former Right to Read Program. This certainly was not what Senator Eagleton and I had intended. I believe that it is essential to continue the former Right to Read Program. This certainly was not what Senator Eagleton and I had in mind.

The magnitude of the problem and the need for action:

Approximately 18% million adults are functional illiterates.

Some 7 million elementary and secondary children are in severe need of special reading assistance.

In urban areas, 40 to 50 percent of the children are reading below grade level. An Office of Education survey indicated 22 percent of the urban schools had 70 to 100 percent of their pupils reading a year or more below grade level.

I now and strongly applaud the public service activities undertaken in the last years by the National Football League. The National Football League players are idolized throughout the width and breadth of this Nation. Therefore, I urge the National Football League to make reading one of their public service activities for the community. I urge the NFL to make its Program, and its effect would be an inspiration to the youngsters with reading difficulties if the National Football League would encourage other players and
teams to adopt a project such as Roy Jeffer-
sen has done in Washington, as well as do
the traditional “television spots” emphasizing
reading and its importance.
As you may know, I authorized the National
Reading Improvement Program that
was enacted in the last Congress. This pro-
gram may be considered as an example of
resulting federal, particularly aimed at elementary
youngsters, to prevent reading problems
in the future.
Contributing to this national attack on reading
problems is the work that Senator Ribicoff
has done in Washington, as well as do
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CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS
The Acting President pro tempore.
Is there further morning business?
If not, morning business is closed.
The Acting President pro tempore.
The clerk called the roll.
The second assistant legislative clerk
proceeded to call the roll.
Mr. Mansfield. Mr. President, I ask
unanimous consent that the order for
the quorum call be rescinded.
Mr. Mansfield. Mr. President, I
ask unanimous consent that the order for
the quorum call be rescinded.
I further announce that the Senator
from Illinois (Mr. Stevenson) is absent
on official business.
Mr. Griffin. I announce that the Senator
from Tennessee (Mr. Baker), the
Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Bell-
mon), the Senator from New York
(Mr. Javits), the Senator from Maryland
(Mr. Mathias), the Senator from Kansas
(Mr. Pearson), the Senator from Ohio
(Mr. O'Byrne), and the Senator from
Texas (Mr. Tower) are necessarily absent.
The Presiding Officer. A quorum
is present.

DETERMINATION OF SENATE ELECTION IN NEW HAMPSHIRE
The Acting President pro tempore.
Under the previous order the Senate
will now resume the consideration of
the unfinished business, Senate Resolu-
tion 166, which the clerk will state.
The legislative clerk read as follows:
A resolution (S. Res. 166) relating to the
determination of the contested election
for a seat in the United States Senate from
the State of New Hampshire.
The Acting President pro tempore.
Under the previous unanimous-
consent agreement, there will be 2 hours
of debate on this issue today.

Quorum Call
Mr. Mansfield. Mr. President, I suggest
the absence of a quorum, and it will
be a live quorum.
The second assistant legislative clerk
called the roll and the following Senators
entered the Chamber and answered
their names:

Mr. Robert C. Byrd. I announce
that the Senator from Indiana (Mr.
Bayh), the Senator from Texas (Mr.
Bentsen), the Senator from Arkansas
(Mr. Bumpers), the Senator from North
Dakota (Mr. Blythe), the Senator from
Iowa (Mr. Culver), the Senator from
Mississippi (Mr. Eastland), the Senator
from Michigan (Mr. Hart), the Senator
from Indiana (Mr. Hartke), the
Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Humphrey),
the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Inouye),
the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Leahy), the
Senator from New Mexico (Mr.
Montoya), the Senator from Maine (Mr.
Muskie), and the Senator from Rhode
Island (Mr. Pastore) are necessarily absent.
I further announce that the Senator
from Illinois (Mr. Stevenson) is absent
on official business.
Mr. Griffin. I announce that the Senator
from Tennessee (Mr. Baker), the
Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Bell-
mon), the Senator from New York
(Mr. Javits), the Senator from Maryland
(Mr. Mathias), the Senator from Kansas
(Mr. Pearson), the Senator from Ohio
(Mr. O'Byrne), and the Senator from
Texas (Mr. Tower) are necessarily absent.
The Presiding Officer. A quorum
is present.

Determination of Senate Election in New Hampshire
The Senate continued with the
consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 166)
relating to the determination of the con-
tested election for a seat in the U.S.
Senate from the State of New Hampshire.
The Presiding Officer. Who
yields time?
Mr. Cannon. Mr. President, what is
the parliamentary situation?
The Presiding Officer. We are
in 1 hour of controlled time on division
2 which is issue (1) which is lines 7
through 12 of page 1 of the resolution;
the vote to come at 2 p.m. tomorrow.
Mr. Cannon. Very well.
Mr. President, I yield myself such time
as I may need.

The request of Mr. Wyman to go
beyond the 3,500 ballots that were protested
during the complete recount of the ap-
proximately 223,000 ballots conducted by
the New Hampshire Secretary of State
and that have already been reviewed by
the Committee on Rules and Administra-
tion and to conduct another recount of
Gorham, Bedford, Somersworth Ward 1,
Claremont Ward 2, Concord Ward 1,
Hanover, Newmarket, Pelham, Salem, and
Weare, has no reasonable basis and
should be denied.
Mr. President, this request should be
denied for several reasons:
First, there is no sound basis for this
protest. There is absolutely no evidence
to support the assertion—just a bald
assertion—that the secretary of state's
talley sheet is inaccurate.
Second, no timely protest was made on
these ballots or the recount performed
during the recount conducted by the New Hamp-
shire secretary of state as is required
by New Hampshire law.
Had Mr. Wyman wanted to protest
these ballots or the recount performed
during the recount he had lost the recount by
10 votes and Mr. Durkin had declared
him the winner.
He did not do that, and the first that
we heard of the issue of these 10 prec-
cincts was after the recount had been
concluded and Mr. Wyman had discover-
ed that he had lost the recount by 10
votes and Mr. Durkin had declared
him the winner.
In addition, the lack of security of
these 180,000 ballots stored in the Na-
tional Guard Armory has seriously com-
promised the integrity of all of those
180,000 paper ballots.
U.S. Marshal Victor Cardosi in the
letter sent to Senator Pell, on January 22,
said that the National Guard Armory,
specifically the bay numbered 8 and 9. The security
there leaves much to be desired as enumerated in
our report.
One of the overhead doors was not locked.
We were told that it did not matter as the
door was frozen and could not be opened.
The security of our inspectors was very cold
and we found this to be true. However,
between the time the ballots were placed there
(January 3rd) and the day of our inspection
(January 7th) there were several warm days
when we feel that if the door was not locked,
it could have been opened.

The accommodations in the bays consist of
chicken wire, 8 feet high, and it would
not be too difficult to gain access to bays 8 and
9 from the other bays.

The method of securing the cardboard boxes
and the heavily wrapped packages leaves
much to be desired. We were told by John
Fraser that some of the checklists used
in the November election were never received,
also some were returned, as requested, to
town officials; therefore, not all of the check-
lists are now in storage.

Now then, Attorney General Warren
Rudman, the New Hampshire attorney
general, who is a member of the ballot
law commission, said, in response to an
inquiry from Senator Pell:
Now you have to understand there were
two classifications of ballots. The ballots
that you see here, about 180,000 ballots,
were never tested by anyone. There were
roughly 3500 ballots that were in fact
tested. Those ballots are under very tight
security. The tightest security imaginable at
the State Police Laboratory in the evidence
safe. Now, at the conclusion of the Ballot
Law Commission hearing it was stated on the
record and agreed to by the parties that these

Sergeant of the Senate, J. Glenn Beall, Jr.
ballots will be placed in a safe, warm, secure place where they wouldn't get wet or spoiled, or what have you, if there were any reason ever to look at them in the future. But there have never been protests by any reason ever to look at them in the future. They've been spoiled, or what have you, and say, 'well, we've got some problems with one. And I think for anyone now to come upon recount, that the ballot counts from the Town of Claremont, Ward 2, and determine the cause for an alleged change in the number of recounted ballots from said Ward 2 in the Town of Claremont;
(4) to once again recount the ballots from the Town of Gilford, and determine the cause for an alleged change in the number of recounted ballots from said Ward 1 in the Town of Gilford;
(5) to once again recount the ballots from the Town of Bedford, and determine the cause for an alleged change in the number of recounted ballots from said Town;
(6) to once again recount the ballots from the Town of Hanover, and determine the cause for an alleged change in the number of recounted ballots from said Town;
(7) to once again recount the ballots from the Town of Newmarket, and determine the cause for an alleged change in the number of recounted ballots from said Town;
(8) to once again recount the ballots from the Town of Pelham, and determine the cause for an alleged change in the number of recounted ballots from said Town;
(9) to once again recount the ballots from the Town of Salem, and determine the cause for an alleged change in the number of recounted ballots from said Town;
(10) to once again recount the ballots from the Town of Somersworth, Ward 1, and determine the cause for an alleged change in the number of recounted ballots from said Ward 1 in the Town of Somersworth;

DEAR MR. SPARK: I am writing to you in your capacity as Secretary of State and member of the New Hampshire Ballot Law Commission.

I am the legal representative of Honorable Louis C. Wyman, present United States Congressman, and candidate for the United States Senate.

Pursuant to RSA 68:4 (II), I am writing to you to hereby appeal from your declaratory action upon recount, that Mr. Wyman did not have the greatest number of votes.

This appeal is from all rulings made by you as Secretary of State, on ballots protested during the recount, and on all rulings related thereto, including but not limited to your rulings denying my protests and my requests as follows:

I point out, Mr. President, that no protest had ever been raised at that point in time. Indeed, I believe it is true what Mr. Bigg did. He went ahead, then, and listed those 10 precincts among other things. I read as follows:

(1) to send for and examine an additional box from the precincts that were contested by any additional ballots, and to recount once more those ballots presently in your possession from the Town of Gorham;
(2) to once again recount the ballots from the Town of Bedford and determine the cause for an alleged change in the number of recounted ballots from said Town;
(3) to once again recount the ballots from the Town of Claremont, Ward 2, and determine the cause for an alleged change in the number of recounted ballots from said Ward 2 in the Town of Claremont;

Mr. President, the allegation there was that there were 100 straight Republican ballots in the box from the town of Gorham that had not been counted, that if this particular box were opened up, the 100 straight Republican ballots would then be discovered. Well, Mr. President, with respect to that rule, here is what happened: On December 9, 1974—I remind you that letter was November 27—the ballot box was opened by Mr. Wyman his attorney alleged would contain 100 straight Republican ballots not counted in the recount. This contention was shown to be totally without substance. The ballot box contained only constitutional question ballots.

Mr. President, that was the disposition of the so-called 100 ballots in issue No. 1. Here was issue No. 2:

the ballot law commission;

Chairman Snow. Give us those again. Gorham and Gilford I got—what were the other two?
Mr. BROWN. Gorham, Bedford, Gilford and Somersworth Ward 1.
Chairman Snow. Okay.
Mr. Browning. The Commission will recall that in the last hearing we listened to several others. We don't intend to pursue the others.

This is Mr. Brown speaking to the Dort Bigg letter of November 27 that outlined the 10 precincts that they wanted recounted. This is Mr. Brown again: "We don't intend to pursue the others."

Mr. Brown again:

What is involved here with these four precincts is that the recount that had already been made by the ballot law commission and the recounts that were conducted on other precincts were conducted in an envelope by Mr. Stark and Mr. Kelly, and those were the envelopes that were referred to. So he said:

With the exception of four precincts that I mentioned—we don't anticipiate having to go outside of the envelopes in which Mr. Stark and Mr. Kelly segregated the ballots that are subject to protest, by all parties.

Now, the protest procedure was that when a ballot was protested before the Secretary of State, it was returned in an envelope by Mr. Stark and Mr. Kelly, and those were the envelopes that were referred to. So he said:

Now, this happened on December 4. In the meantime, all of the parties were doing a lot of checking because there was an appeal to the ballot law commission, and part of the procedure was in progress.

On December 20, some 16 days later, Mr. Wyman, during the proceedings before the New Hampshire Ballot Law Commission, waived his request to recount again all ballots cast in Gorham, Bedford, Gilford, and Somersworth Ward 1. Those were the four that were reserved on December 4, the other six having been waived. I refer now to the transcript of the ballot law commission on December 20, 1974. I quote:

Taking into consideration all of the issues having to do with recounts in Lancaster, Meredith, Goffstown, Merrimack, Seabrook; the absentee vote in Amherst, absentee vote possibility of double vote, which we haven't ruled on, and which we'll rule on, I've been advised of that, and that's correct for the record.

In addition to all of your other objections which have been continuing, that we have no authority to do what we are doing, that we have gone beyond the scope of the ballot law commission on December 9, 1974. I quote:

This is Mr. Millimet, Mr. Durkin's lawyer, now:

Mr. MILLIMET. Yes. It's
Mr. MILLIMET. Well, I haven't said that in the record, we
Mr. MILLIMET. We, I haven't said that about most of the proceedings, may it please the Chairman, but you'll find my views on the issues that you enumerated.

Chairman Snow. I mean, what I'm saying is I don't think you need to state it again, Mr. Millimet. You. It's in the record, we understand that.

This is Mr. Brown now, Mr. Wyman's lawyer, again:

Mr. Brown. So far as the precinct recount requests—and I had four of them—
Chairman Snow. Gilford, Bedford, Somersworth, Ward 1 and Gorum.
Mr. MILLIMET. You didn't mention Somersworth.
Chairman Snow. I was going to ask you about Somersworth.
Mr. BROWN. I am not pressing on any of those, but I may have had some testimony with regard to Somersworth, depending upon how my brother's case develops, and I withdraw the request for the precinct review.

Mr. President, I want to repeat that: I withdraw the request for the precinct reviews.

The transcript continues:
Chairman Snow. Gilford, Bedford, Somersworth Ward 1 and Gorum.
Mr. BROWN. Chairman Snow. Did you get that? Commissioner BUDMAN. Yes, I did.

Incidentally, that is the attorney general that I referred to earlier.
Commissioner CROWLEY. I got it.

So, Mr. President, there we have a complete disposition in satisfaction by Mr. Wyman's lawyers of all of the issues that were raised in the Dort Biggs' letter of November 27 with respect to those 10 precincts, none of those issues having been raised before the secretary of state, and it was to their satisfaction.
Mr. President. We have to bring a conclusion to this matter at some time and I do not know how many times a party has to be satisfied with what has been done with respect to the precinct, but certainly Mr. Brown was satisfied that Mr. Biggs' points raised in his November 27 letter had been concluded.
I submit, Mr. President, that the Senate should not go back now and attempt to recount a recount in these 10 precincts for the reasons I have stated.
Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself sufficient time to cover a few points.
First of all, I find myself in an interesting situation of attempting to interpret verbal facts as a nonlawyer, but I think we have an example here this afternoon that has to be clarified. We have to get this back into English language, the language not of some unique group set aside in our society because of professional training known as lawyers.

The chairman of the committee is an attorney, and I think we have seen this afternoon how lawyers can use words to convey impressions and ideas which are not inaccurate but certainly are not telling the full story.
First of all, let me make very clear that at no time did Mr. Wyman's lawyers waive the rights of their client in the proceedings before the secretary of state of New Hampshire or before the State ballot law commission.
Mr. President this afternoon has been very accurate in using the technical language that Mr. Wyman's attorneys withdrew protests at a certain time and they did not pursue protests under certain circumstances, but there is valid reason for that, and I will explain it.
Let me make the record clear, even though the chairman, I think, misstated himself when he said at one point, he did not use the word "waived," but he used the word "suspended." Neither Mr. Brown nor any of the other attorneys, to my knowledge, in any part of the record, ever waived the rights of Mr. Wyman as their client. Now, let me first of all say this: There is ample basis; there is ample basis, for pursuing the ballot law commission was called upon by Mr. Durkin to rule on the recount of the Salem precinct they avoided the issue at that point and in their formal ruling said that they would not recount such ballots, or such precincts; but that did not, in itself, waive the rights of the contestants.

I think it is very interesting that when the ballot law commission was called upon to rule on the recount of the Salem precinct they avoided the issue at that point and in their formal ruling said that they would not recount such ballots, or such precincts; but that did not, in itself, waive the rights of the contestants.

The chairman of the committee is an attorney, and I think we have seen this afternoon how lawyers can use words to convey impressions and ideas which are not inaccurate but certainly are not telling the full story.
First of all, let me make very clear that at no time did Mr. Wyman's lawyers waive the rights of their client in the proceedings before the secretary of state of New Hampshire or before the State ballot law commission.
Mr. President this afternoon has been very accurate in using the technical language that Mr. Wyman's attorneys withdrew protests at a certain time or they did not pursue protests under cer-
I cannot understand why, when we hear these loud protests that we want to doit, the house of representatives did last November in New Hampshire, what their intent was, that somehow we want to hide from the evidence that we are calling for. We wanted to probe, we want to avoid, we want to dodge, whatever else we want to call it, I do not know what the question is going back and re-counting these 10 precints in which protests were made, we want to look at the evidence. Protests were made before the secretary of state, protests were made before the ballot law commission, and protests were made in the Rules Committee of the U.S. Senate, and at no point again, the secretary of state has this protest been waived, nor has this protest been satisfied.

Again, I want to emphasize that Mr. Wyman's attorneys used lawyer technique, the great question of ballot security or the validity of those ballots to be reviewed at a point or withdrawing from consideration at another point, but that did not waive their rights of protest.

This afternoon we have again heard the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. Durkin, say that we are infallible, I think it is very interesting how it was raised on a very selective basis, under selective circumstances. It was raised in the committee when the matter had been before the entire Senate to find out what the people of New Hampshire really intended in the election that was declared Mr. Wyman's victory by the Senate.

But when we had the Mansfield-Cranston proposal made to the floor, we found that security was not a very important issue. We could now back and forth and get out of those ballots certain ones that had certain skip characteristics even though they were not to be counted.

The point was that there was not a great question of ballot security or the validity of those ballots to be reviewed under the Mansfield-Cranston circumstance, but now this afternoon we hear this great sinister question about who may have tampered with the ballots, all for the validity or integrity of those ballots.

I say that it is not a valid issue at any point along the way, and we have had ample evidence from the attorney general and others. No one has raised a question of tampering with the ballots, no one has raised it in terms of evidence, no one has charged any kind of action of chicanery here as it relates to these ballots. They just raised the issue, I think, as a diversionary point.

No, Mr. President, I think if we really raised any question we wanted to count the ballots that were spoiled, we wanted to count the ballots that were not to be counted in New Hampshire, we cannot just be selective in our evidence, count certain ballots, apply New Hampshire law where we want to, disregard it in other places.

The law that was passed gives rise to the charges of partisanship, and I am not saying there is not, perhaps, a basis upon which both sides could be made to take issue with the issue of ballot law commission.

But let me say this, at no time, at no time has the majority ever said more than, let us apply New Hampshire law; and I have stated myself, from my own personal position, I am not interested in whether the winner is Mr. Wyman or Mr. Durkin, but in the outcome, in the case. I am not arguing on behalf of the minority that says let us apply New Hampshire law. Also, if we are going to make a ruling that ballot law commission, let us consider all the protests of both candidates, not just the protests of one because the majority party has the votes, and then deny the rights of the minority because they do not have sufficient protest reviews.

I am not arguing on behalf of Mr. Wyman. He has his attorneys to do that. I am arguing on behalf of the minority that says let us apply New Hampshire law.

In addition to that, Mr. Wyman requested that we open and examine an Amherst absentee ballot not previously counted at the State level because it was returned to the wrong ward. At Mr. Wyman's urging that ballot was opened and counted for Mr. Wyman by the committee. It was counted on a vote of 8 to 0. Section 180 of the section 180 of the state and the ballot law commission denied Mr. Wyman the right to that ballot, but we took his protest up and we voted and we counted it for him and it is in the ballot by tabulated for Mr. Wyman.

In any event, it had been turned down by the secretary of state and had been turned down by the ballot law commission. But it was counted by the Rules Committee.

Third, we had a request to search for and examine a Portsmouth ward 3 ballot not previously considered by the ballot law commission but counted on Mr. Wyman's urging. That ballot was opened, and in the course of the city clerk for several days before it was turned it. Obviously, it was well known who the ballot would have been counted for, were it counted.
Fourth, Mr. Wyman requested that we test 12 Manchester voting machines to determine if they accurately recorded the vote cast for the candidates for the U.S. Senate. That is one of the issues that is before us. We employed two experts agreed upon by the minority and by the majority to go up there. We took their advice as to what had to be done to determine whether these machines worked properly. We did that. They gave us their report and the report is here.

Now I yield such time to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island as he may need.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

As a matter of record, I wanted to give my reasons why I opposed the rec­ count of the 10 precincts enumerated in issue No. (1) of Senate Resolution 186.

I realize some of these grounds have been covered, but those of us of the committee have a certain obligation to give our own positions.

First, there is no credible evidence of error committed during the recount conducted by the secretary of state of New Hampshire.

Second, the ballot law transcripts for December 4 and December 20, 1974, demonstrate clearly that Mr. Stanley Brown did not pursue his request for review of any of those precincts by the ballot law commission.

The question has been raised that eventually there would be verbal protests and they were followed up with a written protest. But a protest, in order to be effective, must be timely. I think this is an important point to consider.

Third, and finally, the very questionable integrity of the 180,000 odd ballots, including the 10 precincts, all of which were stored in the National Guard garage casts a cloud over the value of any recount. I quote from two New Hampshire sources. First from a letter and a report to me from the U.S. Marshal, Victor Cardinal, who checked on security of ballots and machines at my request.

We examined two buildings in Concord where the ballots are presently stored.

The first building we examined was the laboratory area of the State Police building, allegedly containing 3,500 ballots, which appealed for adequate security as our report indicates.

The second building we examined was the garage at the National Guard Armory, specifically bays numbered 8 and 9. The security there leaves much to be desired as enumerated in our report.

In addition to inspecting the above buildings, we inspected voting machines in four communities; namely, Portsmouth, Exeter, Manchester and Nashua. These voting machines are stored in schools, church halls, police stations, Public Safety and Fire Station, maintenance department building, city library, and a town hall. Visual inspection indicated the seals were not broken with the exception of machine number 27941 located in Portsmouth.

Mr. President, I ask unanomous consent to have printed on this page at this point the full text of the report.

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


REPORT ON BALLOTS AND VOTING MACHINES

Attached to this report are the New Hampshire State Police inventory and security detail card, and listings of voting machine numbers with their protective numbers for the cities of Manchester, Nashua, Portsmouth and Exeter.

The 3,500 ballots, more or less, according to security, are only the above-named have access to it.

We inspected the ballots at the New Hampshire State National Guard Armory in Concord. According to information given to us by Mr. Duffy, there were about 185,000 ballots stored there. These ballots are stored in bays 8 and 9 of the Guard garage with overhead doors at each end. The key is under the control of Richard K. Collins, Business Administrator, Albert Couture, Chairman, and John McSwiney, who is now working with the Secretary of State of New Hampshire and was the Clerk of the Ballot Law Commission.

Major General McSwiney told us that in accepting these ballots he would not take responsibility for anything over and above normal security. He also told us that in the time the ballots were placed there, they were never protested by anyone. There were roughly 3500 ballots that were in fact protested. Those ballots are under very tight security. The tightest security imaginable at the State Police Laboratory in the evidence safe. Now, at the conclusion of the Ballot Law Commission hearings it was stated on the record and agreed to by the parties that these ballots will be placed in a safe, warm, secure place where they wouldn't get wet or spoiled, or what have you, if there were any reason ever to look at them in the future. They have never been protested by anyone. And I think for anyone now to come and say "well, we've got problems with these ballots," that statement is just confusing the public and confusing the issue and I just don't think it's very forthright.

This is what Mr. Rudman said in a taped news program on January 31, 1975. I can say that that statement was qualified by him. This was said in the immediate reaction, and usually I think the truth comes out in the immediate reaction.

I would also like to refer to the debate last week where there were various comments by my Republican colleagues to the effect that I had suggested a review of all of the ballots by an independent panel, such as the American Arbitration Association.

There is some truth in those remarks as they relate to the American Arbitration Association. But there is no such panel, an independent and impartial body could review ballots and make recommendations to the Senate without the burden of partisanship.

In my statement of the opinion and as I stated in my individual views printed in the report, I hope that if another contest should arise in the future, an independent panel might be utilized to assist the Senate by doing the actual counting and reporting its findings to the Senate.

It should be made clear at this point, however, that my suggestion dealt only with those ballots which the committee never ordered the review—namely the 3,500 approximate ballots which were in the custody of the ballot law commission.

I do not today suggest a review of the 185,000 ballots any other number of ballots except the 3,500.

Page 286 of the committee hearing, part II, states my thoughts quite clearly. I refer to page 286 of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, February 17, 1975, agreed to review "the contested ballots, agreed upon by the parties, or the American Arbitration Association to review the contested ballots, agreed upon to be reviewed by previous committee action, 3,500—and report its recom—
mendation as to each ballot to our committee for its decision."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of the motion by Senator Allen specifying which ballots would be counted, which was passed 8 to 0, and also the text of my own motion with regard to the American Arbitration Association, which did not prevail as a result of a 4 to 4 tie.

There being no objection, the motions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

February 19, 1975

Motion by Senator Allen, as amended by Senator Hatfield, that the New Hampshire Senate contest be based upon the following:

1. A recount of the approximately 3,500 ballots before the Ballot Law Commission in New Hampshire, certified by the Ballot Law Commission, and
2. A consideration by the Committee of all the protests made by either party at any stage of the proceedings contemplating that the committee will take the appropriate steps on each protest to ascertain the validity of such protest and the accuracy of the count of the matter protested.

YEAS—8

Mr. Pell.
Mr. Byrd.
Mr. Allen.
Mr. Williams.
Mr. Hatfield.
Mr. Scott.
Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Cannon.

NAYS—0

February 19, 1975

Motion by Senator Pell that the Committee adopt a procedure which would establish a panel, either through agreement by the contestants, or, if they cannot agree, through the American Arbitration Association, to review the contested ballots agreed upon to be reviewed by previous Committee action, and to report its recommendation on each ballot to the Committee for its final decision.

YEAS—4

Mr. Pell.
Mr. Hatfield.
Mr. Scott.
Mr. Griffin.

NAYS—4

Mr. Byrd.
Mr. Allen.
Mr. Williams.
Mr. Cannon.

Mr. Hatfield. Mr. President, I would like to say that I appreciate the recitation of magnanimous expressions this afternoon by the chairman of the committee that the committee has been so generous in its consideration of Mr. Wyman’s protests. I was overwhelmed with the generosity expressed, and I wanted to say that if I did not know the record, I would almost become a believer. “Almost thou persuadest me,” but not quite.

I think, on the first issue, having to do with the absentee ballots, there was not a great deal of choice that the Senate Rules Committee had, for the Supreme Court of the State of New Hampshire had very carefully stated on January 6, 1975, in Louis C. Wyman versus John A. Durkin, Robert L. Stark, Secretary of State, and Carmen Chimento, that this was a matter that only the Senate of the United States could resolve. Therefore, we did not have much choice but to consider this particular issue.

I would also say, as it related to the failure of the court to accept a ballot that was referred to as another one of those great generous moves on the part of the New Hampshire Ballot Law Commission, Mr. Wyman’s protests, that the voter had gone to the polls and had voted in complete compliance with New Hampshire law. It was because the clerk had made a clerical error and the County Committee voted to disenfranchise a valid vote in New Hampshire. This was no great generous action on the part of the committee.

But let us get to the basic heart of the matter, which is, why are we here on this floor today, and why have we been here for the last 18 days, trying to resolve eight of the 35 issues which the committee could resolve? Eight of those issues happen to be Mr. Wyman’s protests. If the committee had been so fair with respect to all these issues, we would not be here today with those eight tie votes.

I submit that the record will show that those protests have not been reviewed in their entirety, and what few may have been related to Mr. Wyman were certainly very patent. The paper ballots appear to be marked in an exceedingly erratic fashion.

There being no objection, the motions were ordered to be printed in the Record.

Mr. Cannon. Mr. President, prior to Saturday, all the major newspapers of New Hampshire had taken an editorial position with respect to this matter. One notable exception was the Detroit Free Press. But on Saturday the Detroit Free Press, which I should like to read into the Record:

The U.S. Senate’s inability to settle the New Hampshire senatorial election is a travesty. It is the only way to keep the country from sliding into the kind of political chaos which we had in the American Civil War. We have a right to expect the U.S. Senate to do its duty, and when it fails, we have a right to expect the American people to do their duty.

Initially, the Republican, Louis Wyman, was declared the winner by 542 votes out of 229,000 cast. The Democrats then, on February 10, challenged the results and, after a recount conducted by the secretary of state of New Hampshire, was declared the winner by 10 votes.

Mr. Wyman challenged that result, however, and the New Hampshire Ballot Commission declared him the winner by two votes.

The ballots have been theoretically impounded, but they have evidently been protected very poorly, and each succeeding recount has demonstrated the difficulty of determining what some voters intended to do. The paper ballots appear to be marked in an exceedingly erratic fashion.

The Senate itself has been trying to settle the issue of who won but the Republicans have been able to prevent the shutting off of debate, and even on a resolution to have the Senate make the decision. And the Democrats have beaten down efforts to have the seat declared vacant and a new election decreed.

Given the inability of the Senate to act, the only reasonable course now is to permit New Hampshire to hold a new election. The passions on both sides are appalling, and the question is so close that a new election offers the only prospect of a clear result and an end to long impasse.

Mr. President, I thought it also interesting that the editorial which appeared in the Washington Post—

Mr. Cannon. Mr. President, will the Senate yield at that point?

Mr. Griffin. I am glad to yield.

Mr. Cannon. Whichever it is, whether the figure is 322 or 323, it is wrong. I am sorry they do not at least attempt to verify the figures after we have been talking about them this long.

Mr. Griffin. If the figure is 322, I am not necessarily subscribing to all the factual representations.

Mr. Cannon. It referred to the number of votes by which Mr. Wyman apparently won the election on election night. I think the Senator read 542. Did I understand that?

Mr. Griffin. Or is it 322?

Mr. Cannon. Whichever it is, whether 532 or 323. It is wrong. I am sorry they do not at least attempt to verify the figures after we have been talking about them this long.

Mr. Griffin. I think there are perhaps several other recitations in there that may not be factual, but I think that the opinion is an opinion which seems to be pretty generally shared across the country now that we are here to solve this issue and the best resolution of this mess is to give the people of New Hampshire another opportunity to express themselves.

I think that this has also interesting to take a look at this afternoon which appeared in this morning’s Washington Post. As far as this Senator knows, it seems to be about the last major holdout. I would say it would say that the opinion against a new election. But even in the
It seems to me the most important point to be made here is that all we are asking is that issue (1) is that the ballots be counted.

Does the Senate want to count the ballots of these 10 precincts or not? If the Senate denies us even the right to count the pieces of paper to determine whether error was made that would be an act so arbitrary as I think to affect the views of Senators on both sides of the aisle as to whether this contest is being conducted fairly in the count the pieces of paper with equal rights to both the parties.

The number of ballots are stated in 10 precincts, and in two of those precincts, Bedford and Salem, the protests are by both contestants.

Mr. Durkin wanted them recounted.
Mr. Wyman wanted them recounted. But the argument is made that they did not protest in time, or what Mr. Wyman asks.

The very first statement made by Attorney Brown in the Rules Committee was that he was indeed preserving all of his rights to protest. That was apparent in all of the debate before the Rules Committee. It was made manifest in at least one of the motions made by the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Hatfield). The reservation of the rights to protest and the argument made by Mr. Millimet, counsel for Mr. Durkin, during earlier proceedings in New Hampshire, as it was made for Mr. Wyman on each occasion.

It cannot be argued that since the Ballot Law Commission was held by the courts not to have jurisdiction over certain actions, including the counting and tallying of certain precincts, that there was, therefore, some kind of a waiver.

There never has been a waiver, and if the Senate wants to find out what is going on, it should accede to what Mr. Durkin wanted them recounted. If the Senate failed to protest in time, as what Mr. Wyman asks.

Therefore, I conclude by making the point that there is only one fair conclusion to issue (1), and that is to let us count the pieces of paper, and let us see whether they were error or not. Both parties have asked for it at some point in the proceedings. Both parties indicate they want it.

Yet it is argued on the other side we do not have to do it because someone did not protest in time.

I answer they did protest in time. They preserved the right of protest. The Rules Committee recognized that they had preserved the right of protest and now some members of the Rules Committee are asking the Senate to deny to the Senate the right to find out in those 10 precincts whether the pieces of paper representing ballots actually were counted accurately or not.

No one knows whether they were or not. No one ever will know unless we count the pieces of paper and count. I submit that is the only fair thing to do. If it is not done, we on this side will certainly take it very hard, and I suppose we will fight harder than ever if we are not going to be given a fair shake.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I know that the distinguished Senator from Michigan would not want to leave the impression that the Washington Post editorial was a supporting election.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thought I made that clear. But go ahead.

Mr. CANNON. He read this far:

And that the best approach would be to hold a new election in the state.

And he said:

That is that the Republicans have advocated all along.

But the editorial goes on to say:

A new election is not, however, the fairest or most desirable remedy. Last November's outcome was obviously very close, and some ballots are very hard to judge. But it has not been shown that, on the merits, the necessary judgments are impossible. A new election would not be a rerun in any real sense; it would not tell us what New Hampshire's voters were trying to say last November. It would be an entirely new election, under different circumstances with, no doubt, different issues and a different turnout. Moreover, there is a chance that a more drastic step might not give New Hampshire another senator any time soon. The state's new special-election law is likely to feature legal challenges that could run for years. The fight for the right to count the ballots might then hold forever.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in its entirety be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE NEW HAMPSHIRE ELECTION CRISIS

Instead of moving smartly toward a resolution of the New Hampshire election case, the Senate ended another week of bitter debate almost as frustrated and frustrated as before. The Democrats made a major overture toward breaking the deadlock, but the Republicans by a narrow margin rejected it. The next cloture attempts fell short. Both sides did manage to agree to vote Tuesday on one proposal involving a possible recount in 10 precincts. But as the Senate suspended its inconclusive arguing and started to take up entirely new elections, all the hopes of New Hampshire were still short a senator.

There may be plenty of reasons, but there is no excuse for the Senate's inability to settle the Wyman-Durkin case. Each day of squabbling merely strengthens the nationwide impression that the Senate cannot decide who won the contest last November, and that the best approach would be to hold a new election in the state that is what the Republicans have advocated all along.

The Post this morning, the editorial includes this statement:

Each day of squabbling merely strengthens the nationwide impression that the Senate cannot decide who won the contest last November, and that the best approach would be to hold a new election in the state.

But beyond that even the Washington Post, which is the last major holdout against a new election, takes the position that a new election takes the position that a new election would be a new election in the state.

So, there is not one newspaper in the country, to my knowledge, that would subscribe to the view taken by the chairman of the Rules Committee and which he is urging his colleagues on that side of the aisle to take.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. If I may yield, Mr. President.

Mr. PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. HATFIELD. I have 5 minutes and I am happy to yield another 2 minutes.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. The Senator from Nevada has 1 minute.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. HATFIELD. We still have 11 minutes.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. The time the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, in my 1 minute may I interject that this is only the controlled time of 1 hour. There still remains time.

Mr. HATFIELD. We will have 11 minutes.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 1 minute remaining of controlled time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I yield the Senator the 1 minute and then from then on the time will not be controlled.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON, not only is editorial opinion virtually unanimous, with one exception, as to the propriety of sending this election back to New Hampshire, but even the exception points out that the Senate's position ought to be given at least the validity of Mr. Durkin's protest and that both of them ought to be reified, if the Senate is interested in the outcome, in knowing who won.

The election is being reviewed for claims by Mr. Durkin not involving fraud or corruption, but which only allege error in the claims of Mr. Wyman, the claims alleging error are only to be reviewed.
Then, Mr. Brown, Mr. President, a very able attorney for Mr. Wyman, first waived the protest as to a number of those ballots that were set forth in Dort Bigg's letter of November 27. I covered that in the Record this morning.

Mr. Brown to the commission:

The Commission will recall that in Mr. Bigg's appeal notice, we listed several others. We do not intend to pursue the others.

Mr. Brown, on December 20: So far as the precinct recount requests—and I had four of them—four of those 10 that we are talking about, because he had already waived the other six—

Mr. Brown, December 20: In the recount request—

Mr. Brown, on December 20: In the recount request and I had four of them—

Chairman Snow: Gilford, Bedford, Somersworth Ward 1. He went on and said:

We do not intend to pursue the others.

Mr. Brown. I do not know of anything in the world that can be called a waiver, because he had satisfied himself with it.

Mr. Brown went on on December 20—

Mr. Brown, December 20: That was December 4. They were massaging this problem all during that period up to December 4.

Mr. Brown, December 20: So far as the precinct recount requests—and I had four of them—four of those 10 that we are talking about, because he had already waived the other six—

Mr. Brown, December 20: In the recount request—

Chairman Snow: Gilford, Bedford, Somersworth Ward 1 in Gorham.

Mr. Muzzman. You didn't mention Somersworth.

Mr. Brown. I am not pressing on any of those, but I may have some live testimony with regard to the Somersworth situation, depending upon how my brother's case develops.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Will the Senator yield on that?

Mr. CANNON. No. I am in the middle of the sentence and I stopped to give emphasis to this. I want to quote again.

Mr. Brown said—

And I withdraw the request for the precinct reviews.

Chairman Snow. Gilford, Bedford, Somersworth Ward 1 and Gorham.

Mr. Brown. Yes.

Chairman Snow. Did you get that?

Commissioner RUDMAN. Yes, I did.

Commissioner CROWLEY. I got it.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Will the Senator yield on that?

Mr. CANNON. No. I am in the middle of the sentence and I stopped to give emphasis to this. I want to quote again.

Mr. Brown said—

And I withdraw the request for the precinct reviews.

Chairman Snow. Gilford, Bedford, Somersworth Ward 1 and Gorham.

Mr. Brown. Yes.

Chairman Snow. Did you get that?

Commissioner RUDMAN. Yes, I did.

Commissioner CROWLEY. I got it.

Now I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. It has been made clear throughout that the ballot law commission and, for that matter, the secretary of state, both had limited authority under New Hampshire law. All rights were specifically reserved because some of the arguments which were being made by counsel in New Hampshire were not allowed to be successfully asserted by the courts. Others were denied by the ballot law commission.

As to Gorham, the story there is that the Senator from Nevada is not talking about the Gorham ballot box, but only about a box containing con-con ballots, which is some 16 ballots that he thought that box and there was not a solitary straight Republican vote in that box. It was entirely con-con ballots.
$500,000. That is a matter of public record.

Mr. HATFIELD. And what am I to draw from that?

Mr. PELL. The talk concerning the sale of embassies or the appointments of ambassadorships or political contributions, which has gone on in recent years, is not directed to the point that any party has a monopoly on it. My point is that these particular embassies seem particularly expensive.

Mr. HATFIELD. Does the Senator have any evidence that they were sold?

Mr. PELL. They were sold and pro quo? No, absolutely not.

Mr. HATFIELD. Does the Senator have any evidence that they were sold?

Mr. PELL. No, only exactly what we said in the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. HATFIELD. May I ask what relevance has to the issue at hand?

Mr. PELL. I do not think there is any direct relevance; but if the Senator will look at the Record of last week, he will find that it was discussed at some length. I could not get to the floor at the time, but I was interested in the subject.

Mr. HATFIELD. Is the Senator making any charges or allegations?

Mr. PELL. No; I am just expressing my regret that whatever the word would be, the "exchange," if that is a happier phrase, that people would be appointed as a result of large contributions, which practice unfortunately will be eliminated as a result of the new legislation.

Mr. HATFIELD. What relevance does that have to the issue of the moment?

Mr. PELL. There was about an hour’s debate last week on this very same issue, on this floor.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, we are now on the issue of the New Hampshire, and think the Senator’s remarks do not clarify this point. We are now on issue No. 1.

Mr. PELL. It is irrelevant to issue No. 1, but I could not get to the floor at the time.

Mr. HATFIELD. Then perhaps the Senator would like to have this discussion come at the end of the discussion we are having this afternoon as to issue No. 1.

Mr. PELL. Absolutely, if the Senator would prefer.

(This concludes the remarks which occurred during the colloquy on issue No. 1, and which be unanimous consent were ordered to be printed in the Record at this point.)

ORDER FOR CHANGE IN TIME FOR DEBATE AND VOTE ON ISSUE NO. 1, SENATE RESOLUTION 166

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, 1 hour for debate on issue No. 1 begins to-morrow at 1 p.m., the vote to occur at 2 p.m. I ask unanimous consent that those hours respectively be changed to 9:45 a.m. and 10:45 a.m. tomorrow.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR DEBATE TO BEGIN AT 9:45 A.M. TOMORROW ON PENDING QUESTIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it has not been decided yet what time the Senate will convene tomorrow, but I ask unanimous consent that beginning at the hour of 9:45 the last hour on the pending question begin operating; that the time be equally divided between the manager and the ranking Republican member of the committee, the vote to occur at the hour of 10:45 a.m.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. They have been ordered.

EMERGENCY PETROLEUM ALLOCATION EXTENSION ACT OF 1975

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 1849, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1849) to extend the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 1, line 10, strike "August 31, 1977," and insert "March 1, 1976."

So as to make the bill read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Petroleum Allocation Extension Act of 1975".

EXTENSION OF MANDATORY ALLOCATION


Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. On whose time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The time to be charged to neither side.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

An assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that it be called on either side.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proved the vote.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the purpose of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 was to provide authority to deal with the impact of shortages of crude oil, refined petroleum products, and other petroleum products on the economy, on individual consumers, and on the independent sector of the petroleum industry. In addition to providing the authorities necessary to deal with the shortage induced by the Arab embargo, the act has served to insulate the economy and the American consumer from the drastic increases in crude oil prices which followed.

The act is now scheduled to expire on August 31, 1975. If it is not extended, Mr. President, the two-thirds of domestic crude oil which now under price controls will jump abruptly from $3.25 to over $13 per barrel. With the President’s $2 tariff in place, removal of price controls will force domestic crude oil prices even above the socially high and economically ruinous prices now set by the OPEC cartel.

If the President imposes a third dollar tariff, the cost to the U.S. economy of detargeting oil which is coupled with higher costs for new and imported oil and competing fuels such as coal and intrastate natural gas—will amount to a staggering $33.3 billion per year. Assuming the OPEC cartel raises world oil prices by $2 this fall, Mr. President, the total drain on the economy would approach $50 billion.

Mr. President, even without a further increase in world oil prices, the administration’s commitment to rationing energy by prohibitive pricing will exert intolerable pressure on the average family’s budget. An increase of $33 billion in energy costs amounts to $60 a man, woman, and child in the United States—over $800 for an average family of four, or $50 a month for that family. Anyone who has received a tax rebate check—or noted reduced utility billing rates—cannot fail to see that this advantage is temporary, that higher energy prices will again lower real incomes and living standards. The President’s energy tax, tariff, and pricing policies amount to no less than a “veto” of the Tax Reduc-
tion Act he reluctantly signed. This energy program more than offsets the economic stimulus that act sought to provide.

There are, of course, those who will reap extravagant benefits from the Ford energy program. Implementation of the President's proposals—principally the decontrol of domestic oil—will generate at least $22 billion in additional revenues for the petroleum industry. Because of the enormous level of domestic production controlled by the major integrated oil companies, nearly 85 percent of these revenues—almost $17 billion—will flow to these 15 energy giants. Exxon's share, for example, will be over $2 billion. Exxon's profits in 1974 were $3.14 billion.

The administration originally proposed a windfall profits tax to capture these new revenues. This tax, of course, does nothing to ease the impact of high energy prices on consumers. The current administration proposal on windfall profits appears to be a decontrol of the authorities provided in the Allocation Act. The Federal Energy Administration is asking Americans to bear intolerable economic costs on behalf of the oil industry.

President Ford has stated that further price hikes by the cartel would be "very disruptive and totally unacceptable." And yet, the administration's oil decontrol program would raise energy prices by over $33 billion annually. The President cannot have it both ways. A steep increase in energy prices—whether the result of administration policies or actions by a foreign cartel—is not in the interest of the American economy or the American consumer. The President's pursuit of higher energy prices not only signifies acquiescence to prolonged recession, but abandonment of the fight against inflation.

Removing domestic crude oil from production is an attempt to transfer the power to set U.S. energy prices from the American people to the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries cartel. This cartel now sets world oil prices at levels which are well above those at which our consumers can maintain are in any way related to the cost of producing oil. The decision to completely remove the insulation between the U.S. economy and these totally unreasonable world crude oil prices would, combination with the President's oil cartel during all of 1974.

Even proponents of decontrol recognize that the immediate lifting of all price controls—which will occur if the Allocation Act is permitted to expire on August 31—would jeopardize any chance for an early economic recovery. In fact, the administration's own proposal to decontrol domestic crude oil prices over 2 or 3 years would accelerate the windfall accruing to energy producers under the President's program, while costing consumers billions of dollars.

A second issue—the prospect of an imminent gasoline shortage—even more clearly illustrates the administration's tilt toward the oil industry. The price of gasoline has moved steadily upward since the beginning of the year, while gasoline stocks have dropped precipitously. We confront a curious situation in which crude oil inventories are at historic highs and gasoline stocks are at perilously low levels. Why? Because the decontrol of oil prices anticipated by the industry will enormously increase its profits.

Mr. President, if the industry continues its constraining of gasoline, the American motorist will be sitting in gas lines before the summer is out. Without the authorities provided in the Allocation Act to deal with such a shortage, the consumer will be inconvenienced, the economy will be burdened, and thousands of independent petroleum marketers will be forced out of business. This administration is asking Americans to bear intolerable economic costs on behalf of the oil industry.

The plan the Ford Administration calls its "energy program" has two principal goals: to substantially raise the energy prices paid by consumers; and to substantially increase the profits of energy companies.

The energy tariff and price decontrol program which the President plans to implement through executive order will raise domestic energy costs for petroleum, natural gas, coal and electricity by at least $33 billion on an annual basis. This virtually identical to the increased costs paid for primary energy in the U.S. in 1974 as a result of the price increases of OPEC and domestic energy producers.

The President's proposed $3 tariff on imported oil increases the price of the one-third of domestic production which is not under price controls.

Added cost of imports (including effect of rebates for imported refined products)—$5.4 billion.

Added costs: "new oil"—$3.3 billion; subtotal $8.7 billion.

The President proposes to decontrol the price of "old oil"—domestic production. With the $3 tariff in effect, the price of this oil would rise by over $6 per barrel.

Added costs: decontrol of old oil—$19.0 billion; total cost: oil $27.7 billion.

COAL AND NATURAL GAS

The prices of natural gas sold on the intrastate market and of coal in response to oil price increases. Each dollar per barrel increase in oil prices is equivalent on a Btu basis to an increase of 18c per thousand cubic feet for natural gas and $4.90 per ton for coal.

Added costs: coal and natural gas—$6.8 billion; total cost: all fuels $33.5 billion.

To the Average American

The $33.5 billion in increased costs to the economy will be paid by consumers in the form of higher prices for fuels and electricity, in higher taxes to support governments; and increased costs of all goods and services whose costs depend in various ways on energy prices.

Spread over 210 million people, $33.5 billion amounts to $160 for each man, woman and child.

Cost to an average four-person family: $600 per year.
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EFFECT ON PETROLEUM PRICES

The price paid by U.S. refiners for crude oil—including new, old and imported oil—would increase by over $6 per barrel.

Average daily cost for unleaded gasoline for all petroleum products: 15 cents per gallon.

Costs tilted towards gasoline: 28 cents per gallon.

PROFITS AND TAXES

Of the $33.5 billion annual cost, $5.4 billion represents Treasury revenues and the remainder, $28.1 billion, represents profits for domestic oil, natural gas and petroleum producers, since no workable windfall profits tax has been proposed.

The Ford administration's discussion of the impact of the decontrol of crude oil prices on domestic production shows projected production with decontrol dropping below current levels. However, the drop projected is smaller than the decline projected with decontrol.

The new act increase is 155,000 barrels per day—or 50 million barrels per year—when the decontrol has been completed. Consumers will pay oil companies an extra $1 billion for this decontrol.

Cost of increased domestic production: $445 per barrel.

FURTHER OPEC PRICE INCREASES

FIA Administrator, Frank Zarb, has indicated that the OPEC cartel can and will raise world oil prices by $2 per barrel this fall. If this happens and domestic energy prices are decontrolled, the price of all domestic oil—and natural gas and coal as well—will rise in response to the OPEC price decision.

FIA Administrator, Frank Zarb, has indicated that the OPEC cartel can and will raise world oil prices by $2 per barrel this fall. If this happens and domestic energy prices are decontrolled, the price of all domestic oil—and natural gas and coal as well—will rise in response to the OPEC price decision.

Added costs: $2 OPEC price increase—$153 billion.

PRICE INCREASES DURING THE 1973-74 EMBARGO

During 1974 the price of all imported oil rose from an annual rate of $7 billion to approximately $34 billion. Domestic energy production increased in price by over $16 billion. Thus the increase in the cost of primary energy for the U.S. economy in 1974-75 was triggered by OPEC's embargo and price escalation—amounted to $33 billion. These increases were a principal factor in the 12% inflation of 1974. High energy costs have also been important in deepening and prolonging the current recession. The energy price increases of 1974-75 brought upon us by OPEC were almost identical in magnitude to those the Ford Administration proposes for 1975 and 1976.

Mr. JACKSON, Mr. President, I re-
serve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following staff members be accorded the privilege of the floor during the debate and voting on S. 1849: Harrison Loesch, Fred Craft, David Stang, Roma Sleem, Mary Adele Shute, Gaye Vaughan, Mike Hathaway, Nolan McKean, Jim Hinh, Tom Imeson, Tom Biery, Linda Gold, and Doug Fant.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I re-
serve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FANNIN, Mr. President, at the re-
quest of the administration last fall, we voted in favor of S. 3717 to extend the expiration date in the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act from February 28, 1975, to June 30, 1975. Our sole purpose for voting to support the 4-month extension was to provide an additional period of time in which to proceed with an orderly and complete phasing out of all price and allocation control. No other amendments than the mere 4-month extension were contemplated or agreed upon in conversations between administration officials and members of this committee on both sides of the aisle.

Such an intent of the committee members was clearly reflected in the following statements made by the chairman, Mr. JACKSON, on the floor of the Senate on August 12, 1974—page 27705 of the Congressional Record of August 19:

The act is now scheduled to expire on February 28, 1975. This expiration date occurs too soon after the new Congress convenes for a careful evaluation of the administration of the act and an informed decision as to the need for a full scale extension of the act in light of conditions then prevailing. Furthermore, if the Congress were unable to complete action on extension proposals, the act would expire at the height of the current heating season, the next year being the allocation for allocation authority could be granted.

The Committee believes that it is too soon to make a final decision on the need for a full scale extension. While this proposed changes should be considered next year in light of more extension experience with the act, the Committee is proposing a short (emphasis added) extension without amendments.

All we are saying is, let us extend the act as it is from February 28 until June 30. We will have time, then, after the first of the year to act carefully and deliberately.


Faced as we are with a coal strike of uncertain duration, with the forecast for a severe winter... the Government must have petroleum allocation authority through the present winter... to satisfy domestic demand, now exist or are imminent; and the wisdom of decontrol would increase by over $6 per barrel.

The chairman, Mr. JACKSON, reiterated in the same floor statement the necessity of an extension of the act, in order to allow Congress time to assess the act.

The purpose of the six month extension provided for in the act provides adequate time for the new Congress and the executive branch to review the act.

Whereas the consideration of a coal strike and the winter of 1974-75 is behind us, the attempt to extend the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 from March 31, 1976, only can be viewed a default of the Congress to honor its pledge to come to grips with energy problems, including the need to repeal or substantially revise the act.

When we considered S. 3717 on the Senate floor last August, the administration's position as we understood it was as follows:

First, the expiration date of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act would be extended to June 30, 1975.

Second, Between August 1974, and June 30, 1975, the administration should proceed with an orderly total phaseout of price and allocation controls to be completed by June 30, 1975.

The Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act by its very title was intended to be an emergency measure to deal with a temporary petroleum fuels shortage which now has ended. It is to be recalled that the act was passed at the time of the oil embargo and was only intended to deal with the supply shortages caused by the oil embargo. That such was what was contemplated is clearly borne out by section 2 of the act which reads as follows:

Sec. 2(a) The Congress hereby determines that—

(1) shortages of crude oil, residual fuel oil, and petroleum products caused by inadequate domestic production, environmental constraints, and the unavailability of imports sufficient to satisfy domestic demand, now exist or are imminent; and

(2) such shortages have created or will create severe economic dislocations and hardships, including loss of jobs, closing of factories and businesses, reduction of crop plantings and harvesting, and curtailment of public service and transportation of food and other essential goods; and

(3) such hardships and dislocations jeopardize the normal flow of commerce and constitute a national energy crisis which is a threat to the public health, safety, and welfare and can be averted or minimized most efficiently and effectively through prompt action by the Executive branch of Government.

(b) The purpose of this Act is to grant to the President of the United States and direct him to extend the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 (emphasis added) authority designed specifically to alleviate shortages of crude oil, residual fuel oil, and petroleum products in the United States.

Act shall be exercised for the purpose of minimizing the adverse impact of such shortages or dislocations on the American people and the domestic economy.

We who voted against the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act at the time did so because we felt that the bill, at best, would only spread shortages around. Additionally, we felt that should the Federal Government intervene in the marketplace by imposing regulations affecting supply and price, no matter how benignly such intervention was intended, unforeseen inequities would result and the shortage would be exacerbated.

The one day of floor debate last year on S. 3717, extending the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act, contained much testimony enumerating and describing the inequities which have resulted from the act. These remarks plainly show both that the legislation was intended to deal with a petroleum fuels emergency which no longer exists and that the wisdom of Federal Government regulation in the marketplace even under the then existing fuel shortage is questionable.

Continued reliance upon legislative author-
ity designed specifically to alleviate the impact of emergency fuel shortages in times of a reported petroleum surplus generates many deleterious effects:

FIA Administrator Frank Zarb presented testimony to the Interior Commit-
tee on May 19 of this year which ana-
lyzed the following deleterious effects of the act:

1. The EPAA is inconsistent with the national goal of achieving long-term energy
independence. The EPAA creates such inflexibility in FEAs price control program that considerable disincentives to increased domestic production. For example, the crude oil entitlements and the buy-sell programs, which are largely designed to give small and independent refiners necessary access to crude oil at prices closer to the prevailing market levels, tend to provide government endorsement of and justification for such profit margins, even though those margins were in some cases unnecessarily high during the base period, and the logic of market conditions might dictate lower margins today.

2. THE PROPOSED TIERED PRICE SYSTEM

An unavoidable effect of an extended allocation program is to maintain within the petroleum industry those inefficiencies and distortions that existed during the period of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act. Continuation of historic distribution patterns may result not only in prolonging such inefficiencies, but also may have adverse impacts on industrial expansion and population movement. With respect to domestic crude oil, for example, FEAs allocation requirements by freezing supplier/purchaser relationships as of December 1, 1973. As domestic production continues to decline at differing rates in different parts of the country, necessary adjustments in crude oil distribution channels cannot be made through the operation of normal market mechanisms, and can only be accomplished by an ad hoc action by FEA, which is ill-equipped to deal with such problems.

Distortion must also result from continued regulation of only petroleum products without comparable regulation of such substitute sources of energy as coal, electricity, and natural gas. Such disparate treatment distorts the functioning of normal market forces, and prevents a coordinated response to the Nation's energy problems.

3. THE PROPOSED TIERED PRICE SYSTEM

The provisions of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act place a lid on prices received for petroleum products while a variety of other factors, including actions by the Congress, create a buildup of costs and a profit squeeze which drains vital capital from our industry and makes other forms of financing difficult or impossible. Many of our domestic consumers long term commitments are locked in and adjustments of budgets to provide for the shortage of available capital, will have a dramatic effect on industry expenditures for exploration and production.

Finally, one must consider the avowed intent of Congress in enacting the EPAA, as stated on page 13 of the conference report accompanying S. 1570, under the "findings and purpose of the EPAA of 1973."

No allocation plan, regulation or order, nor monarch opportunities within our economy, was to be promulgated whose net effect would be a substantial reduction of the total supply of crude oil or refined petroleum products available in or to markets in the United States.

Yet, as noted by the foregoing testimony, and by this apt comment by Charles J. Wadlecich, president of Cities Service Co., the EPAA has created exactly the opposite effect:

Continuation of these restrictive regulations is contrary to the intent of Congress (see page 13, Conference Report to accompany S. 1570, Findings and Purpose for Direct Quotation) when the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 was enacted. These regulations have the effect of curtailing the expansion of oil and gas exploration. Regulation of supply is distorting the work of the market places. The consumer is paying, and will continue to pay, a price for these programs.

Our company's reduced expenditures for exploration and production will mean loss of additional production . . . . loss of employment opportunities within our economy . . . . and a possible effect on employment of contractors and suppliers.

H.R. 4038 as agreed to in conference contains a provision extending the EPAA to December 31, 1975. Another bill, S. 623, the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, 1976. And, of course, S. 1849 as reported is exclusively an extension of the EPAA through March 1, 1976.

The only realistic solutions to our long-term energy problem are new exploration and development. As can be seen from the above discussion of the problems inherent in the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act, the solution to this problem is a complex issue that can never be resolved through the operation of normal market mechanisms, and can only be accomplished by an ad hoc action by FEA, which is ill-equipped to deal with such problems. The intent of Congress in enacting the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1976 and the Energy Policy Act of 1976 was to respond to ever-changing market conditions (such as the establishment of the cost equalization program to solve problems created by the two-tier price system) seriously inhibits the industry's ability to engage in long-term business planning. That planning that can be done must also be redefined to reflect the distortions built into the marketplace as a result of the rigid requirements of the EPAA. This problem will
ourselves from OPEC prices by regulating the price of our domestic fuels. But by so doing they would further discourage domestic production while com-
mitting forces greater dependence upon OPEC prices, the threat of which they have no means of controlling.

Only through use of the unregulated price mechanism can domestic supply be encouraged. The development of the stainless steel surplus thereby not only freeing us from dependence upon OPEC oil at prices we cannot control, but also causing domestic prices ultimately to decline due to supply and demand.

In short, Mr. President, there is no way to regulate domestic energy prices and free ourselves from increased de-
pendency upon imported petroleum at the same time. These are mutually exclu-
sive policy goals.

Mr. President, it is my belief that the best system for holding down inflation and providing an efficient distribution of goods and services is the free market. The more that Government interferes with our business enterprises, the more regulation imposed, the more problems we have for the American consumer.

President Ford is taking the lead in seeking to do away with unneeded Fed-
eral regulation, and I believe that this is the course which will lead to economic stability and a reduction in the forces of inflation.

Mr. President, in the interest of con-
tinuing the discussion regarding infla-
tion and regulation, I refer to an ed-
torial article published in the Phoenix Gazette on July 8, 1975.

I read from that article “On Taming Inflation”:

Has the rate of inflation been tamed? Since the last quarter of 1974, the rate has been cut in half, from about 12 percent to 6 per cent, lower than even some of the more optim-
istic forecasters expected.

Consumer prices rose at only a 5 per cent annual rate in the second quarter of 1975. But whether this trend will continue for the remainder of the year remains much in doubt.

There are signs that prices are moving back up.

The spurt in gasoline prices just before the Fourth of July holiday came as a shock-
ning suggestion to motorists that inflation is still very much alive.

Prime rate boosts to 7½ per cent from 7 per cent appear on the way because of the Federal Reserve's credit tightening and stronger loan demands.

Aluminum producers announced price increases, but then agreed to a 90-day delay at the request of the government's Council on Wage and Price Stability.

The council very well serve as a leading indicator on which way infla-
tion is going to go.

Albert Rees, director of the wage and price stability council, fears that price boosts by the aluminum industry could spark a chain reaction among other "highly concentrated" industries such as steel and automotives. "If such industries make decisions to increase prices at the first stirrings of recovery," Rees says, "I am concerned that such action could blunt the recovery that is in progress."

The council will hold a hearing on the proposed aluminum increase on July 22 in Wash-
ington.

The forces of inflation, however, run much too strong and deep to be controlled by any such agency as the Council on Wage and Price Stability or even the mighty Federal Reserve. The government may succeed in getting the aluminum industry to drop its price increase plans for now, but one way or another the costs of production, includ-
ing price with the high fuel. And a delay in the aluminum industry's price increase could result eventually in an even higher price boost.

Such an adverse result may now be showing up in gasoline prices. If the government hadn't pursued policies designed to hold gas prices down, these prices might have gone up and, as the law of supply and demand operated, now be settling down.

But then no one, it seems, has the courage to let the most effective of inflation fighters—the free market—work its wonders. Inflation may be quieted down but it would be a mis-
take to regard it as tamed.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority report at the desk, No. 606, to the pending Senate bill 1849. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is not in order until the statement amendment has been acted upon.

What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On whose time?

Mr. FANNIN. The time to be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Senator Randolph offers amendment to extend Federal Coal Conversion Pro-
gram

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider an amendment which I have at the desk. It is printed amendment 606 to S. 1849.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FANNIN. Reserving the right to object, I have a parliamentary inquiry. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FANNIN. It is my understanding that this amendment affects the commit-
tee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would merely allow action on the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia prior to action on the Senate amendment. Mr. FANNIN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment will be stated.

The second assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

TITLE II

Sec. 201. This Act may be cited as the "Coal Extension Act of 1978."
Not until June 30, 1975—the last day before its authority expired—did the Federal Energy Administration issue any final coal conversion orders. Moreover, after 1 year, we now are informed that it will take the Environmental Protection Agency an additional 3 to 6 months to complete its evaluation. This is true even though the candidates for conversion were known months ago. These protracted delays are difficult to understand since this is considered a priority program by the Ford administration.

Mr. President, the orders issued on June 30 affect 25 electric utility companies. Some 75 electric powerplants located at 32 generating stations have been ordered to use the cause of oil or natural gas as their primary energy source.

The eventual conversion of these electric power plants to coal—I think this is very important, and I stress it—could result in yearly savings of approximately 64 million barrels of oil, or more than 3.8 billion cubic feet of natural gas. So it is unfortunate that we have not moved more quickly in this matter, because, certainly, the administration has characterized this program as essential to carrying out its commitment to reduce petroleum imports and to reduce the impact of natural gas shortages.

On July 1, 1975, FEA Administrator Frank Zarb declared that the prohibition orders “are essential to encourage powerplants to use coal, our most abundant energy resource, while preserving important environmental objectives.”

I agree with the statement. The Administrator also observed that “American consumers are paying dear prices because of our increasing vulnerability and dependence on foreign oil. Unless our program for self-sufficiency succeeds, cartel nations are in a position to continue to increase prices paid by the American consumers.”

Mr. President, on June 30, 1975, the Federal Energy Administration also issued construction orders to 41 electric utility companies requiring certain proposed new powerplants be built with coal burning capability. These orders will insure that these new installations will be designed and constructed so that coal can be used as a primary energy source. Affected by the construction orders are 47 generating stations representing 74 powerplants in 25 States. While some of these facilities are already being designed to utilize coal, the issuance of these construction orders will assure that this occurs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two tables listing the powerplants that have received coal conversion orders from the Federal Energy Administration, as of June 30, 1975, be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**LIST OF POWERPLANTS THAT HAVE RECEIVED PROHIBITION ORDERS**

### REGION II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docket No.</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Powerplant No.</th>
<th>Generating station</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Capacity (MW)</th>
<th>Estimated annual coal demand upon conversion (10^3 tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOU-053</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Schiller</td>
<td>Portsmouth, N.H.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOU-054</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REGION III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Powerplant No.</th>
<th>Generating station</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Capacity (MW)</th>
<th>Estimated annual coal demand upon conversion (10^3 tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potomac Electric Power Co.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morganstown</td>
<td>Newburg, Md.</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>0  1,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>Chester, Va.</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>1,249 1,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yorktown</td>
<td>Yorktown, Va.</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0 437 429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Portsmout</td>
<td>Chincoteague, Va.</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0 437 429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>Baltimore, Md.</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>0 310 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore Gas &amp; Electric Co.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REGION III—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docket No.</th>
<th>Owner plant Generating station Location</th>
<th>Capacity (MW)</th>
<th>1973 oil consumption (10^3 bbls)</th>
<th>1973 gas consumption (10^3 Mcf)</th>
<th>Estimated annual coal demand upon conversion (10^3 tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFU-060...</td>
<td>Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-061...</td>
<td>Carolina Power &amp; Light Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-062...</td>
<td>Carolina Power &amp; Light Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-063...</td>
<td>Florida Power Corp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-064...</td>
<td>Georgia Power Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-065...</td>
<td>Savannah Electric &amp; Power Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-066...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-067...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-068...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-069...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-070...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,967 12,965 2,192 1973 oil consumption 10^3 bbls 1973 gas consumption (10^3 Mcf) Estimated annual coal demand upon conversion (10^3 tons)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REGION IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docket No.</th>
<th>Owner plant Generating station Location</th>
<th>Capacity (MW)</th>
<th>1973 oil consumption (10^3 bbls)</th>
<th>1973 gas consumption (10^3 Mcf)</th>
<th>Estimated annual coal demand upon conversion (10^3 tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFU-060...</td>
<td>Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-061...</td>
<td>Carolina Power &amp; Light Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-062...</td>
<td>Carolina Power &amp; Light Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-063...</td>
<td>Florida Power Corp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-064...</td>
<td>Georgia Power Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-065...</td>
<td>Savannah Electric &amp; Power Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-066...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-067...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-068...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-069...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-070...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,967 12,965 2,192 1973 oil consumption 10^3 bbls 1973 gas consumption (10^3 Mcf) Estimated annual coal demand upon conversion (10^3 tons)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REGION V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docket No.</th>
<th>Owner plant Generating station Location</th>
<th>Capacity (MW)</th>
<th>1973 oil consumption (10^3 bbls)</th>
<th>1973 gas consumption (10^3 Mcf)</th>
<th>Estimated annual coal demand upon conversion (10^3 tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFU-060...</td>
<td>Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-061...</td>
<td>Carolina Power &amp; Light Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-062...</td>
<td>Carolina Power &amp; Light Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-063...</td>
<td>Florida Power Corp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-064...</td>
<td>Georgia Power Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-065...</td>
<td>Savannah Electric &amp; Power Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-066...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-067...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-068...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-069...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-070...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,967 12,965 2,192 1973 oil consumption 10^3 bbls 1973 gas consumption (10^3 Mcf) Estimated annual coal demand upon conversion (10^3 tons)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REGION VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docket No.</th>
<th>Owner plant Generating station Location</th>
<th>Capacity (MW)</th>
<th>1973 oil consumption (10^3 bbls)</th>
<th>1973 gas consumption (10^3 Mcf)</th>
<th>Estimated annual coal demand upon conversion (10^3 tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFU-060...</td>
<td>Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-061...</td>
<td>Carolina Power &amp; Light Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-062...</td>
<td>Carolina Power &amp; Light Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-063...</td>
<td>Florida Power Corp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-064...</td>
<td>Georgia Power Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-065...</td>
<td>Savannah Electric &amp; Power Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-066...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-067...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-068...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-069...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-070...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,967 12,965 2,192 1973 oil consumption 10^3 bbls 1973 gas consumption (10^3 Mcf) Estimated annual coal demand upon conversion (10^3 tons)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REGION VII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docket No.</th>
<th>Owner plant Generating station Location</th>
<th>Capacity (MW)</th>
<th>1973 oil consumption (10^3 bbls)</th>
<th>1973 gas consumption (10^3 Mcf)</th>
<th>Estimated annual coal demand upon conversion (10^3 tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFU-060...</td>
<td>Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-061...</td>
<td>Carolina Power &amp; Light Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-062...</td>
<td>Carolina Power &amp; Light Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-063...</td>
<td>Florida Power Corp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-064...</td>
<td>Georgia Power Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-065...</td>
<td>Savannah Electric &amp; Power Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-066...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-067...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-068...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-069...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-070...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,967 12,965 2,192 1973 oil consumption 10^3 bbls 1973 gas consumption (10^3 Mcf) Estimated annual coal demand upon conversion (10^3 tons)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some of these plants may presently be burning coal due to recent natural gas curtailments. Source: Federal Energy Administration.
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POWERPLANTS ISSUED CONSTRUCTION ORDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docket No.</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Power-plant No.</th>
<th>Generating station</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFU-034-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central Power &amp; Light</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-035-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dairyland Power Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-036-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iowa Southern Utilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-037-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kansas City Power &amp; Light</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-038-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles Department of Water &amp; Power; and Nevada Power Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-039-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nevada Power Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-040-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nevada Power Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-041-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nevada Power Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-042-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles Department of Water &amp; Power; Power Co. and City of St. George</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-043-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles Gas &amp; Electric Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-044-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Louisiana Gas &amp; Electric Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-045-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-046-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Montana Power Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-047-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oklahoma Gas &amp; Electric Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-048-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Olsen Electric Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-049-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Olsen Electric Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-050-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon Power Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-051-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Service Co. of Colorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-052-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Service Co. of Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-053-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Service Co. of Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-054-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Service Co. of New Mexico; and Tucson Gas &amp; Electric Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-056-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra Pacific Power Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-057-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southern California Edison Co.; Arizona Public Service; Salt River Project; and San Diego Gas &amp; Electric Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-058-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southern California Edison Co.; Arizona Public Service; Salt River Project; and San Diego Gas &amp; Electric Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docket No.</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Power-plant No.</th>
<th>Generating station</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFU-007-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-011-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-012-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-013-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-014-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-015-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-016-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-017-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-019-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-020-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-021-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-022-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-023-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-025-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-026-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-028-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-030-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-031-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFU-033-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Federal Energy Administration has indicated that it had insufficient time during the year to issue conversion orders to all the electric powerplants under its considerations. In addition, there are approximately 4,000 major fuel burning installations order than powerplants under consideration. These other facilities appear to offer an additional energy saving equivalent to some 25,000 barrels of oil per day. However, due to an absence of concise data on the capability for these installations to use coal, it was not possible for the Federal Energy Administration to complete their evaluation of these facilities prior to June 30, 1975. The coal conversion authority has expired at a time when the FEA’s survey of major industrial installations is nearing completion.

In order to obtain maximum benefits from this work the Administration in E. 694, the Energy Independence Act of 1975, requested a 2-year extension of the coal conversion authority contained in the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act of 1974. Recognizing that the Congress is presently considering these amendments as well as Title 1777, the National Petroleum and Natural Gas Conservation and Coal Substitution Act of 1975, on June 2, 1975, the FEA Administrator, Zarb, wrote supporting a 6-month extension of this program stating—

I urgently request that you use your efforts to obtain immediate enactment of a six-month extension of ESECA without tying it to any controversial or complicated issues, so that the President may promptly sign such an extension into law.

Inasmuch as ESECA has been extensively debated in Congress and represents agreements on priorities for achieving national energy and environmental goals, prompt and favorable consideration of a six-month extension can be anticipated. Enforcement will assure continuation of this important program for reducing dependence upon oil and gas and increasing reliance upon domestic coal until Congress has had further opportunity to enact a comprehensive energy program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Zarb’s letter be printed in the Record at this point.

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

FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION
Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Chairman, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to urge prompt Congressional action in order to continue an ongoing program which will make a measurable contribution to attaining National energy independence.

On June 30, 1975, authorities granted to the Federal Energy Administration under the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act of 1974 (ESECA) will expire. Without legislative extension of that Act, the authority to issue orders prohibiting plants and major fuel-burning installations from using oil and natural gas as a primary energy source will expire, as will the authority to issue construction orders requiring new powerplants to be equipped with coal-burning equipment.

In this first year since ESECA was enacted, much progress has been made. We have established an administrative framework to implement the program; notices of intent to issue prohibition orders have been sent to 74 existing powerplants located at 32 generating stations; and notices of intent to issue construction orders have been sent to an additional 26 planned powerplants. We are now evaluating comments submitted in response to our notices of intent, and we will issue appropriate prohibitions and construction orders by June 30.

Despite the efforts made by the Administration, much remains to be done. More time is needed so that approximately 25 additional powerplants and 100 major fuel-burning installations can be placed under prohibition orders, and construction orders be issued for up to 26 planned powerplants.

While the Administration had anticipated Congressional extension of ESECA authorities as an integral part of a comprehensive energy program, to date this necessary extension has not been forthcoming. The President’s Energy Independence Act of 1975, submitted in January, contained as Titles IV and V extension of ESECA and related amendments to the Clean Air Act respectively. It now appears obvious that neither of those Titles will be passed by Congress prior to expiration of the Act.

Although I recognize that extension of ESECA has been included in other legislation, I strongly recommend that you use your efforts to obtain immediate enactment of a six-month extension of ESECA.
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without tying it to any controversial or complicated issues so that the President may promptly sign such an extension into law.

Inasmuch as ESECA has been extensively debated in Congress and represents agreement among the energy and environmental goals, prompt and favorable consideration of a six-month extension is suggested. I am enclosing a simple draft bill to accomplish that extension. Enactment will assure continuation of this important program for reducing dependence upon imported oil and gas and increasing reliance upon domestic coal until Congress has had further opportunity to enact a comprehensive energy program, including further extensions and environmental amendments to ESECA.

I have sent similar requests to Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Chairman of your Subcommittee on Environmental Pollution; Representative Harley O. Staggers, Chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and Representative John D. Dingell, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power of that Committee.

Again, I urge your expeditious action on this urgent matter.

Sincerely,

FRANK G. ZARD
Administrator.

Enclosure.

A bill to amend the Energy Supply and Environment Coordination Act of 1974 in order to extend the authority of the Federal Energy Administration to issue various orders thereunder for an additional six months.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Section 2(f) (1) of the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act of 1974 is amended by striking "June 30, 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1975."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, subsequently FEA Administrator Zard submitted a statement on S. 1777 to the Committee on Public Works in which he noted:

Any examination of government efforts to foster coal utilization should begin with the pioneer program authorized by Congress last June in the Energy Supply and Environment Coordination Act of 1974.

The Administrator prefaced his statement by the observation—

The substitution of coal for insecure foreign sources of oil, and for our own dwindling supplies of natural gas, is imperative if we are to lessen the nation's energy vulnerability.

Mr. President, I think it would be unfortunate—indeed it would be unwise—show this coal conversion authority not be extended. The Federal Energy Administration can obtain extensive experience from this program. Moreover, this experience is needed for the Congress to adequately judge the validity of the additional amendments proposed by the Administration regarding this coal conversion program.

I urge my colleagues to approve this amendment No. 606 to S. 1849.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I am very pleased, from my side, to accept the Senator's amendment. It is a necessary amendment. It is of an emergency nature, basically to extend the coal conversion authority provided by the act until December 31, and unless this authority is extended until that time we could find ourselves in a very difficult situation, as the Senator so ably outlined here in great detail.

I would hope, therefore, that the amendment would be approved unanimously.

Did the Senator wish to comment on this particular amendment?

Mr. FORD. I certainly would.

Mr. JACOBSON. To the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia and I support the request of the manager of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Washington, has made.

With the permission of the Senator from West Virginia, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a co-sponsor of this amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Stafford). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FORD. I thank the Senator very much.

The blessings of coal, as we all know, are not confined to any one State or any one region of this country.

I have always advocated the principle that the short-term and mid-term answer to our energy problems of today will be from coal, and I am convinced more and more, as I said in this distinguished body, that we must look to coal for our answer in the future. Coal can be the buffer against future embargoes, and we know how important this is. Cost of coal, if adequate, can make us self-sufficient. As we talk about converting to coal, I am sure that the Members of this body know that something over 1 million tons of coal per day are used in the generation of electricity. That is 365 million tons of coal per year. Since it is a known fact that it has worked, it is somewhat of a disappointment to me that a greater interest in the use of coal has not been taken by the Federal Government.

So I think this amendment is important, and I am delighted that the manager of the bill and the minority side seem to be in agreement.

I would be very hopeful if, instead of waiting until the last minute, at the eleventh hour, to be using this particular kind of natural resource that we will accelerate the use of coal for not only the economy in regions where it is removed, but for the stability of this country as a whole.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the able Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Ford), who is knowledgeable in this subject.

West Virginia and Kentucky or West Virginia and Kentucky are the leaders, one at one time or another, in the production of bituminous coal. For example, in 1973, West Virginia produced 115 million tons of bituminous and lignite coal compared to 127 million tons for Kentucky. The national total was 591 million tons.

As we look forward during the next 10-year period, we recognize that the projections are for increased productivity in West Virginia and in Kentucky.

There are very real reasons for such a program as we envisage here today to be a part both of the programs of the administration and of Congress. We need not be polarized in our thinking because the administration itself, through the President, and through the energy czar, Mr. Zard, both have indicated their strong advocacy for additional time so that these coal conversions from oil and natural gas can take place.

I remind my colleagues—and the Senator from Kentucky well knows this to be a fact—in coal we have four times the energy from petroleum in the Middle East.

We must use it, and it can be used in environmentally accepted ways. This is a further opportunity, as Senator Fannin and others have indicated, to extend the time so that this coal conversion program can move forward not in a hit-and-miss fashion but in an orderly way. I again commend my colleagues.

Mr. FORD. It is a comforting feeling to know that this body and the Executive are on the same wavelength. I think it is in the best interests of the country that these efforts be extended, and I think we can all agree on.

As the Senator knows, and I know, not only can we furnish coal for the generation of energy, but we can use it for oil and synthetic natural gas which can make this country self-sufficient, and we will not have to look to any other country, and the fact can be that we will be looking to export instead of importing.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there are those who indicate that a doubling of coal production and marketing cannot be done in the next 10-year period.

It can be done. Mr. President, if we ourselves are determined, all of us, that it is to be done and that it be done not in the interest of any particular region of the country but that it be done for the benefit of the American people as a whole.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, it is with pride that I acknowledge the distinguished and able Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Randolph) for the leadership he has furnished over the years in the field of energy. He is not only a leader from his standpoint of an administration but he has been very prominent in assuring legislation that would utilize, promptly utilize, many of our resources.

We are blessed in this country of ours with 40 percent of the world's coal reserves. Many people realize the significance of that blessing, but some do not.

When we look at the figures that illustrate that over 70 percent of all fossil fuel energy is in coal and only 15 percent,
or thereabouts, in petroleum products, we know of the great possibility we have of reaching our goal in furnishing the needs of this country for energy.

We now have programs, such as this particular amendment provides, whereby we can go forward with the utilization of coal.

I am not sure that the amendment that my distinguished Senator from West Virginia has again brought something to our attention that is very essential. He is working with the administration on this measure because he has given more time for the implementation of some of the programs that are in progress.

If the distinguished Senator moves in separate legislation the substance of his amendment to Senator from West Virginia I am reasonably certain that such a bill would become law.

I would suggest to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that his amendment be separately offered as a clean bill.

Mr. President, I again commend the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Randolph) for offering this amendment.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I err in saying that we are extending the authority until December 31 in connection with the amendment that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Randolph) actually, the authority expired on June 30.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON. Which makes more urgent the need to extend the authority provided in the act.

I, therefore, urge that the Senate adopt the amendment offered by the able Senator from West Virginia who has been the pioneer in this area.

As Senator FANNIN has mentioned, no one has taken a greater interest, as far as I know, in the development of the energy resources in this country than the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Randolph) and I commend him highly.

I do not know of anyone else who wants time and I suggest we have a vote.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON. I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are the Senators prepared to yield back their time?

Mr. JACKSON. I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the order for the quorum call to be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the order for the quorum call to be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. What is this?

Mr. JACKSON. This is just the committee amendment changing the date from 1977 to 1976, a routine committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I see.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Does the Senator from Oklahoma seek recognition?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the distinguished Senator from Washington if I could have his attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is being addressed by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the Senator from Washington have to leave the Chamber?

Mr. JACKSON. I have to leave the Chamber for a moment. I will be glad to come back and respond to any question if the Senator will defer it until that time.

Mr. BARTLETT. All right.

Mr. President, I am concerned about the extension of the Petroleum Allocation Act because it does not appear to me to face up to part of the real problem that we have in the domestic energy shortage: that is, the very obvious lack of supply. When one compares the oil in the industry with other industries, if one does it on power concentration, one finds that the number of companies engaged in oil exploration is much larger than that of the average number of companies engaged in any major endeavor in this country. In fact the independents, the non-30 major ones, find about 80 percent of the production found in this country. Obviously, this statistic also indicates that there is not a barrier to entry into the area of petroleum exploration, development, and drilling for oil and gas wells.

It is also obvious in comparing the profits of the major companies, let alone the small ones, that the return on capital investment is about average with that of other major industries.

So, we have in the petroleum industry a number of companies of free enterprise, which are engaging in perhaps the most important business activity of any companies in the country because of the current shortage of domestic oil and gas. Oil is becoming very important because of the shortage of domestic oil and gas, and the needs that we have as a nation to provide the energy needed for all of our business and manufacturing activities.

Yet, in the case of oil and gas, we of Congress seem to think, somehow or other, that we accomplish more for the better interest and the best interest of the nation by using our own natural resources than we could do with oil and gas imports.

We had a cushion of some 2 million to 3 million extra barrels of petroleum that could've been produced domestically at the time that was needed in the Suez crisis of 1956, I believe, and it was used in another crises in the Middle East later on.

But because of the lack of capital formation and the lack of sufficient profit, there was not enough capital for the delusion that the oil was needed to be drilled during the late fifties and sixties to retain the cushion, the extra supply of oil and gas, and to keep up with the demand.

By the time we reached 1971, the number of active rigs had gradually but consistently reduced to less than 1,000, and we had a very severe energy shortage in the United States. Our imports went up way until they are reaching now 40 percent.

It is rather interesting looking back on how much money was regarded during the sixties as compared to today.

At that time, General Lincoln's group, which was concerned with the national security of this country, felt that if imports reached 10 percent they were reaching a level that would threaten the national security. Yet now, we obviously are depending upon others for 38 percent of our imported oil, no one seems to be much concerned about national security.

Yet we only have to look back to 1973, a period of just 2 years ago, when an embargo was placed on the importation of oil from Arab countries. This required us to use all of our ingenuity in order to keep the wheels of industry turning and in order to keep this country moving along with the rest of the world, we suffered considerably because of the lack of energy.

Starting in 1971, because of a relaxation of price controls, a removal of price controls on part of our crude oil, we had an increase in the amount of drilling. This has enabled the number of active rigs to go up to approximately 1,740.

But just 3 months ago, this Congress...
decided that the depletion allowance should be eliminated for the larger companies and should be greatly reduced for all companies engaged in oil and gas exploration. By doing this, the tax on oil and gas incomes was increased by $2.5 billion. This was levied retroactively on the oil and gas industry.

Obviously, the one part of their speech that I would like to take up is the Petroleum Allocation Act is that, in effect, this Act is a cartel that controls the price of imported oil and gas, and the price is set by countries arbitrarily, not based on supply and demand. Then they criticize the decontrol of the price we were able to do, which I think that the world price is not a free market price. But it certainly does not make it any more free market to control the price of domestic oil. In fact, to me, it does not make much sense when the foreign producers of energy, countries which have a great excess of production, set a cartel price that is the world price. Then, of course, comes along, a country very short of production, and they can use that to having adequate supplies by having a controlled price far below the world price.

The world price is a cartel price, but let us face up to it, it is the world price. It is what we pay when we cannot produce enough domestic crude oil to satisfy our needs. We bring in expensive cartel-priced oil, at approximately $12.75 a barrel, whereas we are producing oil in this country and paying for it at an average price of some $7.50 to $8 a barrel. I think we must face up to the basic problem which is a probable element of energy shortage, and analyze that to see how we can deal with it in order to have sufficient supplies.

Mr. HANSEN. Will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for an observation?

Mr. BARTLETT. I very happily yield to my distinguished friend from Wyoming.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I think what the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is saying is very, very important. Practically every authority agrees that there are two steps that need to be taken by America at this time. One is to do all we can, consistent with the needs of providing jobs in America, to conserve energy, and, even more specifically, to conserve the consumption of oil and natural gas. That is part of the job. It is an important part. Many, many speakers have stressed its importance.

On the other hand, there is also need, and I think most people have given more than just a cursory glance at the problem that would agree that we need to do something about bringing into being greater supply. Many things have been proposed. The distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, some months ago, proposed that we deregulate secondary and tertiary recovered oil. That proposal was adopted in the Senate and it since has been stricken from one of the bills that has gone to conference. I think unfortunately, because of all of the opportunities that this country has to increase supply, there is no doing it than to decontrol the price of secondary and tertiary recovered oil.

Why do I say that? For one very obvious reason. At the present time, we have reserves in the United States of some 40 billion barrels of oil. By that is meant that, given the amount of oil in place that we know is there, understanding the cost of pumping that oil to make it available and equating those costs with the selling price of oil, given the present equilibrium that is now established, we can produce from those known reserves some 40 billion barrels. But if we were to double the oil price and say to those thousands of persons, tens of thousands of persons, who own interests in the different oilfields throughout the United States, "We will let the price rise in order to get you willing to pay," then we could produce an additional 60 billion barrels.

In other words, Mr. President, we can take the 40 billion barrels which normally would be produced given present costs and price levels existing now, and we could increase that by an additional 60 billion barrels. In other words, we could get one-and-a-half times as much more out of the ground as we hope to get.

ORDER FOR A RECESS UNTIL 9:15 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BARTLETT. I very happily yield to my distinguished friend from Wyoming.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I think what the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has pointed out is that there is a great opportunity...
about the situation in my State of Wyoming. He states:

In the three months since the President signed into law HR 2166, entitled "Tax Reduction Act of 1975," the average number of drilling rigs active in the State of Wyoming has decreased from 189 to 99, a decrease of over 43%. During the same period last year the average number of drilling rigs in operation increased by 10. The full benefit of HR 2166 has already made any on the industry in this state can best be judged by examining the attached chart showing average rig count in 1974 and 1975. This clearly shows that an escalating trend was almost spontaneously turned into a seriously downward trend. This in my judgment has been almost entirely a result of the major oil companies' reduction in their exploration and development budgets caused by the reduction in their cash flow resulting from the higher income taxes mandated by this law. Nobody, including major oil companies, can spend money they do not have or cannot borrow.

The Society of Independent Professional Geologists, a very sophisticated group of geologists, confirms the same conclusion reached by Mr. True and by the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma. They say:

There are many inequities in this program. They are stacking (storing) rigs in the Midland area and contractors are waiting on new orders.

In other words, the backlog—which means the number of requests for drilling that needs to be done, the uncertainty that faces the industry is a fact that needs to be corrected, but its main fallacy is that it increases the demand for energy and it decreases the supply, which is exactly the opposite of what an emergency energy program should do today for this country.

We have ever increasing shortages of energy, yet the programs that have been adopted by Congress, the great majority of them, have been ones that have extended and increased the shortage. Or, as I said, increased the demand and decreased the supply.

It has made us more dependent upon foreign sources of supply which we know can be used as political blackmail in the form of an embargo to put pressures on this country in its political decisions which foreign nations have made.

Certainly, 6 months is ample time for this body and the other body to consider changes in the Allocation Act.

Think the greatest step that could be taken would be through the Congress in approaching the energy shortages, would be to let this act expire on August 31 because then what would happen is that our price controls would do just the reverse. As we debate it, but I do have an amendment at the clerk's desk and I would like to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. GARN.) The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senate from Oklahoma (Mr. BARTLETT) proposes an amendment to the committee amendment: On page 1, line 10, delete "March 1, 1976," and insert in lieu thereof "December 31, 1978."
Of the oil and gas that this country requires to get us out of the 20th century and into the 21st century, there have been large expenditures that this Nation is making to develop those resources. But I think we are kidding ourselves when we control the prices on the one hand and at the same time refuse to face the problems that we have refused to face up to for so long.

The problems that I see have not been problems of the oil industry, they are problems of the minds of the people of this country, and to the problems of Government to give it the kind of environment in which it needs to operate to do the amount of exploration and development that is required.

This amendment, very simply, gives 6 months for the Congress to improve the Petroleum Allocation Act, if that is its desire, to pass this bill, which certainly should be ample time to go through the enticements problems and the other inequities that do exist.

We have a situation where parts of the country are taking advantage of our dependence on foreign oil by the fact that this Congress has not thought it can, is adequate. I think the fact that this Congress has attempted to deregulate natural gas extends the shortage of that very important energy. So that this Nation has its unemployment increased by the actions of Government.
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that by trying to ascribe the increase at a level of several cents a gallon and no mention of both past history and probable conditions in the future.

At a time when all of the economists seem to agree that the recession has hit a bottom, that the inflation is moderating, to ascribe a disturbance in the one commodity which is a basic ingredient of every other product—energy—makes counterproductive logic.

Not only will the direct inflation caused by an increase in fuel, chemical feedstock and automobile gasoline take place, but the rippling effects through the transport, packaging, fabrication, and use of every other product will greatly rekindle inflation.

Mr. HANSEN. Will the Senator yield for a brief question at this point?

Mr. STONE. The Senator yields.

Mr. HANSEN. Would I like to ask my good friend from Florida if he believes that the ripple effect of inflation is more serious than the specter of being short of fuel and increasing our dependency upon uncertain foreign sources in the light of the possibility of another embargo if we do have an outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East?

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Florida wishes to attack both evils. The Senator from Florida has introduced one bill, and the senior Senator from Florida has introduced several other bills cosponsored by the junior Senator from Florida, which would counteract the cartel price situation and the cartel shortage situation produced by the foreign oil producing nations.

That is one problem. But whether you die by a gun or whether you die by a knife, you die; and the difference between the foreign cartel situation and the de-regulation which otherwise would take place if this bill does not pass is that in this situation we are doing it to ourselves, and if a deregulation of all oil products is in order—and let me say that there is a much greater case for deregulation, partial or complete, of natural gas products than for crude oil, because for natural gas we at least at this time—in any case, when you do this is as important as what you do; and at this moment in the business cycle, to add to the basic cost situation in this economy just when we are trying to reduce unemployment, just when we are trying to control inflation, would give not only a financial and fiscal but a psychological blow to industry and business which is trying mightily to come off the floor.

That is the point I am trying to make.

Of course, a slow deregulation is better than a fast one, but the question before us is, shall we not give ourselves a chance to analyze the regulatory situation more than simply in the last days of the first session of this Congress?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a yeas and nay's request?

Mr. STONE. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. Ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 7 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I shall be brief.

The agreement that we had in committee was a compromise from the date of August 31, 1977, to March 1, 1976. The proposed date of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BURDICK) to maintain the price of crude oil above ground, in inventory, would mean a $2 billion ripoff, with the price going up from $5.25 to over $13 a barrel.

The staff has also assessed the value of the oil in the ground, Mr. President; and if we do an analysis of the increase in the value of the oil in the ground from $5.25 to over $13 a barrel, it is an add-on of $180 billion.

Mr. President, this is old oil, and the issue basically is a very simple one: Are we going to allow the oil cartel to determine the market price of oil here, and the price of goods that are produced by the jet fuel, and what the farmer pays for fertilizer—and that is already up 400 percent—I could go on down the line; every item in the economy is affected.

The utility bills, Mr. President, are such at this time and place in our history that we find that the large American utilities, many of them, are on the verge of bankruptcy because of the rise in fuel prices.

Mr. President, I would just say that it is a great struggle for some Americans, and that in millions and millions, just to meet their heating and light bills. I am getting pathetic letters from senior citizens whose social security checks are not even enough to cover their heating and light bills because of the astronomical increases that have occurred as a result of an oil cartel fixing not only their prices on the world market, but, if we decontrol, fixing ours. I think we have had enough of that.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, would it be in order to adjourn the Senate, in accordance with the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BARTLETT) to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HANSEN), that the Senator from Idaho (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. CULVER), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLUTEN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) be necessary absent?

I further announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLUEN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN, I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEASRON), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAPP), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAPP) would each vote "yea."

The result announced—yeas 30, nays 53, as follows:

[Roll Call Vote No. 276 Leg.]
So Mr. Bartlett's amendment was rejected.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GRAVEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on agreeing to the committee amendment. Let us have order in the Senate.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, we will vacate the well and carry on their debate until the committee amendment is acted upon. The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will vacate the well and carry on their conversations in the cloakroom, please, so that the Senator from Virginia can be heard.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that John L. Brooks of my staff have the privilege of speaking from the floor during the debate on S. 489.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. Ford). The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is not in order until the committee amendment is acted upon.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I thought we acted on the committee amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No.

Mr. JACKSON. Let us vote on the committee amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is now on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Now, the amendment of the Senator from California. The clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TUNNEY. I have the floor and I yielded to the Senator from Washington.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will let the Chair obtain quiet in the Senate Chamber and then we will proceed accordingly. The clerk will finish reporting the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

"Sec. 3. Notwithstanding any other provi- 
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So what this amendment simply does is to say if you should have a rationing plan the Administrator or any other public official who was going to put the rationing plan into effect has to take into consideration regional differences, has to evaluate the availability of mass transit, as an example, as an indication of whether not we can afford nationwide to have a percentage allotment of gaso-

line which could seriously affect the economy of one region more seriously than another region.

It is very simple to understand, and I think that any Senator from the West would certainly understand—and by that I mean west of the Mississippi, any Senator from the South, where they do not have adequate transportation systems, would understand—the value of the particular measure.

I see my dear friend, the Senator from Rhode Island, the senior Senator from Rhode Island here. I do not know what kind of mass transit facilities they have in Rhode Island and, perhaps, 9 gallons a week would be adequate to move every citizen in Rhode Island to and from work, but I can assure the Senator that to people in California, where people commute as much as 100 miles a day with their automobiles, this would be disastrous to them, and create disastrous conditions.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNEY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I want the Senator from California to understand that the famous fight between Jack Dempsey and Tunney was held in the East. We needed mass transportation at that time, and we need it today. It is not adequate.

We need help, much more help than the Senator understands. I hope the Senator will remember that.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. TUNNEY. I yield.

Mr. HANSEN. I am very glad to support the amendment proposed by the two distinguished Senators from California.

It seems evident to me, having examined, as I have, the per capita gas consumption rates in California, and I hope the Senator will remember that.

Two States, the two States, with the highest per capita consumption of gasoline are Nevada and Wyoming, and for very good reasons. We have a new electric generation plant being completed just east of Rock Springs, Wyo., and people are traveling from more than 100 miles away to drive back and forth to that job daily in order to do the job done.

We have strip mining, coal mining, taking place in Wyoming, the same situation applies there.

There is not presently the opportunity for homes and places to live in towns where these necessary jobs have to be undertaken and, as a consequence, what has been historically true continues to be true.

We do need more gasoline. The same situation applies to the State of Nevada, as my good friend from Nevada knows and understands full well.
I would like to say to my distinguished friend from Rhode Island that as I recall it, my father and Jack Dempsey got to the fight by a very simple solution. Mr. PASTORE. And good for them.

Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNEY. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. I think there is considerable merit in the argument that is being made by the distinguished Senator from California, but it is pretty hard to generalize in these matters.

The facts are that the needs in the various parts of the country differ very greatly. I could not agree more than I do with my good friend from California that we have got to look at the situation.

It occurs to me, though, that maybe absent sufficient time or without time to reflect upon the importance of the data that perhaps they might have looked at, they are what I consider very simple solutions when the only way to get around is by automobile.

I suspect that it is appealing to people to say that we will give everybody in the United States so many gallons per week. That is about as simple a solution as we could come up with that kind of ruling?

Mr. HANSEN. Indeed not. Mr. TUNNEY. Yet they said we ought to have a 9-gallon-per-week rationing in every State, in the opinion of the people of region's need for an automobile to get to and from work more than an another region. It is absolutely preposterous.

I would like to ask my distinguished friend from Wyoming if he has had any contact with the FEA and if he was able to uncover what the task force was thinking about when they came up with that decision?

Mr. HANSEN. Indeed not. Mr. TUNNEY. Yet they said we ought to have a 9-gallon-per-week rationing in every State, in the opinion of the people of one region's need for an automobile to get to and from work more than an another region. It is absolutely preposterous.
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Mr. HANSEN. Will the Senator from California yield for an observation?

Mr. TUNNEY. I yield.

Mr. HANSEN. I say to my friend from Massachusetts that the great merit in this amendment is that it recognizes what has been proposed by the task force set up under FEA, which I find deplorably inadequate. Mr. PASTORE also means to imply for a moment that there is not some commodity in terms of the problems the country over. Undoubtedly, as the Senator from Massachusetts has pointed out, there are many areas of that State that do not have any more rapid transit than we have in Medicine Bow, Wyo. That is now seven times weekly Amtrak on the UP Railroad.

Mr. PASTORE. We consider the fact that there are States which use fewer than 4 gallons of gasoline per capita per year, and there are States, such as is true in my State of Wyoming and in Nevada, where they use 16 gallons of gasoline per capita, that reflects upon past practices. It is that sort of thing that I think my good friend from California is addressing which should be looked at and should be examined by FEA or by its representatives. It may be, before any rationing program should be implemented, if one indeed should ever be.

Mr. PASTORE. We all seek equity.

Mr. HANSEN. Right.

Mr. BROOKE. I presume that is what the Senator from California is trying to achieve by his amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNEY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not find any fault with the logic or the merits of the argument being made, but I find some fault with what the Senator is attempting to apply to. He is anchoring this to the fact of mass transportation. We just do not have it. If the Senator wants to say where the distances are, we have people in San Francisco who have to go to work, that would make sense to me. But to say where we have mass transportation—just do not have it. The people in San Francisco have a lot better transportation than we have in the whole State of Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Are we going to do? Do we give them more gasoline in San Francisco?

Mr. TUNNEY. Not necessarily.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is going to go by region.

Mr. TUNNEY. We go by region, but we also hook it not only into mass transit, public transportation, but we also hook it into necessity for, say, ordinary per capita and necessary driving distances. We tie it also into the regional differences. That would be historical differences in use. There are a number of criteria that the amendment uses in making the Administrator determine what the allotment should be per region. Mass transit is one of the factors.

I did not mean to hook the entire amendment to mass transit. It would be an inappropriate amendment if it were just hooked to that.

Mr. BROOKE. What is the formula, if I might ask the Senator from California?

Mr. TUNNEY. These are the criteria: the Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration or any Federal officer or employee, unless such program or plan takes into account area or regional differences, or both, and the availability of public transportation and differences in ordinary and necessary driving distances and provides differential gasoline rations based on such differences.

In other words, we are asking the Administrator to take into consideration those three criteria in making judgment as to how much gasoline should be allocated to drivers in each region.

I think historical patterns are important. That is a regional difference. The availability, public transportation, certainly ought to be taken into account, and differences in ordinary and necessary driving distances.

Mr. BROOKE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNEY. Yes; he makes the decision.

Mr. BROOKE. And there is no appeal from the Administrator's decision?

Mr. TUNNEY. No more than there ever would exist under the basic body of law.

Mr. BROOKE. The Senator is merely suggesting that the Administrator should consider these three criteria prior to making the decision?

Mr. TUNNEY. Prior to making a decision. There should not be just a national plan, but there would be regional schemes. He ought to take into consideration what the differences in the regions are rather than just establishing a national scheme.

Mr. BROOKE. And the national regions are east, west, north, and south, is that it?

Mr. TUNNEY. We do not indicate what those regions are. We ask him to make that determination. I think it is appropriate. I think the Administrator has a far greater degree of expertise available to him than we have here today to make a decision on how the regions ought to break down. I can only say that I know there are some obvious locations in the country where the driving distances are much greater. We can complain about that, but it is a terrible thing that the transportation system in the West developed so that we relied on the automobile exclusively; it is too bad that people in the West live so far from the centers of power. The fact is that this is the way the West has grown up. If we had a rationing scheme that would apply, say, 9 gallons across the board per week, my Lord, you would destroy the economy of that part of the country. It is not only the West. I am sure the same thing is true in many parts of the South as well. And the Midwest and perhaps the East, too.

Mr. HANSEN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNEY. I promised the Senator from Washington I would yield to him.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, might I say to my good friend from California that I am sympathetic to the problem he has presented. We have the same thing in the State of Washington around the Puget Sound. We do not have mass transit. People come from upper peninsulas, great distances. If the law is to be limited to 9 gallons per week per person, obviously it is going to bring about great hardship. That is true, I believe, in many of the great urban areas of America. It is like a whole series of spokes in a wheel. There is not any one single mass transit facility.

My senior colleague, who has worked so long in this area, would agree that the problem is very, very difficult. Since the post-World War II period we have had a large, ongoing suburban development in America which coincided with the proposal of the Senator. We will be getting into the whole question of the provisions of the mandatory allocation act this fall. Hopefully, we can work out and mandate some sound principles that will be applicable.

I just want to point out that I will make a point of order because we do have a series of amendments and we are trying to keep this bill germane to the specific issue which is an urgent one. That is the extension of price control authority. I would not want the Senator to feel that I am not sympathetic.

Mr. TUNNEY. I understand full well how, as manager of the bill, the Senator feels that he has to keep off amendments that are not germane.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator will understand, when I appeal the ruling of the Chair, if it is against me, that I do not do it because I want to be canankerous.

Mr. TUNNEY. But I do it because I feel that it is very important to the citizens of my State.

I have here an editorial from the Los Angeles Times which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point.

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

A DISASTROUS RATIONING PLAN

A Federal Energy Administration task force has drawn up a standby gasoline rationing plan that, in its present form, would be economically disastrous for the Los Angeles area.

The proposal aims at equity in the distribution of curtailed gasoline supplies in the event of a new energy emergency, like another Arab oil embargo. Equity in this case is construed as giving every licensed driver in the country the same amount of gasoline—9 gallons a week is the tentative figure—no matter where he lives or how much he has to drive.

No differential is provided for auto-dependent areas, which lack public transportation systems capable of providing feasible
alternatives to the use of private cars. The reason for this deliberate omission, according to a task force member, is the wish to avoid bureaucratic complexities in the administration of the program.

That's a laudable goal, but its implications simply have not been thought through. For hundreds of thousands of drivers in Southern California and certain other metropolitan areas, the 9-gallon-a-week limitation would be inadequate to provide for commuting to jobs five days a week. The unrealistic ceiling would cut not only into work-related travel as well. The economic consequences would be immense, and chaotic.

The proposed "white market," to make rationing coupons freely transferable would not help much. Demand for surplus coupons in a region that wasn't certain would be greater than supply. Whatever unused coupons individuals might offer for sale would quickly be bought up by the affluent. There would be no equity in that kind of transfer—and no sense, either.

The task force's proposal is a massive step backward. The gasoline rationing plan outlined in December, 1973, by then-federal energy chief William E. Simon. Simon's idea was to take into account the discretionary use but into necessary work-related travel as well. The economic consequences would be immense, and chaotic.

Simon's idea, either.

Mr. TUNNEY. The editorial starts off:

A Federal Energy Administration task force has drawn up a standby gasoline rationing plan that, in its present form, would be economically disastrous for the Los Angeles area.

Then they go on to say:

The task force's plan has gone to FEA Administrator Frank G. Zarb and President Ford for their approval. Both should reject it because of its major inadequacy, and if they fail to do so Congress must act. The plan would be a disaster for Southern California.

To prevent that, some possible "bureaucratic complexities" are permissible.

Mr. TUNNEY. The editorial starts off:

Then they go on to say:

A Federal Energy Administration task force has drawn up a standby gasoline rationing plan that, in its present form, would be economically disastrous for the Los Angeles area.

Well, President Ford has not acted, Mr. Zarb has not acted, and they have had plenty of time to act; and that is why I am offering this amendment at this time.

I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. President, I would like to qualify one part of the amendment offered by the Senator from California. I think it is crucial to whether the amendment covered by the Senator from California could be applied in such a way that the of New York could be seen to constitute several areas or several regions?

In other words, are we talking about vast areas in which two or three or four States are included, or will the Administration tell us that in effect, through the legislative history of the amendment, to consider, in effect, cities and towns area by area?

Mr. TUNNEY. It was my thought that the Administrator would track existing distribution facilities, and base the regions on those distribution facilities which are presently intact.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Therefore, in the case of a rule that is designed for use in a metropolitan area such as New York City that is fully serviced by mass transit, that would be treated differently from other areas of New York which are rural in character and are sparsely settled?

Mr. TUNNEY. Yes.

Mr. BUCKLEY. I thank the Senator.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TUNNEY. I yield.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on passage of the amendment which I am offering be delayed until tomorrow morning at 10:30 a.m.; that rule XII, paragraph 3 be waived; that the Senate convene tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. In any event as originally stated: that immediately upon the passage of S. 1849 tomorrow the vote occur on issue No. 1 of Senate Resolution 166; and that the second roll call vote be a 10-minute rollcall vote, it being a backup vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, resolving the right to object, I understood that there would be 3 hours of debate on the bill, plus 1 hour for each amendment. This would be cutting that considerably short.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Let me say to the Senator from Alabama that it is my intention that this has been cleared on both sides—that debate on the bill, S. 1849, will be finished today, and that actual passage could occur today, but that a Senator from the other side of the aisle is not going to be here for the vote today, and it was understood that if the vote is laid over until tomorrow, he would be here, and the time on the bill and the amendments thereto could be yielded back.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not think I shall object, but there were two nongermane amendments, the nature of which was not identified, that were permitted on S. 1849. I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) has already agreed to.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. The other amendment would be offered by the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAYLOR). He is not here today, and it is my understanding that that amendment is being offered by another Senator.

Mr. ALLEN. Could we have the nature of the amendment identified?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Yes, if the distinguished Senator from California could continue to yield forms for their purposes, I will yield to the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN), so that he may respond to the inquiry of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUNNEY. I yield.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I would say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAYLOR) pertains to price trendsetting and related development of energy, and for other major energy sources which are not subject to direct price regulation at any level by the U.S. Government.

The amendment provides:

As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this subparagraph and at such times thereafter as he deems appropriate, the Federal Energy Administrator, after consultation with such other persons and agencies as he deems appropriate, shall provide an assessment of the relationship between price trends and related developments for energy sources covered by this subparagraph and energy policies, including any recommendations he may have in connection with such assessment.

In other words, it is to make an assessment and recommendations after investigation, is that this amendment pertains to. It relates particularly to coal. That makes me wonder, then, that that is the amendment covered by the unanimous-consent agreement? Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.
EMERGENCY PETROLEUM ALLOCATION EXTENSION ACT OF 1975

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 1849) to extend the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank all Senators, and I thank the distinguished Senator from California for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, I should like to move the adoption of the amendment. I know the Senator from Washington has something that he is planning. Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I express my sympathy for the proposed amendment offered by the Senator from California. I think he has presented a serious problem. But we do have a long series of amendments, and I regret that I will have to make a point of order, on the grounds that the amendment is not germane to the matter before the Senate.

The pending bill simply provides for an extension of the existing Petroleum Allocation Act until March 1, 1976, and unless an amendment relates directly to that it is not germane.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, may I be heard on the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. TUNNEY. It is my understanding that the allocation authority is part of the allocation authority. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will indulge the Senator for a short debate on this.

Mr. TUNNEY. It is just a question, I am asking the Chair, that the rationing authority is a part of the allocation authority. The rationing authority is derived from the allocation authority, and if this amendment is not germane I cannot understand what would be germane to this bill.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, may I respond to the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is required to be germane to the bill before the Senate rather than the underlying law that the bill would amend.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, just to be helpful on the substantive issue to my friend, there is no provision in the existing law, the Petroleum Allocation Act, that covers rationing as contemplated by the Senator. Some 3 months ago, we passed a mandatory conservation bill in the Senate, which does provide, among other things in the area of conservation for end-use rationing and that bill is over in the House of Representatives Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. But there is no authority in the existing act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order raised from the Senator from Washington is well taken. The amendment introduces new subject matter and, therefore, is not germane under the unanimous-consent agreement in the usual form.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, because I consider this matter so important, if there were a boycott, it would be quickly reported to States in the West and South. I appeal the ruling of the Chair and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a sufficient second.

Mr. HANSEN. Yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a sufficient second. The question is on the point of order.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, is this motion debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This motion is debatable. There is a series of amendments, and I regret that it is not germane to the wisdom of this amendment. It is easy to say, as we have heard from time to time that--

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? Excuse me. Who yields time?

Mr. TUNNEY. I yield time to the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thanks the Senator from California.

The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. HANSEN. I say that I think it is important that we anticipate some of the things that are going to happen as we consider this bill before us. This certainly is a very valid point to consider. It does not do much good after the fact—found that out—to be against something.

I think the Senator from California is to be complimented for having the foresight to anticipate that, if we continue to try to put together the sort of an energy policy that Congress so far has come up with, we are going to have to face all sorts of situations, and rationing will very likely be one of them.

So I hope very much that Senators will consider the fact that we are not idle as to something that may never happen; it is a very real prospect, and I would hope that we can vote up or down on this issue and that it will be upheld as germane by the action of the Senate.

I thank my friend from California. Mr. TUNNEY. I thank my very able and distinguished friend from Wyoming for his comments.

I say that whereas I can easily understand the position of the distinguished floor manager of this legislation, the Senator from Washington, that it is not going to have a series of non-germane amendments attached to this legislation that is before us, I just cannot help but think that in a case such as this, which is so important to so many people in this country, that we would be acting as a Senate to put aside procedural niceties and get to the substance of the matter.

We constantly are bending the rules to suit our fancy around here, and there is no reason why we cannot, in this particular instance, bend the rules a little to allow a worthwhile amendment to be adopted. I hope fully will become the law.

I can only say that I would hate to see a situation develop where we would need rationing. I think it is everyone's hope we never will need rationing. If there should suddenly develop the need for rationing, for instance another boycott, and if the Administrator should rely upon his task force recommendation—and I presume he would rely heavily on his task force recommendation—we could be in a position for the people of my State and for the people of a great part of this country, including Wyoming, including Texas, all throughout the West, not only the South and Midwest. As a matter of fact, I cannot understand why anyone would want to vote against this amendment.

I explained it as best I can. Therefore, I stand the position of the distinguished Senator from California is planning. Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are ordered. Mr. ALLEN addressed the Chair.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I think we can vote.

First, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Will the Senators kindly take their seats?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I favor this amendment, and the distinguished Senator from California has said that it would favor areas in the South. But I feel that in the Senate we must have stability, order, and decorum; if the ruling of the Chair is not arbitrary and capricious, I believe that it should be upheld. Even though the amendment is an amendment I would favor under different circumstances. Much of the Senate should be upheld in his ruling.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

I think the Senate must decide whether or not we want to make a real effort to do something about the first issue, and the first issue is whether or not we are going to permit the decontrol of all oil prices on August 31.

We have acted upon earlier, the matter relating to rationing. It is not in the Petroleum Allocation Act that we are extending. It would be a tragedy if we go off on another bent, with which I am very possible, and in which I believe, it would be a great mistake to defeat the whole thrust of our effort here, which is to prevent prices rising from $5.25 a barrel to $13 a barrel overnight. That is the issue before the Senate.

The amendment will completely throw us off the track, and the Senators ought to know it, when this event might well happen on the 31st day of August.

So I think we all understand the issue, and I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, if we can have an immediate vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move to table the appeal from the ruling of the Chair. It would be easier to vote that way.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senate from California yield back his time?
Mr. TUNNEY. I yield back my time. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

Mr. MORGAN. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. TUNNEY. I yield back my time. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENS) is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) would vote “aye.”

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BALLENGER), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. DORE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDBERG), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 68, nays 14, as follows: [Roll Call Vote No. 277 Leg.]

YEAS—88

Abourezk, Mr. Gary
Allen, Mr. Hart, Philip A.
Barkley, Mr. Hatfield
Barlow, Mr. Hatcher
Bentsen, Mr. Hathaway
Bingaman, Mr. B'elli
Blaisdell, Mr. Bentsen
Brock, Mr. Hollings
Buckley, Mr. Huddleston
Bumpers, Mr. Boney
Burdick, Mr. Jackson
Byrd, Mr. Jarrett
Harry F. Mr. Johnston
Byrd, Mr. Loyd
Chiles, Mr. Long
Chesley, Mr. Magnuson
Church, Mr. McCain
Cleaver, Mr. McClure
Culver, Mr. McClure
Curran, Mr. McLure
Eagleton, Mr. Metcalf
Edwards, Mr. Monongahela
Eisenhower, Mr. Montgomery
Ford, Mr. Montoya
Garner, Mr. Morgan
Grievous, Mr. Young

NAYS—14

Brooke, Mr. Hansell
Cassidy, Mr. Hatcher
Cranston, Mr. Manley
Fannin, Mr. McGovern

NOT VOTING—17

Baker, Ms. Glenn
Bagby, Mr. Goddard
Bell, Mr. Hartke
Bellus, Mr. Hartke
Boren, Mr. Humphrey
Brown, Mr. Humphrey
Casey, Mr. Hunter
Chemung, Mr. Hauschka
Dole, Mr. Humphrey
Domino, Mr. Huntley
Eastland, Mr. Leasby

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Chair, on the point of order is agreed to. The decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the Senate.

The bill is open for further amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 669

Mr. FANNIN, Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) has an amendment at the desk, amendment No. 669.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend? The Senate will please be in order. The Senators will please take their seats and suspend their conversations or go to the cloakroom so the Senators can hear the Senator from Arizona.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) unfortunately is necessarily absent. Senator TAFT unfortunately has introduced an amendment to the bill which basically would require the Federal Energy Administration to make a special investigation at the request of any Senator or Senatorial committee of the United States Government on the relationship between these price-related developments and national energy policy. I ask unanimous consent to file this amendment. The Administration would include studies of the economic effect of the energy policy on the industries involved, an analysis of the economic effect of the energy policies on prices in these industries, and an assessment and a recommendation on the relationship between these price-related developments and national energy policy. I ask unanimous consent to file this amendment. Senator TAFT may wish to make.

This amendment already has been passed unanimously by the Senate as part of S. 409, the bill to extend the life of the council on wage and price stability. However, I feel that it is also an amendment to S. 1849 for several reasons. First, the fate of both S. 409 and this amendment in particular still under amended may be jeopardized unduly as part of S. 409 because that bill is not being considered until the United States Congress passes the statute to be amended, the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act of 1974. Third, its subject matter obviously is integrally related to the crucial crude oil price ramifications of S. 1849. Fourth, as a result of the Randolph Amendment S. 1849 would extend for six months the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act of 1974. Thus, S. 1849 already deals with the basic technique which appears in this amendment.

Largely because both crude oil and natural gas prices have been subject to a degree of price regulation, particularly by the Federal Energy Administration, these industries have been carefully monitored. Exhustive analyses have been done concerning the relationship of these prices to our national energy policy. Unfortunately, probably because it is a major energy source not subject to any such constraints, the large electric generating and pricing developments within it have escaped this scrutiny. The drastic recent price increases on the wholesale level in the artificial high OPEC oil prices, are a good indication that this lack of attention has not been warranted.

Indeed I feel it is about time that we addressed this situation. Because of the abundance of coal in America, particularly in Ohio and other states of the Midwest, it is bound to play a major continuing role in the national energy picture and expanded production is crucial. As we try to assess what actions and policies are desirable in the energy field, it is important that we understand what is happening to coal prices. Regular and continuing analyses are particularly important in light of other major complicating factors, such as the effect of any strip mining legislation.

But there is another reason pressing at the moment, why we must correct this situation immediately. Consumers from my state and many others are increasing increases in their electricity bills. They want to know what is happening and why, and they deserve answers.

This amendment will promote a new understanding of the electric utility situation. Electric utilities now account for about 70 percent of the coal market. Almost 40 percent of the electricity generated in the United States in 1973 was based on coal. Obviously, the average increase between September, 1973, and September, 1974, of almost 200 percent in coal spot market prices and about 45 percent increase in long-term contracts. They have had a direct relationship to many consumers’ skyrocketing electricity bills. They deserve a comprehensive, systematic analysis, and an analysis now to assess and evaluate the price increases which have already occurred.

This Amendment does not try to bias in any way the recommendation of FEA may make after it reviews the coal price situation. It is designed solely to correct the present lack of attention to the significant changes in the coal industry, resulting partly from the artificial high OPEC oil prices, and to provide an assessment of the relationship between price trends and related developments for energy sources covered by this subparagraph and energy policies, including any recommendations he may have in connection with such assessment."

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record by Mr. TAFT on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 669

Mr. FANNIN. This amendment is very simple. It requires the Federal Energy Administration to include, in its quarterly energy information reports, information on pricing and related developments in the coal industry and any other major energy industries not subject to Federal price regulation. It also requires an assessment and a recommendation on the relationship between these price-related developments and national energy policy. Including information on the relationships of these price-related developments to coal pricing developments, relative prices in the energy industries subjected to direct government control is the amendment.

Mr. FANNIN. All this provides for is an assessment and a recommendation after investigation, a stipulation so far as the Federal Energy Administration is concerned.
I ask the distinguished Senator from Washington for his approval.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I am prepared to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FANNIN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask for yeas and nays on passage. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I believe that under the unanimous-consent agreement the vote on this bill will occur at 10:45 a.m., and all Senators should be prepared to accept the amendment and vote on this bill.

Mr. FANNIN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McClURE. Mr. President, the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act can be more accurately described as the “Oil Importers Relief Act.” Under the guise of allocating oil supplies, this legislation which rewards those who increase their imports of foreign oil and which penalizes those who have developed domestic oil resources. Under the guise of “protecting the independence,” we have a system of regulations which requires independent refiners to pay major oil companies for the so-called “entitlement” to process domestic oil—oil which in some cases could not be processed by major oil company refineries. Under the guise of protecting the consumer, we have created a subsidy system whereby consumers outside of the Northeast pay part of the fuel costs for the Northeast consumers. In plain language, the act—which is proposed to be extended—is a political giveaway program which, like all Federal welfare programs, takes away from some in order to give to others. In this case, the welfare recipients are the foreign oil importers, the major oil companies who “sell entitlements,” and the Northeast consumers. The major victim, however, is not the domestic producer, the independent refiner who has to “buy entitlements,” or the consumer outside the Northeast. The major victim is the United States.

Our efforts to decrease U.S. dependence on foreign oil are being undermined by this act. The implications for the economy, and for our foreign policy are obvious.

Mr. President, when the Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration testified before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he stated: “The EPAA (Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act) also creates such instability in FEA’s price control program that consider-

able disincentives to increased domestic production are created.

He went on to say:

Moreover, certain FEA allocation programs which are directly or indirectly mandated by EPAA tend to frustrate the goal of reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

Mr. President, it is time to end this “Project Dependence” policy of the Senate. I urge defeat of this extension.

So that my colleagues can more completely analyze the amount of dollar subsidy involved in the EPAA, I ask that data on costs be printed in the Record.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Coast</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NET VALUE OF ENTITLEMENTS BY REGION, FEBRUARY AND MARCH 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Coast</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. McClure. Mr. President, my State of Idaho, for example, pays an annualized cost of over $1 million, due to entitlements. States such as New Jersey and New York benefit from the entitlement program—New Jersey, over $2 million, and New York, almost a quarter of a million dollars.

In addition, we should look closely at the list of entitlements, to see exactly which companies benefit and which lose.

I ask unanimous consent that the entitlements lists for March and April, 1975, be printed in the Record.

The term “Required to Sell” is misleading. This so-called “requirement” is a major benefit, allowing companies such as Amerada-Hess, Standard of California, and Ashland Oil to force their competitors to subsidize the cost of their imported oil.

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

ENTITLEMENTS FOR ALLOCATION OF OLD OIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting firm, short name</th>
<th>Old oil adjusted receipts</th>
<th>Issued</th>
<th>Required to buy</th>
<th>Required to sell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Johnson</td>
<td>43,816</td>
<td>98,633</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied</td>
<td>1,467,587</td>
<td>1,833,743</td>
<td>3,312</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer-Propella</td>
<td>3,850,293</td>
<td>6,418,488</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,568,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amerada-Hess</td>
<td>11,761</td>
<td>8,977,998</td>
<td>3,356,265</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apen</td>
<td>232,271</td>
<td>455,821</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>133,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apex</td>
<td>9,955,456</td>
<td>6,056,193</td>
<td>3,899,263</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>40,816</td>
<td>50,629</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asamerio</td>
<td>11,191</td>
<td>19,946</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>2,682,557</td>
<td>3,677,862</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,134,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>27,195</td>
<td>122,919</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevon</td>
<td>342,352</td>
<td>296,963</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calf</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calumet</td>
<td>19,808</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cana</td>
<td>57,025</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbo</td>
<td>71,643</td>
<td>69,174</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champ</td>
<td>2,161,064</td>
<td>1,558,693</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>662,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charte</td>
<td>757,829</td>
<td>577,371</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>334,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>3,688,118</td>
<td>2,844,503</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>823,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambell</td>
<td>90,974</td>
<td>48,816</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48,816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting firm, short name</th>
<th>Old oil adjusted receipts</th>
<th>Issued</th>
<th>Required to buy</th>
<th>Required to sell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>5,553,874</td>
<td>929,759</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>275,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal</td>
<td>1,782,889</td>
<td>1,267,504</td>
<td>635,985</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conoco</td>
<td>4,296,167</td>
<td>580,844</td>
<td>719,223</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpo</td>
<td>1,204,677</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,204,677</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA-Farmind</td>
<td>556,385,738</td>
<td>65,878</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>556,385,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross</td>
<td>10,975</td>
<td>39,259</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown</td>
<td>11,092</td>
<td>865,291</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal-Oil</td>
<td>92,659</td>
<td>67,658</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>159,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal-Ref</td>
<td>34,436</td>
<td>32,919</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgy</td>
<td>554,850</td>
<td>573,286</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enome</td>
<td>683,507</td>
<td>503,629</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enbelt</td>
<td>34,819</td>
<td>60,894</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exxon</td>
<td>43,410</td>
<td>39,923</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edginton-Oil</td>
<td>7,018</td>
<td>175,670</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>278,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edginton-Oxen</td>
<td>8,318</td>
<td>13,844</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>10,192,395</td>
<td>9,102,786</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>738,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environ</td>
<td>19,952</td>
<td>179,380</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher</td>
<td>250,021</td>
<td>197,642</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>35,266</td>
<td>2,853</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getty</td>
<td>641,782</td>
<td>899,945</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>499,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giant</td>
<td>6,228</td>
<td>6,356</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SPECIAL HEALTH REVENUE SHARING ACT OF 1975—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the conference committee. The Senate and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STAFFORD). The report will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 66) to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of assistance under that title for nurse training and to revise and extend programs of health revenue sharing and health services having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by all the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

(The report is printed in the House proceedings of the Congressional Record of July 11, 1975, at p. 22385.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, since this has already been printed in the House of Representatives, I ask unanimous consent that the printing requirement be waived. I understand this is a routine request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am pleased to report that the Senate/House conferees have reached an agreement on the provisions of S. 66, the Nurse Training and Health Revenue Sharing and Health Services Act of 1975. Indeed, the Senate version of S. 66, which passed this body on April 10 by a vote of 77 to 14, and the House version of the bill which passed unanimously on June 5, were very nearly identical except with respect to authorization levels for the programs involved.

Mr. President, the Senate conferees have accepted the House authorization levels with only a minor adjustment in the area of nurse training, and one with respect to family planning. The effect of these authorization figures is to reduce the cost of the bill by almost $500 million. The original Senate-passed bill would have authorized a total of $2.5 billion. This conference report recognizes that, over $3 billion—and it includes $46 million for the national health service corps which was not even included in the original Senate bill.

Mr. President, this bill extends for 2 years, fiscal years 1976 and fiscal year 1977, support to existing, established DHEW programs whose legislative authority has already expired. It continues, for part (some 600 community mental health centers across the country, over 100 neighborhood health centers, scores of migrant health projects, and a variety of State public health programs. It also extends critical funding to our nation's schools of nursing and to the physicians and other health professionals who staff them. Our country's rural communities by the National Health Service Corps. Over 96 percent of all the funds authorized in this bill extend such existing authorized programs as the $1.4 billion. This conference report authorizes nearly $600 million more than this amount. The conference report devotes to "new programs" such as start-up grants for home health services, diagnostic and blood separation centers for hemophiliacs, sufferers, and prevention and control, and hypertension screening.

The conference report recommends that this Association Conference report to revise and extend the Nurse Training Act of 1974 and the Health Revenue Sharing and the Health Services Act of 1974. Those two measures, which were identical in substance with the measure before the Senate today, had far higher authorization levels and would have been far more costly. In fact, they would have authorized nearly $500 million more than this conference report. In an effort to compromise with the President, and to enable him to sign this measure into law, the Senate conferees have accepted these lower authorization levels. We have cut them to the very bone. The authorization levels that are included in this measure are barely adequate to keep these existing programs functioning.

I am very hopeful that the President will accept this compromise and sign S. 66 into law. The programs that are fund here serve mostly Americans who are poor or living on fixed incomes. They are the Americans who are already most adversely affected by inflation and unemployment in our society. During the summit conference on the economy last fall, delegate after delegate in the health area emphasized the need for health programs that will double the burden of Americans who are already suffering the most from our economic problems. They urged that these programs, such as this compromise proposal to the President would permit the programs to continue essentially at their fiscal year 1975 levels of operation, with minimal new commitments. These authorizations have been delayed all in doubling the burden of Americans who are already suffering the most from our economic problems.

I remain concerned that a foreign nation can buy large amounts of American grain products without the knowledge of American farmers and consumers, and un(not belief that we can continue to do business this way—especially since the catastrophic experiences resulting from the Russian grain deal of 1972.

Today, I sent telegrams to both the Secretaries of the State and the Department of Agriculture that would ease the impact of clandestine grain deals.

I have asked Secretary Kissinger to report to the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations how much the Soviets will be buying as a result of the new policy, and where trade-offs have to be made between programs. What we are bringing today in these authorization figures is an estimate of what minimal funding levels would keep these programs alive and functioning during these hard economic times. If the administration wishes to debate any of these numbers further, I hope they will do it in the context of the appropriations process.

Mr. President, the details of S. 66 and other provisions are enumerated in the conference report. I have published a statement of managers. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4035 BY MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report on H.R. 4035 relating to energy policy, may be filed by midnight tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY TO FILE REPORT ON S. 1518

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be allowed until midnight tonight to file the report on S. 1518, the National Development Act of 1975, together with additional views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EASING THE IMPACT OF CLANDESTINE GRAIN DEALS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, last week, the staff of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations confirmed that the Soviets were negotiating with grain exporters over several million tons of grain, some or all of which could come from this year's American grain harvest.

Following our confirmation of these negotiations, the Agriculture Department said that there had been discussions by American companies with the Soviets on purchasing 10 million tons of grain.

I remain concerned that a foreign nation can buy large amounts of American grain products without the knowledge of American farmers and consumers. I do not believe that we can continue to do business this way—especially since the catastrophic experiences resulting from the Russian grain deal of 1972.

Today, I sent telegrams to both the Secretaries of the State and the Department of Agriculture that would ease the impact of clandestine grain deals.

I have asked Secretary Kissinger to report to the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations how much the Soviets will be buying as a result of the new policy, and where trade-offs have to be made between programs. What we are bringing today in these authorization figures is an estimate of what minimal funding levels would keep these programs alive and functioning during these hard economic times. If the administration wishes to debate any of these numbers further, I hope they will do it in the context of the appropriations process.

Mr. President, the details of S. 66 and other provisions are enumerated in the conference report. I have published a statement of managers. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4035 BY MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report on H.R. 4035 relating to energy policy, may be filed by midnight tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY TO FILE REPORT ON S. 1518

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be allowed until midnight tonight to file the report on S. 1518, the National Development Act of 1975, together with additional views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
We must protect our farmers and con-
sumers from the disadvantages they would suffer from a major grain buy ac-
complished without their timely knowl-
dge.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-
sent to have printed in the Record at
this time the following telegram from Secretaries Kissinger and Butz:

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the Record,
as follows:

Mr. HANSEN. In 1972, when the grain deal was consummated that recurs as a
subject of continuing interest, there was not at that time any mechanism—and
this is my question to my good friend from Washington—at that time there
was not any mechanism whereby the
President could prevent the Secretary of
Agriculture, when he decided, after
knowing what individually might have
been agreed upon between the various
grain dealers of this country and any
other buyers; Is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct.
In fact, Secretary Butz testified that
whereas the largest grain sale in the his-
tory of the world occurred on or about
July 15, 1972, he did not find out about
it until in September of that year.

As a result of investigations, Mr. Presi-
dent, the Department put into effect
new regulations at our request, which re-
quire that where grain sales occur in-
volving 100,000 tons or more, the grain
companies must report those transac-
tions to the department within 24 hours.

I have made a further request of the
Department of Agriculture to require
that the grain companies also report
their anticipated sales. Unless all of these
facts, Mr. President, are out in the pub-
dic domain, and unless he knows that
there is no way of counting up how
the farmer may be selling his grain and
other related crops at an inequitable
price. He ought to know as precisely as
he can what the volume of sales will be,
so he can manage the market here and
he is going to sell his product for.

Likewise, this kind of information will
present a runaway situation which could
be harmful to the American consumers,
all of which occurred in 1972 because of
the lack of proper procedures.

That is the reason for my comments
here this afternoon, and for the sug-
gested approach.

Mr. HANSEN. I think the Senator from
Washington has provided some very
important information for Senators this
afternoon in detailing what the proce-
dures were in 1972, not as they have been changed and amended.

I must say that as to reporting an-
ticipated sales, that probably gets a little
bit hairy or tricky, because it is like an
answer in the middle of the market and
when he came back from Omaha a couple of weeks later, I asked
him how he did, and he said, "Well, I
didn't get quite as much as I expected to,
but really did not expect to, anyway,"
Mr. JACKSON. My friend will agree
that the important thing here is full dis-
losure, so that there is no insider infor-
mation.

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, indeed I do agree
with that.

Mr. JACKSON. The danger of corrup-
tion and insider information, and its im-
 pact on the consumer and the Ameri-
can consumer, could be devastat-
ing.

Mr. HANSEN. I am certain that many
would not occur and in 1972, at
least one, I think, Mr. HANSEN, I wish to say to my good friend
from Washington that despite the fact
that what he says is exactly true, I for
one would not want to change our mar-
keting system for that of the Russians
at all.

Mr. JACKSON. ORDER

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after Mr.
Symington's order is consummated to-

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF BUS-
INESS OF THE DAY

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, will the
distinguished Senator from Washington
yield for a question?

Mr. JACKSON. Certainly.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I am cer-
tain that a substantial number of Americans will agree with the distinguished
Chairman of the Committee on Interior and In-
sular Affairs that there is need for the sort of information he has requested, I
think he will be well advised to observe that last
year, as I understand, or 2 years ago, whenever it was.

Mr. JACKSON. 1972.
morrow, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend beyond the hour of 9:30 a.m., with statements limited therein to 3 minutes each, and for the purpose only of the introduction of bills, resolutions, memorials, petitions, and statements into the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will convene at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, Maj. Gen. Robert T. Marsh, FR, and Maj. Gen. George G. Loving, Jr., FR, will address the Senate.

The following officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8007, and title 32, United States Code, section 2621, for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 1883

I think it would be within the spirit and intent of that order if I should ask unanimous consent that at no later than 11 a.m. tomorrow the Senate would proceed to the consideration of S. 1883, a bill to conserve gasoline by directing the Secretary of Transportation to establish and enforce mandatory fuel economy performance standards for new automobiles and light duty trucks, and other purposes, it being stated on the record that the Senate leadership would intend to proceed on S. 1883 if S. 1849 has not been disposed of.

Mr. McCLURE. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. McCLURE. I do not have any very clear understanding from Senator Harris concerning the 1 hour that might be allocated to the debate of the New Hampshire contest. I wonder if it might be stated that at no later than 1 hour following the completion of the rollcall vote on the Emergency Allocation Act that we would then proceed to S. 1883 so that in the event the Senator from Oregon would desire to pursue the debate on the New Hampshire election contest at that time, the time would be allocated and available for him.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Yes. I am glad the distinguished Senator commented as he has because I made an error in computing the time I thought I was allowing an hour after the first vote but, indeed, I was not.

I will change my request to provide that at no later than the hour of 12 noon the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 1883, which would allow for 1 hour following the second rollcall vote. I again thank the distinguished Senator. That was my intent, but I certainly was not phrasing my request in accordance with it.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. So, Mr. President, rollcall votes may occur during tomorrow afternoon. There will be two back-to-back rollcall votes as I have already indicated, the first to begin at 10:30 a.m. and the second to follow immediately. During the afternoon, rollcall votes may occur on amendments to S. 1883 and on final passage thereof, depending upon the progress made. There is a tentative agreement on the bill of 4 hours for general debate and 1 hour on any amendment in the first degree and one-half hour on any amendment in the second degree. So at least two rollcall votes will occur tomorrow, and in all likelihood additional ones will occur.

RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 9 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and at 6:26 p.m. the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 15, 1975, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 14 (legislative day of July 11, 1975):

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8006, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 8006, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general


IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Stansfield Turner, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties of great importance and responsibility commensurate with the grade of admiral within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 2621, for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, July 14, 1975

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D,D., offered the following prayer:

God is able to provide you in abundance for every good work.—II Corinthians.

We thank Thee, our Father, for Thy goodness to us and for the moving of Thy Spirit leading us toward the fellowship and the freedom that faithful people find in Thee.

Touch Thou our hearts that we may give as well as receive, that we may forgive as well as be forgiven, that we may seek to heal as well as be healed and that we may endeavor to love as well as be loved.

Touch Thou our hands that the work we do may give strength and peace, may offer courage and confidence and may bring joy and life to all who come within the circle of our influence.

In this moment of prayer and for this day and every day unite our hearts and our hands in service to Thee and to our country; for Thy name's sake, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5709. An act to amend the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 to authorize appropriations to carry out the provisions of such act in fiscal year 1976 and for the transition period following such fiscal year, and for other purposes. The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 83. An act to exclude from gross income gains from the condemnation of certain forest lands held in trust for the Klamath Indian Tribe;

H.R. 5447. An act to amend the act of August 16, 1971, as amended, which established the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere, to increase and extend the appropriation authorization thereunder; and