

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUDNUT):

H.R. 13053. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the National Cancer program and to authorize appropriations for such program for the next 3 fiscal years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. McCLOY):

H.R. 13054. A bill to eliminate discrimination based on sex in the youth programs offered by the Naval Sea Cadet Corps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 13055. A bill to improve the conduct and regulation of Federal election campaign activities and to provide public financing for such campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON (for himself, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 13056. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for income averaging in the event of downward fluctuations in income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.J. Res. 916. Joint resolution in support of continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 917. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim April 9, 1974, as "Bataan-Corregidor Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 437. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the imprisonment in the Soviet Union of a Lithuanian seaman who unsuccessfully sought asylum aboard a U.S. Coast Guard ship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DU PONT:

H. Con. Res. 438. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to certain vocational and career stu-

dent organizations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING:

H. Con. Res. 439. Concurrent resolution commending the American Song Festival as an important addition to the cultural life of the United States and paying tribute to the songwriters of the world; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H. Res. 919. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with the respect to the rates of pay of certain Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H. Res. 920. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by H. Res. 19; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GUNTER (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. STEELE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SISK, and Mr. GAYDOS):

H. Res. 921. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the role of the oil and gas industry in contributing to the current energy crisis; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HANRAHAN:

H. Res. 922. Resolution disapproving congressional pay raises; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Res. 923. Resolution providing additional compensation for services performed by certain employees in the House Publications Distribution Service; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H. Res. 924. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 925. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. Res. 926. Resolution relative to consideration of H. Res. 807; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TOWELL of Nevada:

H. Res. 927. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to rates of pay of Members of Congress transmitted to the Congress in the appendix to the budget for the fiscal year 1975, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YATES (for himself, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. BINGHAM,

Mr. STOKES, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. DIGGS):

H. Res. 928. Resolution providing for television and radio coverage of proceedings in the Chamber of the House of Representatives on any resolution to impeach the President of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

358. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

359. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to energy crisis revenue sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. REES introduced a bill (H.R. 13057) for the relief of Jack and Susan Soll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

394. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Maui County Council, Hawaii, relative to the preservation as a National Historic Site of the Kalaupapa Settlement; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OGONTZ FIRE COMPANY HONORS 50-YEAR VETERAN

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, like all States, Pennsylvania is greatly dependent upon its force of volunteer firemen. There are some 245 volunteer fire departments in Pennsylvania, and approximately 165,000 of the State's 170,500 firemen are volunteers.

One of those volunteers, John Gottschalk, has served the Ogontz Fire Department in Cheltenham Township for 50 years, having joined it on his 17th birthday in 1924. He will be honored at a March 2 banquet as the first member of the Ogontz Department to complete 50 years of continuous, active service.

Mr. President, I join with the members of the Ogontz Fire Company in wish-

ing John Gottschalk congratulations on his half a century of dedicated public service, and I ask unanimous consent that a Philadelphia Bulletin article describing his career be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

FIRE COMPANY WILL HONOR 50-YEAR, DEAF VETERANS

(By Judy Tucker)

If John Gottschalk couldn't read lips, he would not have found out about the party. Or about the watch that will be presented to him next month by the Ogontz Volunteer Fire company, Cheltenham township.

Gottschalk just happened to be looking when some of the firehouse crew were discussing plans to honor him for his 50 years of active service.

Gottschalk, 67, doesn't seem to mind that the surprise was spoiled. He is enjoying the anticipation.

Born deaf, Gottschalk attended special schools so he could learn to read lips and to

make the guttural sounds which his close friends and family have come to understand.

During an interview last week, Gottschalk used sounds and motions to tell the story of his fire company service to his wife.

Mrs. Gottschalk repeated it to a reporter. "From the time he was five years old, he says he wanted to be a fireman," Mrs. Gottschalk said. "His father was chief at Ogontz and his four brothers were all firemen there . . . all of them officers and one of them was Cheltenham Township fire marshal."

Mrs. Gottschalk said the women's auxiliary of the fire company had been founded by her mother-in-law and the fire training center, on Tookany Creek Parkway, named in memory of his brother William.

On John Gottschalk's 17th birthday, in 1924, he joined the Ogontz Fire Company—then located on Old York road, just north of the Reading Railroad overpass. At that time, however, no one under the age of 21 could serve as a fire fighter. So Gottschalk had to satisfy himself with the chores of a "junior fireman"—polishing the trucks at the firehouse and working as a "runner," or message carrier.

Since his 21st birthday, however, he has been an active member of the Ogontz Com-

pany, racking up hundreds of hours each year at fires, in training sessions and just by doing chores around the firehouse.

Jack Washington, Ogontz fire chief, calls Gottschalk "a remarkable man . . . a really great person."

"WE DON'T CARRY HIM"

"With his handicap, he can't get right into a hazardous situation because all of our commands are verbal," Washington said. "But there are so many things that John does efficiently on the fire ground (at the scene of a fire). He can drag hose, set up lights and service the equipment."

Washington said that Gottschalk has taught every member of the fire company the art of recoupling hose.

"You see, we don't just carry him along," the chief said. "He is an active, contributing member of the company . . . and really is looked up to at the firehouse."

Washington lives directly across Rock lane from Gottschalk. Whenever the chief leaves his house at night to go to a fire, the red, flashing lights on his car alert Gottschalk to get to the firehouse.

STILL WORKING

Daytime fires are no problem.

Gottschalk—now retired from his job as a wire plater—works as a handyman at a restaurant next door to the firehouse. When the siren sounds during working hours, Gottschalk's boss gives him a signal and permission to leave.

On March 2 the Ogontz Fire Company will hold its 82d annual banquet. Gottschalk will be honored that night as the first member to complete 50 years of continuous, active service.

URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, for the second year in succession, the U.S. Forest Service submitted a plan to the Agriculture Department for inclusion in this year's budget which would have established a research unit on the campus of the State university of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry at Syracuse University. For the second year in a row, the project was not included in the Department's budget submission to the Congress.

I think this is a vital project and I feel that it should be added to the budget at the congressional level. What follows is a summary of the program and I call the attention of my colleagues to it and ask for their support.

Every State in the Nation, particularly throughout megalopolis, is currently involved in an environment-energy crisis—caused mainly because much of the information needed to apply ecological criteria in land use policies is lacking. The maintenance and protection of environmental quality—while at the same time meeting the energy crisis—has become a firm national commitment and an integral part of our institutions and values.

At the same time, man's misuse of forest and water resources throughout megalopolis has caused a regional kaleidoscope of conditions that are so lacking in concern for the basic underlying needs of society for ecological support

systems as to make land use planning an exercise in futility.

The idea that unlimited, uncontrolled growth is good is no longer an unquestioned dogma. Indeed, quite the contrary, communities across the land are alarmed by pollution, congestion, ugliness, sprawl, decaying neighborhoods, and a shortage of energy. Many aspects of the problems are tied inexorably to the destruction of open space, forest conditions, and water resources that are required for community enhancement and life support systems.

Some communities are attacking these problems. Vermont now strictly regulates development of mountainsides. Delaware has outlawed heavy industry along her coasts. Florida has adopted a tough land-use bill. Oregon, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Colorado, and a dozen other States are considering moves which a few years ago would have been denounced as un-American.

The California Supreme Court has held that the State's Environmental Quality Act applies to licensing activities as well as State projects. This interpretation, which follows the explicit intent of the National Environmental Policy Act, had a drastic positive impact on California building permit practices.

One thing is certain. We must begin to look at the use of open space and forest resources—that surround and interlock our metropolitan centers—from a very long-range point of view. That means not decades but generations. For example, the city fathers of Los Angeles would never have torn up their commuter rail lines back in the 1920's if they had anticipated the air pollution and energy crisis consequences of relying almost entirely on the automobile as a means of transportation. Nor, if New Jersey had it to do over again, would they probably convert so much priceless farm land into tract housing and shopping centers, at the price of sacrificing valuable watershed resources needed for metropolitan man's survival.

Some of our society tends to see many such decisions that eventually destroy our air, water, soil, flora and fauna, as ill considered choices. In reality, however, the detrimental changes we see in our natural forest and water environments around our cities were not perpetuated by unwise men; these changes were set in motion by decisionmakers who simply did not have the knowledge and facts necessary to calculate the long-range impact of their policies.

Before ecological criteria can be applied in forest land-use policies, a major Forest Service research effort is needed in at least three interrelated problem areas. First, ecological baseline information through biological research is needed to insure adequate understanding of the forest environment as it relates to the soil, water, and forest vegetation. Second, systems analysis research needs to measure the impact of present and future technology and social systems—and to forecast the consequences of these systems on the ecological baseline data. Finally, multidisciplinary teams of political scientists, biologists, and systems analysts must synthesize the information

gathered in the first two phases and suggest or document imaginative courses of action that will insure the ecological integrity of those forest environments within and surrounding metropolitan regions of the Northeast that are required for man's ultimate survival.

As part of its Pinchot Institute program, the Northeastern Forest Experiment Station of the U.S. Forest Service plans to establish a research project at Syracuse, N.Y., on these complex problems. The first stage of this research effort will require \$425,000 in fiscal year 1975 and the second stage an additional \$425,000 in fiscal year 1976.

INCREASED BENEFITS FOR VETERANS

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that our returning Vietnam veterans receive the fair break they need to reenter the mainstream of American life. Jobs are hard enough to find in 1974, but is especially difficult for veterans who must compete with civilians who have already established themselves in the work force.

In order to make up for this lost time, veterans must be given every opportunity to receive a good education or useful vocational training. But because of spiraling inflation and skyrocketing tuitions, today's veterans often cannot afford to undertake the educational training they need to lead productive and satisfying lives. It is a sad fact of life that the soaring cost of living has prevented the Vietnam veteran from receiving the same break that we provided the returning World War II veteran. Moreover, without remedial action, it is clear that the present-day veteran would be in great danger of slipping even further behind in the way of benefits.

For this reason, I am pleased to note the recent action of the Congress in extending and increasing the educational and training allowances to Vietnam veterans under the GI bill.

On February 19 of this year, the House of Representatives unanimously approved a 5-year \$2.1 billion program which would increase the allowances and extend the eligibility period for Vietnam era veterans. Specifically, this program would increase educational and training benefits by 13.6 percent and extend the period of eligibility for benefits from the present 8 years following discharge to 10 years.

These increases, which are needed just to keep pace with inflation, are significantly larger than the meager 8 percent increase recommended by President Nixon in the state of the Union address.

I believe that the increase in veterans benefits must reflect the dramatic rise in the cost of living and the cost of education. The President's program does not do this. The recent action by the

House of Representatives goes a long way in meeting this goal.

It is also important that today's veterans be given more flexibility to choose the educational programs that suit their particular needs. The number of years that a veteran is eligible for benefits is a prime ingredient in fashioning one's educational program. Where a single veteran may be able to finish his education in 4 years, one with heavy family responsibilities may take several years. While I have cosponsored legislation which would eliminate these time requirements entirely, the extension of the eligibility period by 2 years under the House-passed bill is a significant improvement over the present situation.

HALL BARTLETT AND "JONATHAN LIVINGSTON SEAGULL"

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, in these times of unrest both at home and abroad, it gives me great pleasure to call your attention to a remarkable motion picture and the man responsible for bringing it to the screen. The film is "Jonathan Livingston Seagull," and the producer-director is the distinguished filmmaker Hall Bartlett. The inspirational theme of the Richard Bach book, which has become one of the greatest literary successes in modern times, has been transferred to the screen by Mr. Bartlett with the dedicated care of a man who has already received many honors for making films of the highest quality. This was not a typical Hollywood production in which a bestseller was developed into a film project primarily for financial reward. Mr. Bartlett read the book while it was still relatively unknown, and from that day forward he had but one mission in life, to bring it to the screen. Many of his peers expressed the opinion that the philosophical content of the book was so delicate that it could not be made into a film.

Bartlett undertook the challenge, developing photographic techniques that had never been used before to bring the majestic sweep of the story to the screen intact. Instead of calling upon the major studios for financing, he risked his own money to the point of mortgaging his home to complete the film and retain artistic control. The critical acclaim awarded the film by many of the Nation's foremost critics proves that his faith was justified.

In this period of our history when so much emphasis is being focused on the negative aspects of life, it is, indeed, gratifying to see an artist step forward with an inspirational work that is uplifting to man. This film, distributed by Paramount Pictures, promises to become one of the great motion picture classics that will be viewed by generations to come. It gives me the greatest pleasure to salute Mr. Bartlett and his film, "Jonathan Livingston Seagull."

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES
CENTENNIAL

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1974, I was privileged to take part in the centennial convocation at the Colorado School of Mines. This institution, which has a worldwide reputation for academic excellence in mining and mineral technology, will play an increasingly important role as we search for new sources of energy. Under the leadership of its president, Dr. Guy McBride, the School of Mines is prepared to meet its obligations to the public, and I know its second 100 years will be as productive as the first 100 have been.

The main speaker at the centennial convocation was Mr. David Rockefeller, chairman of the Board of the Chase Manhattan Bank. Mr. Rockefeller addressed himself to the challenges facing our country with respect to energy in a concise, straightforward fashion. I believe many of my colleagues would appreciate the opportunity to peruse Mr. Rockefeller's remarks. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I include them in the RECORD at this point:

LIVING IN AN ENERGY-SCARCE WORLD

(Address by David Rockefeller)

I'm delighted to have this opportunity to participate in today's Convocation. From the impressive roster of guests who have been with you these past two days, I can see that you've had a most interesting and productive experience—as well as a lot of stiff competition for any speaker to follow.

There is, of course, a special excitement in being part of the one-hundredth anniversary of The School of Mines—an institution renowned throughout the world as a center of learning for mining and mineral technology.

In my own case, I also have to admit to a certain layman's sense of awe on the occasion. Being trained myself in economics, I particularly value a chance to associate with experts noted for their practical accomplishments. As you may know, it has been said by some that one could stretch out all the world economists end-to-end and never reach a conclusion!

Although I would hesitate to pass so harsh a judgment on my fellows in the economics profession, nevertheless, viewing the many serious problems we face, there is one conclusion that all of us, including economists, can reach: namely, it is clear that the world will be increasingly reliant in the years ahead on engineers as creators of technology. As we find ourselves living more and more in a world which is running short of energy and other natural resources, we have to be guided to a far greater degree by expert advice on both the limits and the potential of technological innovation.

Many have long sought to bring concern with our dwindling resources closer to the American consciousness, though their audiences have been very small in number and reluctant to respond. It was some 40 years ago that humorist Will Rogers was reminding the nation that, while the pioneer was usually thought of as a hero, he could also be seen as a man who cut down a tree and never planted one, and who plowed under grass that perhaps should have been left undisturbed.

From long before Rogers' time, we have

had a history of often wasteful and short-sighted consumption of our resources and a misdirection of the benefits of technology.

Since we've done precious little about either, the energy crisis may prove to be a blessing in disguise—though, as one commentator has noted, a blessing that is exceedingly well disguised.

Americans are finally realizing that our prosperity and our life-style depend on energy and other resources which have limits, and on technologies which are not magical but also have limits and require vast investments. Now, perhaps at long last, the nation will be prepared to take the very difficult steps that are necessary to any real solution to the problem of both short- and long-range resource shortages. Today I shall confine myself to a discussion of the shortage of energy, although shortages in other natural resources are also very acute.

In approaching the energy crisis, I believe there are at least three critical steps we must take.

First, we must sharply curtail over the next several years the growth of our energy usage and focus energy allocations on those areas most critical for the country's overall economy.

Second, we must stress much more than we have in the past, self-sufficiency in meeting long-term energy needs. Toward this end, we must devise better ways to make vitally needed capital available to the energy industry, as well as to evaluate realistically the trade-offs between our energy and environmental priorities.

Finally, we must recognize that, while self-sufficiency in energy, as in anything else, gives one a sense of independence and security, the energy problem is a global one which will demand global, and not parochial, solutions. Thus, we must cooperate with other nations of the world in finding more universal answers.

On the first point, we already know that the oil embargo and price rises by the oil-producing nations have taken a considerable toll. We at Chase project a period of economic recession during the first half of the year both at home and abroad, in large part directly attributable to the impact of the embargo.

The embargo, however, was only a worsening factor in an already bad situation. For some time now, we have been moving toward a serious strain on our energy capacity, as consumption has continued to increase rapidly while our major domestic supplies, for various reasons, have not kept pace.

For example, at a time when domestic reserves of natural gas have been steadily dwindling, the artificially low, government-controlled price of gas in the United States has discouraged new investment by the industry to find new gas and oil sources.

By the same token, very little new oil refining capacity has been added in the past several years, in part due to the unwillingness of States and regions to permit the construction of new refineries because of environmental concerns as well as uncertainties surrounding new auto pollution control standards, and in part due to the delay of the Alaska pipeline which reduced the rate of growth in domestic production.

Furthermore, environmental concerns and community opposition have both blocked the building of new nuclear energy facilities and encouraged the use of gas as a replacement for coal as a fuel.

For all these reasons, our domestic generation of energy, coupled with expected imports, is not likely to be sufficient to sustain a growing, high employment economy through 1974, 1975, and 1976, regardless of what happens to Mideast oil imports!

The present system of allocation and voluntary conservation measures so far adopted by the Administration may be enough to get us through the period of the

embargo's immediate effects and the normal high energy demands of winter. In addition, sharply higher gasoline prices will put moderate downward pressure on demand and accelerate changes such as the already noticeable shift to smaller cars.

All these factors, however, will not produce miracles. In the months ahead, we will have to bite the bullet a good deal harder than we are at present.

To protect the base of our economy, we must further reduce gasoline and heating oil consumption drastically and direct that energy to the most essential uses. This may even require rationing as the only effective—and fair—means of achieving the change. It is important to note, though, that in order to avoid a major adverse effect of the oil embargo on industry, it would be necessary to reduce private use of automobiles by 25-30%. However, anything over a 15% reduction would severely impair people's ability to get to work and shop. Thus cutting back car usage enough to be really effective is no panacea.

This brings me to the second major step toward living in an energy-scarce world—the hard task of developing new and expanded energy resources in the United States.

Energy self-sufficiency has great emotional appeal, especially in view of the international political aspects of the current crisis. And the present deprivation will doubtless make it easy to get universal agreement that something should be done to guarantee a more secure source of domestic energy in the longer-term. The question of what should be done, however, will elicit considerable controversy.

I need not dwell before this audience on the technical aspects of achieving greater self-sufficiency. With higher prices of crude oil, we may be able to develop more economical methods of extracting oil and gas from coal, our most abundant fossil fuel resource. We can further develop nuclear power which could conceivably generate up to 35% of our necessary electricity in another decade. We can learn to tap our huge supplies of oil shale such as those here in Colorado. We can pursue research into more exotic power sources such as solar energy and the conversion of hydrogen, though substantial benefits here are probably for a more remote future. Most importantly, we can encourage new discoveries and increased production of oil and gas, including greater emphasis on offshore wells.

In all of these cases, it is immediately obvious that tough choices between energy generation and environmental priorities must be made. The effects of strip-mining for coal, thermal pollution from nuclear energy, and the risk of spills from offshore drilling are all important environmental concerns. But these concerns, can also be viewed as obstacles to developing the only resources we have as a nation to meet more fully our energy needs on our own.

I do not believe for a moment that we should or that we need to abandon our national goals to achieve rigorous environmental standards. At the same time, I am convinced that we must recognize more clearly than we have the costs involved in terms of national security, vital services, and jobs. In my judgment we must avoid sensational slogans and must weigh very carefully the complex ramifications of the options available to us. We should strive for a sensible balance between our energy needs and our ecological concerns.

Equally important as a factor in meeting domestic energy needs, we must face some tough decisions involving the availability of capital for the U.S. energy industry.

No matter what new sources are developed, oil will have to supply at least 50% of this country's vastly increased energy needs up to 1985. As things stand today, the U.S. will have to import half its total crude oil con-

sumption by that year, as compared with only a third at present. Furthermore, our greatest reliance will be on Middle Eastern and North African supplies.

This not only has political implications involving a dependency that most Americans find distasteful. If not unacceptable, it is also a monstrous economic prospect. Even at the old prices of a few months ago, the cost of such an import level would be \$25 billion annually, an impossible burden on the U.S. balance of payments and, consequently, a disruption to orderly world trade and monetary stability. At the new prices, the costs would be astronomical—perhaps prohibitive.

However difficult, the only tenable option is to encourage a new and improved domestic oil production. Here, the major challenge for the U.S. oil industry will be finding ways to finance the huge new investment that is involved.

Economists at Chase estimate that to meet the anticipated consumption of the years from 1970 to 1985, our domestic petroleum industry will need some \$450 billion in financing. This enormous amount can come, of course, from only two sources—industry earnings and borrowings.

I'll have more to say in a moment about borrowings, but it is reasonable to assume that external sources of capital cannot meet anything like the entire need. Some large portion of new investment outlays will have to be made out of increased industry earnings.

This will inevitably mean higher prices for domestic petroleum products ranging from crude oil to gasoline and derivatives. Because of the crisis, the entire energy industry has become closely regulated, and the prices of petroleum products are likely to remain strictly controlled by government for the foreseeable future.

It will be up to Washington, then, to decide, after the immediate crisis has been "weathered," if the industry is to receive the needed inflow of cash to sustain the needed outflow of investment.

The political temptation will be all too great to give consumers a supposed "break" by holding product prices down. Americans will do well to shun such "breaks," however, for they will pay dearly for them in ensuing years.

Another source of added income for investment that is under public policy control would be increased tax incentives for oil exploration and other energy development. Unfortunately, the drift of political sentiment over recent years—and, indeed, in recent weeks has been against such tax devices as the oil depletion allowance. The present prospect is that the depletion allowance may be eliminated altogether.

Once again, perhaps the energy crisis will be a blessing in disguise if it serves to bring home to Americans why needed tax incentives are not "loopholes." There is a clear and immediate necessity for less fantasy and more facts in determining an appropriate and realistic tax status for the oil and other energy industries.

Without added funds from these and other sources, it will be impossible to undertake the massive research and development required for a greater degree of energy self-sufficiency.

Even under the best of circumstances, anything approaching self-sufficiency in energy is a long way off—probably around 1990! The cost, in any event, would be enormous and we must ask ourselves how far in this direction we really want to go. Moreover, even if we were to achieve this goal, the impact of energy shortages, shortages on others would continue to have profound economic, trade and political ramifications that will affect us as well.

It must be recognized that the energy challenge is global, requiring nothing less than global solutions. I would like to close

with a few of the directions I see those solutions taking.

First, we must not forget that the rest of the world—including our friends in Europe and Japan—has far heavier dependence on oil imports than we—and no chance for self-sufficiency. We must strengthen trilateral ties among Europe, Japan and North America in an effort to find solutions for all countries.

Second, the development needs of the oil industry worldwide are increasing even faster than our domestic needs. At Chase, we estimate a global financing requirement for the industry exceeding \$1.3 trillion for the period 1970-1985! Funding this requirement, obviously, will require the closest international cooperation in a number of ways.

Third, a truly global approach including the Communist countries should enable the Western nations to draw upon important energy resources such as natural gas in the U.S.S.R. and other parts of Eastern Europe. This would be consistent with our policy of détente and expanded East-West trade.

Finally, when peace and stability have been restored to the Middle East, the political climate should again make possible a clear view of the mutual interest of the large oil-producing nations and the large oil-consuming nations in a fair and uninterrupted market for oil.

The single most important step toward living in an energy-scarce world is insuring the fair and responsible allocation of energy among the nations of the world. Where oil is concerned, the large producers and large consumers will have to sit down together at some point to resolve their differences and work with one another on the allocation question, as well as on the development of an energy industry that will keep pace with the needs of all nations.

An indispensable ingredient needed to accomplish this is the means to finance vast new investments by the world's energy industry.

This is in part a problem of marshaling large amounts of capital in the right place at the right time. In the face of capital shortages aggravating a mounting global crisis in energy, the nations of the world have for years seriously restricted the flow of that most basic resource to the points of greatest need.

In this regard, it was very encouraging to note less than two weeks ago that the United States ended several major controls over the movement of dollars abroad. Hopefully, this will be an enduring step toward the elimination of all barriers to the free flow of capital funds across national boundaries. Controls are a two-way street and the demise of these American restrictions should lead to increased foreign investment in the United States, as well as more American investment abroad.

The highest priority must be given to encouraging unimpeded access to capital globally. The U.S. tax system, for example, can make international investment more attractive by eliminating withholding taxes on interest and dividends from foreign investments in the U.S. This would stimulate an inflow of billions of dollars.

Neither the United States nor any other nation will be able to count on a secure energy supply over the long term without facing up to this fundamental challenge.

Of course, a closely related problem is where to find the huge amounts of funds needed. I mentioned with regard to the U.S. oil industry that borrowings would no doubt account for a sizable portion of the need, and this is true of the industry worldwide. But where beyond traditional sources can funds be found?

One answer is to look to the huge earnings of the oil producing nations—which are growing so large as to create a monetary threat unless some creative solution can be found. Based on a recent trip to the Middle East,

I believe these nations can be persuaded it is in their interest to put a portion of their earnings to use for the further development of the world's energy industry.

They have an opportunity to supply much of the capital needed to expand vastly the horizons of our energy technology and production over the coming decades. By the year 2000, the world cannot possibly hope to depend as much on fossil fuel sources for its energy needs, and the full-scale development of alternative sources is one of the energy industry's greatest—and most capital-expensive—challenges. The industrial nations should welcome the participation of the producing nations in this gigantic but essential endeavor.

If an appropriate mechanism were established that would assure the oil producers of an ample return on a long-term basis, I think they would see the wisdom of such an investment. They realize that their oil reserves are limited and that the hundreds of billions of dollars they will have earned from oil should be well placed by the time these reserves are depleted—for otherwise these are resource-poor countries.

Both oil producers and consumers share a responsibility to future generations to assure a continued supply of energy from new sources. We are now dependent for our economic well-being on setting a match to precious resources that took millions of years to come into being and are consumed in an instant. Surely, we must all accept the burden of finding some replacement for what we use.

There are numerous diplomatic and other problems to overcome, but creating some kind of credit pool mechanism that would make a portion of the oil earnings of producing nations available to energy companies throughout the world for future development would constitute a giant step toward fulfilling this responsibility.

Short-term conservation, building self-sufficiency, cooperating on global aspects of a global problem—these, then, are some of the steps toward living in an energy-scarce world I believe we must be prepared to take.

They are by no means easy, however, and will demand hard work, sacrifice and great effort from all of us—and especially from the highly trained specialists of The School of Mines and their professional colleagues everywhere in the world.

Recently, I read in the press of one man who has developed a uniquely imaginative approach of his own to the energy crisis. He's a 92-year-old dentist in Florida and his solution is to stop talking for four days a week, because, as he says, "We lose more energy through the mouth than anywhere else!"

With that admonition in mind, I'll simply close by saying that, with regard to energy, we've been both a prodigal and a lucky nation. Our luck, like our oil, is now running out. Given a reasoned strategy and serious determination, however, I am convinced we can transform the current crisis into a real opportunity for national growth and international cooperation.

THE GREAT PROTEIN ROBBERY: NO. 14

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 93d Congress I rose on 13 separate occasions to warn my colleagues in the House of the very serious danger that within our lifetime we

might see the end of the U.S. commercial fishing industry and the resulting loss of a great source of protein. The reason for this serious situation is simple: Unregulated foreign overfishing in our rich offshore waters is literally sweeping the ocean floor clean of all forms of fish life with no regard for size limitations, spawning females or conservation measures to insure the continuation of any species. These vastly superior, Government-subsidized foreign fishing fleets are literally robbing us of not only a valuable source of protein but the livelihood of thousands of American fishermen.

The passage of the bill designating the American lobster a creature of the Continental Shelf was a good first step in reversing this trend. We can now give this uniquely American shellfish the protection of U.S. law—regulating the foreign fishing of this species which is found only in the waters of the Northwest Atlantic. But we must do more.

I am the sponsor of an interim 200-mile fish conservation zone bill which now has 71 cosponsors in the House. This legislation would extend our legal authority over fishermen to 200 miles off our shores. It would not affect our present 3-mile territorial waters. It would give us the chance to begin regulating foreign fishermen now while we still have fish left to protect. If and when the Law of the Sea Conference reaches some international agreement on fisheries jurisdiction, this bill would be superseded. I urge my colleagues to give this legislation their urgent consideration and to contact me if they have any questions.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to continue to bring to the attention of this body the seriousness of this situation. I enter in the RECORD at this point an excellent article by Mr. Paul Kempreco of the Cape Codder of Orleans, Mass., entitled "Haddock Headed for Extinction?":

FISHING

HADDOCK HEADED FOR EXTINCTION?

(By Paul Kempreco)

The first thing you notice about Dr. Robert Livingstone's laboratory is its size. It hasn't any to speak of. Perhaps 12 by 12 feet crammed with book shelves, reports, every inch of desk or counter space covered with something or other, a microscope, calculator, electric mixer, on the walls charts, color photos of fish reproductive parts, vials containing mysterious looking fatty blobs.

And in the corner by the window overlooking Woods Hole Harbor a contraption made up of large glass containers, plastic tubes, and strange gadgets all leading somehow into an electronic calculator.

Bob Livingstone is a tallish, pleasant faced man with gray hair and moustache. With his glasses, navy blue crew neck sweater and tan cotton slacks he looks very much like a marine biologist which, in fact, he is.

Dr. Livingstone is with the Marine Fisheries Service. He is also probably the only one doing any sort of detailed research on haddock, their biology and reproduction. He's been at it since 1968. That was shortly after the haddock, a species once so abundant that it filled the nets of fishermen in search of cod, began its slide into a population decline that seems to be heading toward extinction.

We went to see Dr. Livingstone with three general questions in mind: what is the status of the haddock? Have conservation measures worked? And what is the future of the species?

The haddock is part of the family that also includes cod, pollock and the hakes. It has several obvious differences from the cod. It is smaller (a haddock over 30 inches long is rare). And it has a smaller mouth in proportion. The most distinctive mark of the haddock is the black patch on its shoulder known as the "devil's thumbprint."

Haddock live deeper than cod and their range in the North Atlantic is restricted by the fact that they live at temperatures from about 34 to 50 degrees and in depths of less than 600 feet.

Almost all haddock landed through the years have come from three areas: the Grand Banks, the Nova Scotian shelf and easterly of Cape Cod. They spawn in the spring, usually in March or April off New England. A female may produce from 150,000 to one million eggs. The fish matures in three years and can reproduce at this age. An adult haddock will be about 16 to 18 inches and 1½ to 2 pounds in weight.

Fishermen know that the abundance of the haddock has always varied from year to year regardless of the fishery. The crop is dependent on several variables, the number of larvae that hatch, the number that survive and the number that stays in the same general area.

Haddock was once less favored than cod. But later, at Chatham, for instance, haddock replaced cod as a major catch before its numbers began to diminish. Or as one Chatham fisherman described the situation: "haddock? that's an extinct animal."

Most haddock has not been caught with the long line trawl method used in Chatham but by net. Until 1960 most haddock fishing was conducted by U.S. fishermen. In 1962 Canada and Russia came into the fishery. In 1964 these two countries caught a quarter of the 140 million pounds of haddock taken on Georges Bank. In 1965 more than 330 million pounds were taken on Georges but this was because the foreign fleets exploited a bumper crop.

The catch that year may have dealt the death blow to the haddock fishery and possibly the haddock as a species.

Shortly after that big catch an international agreement was reached on the size of the mesh of nets used. Next it was agreed to close off part of the haddock spawning grounds for a part of each year. Quotas were established as well.

Dr. Livingstone's project started as the haddock population appeared to be skidding to an all time low. Working with the help of college students, he planned to look into the reproductive biology of the haddock. He wanted information on its sexual maturity and the structure of spawning patterns as they related to the fishery.

He hoped to explore the questions of how spawning is affected by fishing. For instance, if fishing reduced the fish population, did that mean that the growth rate of the survivors might change? He also wanted to study the egg production or "fecundity" of the female haddock. The last detailed information on this was published in the 1880's. Dr. Livingstone is now ready to summarize and publish his findings.

One of the problems with a fish that lays a million eggs is how to count them. A million eggs could fit into an empty nip of Jack Daniels with room for company.

Haddock were caught during trips on the research vessel "Albatross IV." Plugs, or core samples were taken from the ovaries which are elongated fatty looking globs several inches long. Each plug contained between 12,000 and 65,000 eggs.

The plugs are mixed to separate the eggs and whirled in a container with water. They move along plastic tubes and past a photoelectric cell to be caught in another container. The electric eye counts the passing eggs and the figure registers on an electronic calculator.

Dr. Livingstone said the haddock fishery is in serious trouble. In 1972 US fishing vessels only brought in 4700 metric tons, not even making the allowable quota of 5000. In 1964 from the same area fishing boats got 57,027 tons.

The last successful spawning of haddock was in 1963. Some of those spawned then are still providing part of the current catch. On its spring survey in 1972 the Albatross found that 39 per cent of the samples were three years old from the 1969 class year.

"There really isn't enough spawning to really make a dent in the fishing," Dr. Livingstone said. The fishermen are running into a smaller haddock, 35 to 40 centimeters, on south east Georges.

He said "we may be getting a change in the growth rate." But some fish are being caught before they have a chance to mature. With the high price of haddock fishermen are bringing in even the smaller "snapper schrod" that might have been passed up before.

Dr. Livingstone said that the accelerated growth rate might be caused by a warming cycle or it might be because the population has been reduced so much that more food is available. It might be a way Nature has of compensating for a decrease in the population of a species.

He said the haddock had its real decline in the 1960's. The foreign boats fishing for herring with bottom trawls ran into the fish from that unusually good class year of 1963. In 1964 and '65 he said this class was heavily overfished. "In those two years you had those haddock before they had a chance to mature ... they were really overfished."

He said he didn't think the conservation methods have had very much of an effect on the fisheries. If they had been instituted earlier they would have, he said. "I think the fishery is in pretty serious condition because the price is high."

He said a problem is that haddock are often taken in mixed catches with other species, making control difficult. "This is quite a problem when you talk about conservation."

He said there has been a small spurt of fish in the last year or so. It is probably from the 1972 spawning. He said some New Bedford fishermen are excited over this increase but the pattern is that when the fish are caught at the age of two or three years, the numbers are so depleted that the survivors probably can't contribute much to the population when they do become mature.

It would appear that several conclusions can be drawn from the research. The haddock is maturing earlier. Females taken in 1973 have had more eggs proportionately than those caught in 1972. And the number of haddock is showing a small increase.

There are still questions to be answered, Dr. Livingstone said. How big an adult population is needed to perpetuate the fishery? What happens when cod and haddock spawn at the same time?

Dr. Livingstone said the "bump" in the population is a good sign but what it means in terms of the future of the haddock is anyone's guess.

Outside of the establishment of some sort of 200 mile limit, Dr. Livingstone said, the only major help for the haddock might be its scarcity. "In terms of the total amount of fish it might not be economically feasible to continue fishing this species."

CITIZENS SUPPORT PRESIDENT

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a petition from my district upon

which a number of citizens affixed their signatures in support "for the President of the United States and the Presidency as a coordinate branch of Government" and requesting me to make known their views to this body.

This request I am pleased to grant by placing these names in the RECORD at this point:

LIST OF SIGNATURES

Mrs. A. C. Woodall, Gerald Goldberg, Mickie Morris, Terry Johnson, Charles F. Warring, Marjorie Luton, Dorothy B. Simmonds.

Suzanne Williamgan, Katherine H. Banay, Louis W. Davis, Mrs. Betty A. Bandy, Jonathan Harold Bandy, G. Wilson Simmonds, Geo. W. Chance, Mrs. Geo. W. Chance.

SOLZHENITSYN

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, the recent action of the Soviet Government sending the great writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn into exile should be a lesson to all Americans regarding the price one must pay for freedom of thought and freedom of speech in a totalitarian society. He pointed out to the world by the power of his pen the sufferings of millions of people in forced labor camps. Although Russia under the rule of the Czars punished its dissidents, Solzhenitsyn has documented that the punishments under the Communist regime in Russia made the Czarist persecutions—in style and in numbers—insignificant by comparison.

Solzhenitsyn's "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich" provided an indictment of Communist tyranny as well as the story of one man's heroic spirit in struggling to survive in one of the Soviet work camps. The columnist James Jackson Kilpatrick wrote an excellent column on this literary figure entitled "Solzhenitsyn Shows Force of Truth" which appeared in the Washington Star-News of February 20, 1974. It is a fine tribute to this brave man.

SOLZHENITSYN SHOWS FORCE OF TRUTH

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The first stories last week on the arrest of Alexander Solzhenitsyn said that the Russian police sent seven men to pick him up. Seven men! If laughter can be found in this affair, let us find laughter here.

Seven men! The masters of the Kremlin might as well have sent a battalion, or two divisions, or a thousand armored cars. In making this arrest, the many would have been as helpless as the few.

How do you arrest an idea? How do you put truth in irons? They came too late for Solzhenitsyn. They should have seized him 50 years ago, before the boy learned to write.

The story speaks at two levels of time and truth. The first has to do with the Soviet Union in this century. The second has to do with man past and man future.

Nothing could more clearly reveal the fundamental weakness of communism—the rotten core at the heart of the ideology—than the story of Solzhenitsyn. A vast deal of nonsense has been written in recent years to the effect that the Communist revolution has "matured," or "come of age." Specialists in Kremlinology have found "cracks in the Iron Curtain." The cheery watchword is "detente."

Yet nothing has changed, nothing at all. Communism is as fearful, as suspicious, as paranoid as it was in the bloody day of Stalin. The party cannot rule by region; it can rule by force alone. In Hungary, in Czechoslovakia, in Poland, on Gorky Street last week, it is always the same: Dissent is equated with heresy, and public criticism with darkest treason. The Soviet Union has the mightiest army on earth, the greatest navy and the deadliest missiles. And the Soviet Union is afraid—afraid of a novelist, afraid of a man's ideas.

But the encouraging thing—the part of the story that lifts us up—is that man endures. For 50 years the Communist masters have labored to put out the fires of human freedom. They have made the press an instrument of propaganda. They have herded their children into state nurseries. They have purged their libraries and monopolized the book stalls. They have jammed the air waves and stopped up the people's ears. They have banned travel in the free world. They have corrupted law and perverted education.

Solzhenitsyn is 55. He was reared in this darkness, punished by imprisonment, denied access to every tool that might sharpen his intellect. But the fires cannot be wholly extinguished. The spark never quite goes out. It is a lesson that tyrants learn in time: Something in the soul of stubborn man goes on. They could pave Red Square with granite blocks and cover the blocks with thick concrete. One day, in some distant spring, a seed still would come up.

To speak in terms of man or of mankind is to speak in abstract terms. Survival is personal. It manifests itself in the one human being—Joan at the stake, Luther at the door, Patrick Henry in a schoolhouse, Rosa Parks in an Alabama bus. The trees of freedom are metaphorical trees, but they are watered in real blood and tears. Solzhenitsyn is a symbol; he is also a very courageous man.

As for today's world, it has to be said that his act of martyrdom will not accomplish much. He has not loosened so much as one stone in the monolith. The Russian people will not be roused to counter-revolution. After a week or two, when the story drops out of the news, detente will continue as before. If Solzhenitsyn had been executed or imprisoned, the prospect might be different, but the Kremlin masters are brutal, not stupid. Exile, even brilliant exile, get to be tedious old men. Banishment was better.

Yet things will not be precisely as before. Within the Soviet Union, the story will be told, and told again, of how the seven came for Solzhenitsyn; and under the snows of Russia the story will sleep like a single, indomitable seed.

INCOME TAX REFORM OR TAX FORM SIMPLIFICATION?

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine, Liz Carpenter, who many of us know, called to my attention a survey made by Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton, N.J., concerning taxpayer opinion of the Federal tax system.

Mrs. Carpenter provided me a complete copy of the survey and I understand copies can be obtained from Mrs. Carpenter or the H & R Block Co. which commissioned Opinion Research Corp. to do this piece of research and whose address is 4410 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo. 64111.

I think most Members would be inter-

ested in the following statement that briefly summarizes the survey:

U.S. TAXPAYERS OPT FOR REFORM FIRST, 6 TO 1.

PRINCETON, N.J., February 26.—Given a choice, would American taxpayers opt for federal income tax law changes aimed first at assuring that each person pays his fair share or at simplification or the calculation of taxes due?

How does the public consider it is now treated by the Federal government at tax-paying time, fairly? Unfairly? O.K.?

These and other questions were asked recently of a representative sample of 2,073 persons age 18 and above in a nationwide public opinion survey conducted by Opinion Research Corporation of Princeton at the assignment of H & R Block Inc., the nation's leading income tax service firm.

Not surprisingly, the survey found that no tax is popular with the American public. Opinions on the federal income tax were mixed. The majority of respondents felt that present federal income tax laws were fair to them personally, but about the same number believed that tax laws are unfair to the "average" taxpayer.

Middle income people were most often named as paying more than their "fair share" of federal income tax. The second ranking group in this category was the low-income segment. Last named were people in the upper income brackets. Also, in a direct comparison with the upper income taxpayer, the middle income taxpayer was seen to be unfairly treated by an overwhelming majority (87%) of the public.

On the question of an overall need for reform, more than 75% of the people surveyed believed that at least minor changes in present tax laws were needed, while more than 50% supported major revisions.

Nearly 75% of the respondents agreed that present tax forms were "too complicated for the average person to understand." However, tax reforms aimed at ensuring fairness rather than simplification were favored by a margin of better than six to one (79% to 12%). And, the survey indicated, nearly half the public believed that simplification of the tax process would result in unfair treatment of taxpayers because differing personal circumstances could no longer be considered.

Not surprisingly, public reaction was favorable to changes in tax laws which might reduce the amount of tax paid. The survey showed an overwhelming majority (85%) supported an increase in the current \$750 allowance for dependents, and 84% favored a deduction for at least some of the cost of a child's college education.

A majority of persons opposed elimination of itemized deductions or joint returns. Among those deductions of which the average taxpayer currently can take advantage, only contributions to political candidates were singled out by a sizable number (47%) as a deduction which might be eliminated.

The survey indicated that even special tax provisions benefiting investors were not opposed by a majority. The only provisions opposed by as many as a fourth of the respondents were the depletion allowance (31%) and the special tax treatment for investors in commercial real estate (25%).

Reaction to a proposal for a flat rate tax on total income, regardless of the source with no exclusions or deductions, was more favorable (45%) than not (30%). However, the survey indicated respondents were fairly evenly divided in their opinion of how a flat rate tax would affect them individually. About 48% of the public believed that such a flat rate system either would have no effect on the amount of federal income tax paid, or would result in their paying more tax than at present. Perhaps that accounts somewhat for the less than a majority favorable vote.

According to the study, nearly half the public sought professional assistance in the filing of their 1972 income tax returns. Of these, about half sought the help of an

accountant, and half the help of a firm specializing in preparation of tax returns.

Of those who used professional assistance, an overwhelming number (93%) indicated satisfaction with the work done, while 88% felt that the charges for these services were reasonable."

H&R Block Inc., which commissioned the survey, is headquartered in Kansas City, Mo. It has 6,500 offices throughout the country and is the nation's largest firm specializing in preparation of income tax returns.

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, a bright man from my district, whose record of achievements is as long as he is tall—6 foot 4 inches, at least—has won the Voice of Democracy contest in Kansas. Speaking on "My Responsibility as a Citizen," Steven Alan Steinbach of Winfield, Kans., delivered a very challenging message. He asks each American to make a personal vow:

... to stop living for the tomorrows, and to begin living for today. . . . A today that will guarantee life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—for everyone.

Mr. Speaker, America's future lies in the hearts of her young people—in their hopes, in their dreams, in their personal determination to shape their own destinies. Steven Steinbach bolsters my faith in youth. We are going to see a new generation of young leaders who may find better answers to our problems than any generation to date. I would like to share Steven's message with my colleagues:

VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY—"MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN"
(By Steven Steinbach)

The day is almost over. A day I will never have again. Was it wasted? Would I do it different? It was so easy to say *Tomorrow* and so hard to say *Today*. It was so easy to say *I'm busy* and so hard to say *I'm ready*. It was so easy to say *Later* and so hard to say *Now*.

The day is almost over. Did I do justice to America today, or did I shove America into a corner? Would America shove me into a corner? Did I soak the resources of this country without regard for my descendants? Did I hoard the treasures of this country without regard for my counterparts? Did I receive the bounties of this country without respect for my ancestors?

I ask myself: Today: Did I work for America, so that America was strengthened and continued? Did I speak for America so that America was defended and promoted? Did I act for America, so that America was preserved and protected? Did I pray for America, so that America was guided and directed? Did I hope for America, so that America was remembered and loved?

Or, did I even *think* of America? So today wasn't what it should have been. So I turned the other way as the sick, the needy, the hungry, and the lonely filed by. So I didn't see the emptiness and the longing in the eyes of my neighbors. So today was wasted. So today, I shoved America into the corner.

But there still is tomorrow. There still is time. There still is time to "bind up the nation's wounds, to go firmly in the right, as God shows us the right." There still is time to build a Square Deal, a New Deal, a Fair

Deal, and a Great Society. There still is time. Time for me to fulfill my responsibility as a citizen of this great country. There still is time—time to dream those impossible dreams—to fight those unbeatable foes—to right those unrightable wrongs—to climb every mountain—to reach that unreachable star.

There is more to bring a citizen of this country than loving it; supporting it; obeying it; respecting it; and defending it. There is serving it. And doing my part to guarantee that the true "American Dream" is enforced: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for *all*. For I am NOT a citizen when I eat and others do not; I am NOT a citizen when I work and others cannot; I am NOT a citizen when I am satisfied and others are not; I am NOT a citizen when I have and others have not. Americans, as well as America, must not remain in the corner.

There still is time, and there still is tomorrow. But what can I, as one and only one, what can I do? Robert Kennedy said, "Each time a man stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a mission different centers of energy and daring, those ripples build currents that can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance." The defense of my citizenship falls squarely on *my* shoulders—If I don't serve my government, and everyone was like me, no one would serve. And if I don't "dream on", and everyone was like me, no one would dream, and nothing would change.

So as today blends into tomorrow, as tomorrow becomes today, I must make one vow as a citizen of the United States of America: to stop living for the tomorrows, and to begin living for today. A today that will right the unrightable wrong. A today that will guarantee life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—for everyone.

THE 56TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, Lithuanians throughout the world observed the 56th anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence. I would like today to voice my admiration for the courage of these people and join them in paying tribute to that historic event.

Sadly enough, the only country where the people will be unable to commemorate this event will be in Lithuania itself because of the continuing domination and oppression by the Soviet Union. It is fitting then, that we in the free world rededicate ourselves at this time to the continuing struggle to free all the Baltic States from foreign domination.

Although the Lithuanians were overrun by the Communist forces in 1940 after only 22 years of independence, the flame of democracy that they lit has never been extinguished by the ruthless tactics of the Soviet Union. It has continued to grow and today provides hope for all Lithuanians that the day will soon come when their nation will once again be independent.

It is a tribute to the spirit of the Lithuanian people that they continue to risk

their lives today in their quest for freedom.

The efforts of Lithuanian-Americans in this country to keep the cause of freedom alive for their countrymen has been an inspiration to all of us who value democracy.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge my colleagues to lend their support to Mr. HANRAHAN's resolution, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, to encourage the Secretary of State and the President to seek freedom for Lithuanian seaman Simas Kudirka. Mr. Kudirka symbolizes the Lithuanian struggle for freedom, and I can think of no better way of paying tribute to this struggle than for Congress to lend its full support to this resolution.

A POET HONORS ALEXANDER SOLZHENITSYN

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the past weeks we have all been outraged and disappointed by the harsh and cruel actions taken by the Soviet Union against one of the world's greatest literary giants of our time, Alexander Solzhenitsyn. It is indeed discouraging to see and watch a man stripped of his citizenship in a desperate attempt to cut a man off from his national heritage simply for writing, for all the world to know, a devastating but well documented account of Lenin's and Stalin's reign of terror—a grim reminder of how unfree Soviet society was, and still is.

As a constituent of freedom and Democracy, a poet from Randolph, Mass., who wishes to be known only by his pen name, "Tobe," has submitted to me, in the name of the American people, the following poem in honor of Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

The poem follows:

"ALEXANDER"

For you
A Noble's just a flashing flicker
As you await the surer aura
Of purer purest Being,
Your Light
Liquidates
Lies
Like a
Laser
Listen:
Witless, conspiring
Waves whispering
Against the banks
Of the lapping lamenting
Oka Da-Da
Listen:
You can hear the hissing pulse of human-
ity unhumanized
Listen:
Feel:
In the darkest
debilitate
dastardness
of the Gulag
You can hear; feel
The cringing world cringe
But for the hope of these words the hope of
The whole world
whole world
Being out weighted out waited. Da-Da

U.S. AID BACKS CONTINUING WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, according to an important analytical article in the February 25, New York Times, American foreign aid is the main funding apparatus for the still on-going war in Vietnam.

In this significant inspection of what our aid to South Vietnam is accomplishing, David K. Shipler notes:

American military aid continues to set the course of the war more than a year after the signing of the Paris Peace Agreements and the final withdrawal of American troops.

American aid directly supports South Vietnamese violations and so breaks the spirit of the accords.

American involvement has descended from a peak of warfare to a high plateau of substantial support, dispatching not only huge quantities of weapons and ammunition, but also large numbers of American citizens who have become integral parts of the South Vietnamese supply, transport and intelligence systems.

The effect of this aid has been to provide Thieu with the muscle to forestall a political settlement. In recent months, the Saigon regime has announced that it will not allow elections called for under the Paris Agreement to be held, while at the same time, Thieu has been stepping up offensive military operations upon PRG zones.

The Shipler article brings together much of the information we have been receiving during recent months about the continuing nature of the Vietnam war and the continuing authoritarian and repressive regime in Saigon—a clique which survives only because of U.S. funding.

Or, in other words, take away American aid to Thieu and it is possible that there indeed may be an enduring political and military solution in Vietnam; continue that aid and American taxpayers can expect even higher funding of Thieu and his cohorts in the future.

The article follows:

VAST AID FROM UNITED STATES BACKS SAIGON IN CONTINUING WAR

(By David K. Shipler)

SAIGON, South Vietnam, Feb. 16.—Ray Harris of Ponca City, Okla., has come back to Vietnam. This time he is not behind the machine gun of an Army helicopter but behind a workbench at the Bien Hoa air base, sitting next to South Vietnamese Air Force men and repairing jet fighter engines.

Mr. Harris is a civilian now, safer and better paid. But his changed role in the continuing Vietnam war has scarcely diminished his importance, for a 27-year-old jet-engine mechanic he remains as vital to the South Vietnamese military as he was in 1966 as a 19-year-old helicopter gunner.

He is among 2,800 American civilians without whose skills South Vietnam's most sophisticated weapons would fall into disrepair. Employed by private companies under contract to the United States Department of Defense, these men constitute one facet of a vast program of American military aid that continues to set the course of the war more than a year after the signing of the Paris

peace agreements and the final withdrawal of American troops.

Whether the United States is breaking the letter of the agreements could probably be argued either way. But certainly the aid directly supports South Vietnamese violations and so breaks the spirit of the accords.

The United States, far from phasing out its military involvement in South Vietnam, has descended from a peak of warfare to a high plateau of substantial support, dispatching not only huge quantities of weapons and ammunition but also large numbers of American citizens who have become integral parts of the South Vietnamese supply, transport and intelligence systems.

These include not just the Vietnam-based mechanics and technicians but also the Pentagon-based generals who tour airfields to ascertain the needs of the South Vietnamese Air Force, the "liaison men" who reportedly give military advice from time to time, the civilian Defense Department employees who make two-to-three-week visits to provide highly specialized technical help, and the Central Intelligence Agency officials who continue to advise South Vietnam's national police on intelligence matters.

The total budgeted cost of military aid to South Vietnam is \$813-million in this fiscal year, and the Pentagon has asked Congress for \$1.45-billion next year, with most of the increase probably going for ammunition, which the South Vietnamese forces have expended at a high rate.

TRUE COST EVEN HIGHER

The true costs of the military support probably rise considerably above the official figures. Some of the aid, for example, comes in through economic programs that dump millions in cash into the Saigon Government's defense budget. And other costs—salaries of Pentagon technicians who make special visits, for example—are hidden in the vast budgets of the United States Air Force, Army and Navy and are not labeled "Vietnam."

These valuable military goods and services have a sharp political impact. They are indispensable to the South Vietnamese Government's policy of resistance to any accommodation with the Communists. Militarily, the extensive aid has enabled President Nguyen Van Thieu to take the offensive at times, launching intensive attacks with artillery and jet fighters against Vietcong-held territory.

Furthermore, the American-financed military shield has provided Mr. Thieu with the muscle to forestall a political settlement. He has rejected the Paris agreements' provision for general elections, in which the Communists would be given access to the press, permission to run candidates and freedom to rally support openly and without interference from the police.

VIETCONG MAINTAIN PRESSURE

Mr. Thieu has offered elections, but without the freedoms. The Vietcong, refusing to participate unless the freedoms are guaranteed, have maintained military pressure throughout the country, mostly with artillery and rocket attacks on Government outposts and, from time to time, with devastating ground assaults against Government-held positions.

United States intelligence officials contend that continuing American aerial reconnaissance, as well as prisoner interrogation and radio monitoring, shows that the North Vietnamese have sent thousands of troops and hundreds of tanks and artillery pieces south in violation of the Paris agreements. They have also refurbished a dozen captured airfields and built a large network of roads that threatened to cut South Vietnam in two.

Yet in battle the Communists appear more frugal with ammunition than the Government troops, who have been seen recently by Western correspondents spraying artillery

across wide areas under Vietcong control as if there was no end to the supply of shells. This difference has bolstered the view of some diplomats that China and the Soviet Union, unwilling to support an all-out offensive now, have placed limits on the rate of resupply to Hanoi.

Amid the political stalemate then, the inconclusive war continues.

KEEPING JETS IN THE AIR

Ray Harris is at his workbench in the huge engine shop at the Bien Hoa air base just north of Saigon. He works for General Electric, which manufactures the jet engine that drives the Northrop F-5 fighter, the mainstay of Saigon's air force.

He hunches over a circular fuser assembly, the last part of the engine before the afterburner. The assembly is invisibly cracked, and Mr. Harris is using a machine about the size of a dentist's drill to grind down the metal so the crack can be welded.

There are Americans everywhere in the shop, which is devoted to repairing and overhauling fighter and helicopter engines. There is virtually no workroom or machine or assembly line where Americans are anything less than essential parts of the process. Although a few are training Vietnamese to take over the work eventually, most are simply doing the work, especially the highly technical jobs, themselves.

The line where rebuilt jet engines are finally assembled, for example, looks more like a factory somewhere in the United States than a shop belonging to the Vietnamese Air Force. Eight or 10 Americans work on several engines, and not a Vietnamese is in sight.

There are 25 Vietnamese assigned here, a technician says with a shrug, but he adds, "I never see them."

OUTPUT IS KEPT HIGH

Ken Martin of G.E. is crouching with another American beside a jet engine that he has just assembled himself in four 12-hour days. Without the American technicians, he says, the shop could produce no more than 40 per cent of what it does. Another American, asked what would happen if he and his colleagues pulled out, replied, "This would turn into a big Honda repair shop."

As self-serving and exaggerated as these assessments seem, they underscore the long-term military role that American civilians will have to play if the South Vietnamese are to have continued use of their complex weapons.

Without long training, mechanics in any modern air force probably could not match the skills of the American technicians, most of whom are not young Vietnam war veterans like Mr. Harris but seasoned experts who have been building and rebuilding engines for years on bases here and in the United States.

"Most of our people—this is the only work they've ever done," said Glenn Miller, the 47-year-old G.E. supervisor at the shop. Mr. Miller has 22 year's experience with the company, all on jet engines.

His men are so vital that they—and those working on helicopters for Lycoming Aircraft—were all placed on 12-hour shifts last month during the week before Tet, the Lunar New Year holiday. Their objective was to get as many aircraft flying as possible, Mr. Miller explained, to be ready for any Communist offensive.

MAKES \$1,000 IN A LONG WEEK

Mr. Miller figures that with overtime and other bonuses, some of the men made \$1,000 a piece that week.

High pay is cited by many of the civilians as the main reason for their choice of Vietnam as a place of work. After a year on the job G.E. employees get double their base salaries, bringing the average pay to \$20,000 or

more, plus \$16 a day for food and lodging—an annual total in excess of \$25,000.

Since living costs are low by American standards, and since the employees do not have to pay any Federal income tax on \$20,000 a year if they are off American soil for at least 18 months, many say they save a good deal of money. Some add that the money has become a silent source of resentment among the Vietnamese Air Force men, who earn only \$10 to \$35 a month.

This, plus profound war-weariness, has made many Vietnamese men difficult to teach, the contractors say. "They are only kids, all of them—they don't want to be in the military to begin with," said Elmer Adams, a former United States Air Force man who works for Lycoming supervising helicopter repairs.

"It's a lack of desire," said a technician for Cessna Aircraft working at the Da Nang air base. "They've been under so much pressure for so long they just want peace. They're peace-minded."

CRITICISM OF AMERICANS

It was said sympathetically, and the Cessna man went on: "All they know is that Americans came over here and tore up their country, uprooted their villages and now they're looking for food."

Gilbert Walker, another technician, who asked that his company not be identified, observed: "The people I talk to in town care very little about the form of government they have. I guess I don't feel much difference. I don't feel too much admiration for the present Government."

In that case, he was asked, why is he helping the South Vietnamese carry on the war? "I work for my company and I try to keep the aircraft flying," he replied. "I'm working on helicopters, that's all I know. Sometimes I sit back and think, What's it all for, what's the good of it all? It seems like an exercise in futility, what I'm doing."

Futile or not, the Americans' work has carried some of them to positions of considerable authority in the South Vietnamese military supply system. The South Vietnamese still call many of them "co van," which means "advisers," and the American office at the Da Nang base has a big sign over the door that reads, "Co Van."

The Americans often come to identify closely with their jobs, perhaps taking more responsibility than their contracts call for. In a revealing slip of the tongue, Mr. Adams of Lycoming looked around the Bien Hoa engine shop and remarked, "We're in the process—they're in the process, rather—of reorganizing the shop."

MANY STILL ON PAYROLL

The fact is that supply and transportation have remained an American operation. "We Vietnamized the fighting, but we never Vietnamized logistics," said a Defense Department official based in Saigon.

That is reportedly the principal reason the United States Defense Attaché's Office—originally scheduled to be dismantled early this year—still contains about 1,150 people of whom 50 are military men, according to official figures.

In addition, the reduction in the number of Americans working for private defense contractors has halted, allowing the figure to level off at approximately 2,800, down 2,200 since July, according to a spokesman for the Defense Attaché's office.

The logistics effort—provision of maintenance, ammunition, weapons, trucks, fuel, electronics parts and the like—is now the basis for the Americans' most pervasive and intimate contacts with the South Vietnamese military. Depending on how such terms as "military" and "advisers" are defined, there is evidence that the contacts occasionally cross into areas of relationship prohibited by the Paris agreements.

"The United States will not continue its military involvement or intervene in the internal affairs of South Vietnam," Article 4 of the cease-fire agreement declares.

"TOTAL WITHDRAWAL"

Article 5 says: "Within 60 days of the signing of this agreement, there will be a total withdrawal from South Vietnam of troops, military advisers and military personnel, including technical military personnel and military personnel associated with the pacification program, armaments, munitions and war material of the United States and those of the other foreign countries mentioned in Article 3(a). Advisers from the above-mentioned countries to all para-military organizations and the police force will also be withdrawn within the same period of time."

According to both American and South Vietnamese officials, the American civilians—both employees of private companies and those of the Defense Department—who help with supply activities not only see that the South Vietnamese get the equipment and ammunition they ask for but also advise them on what to ask for.

Some of these activities came to light as a result of the capture by the Chinese last month of a former United States Army Special Forces captain, Gerald E. Kosh, who was aboard a South Vietnamese naval vessel during a two-day battle with Chinese forces in the Paracel Islands, in the South China Sea.

Mr. Kosh, who was taken prisoner and later released, was described by a spokesman for the United States Embassy as a "liaison officer" with the South Vietnamese military whose job was to observe the efficiency of various army, navy and air force units and report to the Pentagon.

American officials steadfastly refused to provide further details of Mr. Kosh's job. They would not say exactly what he was supposed to observe or whether his reports were ultimately shared with the South Vietnamese. They did say that there were 12 such liaison men based in various parts of Vietnam.

EXTENT OF ROLE UNCLEAR

What is not clear is whether they confine their observations to such matters as the condition of equipment and the rate of ammunition expenditure, or whether they evaluate military tactics and strategies and go so far as to suggest alternatives.

What is fairly certain is that their reports end up in the hands of the South Vietnamese, perhaps providing indirect advice of one sort or another.

A South Vietnamese officer in a position to know said recently that normal procedure called for an American and a South Vietnamese to make an inspection or auditing tour of a military unit together. Then they write up their reports, sometimes separately, sometimes together. The reports, he said, are forwarded up the chain of command in the United States Defense Attaché's Office, which then relays copies of them to Lieut. Gen. Dong Van Khuyen, head of the Logistic Command for the South Vietnamese Joint General Staff.

More direct, overt advice is sometimes given by zealous Americans who are still stationed in every province. An embassy official reported recently that an American based in one province boasted to him about a successful military operation: "I told them to clear the Communists out of there."

Actually, South Vietnamese military men do not seem anxious for such guidance, noting with some pain that their country has suffered for years under American advice. What they want from the United States is military aid.

SIX GENERALS PAY A VISIT

Clearly, the Pentagon continues to attach high priority to the success of the South Vietnamese military. Last fall a group of six Air Force generals based in the Pentagon

visited the Da Nang air base to find out what equipment and aid were needed, according to the base commander, Lieut. Col. Nguyen Tan Dinh. He said they were scheduled to come again this month.

A few weeks ago two civilian employees of the Air Force—one based in Hawaii and the other in Texas—were flown to Vietnam for a short stay so they could give advice on the repair and upkeep of plants that manufacture oxygen for jet fighters. One said he had been in and out of Vietnam frequently on similar missions since 1964, the other since 1968.

Although the Paris agreements explicitly rule out advisers to the police force, the South Vietnamese National Police continue to receive regular advice from Americans.

In a recent conversation with this correspondent, two high-ranking officers said they and their staffs met frequently with the Saigon station chief of the C.I.A. and his staff. Sometimes, they said, the C.I.A. chief asks the police to gather intelligence for him, and often they meet to help each other analyze the data collected.

A police official confirmed that in some provinces "American liaison men" who work with the police remain on the job. "There are still some; but not so many," he said.

EPISODE IN POLICE STATION

Local policemen still refer to "American police advisers," according to James M. Markham, Saigon bureau chief of The New York Times, who was detained by the police late in January after a visit to a Vietcong-held area.

Mr. Markham said that in both Qui Nhon, where he was held overnight, and Phan Thiet, where he was detained briefly while being transferred to Saigon, policemen, talking among themselves, referred to the "police adviser." In Phan Thiet, he reported, a policeman was overheard saying, "Let's get the American police adviser over here."

In the last six weeks The New York Times has made repeated attempts to interview officials in the United States Agency for International Development who are responsible for American aid to the police. Although the officials appeared ready to discuss the subject, they were ordered by the United States Ambassador, Graham A. Martin, to say nothing.

In the absence of official United States figures, the best information on police aid comes from Senator Edward M. Kennedy, who calculated that as of last June 30 the Agency for International Development and the Defense Department have spent \$131.7-million over the years for police and prisons in South Vietnam. Despite a Congressional ban on such assistance enacted last December, such support has continued, according to American officials, but they say that no decision has yet been made on how to phase out the programs.

Section 112 of the new foreign aid bill reads: "None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this act and no local currencies generated as a result of assistance furnished under this act may be used for the support of police or prison construction and administration within South Vietnam, for training, including computer training, of South Vietnamese with respect to police, criminal or prison matters, or for computers, or computer parts for use for South Vietnam with respect to police, criminal or prison matters."

TRAINING IN WASHINGTON

South Vietnamese policemen are reportedly still being trained at the International Police Academy in Washington, and technical contracts with private companies that provide computer services and communication equipment have not been terminated.

Senator Kennedy reported that the Nixon Administration had requested \$869,000 for

the current fiscal year for police computer training, \$256,000 for direct training of policemen, \$1.5-million for police communications and \$8.8-million for police equipment, presumably weapons and ammunition, from the Defense Department.

Although these figures are not normally included in the totals for military aid, the police here have military functions, and engage in infiltration, arrest, interrogation and torture of Communists and political dissidents.

This activity violates the cease-fire agreement, which states in Article 11: "Immediately after the cease-fire, the two South Vietnamese parties will . . . prohibit all acts of reprisal and discrimination against individuals or organizations that have collaborated with one side or the other, insure . . . freedom of organization, freedom of political activities, freedom of belief."

INTERVIEWS ARE REFUSED

Not only has Ambassador Martin ordered American officials to remain silent on the subjects of military and police aid; both he and the Defense Attaché, Maj. Gen. John E. Murray, refused requests by The New York Times for interviews. Furthermore, the embassy told at least two private companies—Lear-Siegler which employs a large force of aircraft mechanics here, and Computer Science Corporation, which works on military and police computer systems—to say nothing publicly about their work, according to company executives.

The official nervousness is attributed by an embassy employe to the Nixon Administration's apprehension about the inclination of Congress to cut aid to South Vietnam. The Ambassador has reportedly told several non-Government visitors recently that South Vietnam is in a crucial period and that he sees his role as unyielding support to build up and preserve a nonCommunist regime.

He is reported to have pressed Washington to provide new weapons for Saigon to counteract the infiltration of troops, tanks and artillery from North Vietnam since the cease-fire. For example, plans have been made for the delivery of F-5E fighter planes to replace the slower, less maneuverable and less heavily armed F-5's, many of which were rushed to South Vietnam in the weeks before the cease-fire.

VIOLATION IS CHARGED

Privately, officers in the International Commission of Control and Supervision scoff at the American contention that supply of the planes does not violate the Paris agreements, which permit only one-for-one replacement of weapons "of the same characteristics and properties." A high-ranking official of one of the non-Communist delegations, asked recently if he thought the United States was faithfully observing the one-for-one rule, replied, "Of course not."

There is nothing the commission can do about it without permission from both the South Vietnamese Government and the Vietcong to investigate, and permission is unlikely to be forthcoming from the Saigon side. Similarly, the commission has been unable to audit other incoming weapons and ammunition for both sides. During the first year after the cease fire, the United States provided South Vietnam with \$5.4-million worth of ammunition a week, apparently unaccompanied by pressure to restrain military activities.

Several weeks ago Elbridge Durbrow, who was Ambassador to South Vietnam from 1957 to 1961, came to Saigon and met with Ambassador Martin and General Murray. Mr. Durbrow, who denounced the Paris agreements and who declares, "I am a domino-theory man," was asked by newsmen whether the American officials had indicated that they were trying to keep South Vietnam from violating the cease-fire.

"Not from anybody did we hear that," he replied. Then, referring to General Murray, he said: "He's not that kind of man at all—just the opposite. If you are not going to defend yourself you might as well give up and let Hanoi take over."

UTOPIA GOES BELLY UP

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, professional engineer Robert Kuntz has written an excellent article examining basic inconsistencies with our economic system: That to continue to function well, the system needs unlimited natural resources, an inexhaustible supply of energy and a bottomless dump. The first warning that the system was malfunctioning was the growing waste management problem, termed the environmental crisis. The second sign has manifest itself as the energy crisis. And the third, if the preceding are valid, is a dwindling supply of raw materials which threatens our ability to continue supplying our basic needs.

As all of us realize, basic changes are imperative. In discussing the many needed modifications of our system, Mr. Kuntz emphasizes the need to utilize our great wealth of scientific and engineering people. Only the scientific and engineering community has the technological acumen enabling them to translate statute and policy directives into actual plans and substantive action.

His article is very perceptive, and I submit it so that my colleagues will have an opportunity to benefit from it.

The article follows:

UTOPIA GOES BELLY UP

(By Robert J. Kuntz, P.E.)

The United States, and the other developing nations of the world, have evolved an "open loop" economic system that has been approaching a loss of control for many years. The present energy crisis is just the second and stronger signal that the control system is not functioning. In the early 1960's major concern was raised with the waste management problem. Rachel Carson in her book, "The Silent Spring," alerted society to the ominous conditions that existed in our environment and predicted catastrophe for future wild life and even man if changes in behavior were not instituted. As we all know, Rachel had a profound affect upon the ecology movement. Unfortunately, the damage created in some areas is beyond repair. Some have referred to Lake Erie as the world's largest cesspool. Raw sewage, toxic chemicals, and effluents of all kinds have been dumped into that once beautiful body of water. Pollution has hit every fresh water supply in the Nation and world. The seas and oceans are also being subjected to the wastes from our industrialized societies at such rates that "digestion" is impossible. Thor Heyerdahl on his voyage across the Atlantic on his papyrus boat Ra II observed pollution in the open sea to an extent previously not recognized. He has expressed concern with the damage being done to the continental shelves sea life by toxic discharges either directly into the ocean or into steams emptying into the oceans. Some areas

in the Pacific Ocean near Hawaii have lost almost all sea life because of the dumping of horrendous quantities of raw sewage and other toxic wastes. The quest for profits prevents the construction of sewage treatment facilities, and local governments, controlled by the same interests, have not had the intestinal fortitude to stop the rape.

The economic system in the U.S. can be compared to a giant electrical coil. The figure shown (described) below may not be completely correct in terms of electrical engineering, but the parallel can be seen just the same. The primary coil has two poles. The one marked "NR" represents our natural resources. The other marked "D" represents all of our dumps—land, air and water. The battery connected across the poles represents our energy resources. The secondary coil is connected to a resistor and a galvanometer. The galvanometer reads the induced current or cash flow which is measured as the gross national product (GNP).

To explain, our economic system functions by taking low-cost raw materials from natural resources of all kinds, organic and inorganic and adds to them large quantities of energy. The manufactured materials and products are then moved to the dumps as quickly as the consumer will tolerate. In some cases, obsolescence is designed into the product so that artificial wear out will occur before actual wear out. In the latter case, energy is sometimes applied to the system to insure this in the form of "romance" advertising.

The flow of goods and materials in the primary causes a current to be induced in the secondary which passes through the resistor which in turn gives off heat. When the flow in primary slows down, it is referred to as a recession. A more severe slow down or stoppage is called a depression. Though not mentioned specifically, there are some human resources added to this system, but these are minimized to maintain a high "productivity". This term really means that less human resources and more energy resources are used to add value to the raw materials on their way to the dump. Thus, up to this time the solution to a potential recession has been to accelerate the flow of materials from natural resources to the dumps.

This system has functioned rather well over the past few years in the U.S. We have only consumed more energy resources in the past 35 years than was consumed by all mankind prior to that time since the beginning of the world. Mineral sources are now so depleted in this country that over 50% of our raw materials must be imported. The great iron range in Minnesota once produced 65% ore. It has been so depleted that it now produces only 15% ore. And where has all of this material gone? It is now in low concentration form spread over the country side, lying at the bottom of the ocean, or clogging and poisoning our rivers and streams.

The fallacy of our economic system is that it is based upon completely erroneous premises. To continue to function well, we must have unlimited natural resources, and inexhaustible supply of energy, and a bottomless dump. This is the "open loop" civil system that has been giving us the highest standard of living ever known to man. However, storm clouds began to appear on the horizon in the 1960's. The first sign that the system was going unstable was the waste management problem. Our dumped "garbage" was fouling the air, polluting the water, and covering our landscape with unsightly discards creating in some cases severe health hazards. The group most vocal in alerting society to the potential disaster was referred to as the "ecology freaks". Our economic system was telling us that the dumps were not deep enough. Our response to this

data was ocean dumping, transporting garbage to mountain valleys, compacters (using more energy to reduce the volume of the discards), and developing various methods to incinerate or make building blocks with the discarded materials.

Our economic system has now given its second warning as control is lost and the error increases. This time it is saying that the energy supply is not inexhaustible. Of course, there may be some blame levied on those who stimulated the energy crisis to occur so quickly; and there are many who feel that it was prompted by the large oil trusts in their quest for greater profits. Some of this may be true, but the fact remains that had the "crisis" not happened in 1973, it would eventually happen, since the oil and natural gas we are using are not being replaced.

If we have interpreted correctly the message that our "open loop" system is sending, then we can predict the next and final behavior. The dwindling supply of raw materials will no longer be able to supply our basic needs. When artificial fertilizer is not available (much of it is made from oil and natural gas), and we suddenly discover that a large portion of our fertile land is buried beneath asphalt and houses and the remaining cannot produce sufficient food without artificial fertilizer to meet the basic needs of our people, the final coup de grace will be levied. Shall we continue to allow ourselves to be lulled into a state of complacency that all will be well, and that our great institutions will rise to the challenge and increase "productivity" and satisfy all of our needs? Our legislators will just pass another law and legislate the problem away, or the profit motive will stimulate solutions. Well, possibly; but it is also possible that there may be some basic deficiency in the design of the system.

What is needed is a "closed loop" system which can provide a high standard of living and still preserve that standard for generations to come. Let's examine some of the changes that would be required to "close the loop". The first is that waste must be significantly reduced. To accomplish this, it will require some initial engineering. Products will have to be designed for maximum life instead of minimum life. Instead of discarding a worn item, it should be designed to be completely refurbished. An automobile is a good example. Little change has occurred in the design of the auto in the past 30 years, yet the new models every year force depreciation of the last year's model. The internal combustion engine for a car is designed to last about 3,000 hours before major overhaul. This is equivalent to about 100,000 miles. With sufficient care, 150,000 miles can be obtained. The point is that with proper design, an auto could last a lifetime with modular replacement of the parts that wear. In the latter case, human resources are substituted for natural resources and energy, and there would be no need to consume the large quantities of energy to make new fenders, bodies, etc., and smelter additional iron from ore. The example could be applied to many other products in our system.

Devices using energy must be designed for maximum efficiency compatible with a total thermal balance. By this it is meant that the energy needed to increase the efficiency of a device does not exceed the energy saved. The same philosophy applies to building design. If it takes more energy to produce insulation 10 inches thick instead of 6 inches, and install vacuum-seal windows and aluminum reflectors than the energy saved by the devices over the life of the structure, the optimum trade off point should be chosen. However, we are far from that condition at the present level of design where fuel cost is merely traded off against capital invest-

ment amortized over the life of the structure.

Total energy systems must be considered in every application. The heat rejected from one process can often be the heat input for another.

New energy sources must be developed which minimize the use of fossilized fuels. Though the near term will demand the use of fission nuclear power plants, they must be eliminated as quickly as possible. The radioactive wastes from these plants will be toxic for over 250,000 years and create waste management problems that boggle the mind for generations to come. Fusion power plants, which use "heavy hydrogen" from the ocean, must be developed on a crash basis, since the reaction does not produce radioactive waste. Solar and geothermal energy must be developed, since these energy sources are already available and have the most benign effect upon the environment. Work should be done to develop low-cost and efficient means for producing hydrogen, since it will become the basic combustion and fuel cell fuel for tomorrow. It can be used as a substitute for natural gas, will replace hydrocarbon fuel for internal combustion engines, and it can keep the jet aircraft flying as a jet fuel. It can also be used to produce synthetic liquid fuels that have longer storage life than hydrogen alone. Coal gasification and other fossil-fuel development will have to satisfy the interim, since the other solutions will require long term development and implementation.

In all of this, the only common denominator is engineering and the engineer. All of the rhetoric flowing from the state houses and Washington will do little to solve the basic needs of the system. It is time that the engineering profession assumes its proper role in providing the planning and solutions to the nation's pressing problems. Presently, the nonscientific trained legislator's approach to the problem of the energy crisis has some recognizable buzz words. Over 1000 bills have been introduced in Congress, and many of them have terminology such as: statute, rule, regulation, policy, requirements, curtailment, restriction, allocation, rationing, etc. Words that may result in solving the problem would be more pleasing, such as: definition, hypothesis, thesis, empirical evaluation, selection, implementation, modification, and maintenance. If there were more engineering-trained legislators, the latter terminology may be more prevalent than the former.

As the nation moves into gasless Sundays, 68 degree homes, dim offices, and other curtailments, the engineering profession enjoys average salaries that now have the purchasing power equivalent to the 1963 time period. While trucks block the highways because of shortages of diesel fuel and supplier "rip-off", while airline pilots contemplate strike because of a shortage of jet fuel which has caused flight curtailment and personnel layoffs, while the president rides the train, while grain rots in the fields because of shortages in fuel for tractors, over 100,000 professionals (engineers and scientists) have "evaporated" from the job market. Over the past 3 years, the nation has thrown away over 300,000 man years of engineering and scientific talent as a result of a shift in "national priorities". Much of that talent can no longer be recruited back into technical cadres because of disillusionment on the part of the professionals. What is now needed is a long-term national commitment to properly utilize one of the nation's great resources—its engineering and scientific people—and direct their efforts to the solution of the nation's most critical problems. Additionally, our citizens must modify their consumptive and wasteful habits. If this isn't done, our economic system will truly go "belly up"!!

AMENDMENT NECESSARY FOR
PENSION BILL

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge the necessity for pension bill H.R. 12906, knowing the extreme need for protecting working men and women. In our struggle to achieve this protection we must not overlook certain points in the pension bill that is before Congress today, points that will have major effects on a large segment of our labor force. I am referring to the provision in H.R. 12906 that stipulates an eligibility requirement for pension plans of 25 years of age, or 1 year of service, whichever comes latest. Though this is an improvement on H.R. 4200, which had a minimum age limit of 30, I feel that H.R. 12906 still excludes an unnecessarily large segment of our labor force.

I am proposing, along with Congresswoman ABZUG, that H.R. 12906 be amended to read that eligibility requirements be: 3 years of service or a minimum of 24 years of age and 1 year of service, whichever comes first. The 3-year stipulation would rule out any employees who work only a year or two at one job, thereby eliminating the additional costs of bookkeeping that would be encountered if the employers had to include such transient workers in their pension plans. Statistics show that 16-to-19-year-olds work an average of 6 months at one job, and 20-to-24-year-olds work 1 year on the average. These workers would not be able to participate in their companies' pension plans. The advantage would be for those young workers who do stay with their jobs for a period of at least 3 years, and I feel they have a right to coverage.

We are speaking not only of the young, who are just beginning work, but of our older citizens at the age of retirement. There are many workers that have worked from the age of 16 to 25 for one company. As the bill now stands, when the time comes for retirement, these people cannot count those 9 years of service before the age of 25. This 3-year provision will aid that situation, allowing a 16-year-old to begin participation in the company pension plan at the age of 19.

With respect to vesting plans, I propose that the 25-year-old minimum be deleted from the bill. H.R. 12906 states that any service before the age of 25 is to be disregarded in computing the period of service for purposes of determining the percentage of nonforfeitable accrued benefits. Thus, in the 5-to-15-year vesting plan, an employee who works from age 25 to 30 begins receiving 25 percent of his nonforfeitable accrued benefits, but an employee working from age 18 to 23 will receive nothing. By deleting the age limit, those beginning work for a company between the ages of 16 to 24 will have their first years of service count toward their vesting privileges.

Tomorrow, I will offer this amendment

to the pension bill, H.R. 12906, so that these discriminatory features will be eliminated. I hope my fellow Representatives will join Congresswoman ABZUG and me in this endeavor.

GROWING TRADE WITH RED
CHINA: IN WHOSE INTEREST?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, within the past year the Congress has started debating the problems to American security of dealing with the Soviet Union and the House has begun the process of putting some of the necessary conditions on that trade. There are still a number of other steps that must be taken in this regard if America's interests are to be safeguarded.

Unfortunately, there has been little discussion of the rapidly expanding trade with Red China and what its effect may be on the United States. The Red Chinese, by their sending of troops to the Parcel Islands to battle the South Vietnamese troops already there, would seem to put the lie to the contention that the Communist Chinese leadership is a pacific one.

In a previous speech that appears in the RECORD on January 30, 1974, I raised the question "Is the United States building Communist China's military might?" At that time, I discussed the building of five fertilizer-ammonia plants which also may be converted to the making of explosives. Is this in the interests of the United States? Should the Congress be passing enforceable restrictions on such trade? Does the building of Communist China's industrial base with American technology serve the cause of free men?

Within the past month a number of new deals are being negotiated or have been announced as finalized. These include Bucyrus-Erie Co.'s selling \$19.6 million worth of mining equipment, Reed Tool's supplying \$1 million worth of oil-field equipment, the Rucker Corp.'s providing a \$2 million order of pressure gears for oil drilling, Gleason Works' selling \$8.2 million worth of machinery to produce gears and axles ostensibly for automobiles—but possibly for jeeps? Additionally, the U.S. State Department has approved a sale by Litton Industries of highly advanced computerized navigation systems for commercial jets. United Aircraft has held preliminary discussions with Communist officials about the sale of Sikorsky S61N helicopters which is a newer model of the Navy's SH-3 helicopter.

I ask what are the goals of this trade: Is it the old, tired view that trade will lead to peace and a better world? I hope not. This theory has been historically tested time and time again and each time it has failed that test. Trade does not stop conflicts or wars. Trade can build the strength of a country so that it can then engage in war. Is the United States presently helping Red China to

become strong which will then allow that same Red China to more effectively threaten the independence of smaller countries in Asia and to work against American interests? I hope not, but it is time to take off the rose-colored glasses in regard to trade with Red China and to realistically assess the results that that trade is having and will have.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 24 marked the 56th anniversary of the declaration of Estonian independence. I would like to take this time to praise the freedom-loving people of Estonia who are forced to refrain from celebration due to Soviet repression.

Estonia, the smallest of the Baltic States, has struggled for peace and freedom throughout its history. When the Communists became masters of Russia late in 1917, they enforced a rule of "red terror" over most of Estonia. In the midst of World War I, German troops entered Estonia and the Communists fled the country. On the next day, February 24, 1918, Estonia proclaimed its independence.

Many Estonians fled the German-occupied country to seek the support of the Allied nations in behalf of their compatriots back home. As a result, in the spring of 1918, France, Great Britain, and Italy accorded de facto recognition to Estonia as an independent state. With the withdrawal of Germany in November 1918, the Soviets again attacked Estonia. But with the support of the British and the Finns, Estonia was able to put down the attack of the Red army.

At long last the people of Estonia were truly independent, to live in the cherished freedom they sought for so long. They drafted a Constitution with principles similar to those embodied in our Constitution.

Unfortunately, Estonian independence was to last no longer than two decades. With the outbreak of World War II, the Soviet Union constructed military bases in Estonia. In June of 1940, the Soviets again entered and occupied Estonia. Some 14 months later, with at least 10 percent of its population killed, Estonia was taken over by the Nazis. For more than 3 years Estonians were forced to work for Hitler's war effort.

In October 1944, the Red army reoccupied Estonia. The country has remained under the control of the Kremlin since that time.

Despite their history of Communist domination, the spirit of freedom endures in the hearts of all Estonians. We who are blessed with liberty must never cease to encourage the citizens of Estonia in their struggle for dignity and peace.

LAND USE PLANNING AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, this week the House of Representatives will probably vote on the Land Use Planning Act of 1974. This is landmark legislation which will help our country use our resources more wisely. It will help assure that the environmental, social, and economic implications of major decisions concerning the use of the Nation's land will be given adequate consideration and that the public will be involved in these decisions.

One area of concern that is inextricably bound with any land use planning process is historic preservation. Indeed, the bill requires that participating States give special attention to "areas of critical environmental concern," which include historic as well as cultural, scientific, and natural values of more than local significance. It is important that the States, in developing their land use planning, process, give equal consideration to both the historical and natural environments. Both are vital in creating and maintaining conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony.

Last month, I spoke to Federal and State officials at the annual State Historic Preservation Officers meeting, sponsored by the National Park Service. They were concerned about how the Land Use Planning Act would affect their mission, on both the State and Federal level. Since Members will be voting soon on this bill, I would like to share with them my remarks to the historic preservation officers, which explains how historic preservation would relate to the land use planning process. My remarks follow:

HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND LAND USE PLANNING

The Ohio Historical Society publishes a very good newsletter, *Echoes*, which I read faithfully each month when it comes across my desk. Last year they had a rather nice little story in it about a Connecticut minister who went out to the Ohio country, as it was called before the American Revolution. He was looking into the possibilities of converting the Indians to Christianity, and he spent a few weeks at an Indian village in central Ohio. He had to leave, finally, because the Revolution was about to break out and the British were stirring up the Indians against the colonists who were getting obstreperous. (The Indians weren't very happy anyway because the European settlers were encroaching on their hunting lands.) Finally one of the chiefs came to him and said, "Brother, it is time to go." But before he went, the minister had a long talk with the same chief about religion. And the chief finally said to him, and the minister recorded this all in his diary, "Well, I have no doubt that your Bible is a great book, and for you it is undoubtedly a great thing to have a book so that whenever you have a problem, it will tell you what to do. But we don't have that kind of a book and so when we have a problem we have to think," and he pointed to his forehead. And I've often thought that while there are times when we need religious books, there also are times when books won't help and we just have to think.

I feel it's the time to think about the status of historic preservation and its relation to other important values that we are trying to preserve in this day and age.

Thomas Jefferson said that the earth belongs to the living generation. And of course he was trying to break what he called "the dead hand of the past" under which, by law, owners of property could entail their property so that subsequent owners were put in a strait jacket. They couldn't sell the property, they couldn't develop it, they couldn't do anything. And I think we all agree that he was right in so doing. But Jefferson left out one thing in his efforts to break the dead hand of the past: the concept that the earth also is held in trust by the living generation for future generations. That puts it all in a little bit different light, and it seems to me that we need to develop that ethic a little more in this day and age.

When Abraham Lincoln made his famous first inaugural address, he was, as you know, making a last plea to the Southern States not to break their ties with the union. It always struck me that he saved for the very last of his address what he thought was the most powerful, emotional argument of all. He said, "The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature." It's rather interesting to me that he appealed to a sense of place when he appealed to their emotions. He appealed to their remembrance of the battlefield and to the patriots' grave. He understood that the land itself, and the places where our people sacrificed and fought and died, have a tremendous impact on our thinking. And I would like to talk a little about that today.

As a land-rich nation, we have for too long treated our land as if it were an unlimited supply. Today, as a result, we're verging on a land use crisis. Our farmlands are being swallowed up by sprawling cities. Our historic and cultural treasures are being bulldozed to make way for skyscrapers and shopping centers. Power lines and massive highways are cutting ugly swaths across our rural landscapes, and open space around our major metropolitan centers is being consumed by haphazard and uncontrolled development. You who are here today are here because of your interest in historic preservation. But you should not, and indeed you cannot, think of historic preservation without also thinking of environmental preservation. Both are linked together under the broader concept of land use planning.

Land use planning is a pivotal issue in this country and in the Congress. How we use or misuse our land affects our environment, our economy, our cultural, physical, and social well being. It affects our transportation systems and our use and methods of obtaining energy. It affects our sense of the present and our identification with the past. It affects the historic character of the land itself, which has colored and shaped our past and will likewise color and shape our future. The values of the past were in part derived from our sense of the land and its peculiar qualities, the qualities of beauty, harshness, challenge.

Right now a powerful example of the need for land use planning is beginning to occur in the West. Our Western lands are being threatened by the onslaught of industrialization. Up to now the West has remained a symbol of the frontier, clear skies and magnificent open spaces. This land is still sparsely populated, and is largely government-owned and mainly used for agriculture and grazing. But a dark cloud hangs over the big sky country, literally as well as figuratively. Strip mining threatens hundreds of thousands of acres of near-virgin land. Nobody knows whether they can even be re-

vegetated because of the dry climate. Huge power plants are being developed and plans are being drawn for enormous complexes with energy-producing capabilities. *LIFE* magazine had an article a few years ago about the Four Corners Power Plant development. The title of the article was "Goodbye Big Sky" because the big sky is going to be filled with big air pollution. Industry has plans for some 40 or 50 coal gasification plants out in the Northwest States. And precious waters are about to be diverted from agriculture to provide for the insatiable thirst of industrialization.

The glitter of industrialization promises economic rewards for a few, but it often turns to fool's gold for the many who must inhabit and contend with a degraded environment. Without intelligent planning the insatiable thirst for industrialization may well destroy our Western heritage. It may wipe out, literally, whole landscapes, and whole lifestyles as well. And our country may become one huge industrial megalopolis from sea to shining sea.

Ownership in this country has always implied the private owner's right to do anything he wants with his land. This is not true in other parts of the world, particularly in Europe. In those countries the public interest must be considered.

The scope of such public interest and the mechanism for expressing and enforcing that public interest are broad indeed. Anyone who has traveled in England cannot fail to be impressed with the way that the small villages in the countryside have been preserved; free of the squalid blight that affects almost every community, large and small, in our own country. Yet the population density of England is almost twenty times that of the United States. Both countries share a common legal heritage. The difference lies in the realization of the people as to their true situation and what they've done by legislation to cope with it.

We have a doctrine in the common law which goes way, way back, and it modifies the right of ownership. It's called the doctrine of "sic utere tuo ut alienum non laedas." It means "so use your property that you do not injure with the rights of others." I've been down in Southern Ohio where I've seen land that's been absolutely destroyed by strip mining without any reclamation worthy of the name, and it's been done in the name of private ownership. Yet what right does the farmer have who refuses to sell out when the land all around him is stripped and the water table is lowered and the aesthetic appeal is gone, and the dust and the mess is all around, and the very value of this land is cut to a fraction of what it was by others exercising their right to do something on their land. It's quite obvious that our concept of private ownership, and the rights that go with it, is going to have to change radically. That doesn't mean it must be socialized, but it must be harmonized with the overall needs of the American people.

In contrast to Europe, historic preservation in the United States is in its infancy. We're only now beginning to think of historic preservation in terms of the total environment and not merely in relation to specific people and events. But in Europe whole cities have been declared historic districts where strict controls have been put on any alteration, conversion or demolition of buildings built before a certain specified date. Regardless of their local or national significance, these historic treasures reflect very definitive cultures in their time and in their place.

I was in Nuremberg in 1945 and it was a depressing sight. Here was the great merchant city of the Middle Ages in ruin. Those of you who have been to Nuremberg in recent years and were not there right after the war will find it hard to believe that that

beautiful inner-walled city was almost totally destroyed. The Germans had very carefully collected all the stones from the buildings and they had carefully collected all the photographs and postcards and reconstructed, with the very original stone wherever possible, the buildings as near to their original form as possible. They had a sense of the importance to their culture of recreating Nuremberg as it was.

By contrast, Americans lack a strong sense of place, just as they lack a strong sense of the continuity of history. Our history is too new. Fifty percent of us move every five years. Mobility has its economic advantages, but lost are our roots and our identification with our ancestral heritage. We're becoming a homogeneous society. As we travel this land, only the geography changes; the man-made forms remain the same. The Golden Arches are the same in Cheyenne, Wyoming, as in Atlanta, Georgia. Downtown Oklahoma City looks much like downtown Akron, Ohio.

But this need not be so. If you look beyond the main streets, the vestiges of our varied heritage are there—the white clapboard house of New England is not the same as the farmhouse of Indiana or the adobe hacienda of New Mexico. Each remains singular and each retains a statement of its time and place.

If we're to save the uniqueness of our past, and make it workable for the future, historic preservation and land use planning must go hand in hand. This will not be an easy job. For many of us the subject is new and untried. Land use planning is still embryonic; zoning remains the only major practiced form of land use control. But zoning only deals with type and density of development. It does not deal with the larger issues of people as individuals, neighborhoods and cultures.

Historic preservation is also new; it began as a fragmented effort by people who lived with and loved their historic treasures. They did not view their history from the outside—they were part of it. In contrast, most of us in this room are beginners. In our work-a-day world we must identify with these pioneer efforts. Concerted state and Federal efforts have only taken place within this generation. Congress is now working on major legislation to create an integrated approach to land-use planning. The Senate has passed a land use planning bill. The House Interior Committee completed work in mid-January on a similar bill. This is truly landmark legislation, but of itself it only provides a bare framework which must be added to. Its effectiveness will largely depend on how well Federal, state and local officials and private individuals work together.

Contrary to the views of its opponents, the land use planning bill would not create Federal zoning. It would not threaten private property. It would not remove land use decisions from local government. What it would do is to provide grants to states to help them prepare and implement a comprehensive land use planning process. The process would be developed by and tailored to the needs of each state. The bill sets some guidelines for preparing these plans and, once prepared, for administering them. Participation is voluntary. There are no sanctions in the bill, only a carrot, not a stick; and the carrot is that the states in order to obtain the Federal grants must meet the basic requirements of the bill.

The key to the bill is the requirement that a participating state must develop a comprehensive land use planning process which must take into account all lands and all other natural resources within the state and the cost and benefit of their use and conservation. The process must include the development of an adequate data base, technical systems and training programs for state and local agency personnel and public involvement on a continuing basis. It must

coordinate land use planning activities with local governments and with state, interstate, and Federal agencies. Natural and physical resources and recreation needs must be considered and the suitability of land for various purposes.

I'm not going to give you a section-by-section analysis of the bill, but I would like to highlight a few key portions which will affect your mission both on the Federal and state level. For you, as leaders in historic preservation, have a unique opportunity to assume a leadership role in this process. But if you want to have a significant voice in it, and I feel it's vital that you do, you will have to assert yourselves actively from the very beginning. I believe that just as historic preservation must be viewed in the broader spectrum of the total environment, you must view your jobs within the wider context of land use planning.

How can you do this? Well, on the Federal level it's already begun. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 provides protection for any property included in the National Register that might be endangered by a Federally-funded or licensed project. And the President's Executive Order 11593 requires that Federal agencies designate historic properties under their jurisdiction for nomination to the National Register. The fact that so many of you are from a variety of Federal agencies shows that Federal participation is viable and healthy. It shows that the government understands that historic preservation is not under the sole purview of the historian; many of our country's historic properties are owned by Federal agencies, and these properties are part of our cultural heritage.

But the Federal role as a result of the land use planning bill may be more significant in the future and it will not be achieved in isolation. You will need a good working relationship with other Federal agencies and with State and local governments in order to be effective.

The bill is a two-way street; it requires states to consider the impact of their actions on areas near Federal public lands such as national parks, forests, wilderness areas and wildlife refuges. It also requires Federal agencies and Federal projects to have similar responsibilities. Federal projects and activities affecting the use of non-Federal lands must be consistent with the states' comprehensive land use planning process, except in cases where the President determines there is an overriding national interest not to comply. The bill would require each Federal public land management agency to prepare and maintain an inventory of all public lands and resources under its jurisdiction. The bill provides the framework for the Federal government to develop land use policies and plans for these lands. These could also serve as standards for the states to consider developing their own plans, just as the Federal agencies can learn much from the work done by the states. As a matter of fact, in my opinion, the portion of the bill that lays out the priorities and standards for the Federal government is much better than the section that covers the priorities for the states. The reason is that we did not feel that we were in a position to dictate to the states what these standards should be, but merely to say that they should develop them.

I think it's only fair to recognize that many states are already working on land use legislation. Vermont, for example, has a very strong land use planning law, probably a model for other states. But it's important that State Historic Preservation Officers act now to shape such legislation before it's passed.

You already have a working tool in the guidelines outlined in the State Historic Preservation Plan required for historic preservation grants-in-aid. Basic to the plan is an inventory of the state's historical prop-

erties. I suggest that that is the place to begin, in analyzing and reevaluating this inventory. As I pointed out earlier, the development of the data bank is only one of the requirements for the state's comprehensive land use planning process. You should look at your inventory within the broader context of that land use planning approach. You'll need to ask and answer such questions as these: What are your state's historical resources? How do they fit in with the state's environment? How is the land in the state currently being used? What areas are most threatened? These are the kinds of questions the planners will be asking, and you should be armed with the answers.

In addition, I suggest that you begin now to ensure that historic preservation is given adequate consideration in any state land use legislation and policy. Take a look at the Federal bill; learn what's specifically required of you; notice what language is used to provide for consideration of historic preservation. In working on the bill, we in the Interior Committee were particularly concerned that the states give special attention to certain problem areas. We called them "areas of critical environmental concern."

These were defined as areas of more than local significance where uncontrolled or incompatible development could result in irreversible damage to important historic, cultural, scientific, and natural values, in that order; or where development could endanger life and property or future productivity of water, wood and fibers. The states under this bill must designate these areas of critical environmental concern and must regulate how they are to be used. It's very significant that the term "areas of critical environmental concern" includes both natural and historic areas. You should be alert to any attempt to give less than equal protection status to either, for the historic environment and natural environment are inseparable.

Some years ago when my family gave Stan Hywet Hall, the Tudor-style estate built by my grandparents, to the community of Akron, some people said, "Well, of course the house is the big thing and the grounds aren't that important; concentrate on preserving this house." It just happens that the plans for the grounds—there are some 70 acres of lawns and gardens—were drawn by the firm founded by Frederick Law Olmsted, the great landscape architect who laid out New York's Central Park, who laid out and designed the west porch of the U.S. Capitol. The house without the grounds would be diminished and much less significant. And that's true of many of our historic sites. Both the natural and historic environment are irreplaceable, and both yield information about the past, giving us understanding and appreciation of our physical and human evolution.

Linking historical and natural resources may seem obvious to those of us who are accustomed to thinking that way, but unfortunately most people in this country don't make that connection. The industrial opportunist sees these lands as a commodity to exploit, and man-made objects as a potential return on the dollar.

I remember riding to Cleveland one day with a county engineer, and we passed a particularly beautiful tract of woodland that bordered the highway. I said, "You know, it's interesting that all this area is becoming filled up with suburban sprawl but that particular area has remained open." I was just about to say that we ought to figure out some way to keep it that way, and the engineer said, "Yeh, we've been trying for years to figure out what we could put in that space." His idea was that unless you fill up every inch of space with some man-made creation, you haven't really developed it.

Well, some things are better left undeveloped.

Even without that extreme, however, most people do not understand the varying degrees of what we call nature and of what we call history. They do not understand how the natural elements interact with man to produce a total environment. I have a Sierra Club calendar at home and the January page has a picture of a little area in New England. The caption under it contains a quotation from Thoreau in which he said, "A village is preserved not more by the people in it, than by the swamps and woods that surround it." This was a puzzling thing the first time I read it and I had read it several times to begin to get what he was talking about, but it's true.

The practice of strip mining of coal is a perfect example of how we destroy our historical heritage when we destroy the land. Southeastern and east central Ohio is, I think, one of the most beautiful parts of our state. An area of really magical charm, it reminds you somewhat of the Downs of southern England; it has that special mystical quality about the landscape. It's a rolling, beautifully unspoiled, pristine landscape, except that it's being rapidly destroyed by huge earthmovers 20 stories high that are tearing it apart. Whole towns have disappeared from the face of the earth, whole highways have been removed. Woods and fields have all been turned under and replaced by heaps of rubble. This isn't just destroying productive land, although that is also the case, but it's destroying our past, it's destroying our youth. The people who do that are killers of the dream. We don't have a word for it, but we ought to have a word that covers that kind of destruction, and somehow we have got to stop it.

Not all of man's historic treasures are beautiful, and not all of nature is pristine. But something in all of it is worth saving if we can put it in proper perspective. And the signs of change are here. Last week I met with a representative of one of our country's major conservation groups and we discussed the proposed Cuyahoga Valley National Historical Park and Recreation Area between Akron and Cleveland. Normally this person would only have been interested in preserving wilderness, but he said he realized that we will not preserve our wilderness unless we also provide attractive alternatives for outdoor recreation like the Cuyahoga Valley close to the cities where most of our people live. And that's also the way we give people who live in the filled-up parts of our city a sense of what it means to be out in open country.

The Cuyahoga Valley is not pristine like the backcountry of Yellowstone, a superior national wilderness area. But each has unique qualities to preserve. And in preserving places like the Cuyahoga Valley we can ensure that the wilderness of Yellowstone will be preserved as a wilderness for future generations.

A similar analogy holds true for historic preservation. Not every historic building needs to be a museum. Ghirardelli Square in San Francisco and Canal Square here in Washington, D.C., are examples of how old structures can be given new life while maintaining a sense of their original integrity. Historic resources interact with the contemporary environment giving a region its character and sense of place. Another example is Independence Square in Philadelphia. A tremendous job was done to restore it to its 18th century scale and appearance. However, many beautiful old 19th century structures were demolished in the process. Historic preservation shouldn't mean that we're frozen to one period of the past. Rather, we must recognize that we have a series of pasts that should and can live together harmoniously. Then we can truly recognize and personally

understand how we fit into the patterns of history.

If you ever go to Stan Hywet Hall, the former family home I've been telling you about, you'll be interested to learn that the interior of the house was designed to look as though it had been added on to in various generations. The house starts out with a Tudor or pre-Tudor style and it carries rooms in it of every style of English interiors right up to the 19th century. So, this has recreated a sense of various ages.

As State Historic Preservation Officers, you are no doubt accustomed to looking within the patterns of history and identifying our cultural, racial, and ethnic diversity. Ours is a nation of contrast; our country's identity lies in the slums and ethnic ghettos, as well as within our magnificent mansions and public buildings. And the worthwhile features of these contrasts, if they're not identified and preserved now, may well be lost forever. Someday the people of this country, hopefully, will not have to live in any slums. But they'll want to know what one looked like, and that's worth preserving to remind them.

Hopefully one day we'll not even need a National Register. Historic preservation will be a personal ethic in each of us; it will be part of our ingrained culture in all its aspects—legal, governmental, commercial and educational. How we treat the land today, and more importantly, tomorrow, hopefully will be the result of this changing system of values.

We will never see the land as our ancestors did; for we can never totally reconstruct or preserve the past. But we can understand what made it beautiful, and why they lived and died to preserve it for us. And in preserving it for future generations we'll preserve something of ourselves. I think the young people of this country sense this. One of the songs they seem to like to sing most often has these familiar words in it: "This land is your land, this land is my land; from California to the New York island; from the redwood forests to the Gulf stream waters, this land was made for you and me."

If indeed we all have an interest in this land, then we all have a stake in its preservation. I think there's no more worthwhile cause. Thank you very much.

AMERICAN PEOPLE SUPPORT RIGHT TO ABORTION

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, recent mail and public reaction have displayed the support of the American people for the Supreme Court decision that has insured every woman of the right to determine whether or not she will have an abortion. As this public response indicates, women were denied a basic right for too long. Any legislative effort to restrict women from having abortions would be regarded as an attempt to violate human rights and to inflict the moral judgment of a minority on the American people as a whole.

The letters and information that follow show strong support for abortion from one community organization and two national organizations. The board of directors of the Young Women's Christian Association of Oakland has reaffirmed its support for a woman's right

to have an abortion. The board expresses its opposition to antiabortion constitutional amendments and "sleeper amendments" that would restrict the availability of abortions.

The National Association of Laity, the independent lay organization in the U.S. Catholic community applauds the Supreme Court decision for preventing the moral judgment of some from being forced upon everyone. The NAL sent a copy of a press release that explains its position and a table that indicates the support of the Catholic people for the right to an abortion.

The National Abortion Rights Action League provides information that shows that a majority of the American people support the Court's decision. Broad public support of the decision is made apparent by these revealing statistics.

It is encouraging to see these organizations take a firm stand in favor of the protection of the human right to choose. I am proud to include the letters and information from these three distinguished organization in the RECORD:

YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN
ASSOCIATION OF OAKLAND,
Oakland, Calif., February 5, 1974.

HON. RONALD DELLUMS,
House Office Building.

DEAR SIR: On February 4, 1974, the Board of Directors of the YWCA of Oakland voted to reaffirm the 1973 National Convention Resolution regarding "a woman's right to determine whether or not she wishes to have an abortion . . . therefore the YWCA shall support efforts to provide safe, low-cost abortions to all women who desire them."

The Board of Directors wishes you to be fully aware of its opposition to the various anti-abortion Constitutional Amendments as listed below:

1. Hogan Amendment H.J. 261 & 473
2. Buckley Amendment S.J. 119
3. Whitehurst Amendment

In addition, and in keeping with the resolution, we therefore openly register our opposition to the various anti-abortion "sleeper Amendments":

1. Buckley Amendment to the Social Security Amendment of 1973.
2. Legal Services Amendment to the Legal Services Act.
3. Resolution introduced by Harold Froehlich.
4. Church Amendment extending the Public Services Act.
5. Helms Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act.

A copy of our recommendations, as passed by our Board of Directors, is enclosed. We urge you to take strong action in this matter at every opportunity.

Thank you,

ORTHA WULFING, President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LAITY,
January 1974.

DEAR READER: The National Association of Laity (NAL) is the independent, lay organization in the U.S. Catholic community, dedicated to implementing Vatican II Council reforms.

During the public debate about criminal laws on abortion, the NAL Board felt that Catholic Lay opinion was being distorted or ignored. Thus, NAL publicly praised the Supreme Court for its decision heeding U.S. Catholic opinion rather than episcopal policy. On January 26, 1974, our Board of Directors confirmed the Assembly's statement of June, 1973, which "affirms the sanctity of life", yet "rejects . . . attempt to force a moral judgment on others."

We applaud the Supreme Court for stressing an individual's "right to privacy" and "free exercise of conscience." We feel the decision "in no way impedes the rights of our church to teach" but insures "a civil right and a personal option."

Enclosed is a press release explaining the National Association of Laity's position on abortion and the results of a study which indicate that our stand is truly representative of the U.S. Catholic community.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

DR. JOSEPH T. SKEHAN,
Secretary of the National Association of Laity.

LAY CATHOLICS APPLAUD SUPREME COURT ON ABORTION DECISION

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF THE LAITY.

After studying the decision, the Board of Officers of the National Association of the Laity (NAL), applauds the Supreme Court on its decision emphasizing the individual's right to privacy in making a decision on abortion. The Court's decision is not inconsistent with the Catholic Church's teaching that responsible persons exercise their conscience in matters of morality.

The NAL is the independent national Catholic lay reform organization in the U.S. For three years it has researched and debated this complex issue. Given the many aspects of this sensitive issue, the NAL is not yet ready to present a full position in a consensus. But implicit in the NAL's study has been dissatisfaction with their hierarchy's rigid position and with its insensitivity to the moral complexity of this issue.

The Court's decision in no way impedes the rights of our church to teach a doctrine limiting or prohibiting its members' use of abortion. But it also permits the free exercise of conscience for those citizens who regard abortion as a civil right and a personal option.

The Court has fulfilled its responsibility to the whole of the American people in dealing with this constitutional question. Now the Church can concentrate on re-examining its abortion teaching and restating it lucidly to Catholics, while not imposing its position on our fellow citizens who may not agree with us.

The National Catholic Reporter published this to indicate its concern for declining Church influence.

TABLE 3.—ATTITUDES TOWARD ABORTION BY RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION, 1972-73

Reason for abortion	[Percent approve]					
	Protestant		Catholic		Jew	
	1972	1973	1972	1973	1972	1973
Danger to mother's health.....	83	91	80	88	96	100
Rape.....	74	81	70	75	96	98
Chance of defective child.....	75	83	67	77	91	100
Does not want more children.....	36	46	29	34	70	91
Mother is unwed.....	39	48	32	34	80	88
Too poor to have more children.....	45	52	36	39	78	92

TABLE 4.—ATTITUDES TOWARD ABORTION FOR PROTESTANTS AND CATHOLICS UNDER 30, 1972-73

Reason for abortion	[Percent approve]			
	Protestant		Catholic	
	1972	1973	1972	1973
Health.....	89	93	89	93
Rape.....	76	82	77	79
Defective child.....	84	81	74	83
Does not want more.....	45	53	32	47
Unwed mother.....	44	52	32	41
Too poor.....	50	58	43	47
Number.....	222	193	111	112

TABLE 5.—DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROTESTANTS AND CATHOLICS UNDER 30 IN ABORTION ATTITUDES

Reason for abortion	[Percent Protestant margin approve over Catholic]	
	1972	1973
Health.....	10	2
Rape.....	1	3
Defective child.....	0	0
Does not want more.....	13	6
Unwed mother.....	12	11
Too poor.....	7	11

NATIONAL ABORTION RIGHTS ACTION LEAGUE,
Washington, D.C., February 13, 1974.

DEAR REP. DELLUMS: The National Abortion Rights Action League, NARAL, is dedicated to protecting and implementing the Supreme Court decisions legalizing abortion. Formerly known as the National Association for the Repeal of Abortion Laws, NARAL is a coalition of over 90 state and local organizations.

The information that we are sending you today appears to confirm what we have known for some time—that is, that a majority of the American people support the Supreme Court decisions on abortion. As you can see, of the 28 polls by Members of Congress of their own districts that we are aware of where the question was asked, 21 show clear support of the Court position and only two demonstrate majority disapproval.

Of perhaps more interest are the results of a recent major survey of the metropolitan Washington, D.C. region, conducted by the Bureau of Social Science Research. Over one thousand people were questioned on a variety of subjects, in a sample drawn to be highly representative. The results of a special analysis of one question on abortion, recently done for NARAL, are enclosed. It is of special interest to note that Prince George's County, Maryland, which is represented by Hon. Lawrence Hogan, would overwhelmingly oppose a Constitutional amendment outlawing abortion.

RESULTS OF CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRES ON THE ABORTION ISSUE

[Answers in percent]

MAJORITY SUPPORT THE RIGHT TO ABORTION

Edward G. Biester, Jr. (8th District, Pennsylvania, Republican): The Supreme Court recently handed down a decision liberalizing abortion. What is your opinion regarding the decision and future policy?

Agree with the Supreme Court decision.....	50.0
Favor a constitutional amendment banning abortions.....	14.0
Favor a constitutional amendment giving the States the power to decide under what circumstances an abortion may be performed.....	27.0

Adults Youths

Jonathan B. Bingham (23d District, New York, Democrat): Abortion: Should be left entirely to the woman and her doctor..... 80 90
Should be allowed only under special circumstances (like danger to the mother's life)..... 14 9
Should not be permitted..... 5 1
Don't know, no opinion..... 1 0

Thad Cochran (4th District, Mississippi, Republican): Do you approve the recent legal decision that abortion can be permitted under certain guidelines?
Yes..... 69.4
No..... 30.6

Harold R. Collier (6th District, Illinois, Republican): Do you approve the Supreme Court ruling that abortions are permissible under certain circumstances?
Yes..... 72.2
No..... 25.6
No response..... 2.2

R. Lawrence Coughlin (13th District, Pennsylvania, Republican): Do you approve the Supreme Court decisions on abortion?
Yes..... 61.0
No..... 26.0
Undecided..... 13.0

John N. Erlenborn (14th District, Illinois, Republican): In light of the recent Supreme Court decision declaring a constitutional right to abortion, which course of action do you favor? Do nothing. Let the decision permitting abortion stand:
Men..... 60.3
Women..... 59.2
Combined..... 59.7

Enact a constitutional amendment allowing the people of each state, through their legislatures, to prohibit or regulate abortions:
Men..... 39.7
Women..... 40.8
Combined..... 40.3

Paul Findley (20th District, Illinois, Republican): The Supreme Court has stated that during the 1st 3 months of pregnancy, a woman and her doctor should have the right to decide whether she will have an abortion. Only in the last 3 months can States prohibit all abortions. Do you feel this decision is right?

	Yes	No	Undecided
His.....	8,260	5,843	1,376
Hers.....	8,219	6,399	1,252
Total.....	16,479	12,242	2,628

Bill Frenzel (3d District, Minnesota, Republican): Do you favor a Constitutional amendment prohibiting abortion?

Yes.....	24.0
No.....	67.0
No response.....	9.0

Benjamin A. Gilman (26th District, New York, Republican): Do you favor Congress:

(1) Letting States devise their own abortion laws.....	21.0
(2) Upholding the Supreme Court decision permitting abortion.....	55.0
(3) Enacting a constitutional amendment prohibiting abortions.....	21.0
(4) No opinion.....	3.0

Gilbert Gude (8th District, Maryland, Republican): I would like to see:

(a) The recent Supreme Court decision on abortion stand.....	41.1
(b) A constitutional amendment eliminating all abortions.....	11.3
(c) An amendment returning to the States the power to restrict abortions.....	14.1
(d) Further liberalization.....	27.9

H. John Heinz (18th District, Pennsylvania, Republican): Do you favor constitutionally outlawing abortion?

Yes.....	38.0
No.....	55.0
Undecided.....	7.0

Morgan F. Murphy (2d District, Illinois, Democrat): Abortion—Agree with the recent Supreme Court decision on abortion:

Agreed.....	52.0
Disagreed.....	39.0
Undecided.....	9.0

L. Richardson Preyer (6th District, North Carolina, Democrat): Do you agree with the Supreme Court decision establishing the legality of abortion during the 1st 3 months if the woman and her physician agree?

Yes.....	72.0
No.....	22.0
No answer.....	6.0

MAJORITY SUPPORT THE RIGHT TO ABORTION—Continued

Tom Railsback (19th District, Illinois, Republican): Do you agree with the Supreme Court ruling on abortion that it is permissible under certain guidelines?

	Yes	No
His.....	76	24
Hers.....	67	33

Howard W. Robison (27th District, New York, Republican): Would you favor an amendment to the Federal constitution to (in effect) repeal such laws and allow abortion only to save the life of the mother?..... 68 percent oppose

James W. Symington (2d District, Montana, Democrat): The Constitution is the basic document of our American political system. From this fundamental document our laws are derived. In our Nation's history it has been altered only 26 times, and only after long debate and serious thought. Recently, several new amendments have been proposed; which, if any, would you support?
An amendment to prohibit abortion under all circumstances except to save the life of the mother?

	Yes	No
His.....	18.0	
Hers.....	21.0	

Lionel Van Deerlin (41st District, California, Democrat): The Supreme Court has acted to relax State abortion control laws. Do you think abortions should be:

	Yes	No
Left to the woman and her doctor?.....	82.1	
Regulated by Government?.....	5.2	
Other (specify).....	12.7	

Larry Winn (3d District, Kansas, Republican): Do you agree with the recent Supreme Court decision regarding the liberalization of abortion laws?

	Yes	No
Male.....	62	33
Female.....	63	37

Chalmers Wylie (15th District, Ohio, Republican): On the question of abortion do you favor:

	Yes	No
(a) The Supreme Court decision:		
His.....	74	26
Hers.....	72	28
(b) Absolute prohibition:		
His.....	19	81
Hers.....	20	80
(c) Limited laws permitting abortion when medically judged necessary to preserve the health or life of the mother:		
His.....	61	39
Hers.....	61	39
(d) Limited laws including the above and adding pregnancies resulting from rape and incest:		
His.....	71	29
Hers.....	72	28

C. W. Bill Young (6th District, Florida, Republican): Do you believe that a woman and her doctor should have a legal right to make a decision regarding abortion?

	Yes	No	No opinion
Yes.....	79.9		
No.....		14.7	
No opinion.....			5.4

BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, INC., Washington, D.C., February 1974. THE ISSUE OF ABORTION

In a study carried out by The Washington Survey last summer, 78 percent of adult residents in the Washington metropolitan area agreed that "the decision to have an abortion should be made solely by a woman and her physician." As reported by WTOP-TV, the proportions in favor of this proposition varied only marginally (77-79%) across the area's six major jurisdictions. Eighteen percent of the respondents disagreed, and 4 percent expressed no opinion. Excluding this latter group, four adults out of five (81%) held this point of view. Thus, the residents in the Greater Washington area generally support the position enunciated in the January, 1973 Supreme Court decision concerning abortion.

More intensive analysis showed little variation in the views held by different segments of the adult population. When answers were analyzed by sex, race, marital status, age, and income, few significant variations were found. Only with respect to religion were substantial differences observed. As expected, Catholic respondents were less often in favor of this concept: only 67 percent agreed with the proposition quoted above, compared with 82 percent of Protestants, 89 percent of those in other religious groups, and 95 percent of those with no religious preference (see accompanying table). Among those least in favor of this concept were Catholic men and Catholics over the age of 45: a sharply reduced majority (60%) of these subgroups agreed with this position on the abortion issue. No such sex or age-linked variations were observed in the answers given by Protestants.

These findings emerged from a study done by The Washington Survey, a research fac-

ity of the Bureau of Social Science Research. Personal face-to-face interviews were conducted in the period mid-June through August, 1973, with a representative cross-section of 1,209 Washington area residents. They were selected by means of an area probability sample design which insured that respondents formed a valid cross-section of Greater Washington, and also of each of its majority components: Washington, D.C.; Alexandria; Arlington and Fairfax counties in Virginia; and Prince George's and Montgomery counties in Maryland.

ABORTION DECISION

[Proportion who agree or disagree with this statement: "The decision to have an abortion should be made solely by a woman and her physician."]

	[In percent]	
	Agree	Disagree
Total.....	81	19
Sex:		
Male.....	79	21
Female.....	82	18
Race:		
White.....	82	18
Nonwhite.....	78	22
Marital status:		
Never married.....	86	14
Married.....	80	20
Other.....	81	19
Age:		
18 to 24 yr.....	84	16
25 to 44 yr.....	81	19
45 and over.....	79	21
Income:		
Below \$10,000.....	82	18
\$10,000 to \$20,000.....	80	20
\$20,000 and up.....	82	18
Religion:		
Protestant.....	82	18
Catholic.....	67	33
Other.....	89	11
None.....	95	5

Samuel Young (10th District, Illinois, Republican): Do you approve the Supreme Court ruling that abortion is now permissible?

	Yes	No
His.....	75.6	24.4
Hers.....	68.4	31.6
Total.....	72.1	27.9

NO CLEAR MAJORITY

Frank Annunzio (11th District, Illinois Democrat): Abortion—amend the Constitution to overturn the Supreme Court decision which liberalizes abortion regulations?

	Yes	No
Yes.....	43.0	
No.....	44.0	
Undecided.....	13.0	

Harold Froehlich (8th District, Wisconsin, Republican): Abortion: Agree with the recent Supreme Court decision?

	Yes	No
Yes.....	48.0	
No.....	38.0	
Undecided.....	14.0	

Joseph E. Karth (4th District, Minnesota, Democrat):

(a) Agree with U.S. Supreme Court decision..... 49.0
(b) Disagree with the court decision and favor a Federal Constitutional Amendment that would:

(1) Forbid all abortions.....	10.0
(2) Forbid all abortions except under special medical circumstances (danger to mother's life, victims of rape or incest).....	36.0
(3) Let each state decide whether or not to legalize abortion.....	5.0

Sam Steiger (3rd District, Arizona, Republican): On abortion do you favor:
(a) A constitutional amendment to prohibit abortion in all but extreme circumstances?..... 37.0
(b) A constitutional amendment to allow each state to decide the abortion question?..... 28.0
(c) Do nothing at all and let the Supreme Court decision permitting abortion stand?..... 35.0

MAJORITY OPPOSE SUPREME COURT DECISION

M. G. Snyder (4th District, Kentucky, Republican): Do you favor the recent Supreme Court ruling making abortions permissible?

	Yes	No	No opinion
Yes.....	45.3		
No.....		51.3	
No opinion.....			3.2

William A. Steiger (6th District, Wisconsin, Republican): Abortion:

Allowing the Supreme Court decision to stand.....	36.0
Amending the Constitution to restore to the States the power to regulate abortion.....	11.5
Amending the Constitution to prohibit in all but extreme circumstances.....	52.0
No abortion in any circumstance.....	5.0

MAJORITY FAVORS STATES RIGHTS

George M. O'Brien (17th District, Illinois, Republican): Do you favor a constitutional amendment which would return the power to the states to enact laws with respect to abortion?

	Yes	No
Yes.....	59.0	
No.....		41.0

[Analysis of religious groups, by age of respondents]

Protestant:			
18 to 24.....	81	19	
25 to 44.....	83	17	
45 and over.....	82	18	
Catholic:			
18 to 24.....	74	26	
25 to 44.....	69	31	
45 and over.....	60	40	
Other:			
18 to 24.....	77	23	
25 to 44.....	91	9	
45 and over.....	92	8	
None:			
18 to 24.....	100	0	
25 to 44.....	91	9	
45 and over.....	100	0	

[Proportion who agree or disagree with the abortion question from the 6 communities included in the sample]

	District of Columbia	Arlington	Alexandria	Fairfax	Montgomery	Prince Georges
Agree.....	77	77	79			
Disagree.....	18	14	20			
No opinion.....	5	9	2			
Agree.....	79	78	79			
Disagree.....	17	20	19			
No opinion.....	4	2	2			

THE BALTIC STATES

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER OF PENNSYLVANIA IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, February and March 1974 mark the 56th

anniversaries of the Republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

It is fitting that we pause to commemorate the struggle of the Baltic States for freedom and self-determination, and to reaffirm our support for that struggle.

I ask unanimous consent that a portion of a 1959 New York Times editorial on the plight of the Baltic States be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

BALTIC STATES

We do not propose to go to war for the liberation of the Baltic States. Nor do the citizens of those states, still resident there or in exile in other lands, argue for the sort of nationalism that existed between the first and second World War. What they do ask for is political, religious and cultural freedom. They are as aware as the rest of us that such freedom can exist only in a world of freedom.

In the Baltic countries the path to a better future is still dark, but it is not lost and will not be. The day of the overlords will not last forever. The time will come when the three lost little nations will be able to come out and join us.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month—on February 16—the 724th anniversary of Lithuanian independence was observed.

Certainly, this is an important milestone in the history of these freedom-loving people. Yet, one is saddened by the fact that those living in Lithuania probably were unable to commemorate this day.

Since the emergence of Lithuania as a free nation so many centuries ago, its people have been masters of their destiny for only 21 years. Currently, of course, Lithuanians are under the cruel yoke of Soviet domination, a harsh fate for these peaceful, hard-working people who are so dedicated to the ideals of liberty and justice for all the citizens of the Earth.

Despite their domination, however, the Lithuanians have retained their spirit and still long for a time when once again they will be able to guide the course of their country's history and provide for the welfare of all their brothers and sisters.

The mettle of the people of Lithuania and their desire for freedom and peace and justice are indeed admirable traits—qualities which make them truly deserving of the independence they seek.

The character of Lithuania and its people is reflected in the diligence and patriotism exhibited by Americans of Lithuanian descent in Connecticut and throughout the Nation, who have made so many lasting contributions to the well-being of this great country of ours.

At this time, then, let us renew our commitment to insure that in the years ahead Lithuanians can once again become members of that community of free and sovereign states whose people are blessed with freedom in abundance.

THE OIL COMPANY BLUES

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, my colleague LES ASPIN has written a most revealing and analytical article on the U.S. oil industry that appears in the current New York Review of Books. He raises questions that are all too frequently ignored, but that will be recurrent until we face the issue squarely. I cannot commend my colleague too highly for saying in a most straightforward manner what so many in Government have been reluctant even to discuss.

It seems that we are now at somewhat of a stalemate in our attempts to solve the energy crisis. Everyone who stands in line for gas accuses the oil companies of withholding supply for higher profits. We in this body respond by agreeing that, indeed, there must be a new look taken at our national oil and energy policies. But we go no deeper. We consider rollbacks on certain prices and even windfall profits taxes. Nowhere do we honestly address what lies at the heart of the crunch—the fact that the oil industry occupies a uniquely advantageous position in our economy. It is totally unregulated and free to operate clandestinely, while it also benefits from advantages granted by the Federal Government matched in no other industry.

As my colleague from Wisconsin so accurately observes, we treat the oil industry as a member of the free enterprise system while we grant it preferential treatment reserved traditionally for semipublic companies subsidized by the Government. We do not regulate the oil companies, but we turn around and give them tax shelters and import assistance.

This is the very basic question that must be resolved before there can be a real, lasting end to our fuel shortage. As long as the oil industry remains securely above and protected from all other free market forces, we can expect to be treated according to its own best interest. Nationalize and regulate the industry or break it up and make it competitive. We have no other alternatives.

The article follows:

THE OIL COMPANY BLUES

(By LES ASPIN)

The seven oil executives who testified on the energy crisis before Senator Jackson's subcommittee in January claimed that Jackson was picking fights with the oil witnesses, was making unsubstantiated accusations, and was generally acting like a politician seeking his party's presidential nomination. Many journalists and editorial writers seem to share some of the industry's misgivings. The Jackson hearings and the oil companies' rapidly intensifying public relations cam-

paign may have left the public more confused than ever about the current energy shortage. The consumers know they are paying higher and higher energy prices. But are the gains enjoyed by the oil companies fair and equitable, or not?

To evaluate fairly what the oil companies have gained, it is necessary to examine their recent record, or at least what we know of it, since they have been more secretive about their operations than most other industries. According to the Consumer Price Index, calculated by the US Government of Labor's Bureau of Statistics, the price of gasoline rose 19.7 percent during 1973, while the price of fuel oil rose 46.8 percent. Some petroleum products such as propane, used for home heating in the South and crop drying in agricultural sections of the Midwest, have increased in price by 300 percent.

In recent weeks the price of gasoline has continued to climb at an accelerated pace without any sign of leveling off. Spot shortages in a number of cities, particularly in the Northeast, have led to price gouging and long waits for motorists who are allowed to buy a limited amount of gas on each visit to the stations. Naturally, these rising prices have been reflected in higher profits for the oil industry. Profits for the top ten companies this year will total \$7.8 billion—up 51.2 percent over last year's figure.

In the face of these rather disturbing statistics, the oil companies argue that their higher profits are needed to provide the capital necessary to search for new sources of oil and gas around the world. In fact, the industry estimates that between now and 1985 more than \$800 billion in investment capital will be needed in order to keep pace with the US demand for fossil fuels (assuming that the demand for these fuels continues to grow at the current rate).

However, these claims about the need for higher profits for investment are somewhat suspect in view of the oil industry's unwillingness to go into debt to find new capital. Traditionally the oil industry—and it is nearly alone in this respect—has depended heavily on retained earnings for investment. For example, during the third quarter of 1972, according to the Federal Trade Commission, for every five dollars invested from profits for all US manufacturing the companies also borrowed two dollars, a ratio of 2.5:1. For the oil industry, however, the ratio was closer to 6:1, a figure reflecting the oil industry's reluctance to borrow.

The most convincing test of the oil industry's seriousness about reinvesting profits for exploration and development of new sources of oil would be its willingness to retain earnings and not increase dividends as profits go up. The evidence, although preliminary and incomplete, suggests that many of the oil companies may plan to increase dividends relatively more and reinvestment less. Exxon has already announced a 12 percent increase in dividends. Mobil and Standard of California, Standard of Indiana, Texaco, Union, Continental Oil, Getty, Murphy Oil, and Ashland are all increasing their dividends. As corporate profits continue to grow, further increases in dividends will tell much about their real intentions to develop new sources of energy in the public interest.

In addition to arguing that higher profits are needed, the oil industry, in its latest round of newspaper advertisements, is claiming that 1973 profits should not be compared to the previous year's profits or to profits in the last few years, since oil profits have in the past been too low.

It is true that at the beginning of this decade the oil companies fell on relatively hard times so far as profits are concerned. Although sales went up 6.2 percent in 1970, the profits of thirty-eight integrated oil companies actually went down 1.9 percent. The Tax Reform Act of 1969 reduced the oil companies' depletion allowance from 27.5 percent

to 22 percent and on August 15, 1971, the President imposed Phase I economic controls freezing the price of petroleum products at a low profit level.

By the fall of 1972, the Nixon Administration became concerned about fuel supplies for the coming winter in view of the industry's sluggish production. According to officials at the Cost of Living Council, the oil industry could, under controlled prices, have made what government officials believed was a reasonable profit on #2 home heating oil. But the oil companies did not produce as much as needed. According to one staff member of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, CITCO the fifteenth largest oil company acknowledged that it was deliberately producing less fuel oil, for "economic reasons."

Apparently, the oil companies in the fall of 1972 could have made a profit by producing fuel oil, but they felt that the size of the profit and profit margin were unsatisfactory. Later the Office of Emergency Planning calculated that if the oil industry had maximized production during the autumn, a surplus of 4 million barrels of fuel oil would have been produced. Instead, production lagged and there was a 26 million barrel deficit.

Nothing in the industry's apparent hesitation to produce fuel oil suggests any collusion on the industry's part; but it says something about the impotence of the government. The Nixon Administration thought there was enough profit for the oil companies to produce at maximum output, but when they did not do this the government was unable (or unwilling) to do anything about it.

For its part, the industry maintains that its rate of return on equity—i.e., on total net investment—is too low. Since 1969 the average rate of return has been approximately 10 percent, which, the companies argue, is considerably lower than the rate of return on equity in manufacturing. Interestingly, according to the Federal Trade Commission, the rate of return on equity for manufacturing since 1969 has, on the average, been the same as the rate of return on oil (both exactly 10.3 percent). It was only in 1972 that the oil industry's rate of return lagged (8.5 percent as compared with 12.0 percent for manufacturing). But it is estimated that in 1973 both the oil and other manufacturing industries earned about 12 percent on their investments. In short, the oil industry's claim that their rate of return has fallen below other industries simply is not justified by the facts.

More important, measuring the oil industry's profits on the basis of rate of return on equity only creates a distorted and incomplete picture of oil industry profitability. A more accurate picture of profits is provided by measuring profit as a percentage of sales. By this standard, the oil industry's average in the last two years has been well above the average for all manufacturing. During the first three quarters of 1972, oil industry profits were 6.5 percent of sales, compared to 4.2 percent for all manufacturing. The gap widened during the first three quarters of 1973 when oil industry profitability reached 7.4 percent and all manufacturing profitability was 4.7 percent. Dramatically increasing gasoline prices this year will obviously have their effect, and first quarter 1974 profits on sales for the oil industry should be spectacular.

Any analyst should consider both rate of return on equity and profit as a percentage of sales in analyzing the profits of a major industry. But, in an industry with a rapid turnover in sales, such as gasoline marketing, profit as a percentage of sales is a much more convincing measure of corporate success. Some analysts completely discount the measure of rate of return on equity as irrelevant

to the profits of the oil industry. They point out that the return on investment in normal manufacturing such as automobile production will appear quite quickly on the corporate balance sheet. But return on investments in the oil industry for exploration and development may not appear on the books for decades either because actual production does not take place immediately or because the value of the new oil acquired cannot be fully estimated in the short run. This time lag in realizing gains in real dollars makes rate of return on equity a less accurate measure.

Although the oil companies' claims that they must have higher profits are not very persuasive, their attitude is typical of the attitude many large businesses take toward government: when it is in their best interest to be treated as part of the "free enterprise system," they insist on being treated that way. But when it is to their advantage to be considered wards of the state they forget their dedication to free enterprise.

The oil companies want to be treated like any other business when they oppose price and wage controls, resist new environmental standards, and fight government efforts to restrain the mergers and mutual price agreements and discrimination against independent gas stations that prevent the industry from being competitive. But the oil companies also want to be treated like wards of the state when it comes to subsidies in the form of tax breaks or import quotas. The oil import quota system was established during the Eisenhower Administration, ostensibly on the grounds that oil is an important national resource and the US must have its own supply. In fact the quotas blocked the entry of cheap foreign oil into the US and kept the domestic price from falling. Not only did this policy hurt consumers but it resulted in a system of "drain America first." But import quotas are what the oil companies wanted, and only when the price of Mideast oil was already rising did the Nixon Administration relax them in 1973.

Similarly, the oil industry avoids an estimated \$1.5 billion per year in taxes because of the 22 percent depletion allowance and an additional \$325 million in taxes from deductions derived from so-called intangible drilling expenses, on the grounds that these promote further exploration and greater supplies. Moreover, the Treasury Department estimates that U.S. oil corporations will claim nearly \$3 billion in credits against their 1974 income taxes on the basis of taxes paid to foreign governments—another special privilege. The fact that supplies of oil are a little short—because of the oil companies' own actions, including their failure to expand refinery capacity does not deter them. The oil companies will still argue that they must have the depletion allowance and foreign tax credits because of the need to find new sources of energy.

The government's position toward the oil companies has been to encourage free enterprise so far as economic controls are concerned but to provide public welfare in matters of tax policy and imports. This goes a long way toward explaining why the Nixon Administration has been able to do so little about the current crisis. The government has a hands-off policy that provides a carrot for the oil industry; but it has no stick.

It is time for American citizens and the Congress to decide: Are the oil companies to be treated as part of the free enterprise system they claim to defend or are they not? If they are, then all of their special tax and other privileges should be abolished, our policy should be to break up the oil industry, above all by requiring that the functions of production, refining, transport by pipeline, and marketing each be performed by independent companies. If this were done, real

competition would provide the stick and we could expect both a lowering of prices and intensive efforts in the industry to open up new sources of energy.

On the other hand, Congress and the nation could decide that energy is so important that the oil industry should truly be a ward of the state that in the public interest the oil industry must be subject to strict government control in its pricing, its effects on the environment, and its planning for the future. In that case nationalization, or something approaching it, should be our policy. Then the government would control the stick.

To make either of these choices will be immensely difficult for American politicians. One need only take account of the millions of dollars in campaign contributions by the oil companies to candidates in both parties to see just how difficult both choices are. The oil companies and their officers and directors, for example, made legal and illegal contributions of more than \$4.9 million to Mr. Nixon's 1972 campaign. But as the oil industry bears more and more heavily on every aspect of economic life this is the kind of choice our political system will have to face.

MEDICAL RESEARCH SHOWS THE DANGER OF MARIHUANA

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, recently a friend of mine sent me an article about a medical research project which proved, contrary to many assertions, that marihuana is a harmful drug. While this study was completed some time ago, I had not heard of it, and I believe that relatively few people outside the medical profession have heard of it either. Thus I would like to insert this article into the RECORD, for this research and the other projects like it should be a significant influence in deciding what our policy toward narcotics should be:

MARIHUANA

The UPI in a recent news release reported that two Philadelphia psychoanalysts studied 38 previously normal individuals who had smoked marihuana regularly. The results show that this drug produces a serious mental disturbance, including psychosis in some cases. The researchers said that "these patients consistently showed very poor social judgment, poor attention span, poor concentration, confusion, anxiety, depression, apathy, passivity, indifference, and often a slowed and slurred speech." They also listed among other symptoms "an alteration of consciousness which included a split between an observing and an experiencing portion of the ego, an inability to bring thoughts together, a paranoid suspiciousness of others, and a regression to a more infantile state". Other symptoms noted were sexual promiscuity, "a marked interference with personal cleanliness, grooming, dressing and study habits or work habits or both".

A spokesman for the AMA said that the report, published in the April 19, 1971 issue of the "Journal of the American Medical Association", is "the first real evidence, based on good research, of harmful effects from smoking marihuana. Heretofore, medicine has been able to say only that there was no good evidence of harm from smoking pot. Now we have some evidence."

The findings of these researchers are reminiscent of the warning given by Pope Paul VI last December, when, in an address to a group of teachers and social workers concerned about the growing drug problem, he pointed out that contrary to the myth that drugs help people to discover more personal and authentic values, no one with his brains addled by powerful narcotics was fit to accomplish much of anything, least of all a better world or reformed society.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNER

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are well aware of the wonderful opportunity given by the Veterans of Foreign Wars to the young people in our country with its Voice of Democracy contest which is held annually.

This year, the winner from Idaho is a young lady from my district, Sally Anne Wellman of Kellogg, Idaho. I have read Sally's speech and in reading it, it is apparent this fine competition brings out everything good in our young people today. It is my pleasure to commend Sally's speech to the reading of my colleagues:

I AM AN AMERICAN

(By Sally Anne Wellman)

I am an American—a citizen of the United States of America. My citizenship is part of me. I cannot escape it. In a sense it is inherent. I can put it to use as I do my time and talents. It is a responsibility requiring courage, love, faith, and hope.

You see, ours is a young country. It was conceived in the hearts of the Pilgrim Fathers. In embryo it survived the colonial years and it was born in bloodshed and sacrifice in 1776. It became lusty and independent and grew and flourished. It conquered—yet bestowed kindness. With open arms it has embraced the world. It has been repulsed and has experienced hurt because of its youthful innocence. But in spite of this our country has grown and grown until today it is a teenager, so to speak.

It has grown under the government for the people and by the the people. It has been nourished by its citizens. Its citizens voted or forgot to vote. They kept the laws they made or they neglected them. They sometimes knowingly or ignorantly followed leaders who sought mastery rather than stewardship—but they were citizens—they contributed.

We still have our United States free, true and beautiful. As an eighteen year old, I ponder my responsibilities.

Gibran has said: "Citizenship is to acknowledge the other person's rights, before asserting your own, but always to be conscious of your own. It is to be free in word and in deed, but it is also to know that your freedom is subject to the other person's freedom. It is to create the useful and beautiful with your own hands and to admire what others have created in love and faith."

Citizenship, then, means that I must look outward to the other fellow knowing my own responsibilities and recognizing and respecting his. I must realize that I can only be free if I allow others to be free. The overseer is less free than the slave.

My citizenship allows me to create what I consider beautiful with both my hands and my mind. And the more I appreciate the works of others, the worthier will my works shine.

Only by observing these moral laws can I keep the civil ones which I must do with all my might.

I pledge my allegiance—I vow to thee, my country—all earthly things above—entire and whole and perfect—the service of my love.

BAYARD RUSTIN: LABOR AND BLACK HISTORY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the pioneers in the fight for labor rights, Bayard Rustin, has written a timely article on labor and black history. I would like to share Mr. Rustin's thoughts with my colleagues at this point in the RECORD:

[From the New York Amsterdam News, Feb. 23, 1974]

LABOR AND BLACK HISTORY

(By Bayard Rustin)

The debate over the effectiveness of Black capitalism as a strategy for racial progress has intensified with the revelations of widespread scandal within the Nixon Administration's minority opportunity effort.

But the most significant issues are not the details of venality, partisanship, and corruption which pervaded the operation of the Office of Minority Business Enterprise.

More important is the extent to which the abysmal failure of this program forces Blacks to reexamine the means by which they hope to achieve a society that is equal and just.

Since the end of slavery Black leaders have argued over how to end discrimination and poverty, but the most fundamental debate has centered on the question of which social force—capital or labor—Blacks should align themselves with.

Thus today's proponents of Black capitalism have their historical ancestors in such figures as Booker T. Washington and Marcus Garvey, who, despite their differences, both believed that Blacks would be best advised to cast their lot with the forces of capitalism. (Garvey once went so far as to assert that for Blacks to join together with trade unions would lead to "complete economic and general extermination.")

There are, of course, important differences between the Black economic structure envisioned by Garvey, the accommodationist doctrine of Washington, and the various schemes of black business advancement proposed today.

But there is also a basic, and quite important similarity: Black capitalism, whether it consists of buying shares in a ship company or operating a corner grocery store, can at best lead to the economic uplift of a very marginal segment of the Black community. It cannot reach the masses of working people or impoverished families that comprise the vast majority of the black populace.

The only institution capable of transforming the conditions of working people—Black and white—is the labor movement. And in the wake of the demise of Black capitalism, and the inability of separatism to elicit a mass following, I think it is essential to reevaluate labor's role in the struggle for racial advancement.

TWO PERIODS

This century has seen two periods of significant economic progress for Blacks, and labor played a pivotal role on each occasion. The first period was in the 1930's, when the industrial unions which came to form the

CIO, along with the AFL unions like the garment workers, initiated a broad campaign to organize the nation's mass production industries.

Until that time the trade union movement, like almost every other American institution, had with a few notable exceptions systematically excluded Black workers, or had relegated Blacks to separate and inferior segregated locals.

The advent of industrial unionism changed all that. Now all workers were organized regardless of race; the standards of living of these newly-organized workers, moreover, were substantially improved because of the contracts negotiated by the unions.

The second period of Black advancement was, of course, the 1960's, when the Social, legal and political structures of Jim Crow were broken under the weight of the civil rights movement.

Here labor's role was essentially political: the AFL-CIO was the driving force behind both the measures which laid the groundwork for the abolition of racial bias, and for those efforts to guarantee a measure of economic justice to those who had been shut out from the economic mainstream.

In all of this labor has been acting in the interest of millions of American workers, both those who belong to its ranks, and those unorganized workers who benefit from the political gains secured by the unions.

It can be argued that criticizing a discredited program like Black capitalism is like flaying a dead horse.

The point, however, is that Black capitalism was not created in a vacuum; it was the progeny of some profoundly flawed thinking.

Bad ideas have a way of taking root in social policy. The accommodationist philosophy infected the Black movement for generations, while separatism diverted the civil rights movement at precisely the time of greatest opportunity for success.

Black people can afford no further diversions. History has taught us that progress is gained only through a strategy which seeks the economic and social elevation of great masses of people. And that strategy is best embodied in the programs and ideals of the American labor movement.

A LAW TO ELIMINATE THE REQUIREMENT OF CORROBORATION IN RAPE CASES

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week the State of New York enacted a law to eliminate the requirement of corroboration in rape cases. Until the passage of this law, the word of a woman who was raped in New York was insufficient to bring about a conviction for rape—additional, independent evidence was required to "corroborate" the word of the victim. Yet in other crimes, such as purse-snatchings or beatings, the word of the victim has always been sufficient to bring about a conviction.

Surely the word of a rape victim can be no less believable than that of the victim of a purse-snatching, beating, or other crime. The fact that the "corroboration" rule, as it is known, has only been applied to rape cases would seem to justify the widespread attack on it as

sexually discriminatory and as contributing to make conviction for rape virtually impossible to obtain.

I am very pleased by the action of New York State. I would hope the example of New York might persuade the remaining jurisdictions in which the corroboration rule is still in force to take similar action.

LABOR APPORTION TO METRIC CONVERSION NOT JUSTIFIED

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the allegations that conversion to the metric system of weights and measures would create hardships or exorbitant expenses to business and industrial concerns, I feel that a substantial refutation is to be found in a recent issue of the Industrial Construction magazine. According to this report, some 155 businesses, large and small, were surveyed on various aspects relative to conversion to the metric system of weights and measures, and the results support the position that I have maintained for many years; namely, that the costs of conversion will be assimilated and defrayed rapidly and at far less than most estimates of objectors to the metric system.

The summary of this article reporting on the American Management Association survey is inserted in the RECORD for the enlightenment of my colleagues who will be considering the Metric Conversion Act (H.R. 11035) within the next few days:

PUSH FOR GOVERNMENT AID IN METRIC SWITCH COULD PERIL FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Metric conversion legislation in this Congress could be killed, according to Rep. Robert McClory (R. Ill.), by related lobbying drives by organized labor and business for federal aid to firms for conversion to the metric system.

The AFL-CIO is demanding that the government provide compensation and adjustment aid to workers for cost of tools, costs of educational retraining, and other conversion transition costs, including relocation, job loss, downgrading and loss of income or promotion opportunities due to workers' lack of familiarity with the metric system.

The National Federation of Business also is seeking money and aid from the taxpayer, McClory reports. NFIB wants the Small Business Administration to have power from Congress to make loans to help small firms change equipment, facilities, methods of operations, or to retrain and educate workers to conform to a metric system.

McClory charged that these groups are seeking aid unnecessarily and points out that no other country in the world that has undergone conversion has found such aid necessary and has let the costs fall where they may.

McClory's warning that if these groups obtain the aid they are seeking, this may well destroy any federal metric legislation that was placed in the Nov. 14 Congressional Record. He stressed that the United States is going metric at an ever increasing rate with or without federal legislation, and the main argument for a federal conversion law is that it would cost less to convert under a care-

fully coordinated plan rather than to "continue our present drift".

The Senate Commerce Committee is now holding in abeyance a conversion bill it had approved for a 10-year voluntary metric conversion plan. A similar measure (H.R. 11035) won House Space Committee approval only to be sidetracked for the time being in the House Rules Committee.

McClory noted that two years ago the Commerce Secretary called for a deliberate and careful conversion on a voluntary basis, to make the metric system the "predominant" one in this country, with the change-over costs to lie where they fall. That meant costs would be borne by those benefiting from the changeover.

The Commerce Secretary has felt so strongly about keeping government cost factors low, that he indicated enactment of metric legislation without higher costs could only help smaller business, McClory said. McClory added that any improvement in the economy brought about by conversion to a metric system will help small and big business as well as labor. But labor and business will both be hurt if conversion can't be done in an orderly manner with little or no costs.

Small business needs a coordinated metric conversion plan while bigger firms have the technical and financial resources to make their own changeover. General Motors, Ford, Caterpillar Tractor, International Harvester, and Timken Roller Bearing are among big corporations already into the conversion process and assuming all costs for the process.

"Why forfeit such beneficial legislation by asking for unreasonable handouts?" McClory asked. The National Bureau of Standards concluded that retraining of workers will not be any problem, and workers need learn only a small part of the metric system, an educational process, that will take only a few hours.

The United States needs metric conversion to stay competitive in world markets, McClory believes, and if it does not make the conversion, then other nations will simply not buy U.S. goods or trade with the U.S.—AMM/MN.

FARM TALK

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, there is a new newspaper in my district. It is called Farm Talk, and it is getting to be well known in farm homes in southeast Kansas.

The commonsense editor of Farm Talk is Thayne Cozart. He resigned a faculty position at Washington State University in order to return to his native State of Kansas and be close to the farming communities he knows so well.

I would like to share a bit of his agricultural wisdom with my colleagues by reading to you his editorial comment in the first edition of Farm Talk:

No one seems to have noticed yet, but there's a valuable lesson for folks, both in and out of agriculture, to learn from the present energy crisis. The energy crisis is partial testimony to America's voracious energy appetite, but even more of a testimonial to our shortsightedness in funding and conducting research into sources of energy other than fossil fuels.

Just as the energy crisis traces back to our willingness to accept tight purse-strings on energy research budgets in the name of tax dollar savings, so could a similar new technology crisis engulf agriculture if we lack the foresight to insist upon adequate funding of agricultural research and development on both a statewide and national scale.

Research results do not happen overnight in response to a crisis. They are the returns on long-term, sustained investments of tax dollars and private dollars in research and development programs. Research and development is insurance against a crisis.

The annual legislative and bureaucratic struggles in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri to fund agricultural research and development look like a rerun of the energy pennypinching that preceded our energy crisis.

In spite of our agricultural bounty, we're still behind in agricultural research.

It's time for all of us—as farmers, businessmen, legislators, and citizens—to insist upon future agricultural security based upon adequate research and development. By so doing, we can probably avert an agricultural crisis similar to the energy crisis.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY— 1974

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues and my Estonian-American friends in commemorating the 56th anniversary of Estonian independence day. Yet this represents a hollow celebration because for more than half of these 56 years, independence and freedom has been nothing but an elusive dream for the people of Estonia, who have been forced to live under the harsh and ruthless regime of the Soviet Union.

The pill of Russian rule has been a particularly hard one for the freedom-loving people of Estonia to swallow. Prior to their being overrun by the Russians, the small nation had registered rapid economic growth, and the nation had a bright and promising future. Yet since the Russian takeover in 1939, life for the Estonian people has been characterized by economic regression as well as social and political repression, and the future looks none too bright.

As we view the sad state of the Estonian nation today let us not overlook the nation which is responsible for this tragedy, the Soviet Union. As we rush headstrong into a policy of détente with the Soviets, let us remember the Estonians and their constant search for freedom and dignity. Let us remember the tragic case of Alexander Solzhenitsyn who was ruthlessly arrested and then exiled from his family and homeland. As we reflect on these events, let us use the utmost caution in our dealings with the U.S.S.R.

We in the United States must be firm in its dealings with the Russians. We must instill in them the strong wishes of the people of this Nation that all nations have the right to self-determina-

tion. The people of Estonia will continue their lonely fight to regain the freedom and dignity which was once theirs. They desperately need our help. Let us answer their call.

THE RAVAGES OF INFLATION

HON. DAVID C. TREEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the average wage earner in this country already works 2 hours and 39 minutes out of every day just to pay his tax bill the ravages of inflation are all the more important.

Mr. W. T. Freeland of New Orleans, La., recently brought an article to my attention by the University of Chicago economist, Milton Friedman. The article discusses the problems of inflation, as well as some of the measures which could be undertaken by Congress to protect the American wage earner. I am inserting the article in the RECORD at this time for the consideration of my colleagues. The article follows:

MORE ON LIVING WITH INFLATION

(By Milton Friedman)

The hard truth is that we face continuing inflation at a substantial though uncertain rate. The hard truth is that it is extremely difficult for the ordinary man to protect himself from the ravages of inflation. The encouraging fact is that there are feasible innovations that would reduce the ravages of inflation. The sooner these are adopted the better.

The basic principle is simple: express all transactions that have a time duration in terms that eliminate the effect of inflation. The application of this principle is anything but simple—indeed, the great virtue of relatively stable prices is precisely that it makes such costly and cumbersome arrangements unnecessary.

CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS

The basic principle has already been applied to some transactions in this country and to a much larger number in other countries that have suffered more from inflation.

WAGES

Many union contracts contain escalator clauses that adjust wages automatically to changes in the cost of living.

INTEREST RATES

Loans to small businesses guaranteed by the government and many private loans are at interest rates that vary over the life of the loan with the prime rate—which produces a rough adjustment for inflation. Variable interest rates are being experimented with for mortgage loans and some bank certificates of deposit.

SOCIAL SECURITY

A recent law provides that payments shall be automatically adjusted to the cost of living.

INSURANCE

The face value of some property policies is automatically adjusted for inflation. Variable annuity retirement and life insurance policies have spread rapidly, but they are linked to the stock market, which offers a highly imperfect protection against inflation.

Though this list is far from exhaustive, such arrangements apply as yet to only a tiny fraction of all transactions. We need to go much farther.

PRIVATE MEASURES

The most important private measures would be the inclusion of escalator clauses in a much wider range of employment contracts and the issuance of purchasing-power bonds.

A wage escalator clause is familiar to most of you. A purchasing-power bond is much less familiar. Like an ordinary bond, it consists of a promise to pay a certain amount in interest each year and to repay the principal at the end of a definite period. Unlike an ordinary bond, the annual interest and the terminal repayment are not stated as a fixed number of dollars but are adjusted for changes in a price index. For example, such a bond might pay each year a sum equal to \$4 times a price index and repay at the end of ten years \$100 times a price index. If prices rose by 5 per cent in the first year that such a bond was outstanding, the interest payment would be \$4.20, not \$4. If prices rose a further 10 per cent the next year, the interest payment would become \$4.62, and so on. If prices doubled over the ten-year life of the bond, the amount repaid would be \$200, not \$100.*

I conjecture that the time is ripe for private purchasing-power bonds. A breakthrough awaits only an imaginative bond underwriter.

The issuance of purchasing-power bonds on a large scale is a prerequisite for any extensive issuance of price-escalated life insurance, in order to provide the appropriate assets to match such liabilities.

GOVERNMENT MEASURES

The most critical governmental measures are inflation-proofing the income tax and issuing purchasing-power securities.

INCOME TAX

Suppose your income goes up by 10 per cent when prices go up by 10 per cent. You have no more purchasing power than before. Yet you will pay a larger fraction of your income as income tax because the personal exemption will mean less and you will be pushed into higher tax brackets.

The simplest way to inflation-proof the income tax is to express both the personal exemption and the limits of the tax brackets as a number of dollars times a price index. For example, if prices rise by 10 per cent, the personal exemption should become \$825 instead of \$750, the first bracket taxed at 14 per cent should become 0 to \$550 instead of 0 to \$500. This adjustment can be incorporated in the printed tax returns so that it does not complicate the taxpayer's task.

In addition, the base for capital gains and for depreciation of assets should be redefined as the present base multiplied by a price index. If you bought a house in 1960 for, say, \$20,000 and sell it now for \$30,000, you will be taxed on a \$10,000 capital gain, even though prices have risen by 50 per cent in the interim. You have only a paper capital gain, not a real gain, and should pay no tax at all. Similarly, business enterprises are required to calculate depreciation on machines at original cost rather than at today's higher replacement cost.

PURCHASING-POWER BONDS

If you have invested your savings in Treasury savings bonds, you have been taken for a ride. The sum you get for the bonds when they mature will buy less at today's prices than the amount you paid for the bonds would have bought at the earlier prices. To add insult to injury, you are required to pay taxes on the so-called "interest"!

High government officials have urged citizens to buy savings bonds to help the country and themselves. At the same time,

*An alternative is to have the annual interest rate equal a fixed number plus the rate of price rise but to make the terminal repayment a fixed number of dollars. In effect, this involves gradual amortization of the real value of the bond during inflationary periods.

the government has produced inflation. The result has been to fleece innocent and patriotic citizens on a scale that no bucket-shop operator has ever approached.

Personally, I regard this confidence game as no less destructive of faith in the democratic process than Watergate. Congress should end this disgraceful practice by mandating that the Treasury issue purchasing-power securities, thereby giving the small saver a way to protect his savings from inflation.

The Congressional tax committees that are now considering tax measures have been urged by a number of legislators to give pride of place to inflation-proofing the income tax and to requiring the Treasury to issue purchasing-power securities. If the tax bill that comes out of committee does not embody these reforms, Sen. James Buckley has said that he will offer them as amendments.

These reforms deserve wide support. They would reduce the harm done by inflation and would ease the withdrawal pains from reducing inflation. They would also lower the revenue that the government gets from inflation and hence the government's incentive to engage in inflation. This is at one and the same time a major argument in their behalf and the chief obstacle to their enactment.

GROSS TO GO

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the decision by our colleague from Iowa (Mr. Gross) to retire after 25 years of service to his country has been lamented by Members from both sides of the aisle.

During his quarter of a century in this Chamber, Mr. Gross has vigorously pursued his quest of saving the taxpayer's money from unnecessary and wasteful uses. His direct and probing questions have made all of us think a little harder; his abundant wit has entertained and educated us.

The Baltimore Sun on February 18, 1974, had the following editorial dealing with Mr. Gross' retirement:

Gross To Go

Even his name has the flavor of the House of Representatives about it. For he is H. R. Gross, and the initials H. R. often come up in debate in reference to House Resolutions. An intriguing curmudgeon, Congressman Gross has spent much of his quarter-century on Capitol Hill calling his colleagues to order. His has been the voice demanding quorum calls, ranting against junketing, opposing all government spending except that benefiting his Iowa farm district. When he retires at the end of this term, the House will lose one of its prickliest yet engaging personalities. Who but H. R. Gross could oppose a public works bill by saying if it were passed, "I would like to make a trip to New York, climb the Statue of Liberty, remove the torch and put a tin cup in the statue's hand." Who but he would tell colleagues who disbelieved the government would have to subsidize Washington subway bonds that they could also look outside "and see pigs flying by." We will miss him, if not his voting record.

Yes, Congressman Gross will be sorely missed. Let us hope that his crusade for fiscal responsibility will continue long after his retirement.

GENERAL TRANSIT FUNDING
NEEDED NOW**HON. HUGH L. CAREY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the administration has proposed to spend about \$2.4 billion per year, beginning in fiscal year 1975, on assisting general transit. This is too late and too little, particularly, since about \$1 billion of these funds are not new funds, but are coming from the highway trust fund, and there is no guarantee that they will be used to assist general transit.

Legislation which House Ways and Means Chairman WILBUR MILLS and I will introduce shortly, will provide between \$2.2 and \$2.4 billion annually for the next 5 years. This is all new money—raised by variable taxes on windfall profits of the major oil companies and on various wasteful uses of energy—taxes that cannot be passed on to the individual energy consumer.

All this new money will go to assist general transportation now—not in the summer of 1975. It will be used for capital investment, spurring a boom in industries that build and equip buses, subway, and rail cars, and items needed to operate transportation systems efficiently and economically. It will be used to subsidize operating expenses, thus permitting transit authorities to stabilize or even lower transit fares. It will be used to improve commuter systems and service.

The funds I propose to make available can be at work as soon as the House and the Senate can pass legislation I propose. There is no need for an appropriation, as the bill is a tax measure. Surely, Mr. Speaker, as the Christian Science Monitor states in its lead editorial of Monday, February 11, 1974, what Congress does in assisting mass transit, "will help mold the lifestyles of Americans for decades to come."

As I have stated before, the administration's plan is "fiscal-foolery"—another example of loud talk but no dough. I am very pleased to see that the Monitor has seen through this latest of the administration's tent shows and has evaluated its plan as a bare minimum, or a "base line" upon which the Congress must build a realistic structure of assistance to general transportation—a structure the Carey-Mills general transit legislation will build and will pump new life into our transit systems and facilities: expansion of bus and rail fleets, reasonably priced services, a viable alternative to continued overuse of private autos and the needless fuel consumption and pollution they leave in their wakes.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Monitor editorial to my colleagues and await the next transit editorial, which hopefully will be an endorsement of the transportation concepts and financing contained in the Carey-Mills General Transit Assistance Act. Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the editorial as the conclusion of my remarks:

MONEY FOR MASS TRANSIT

President Nixon sent to Congress a \$16 billion, six-year mass transit bill. It reflects a welcome awakening commitment to mass transit by the administration—albeit at the prompting of the energy crisis.

It should be noted that the \$16 billion, or about \$2.5 billion a year, is not all new money. More than a billion dollars each year, for example, is urban transportation money now being spent under the Highway Act. Perhaps a fourth of the \$16 billion, if Congress approves the proposal, would be newly allocated.

Also, the proposal should be viewed in terms of what level of spending is necessary. The American Transit Association has been calling for \$2.5 billion a year in federal aid for capital spending alone, plus another \$1 billion a year for the next two years for "emergency" aid, including relief for operating deficits of local transit systems. This would mean outlays of \$3.5 billion per year, a billion more than the President's request.

The case for greater mass transit spending has been easier to see for many Americans while they have sat in long lines waiting to fill their tanks with gasoline. But as we have earlier warned in these columns, the case for mass transit should not be so closely tied to the inconvenience of the moment that enthusiasm for it might wane with the availability of more gasoline. The ATA is correct in calling for the development of a farsighted national transportation policy, with federal leadership and coordination. The administration, however, appears to want to stay on the underside of the range of possible mass transit efforts.

The administration, with an echo of its revenue sharing proposals, proposes that part of the federal mass transit money be spent at the discretion of local leaders for buses or rail transit—or, conceivably, and to the horror of mass transit supporters, for roads.

Congress should look at the administration's proposals as a base-line target for its mass transit decisions. Just in terms of new rider loads on existing transit systems, greater funds are needed to offset higher deficits. A 50 percent larger bus fleet is called for.

The United States continues to spend some \$20 billion a year on highways. Hundreds of billions of dollars will be invested by the oil industry in the next decade to fuel the automobile fleet on the highways. Next to these outlays, even the proposed new level of investment in mass transit seems low.

Government policy in such areas is crucial. The growth of the second most populous urban region in America, Los Angeles, during the car age finds 88.8 percent of workers dependent on the auto to get to work. But in New York, the most populous urban area with a transit system developed before the huge federal push for the auto, only 50 percent of the workers must drive to work.

Congress's mass transit decision on the White House proposal will help mold the lifestyle of America for decades to come.

THE 56TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
INDEPENDENCE OF THE REPUBLIC
OF ESTONIA**HON. ALPHONZO BELL**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 56th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Estonia. Although Estonia was forcibly incorporated into the U.S.S.R. in July 1940, and today remains under Soviet rule, the people have kept alive their national

identity and Western orientation. Since 1940, a total of 140,000 Estonians have been deported and now only 66.2 percent of the population of Estonia consists of persons of Estonian heritage.

The Estonians have inhabited their country for at least five to six millenniums. Estonia is located along the coast of the Baltic Sea, at the northernmost part of the Baltic nations. The people are proud of their folklore, and their collection is considered among the richest in the world. Every 5 years since 1869, Estonians have held a traditional festival that includes songs, and bands consisting of 5,000 players. They have also established their place in the sports world. Chess, track, and ball games are some of the strong points of the Estonian athletes. Marksmanship was a former highlight for the Estonians, and in 1937 and 1939, their marksman team held the Argentine trophy. However, with the Soviet occupation, this sport was quickly terminated.

It is important that we recognize the determination with which the Estonians have struggled to retain their national identity and cultural heritage. We must also admire them for their unity in attempting to regain independence. I would like to pay tribute to the people of Estonia and Estonian heritage by recalling that today in 1918, they achieved independence and join many others in hoping that independence will again be theirs in the near future.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME RE-
SCHEDULES HEARING ON H.R. 4191
AND H.R. 8722 TO AMEND THE FED-
ERAL KIDNAPING STATUTE**HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the hearing of the Subcommittee on Crime of the House Judiciary Committee scheduled for Thursday, February 28, 1974, has been rescheduled to Wednesday, February 27, 1974, due to matters pending in the full committee. The hearing will commence at 10 a.m., in 2141 Rayburn House Office Building.

Under consideration are two bills to amend section 1201 of title 18 of the United States Code. The subcommittee will consider H.R. 4191 which would remove the parental exception to kidnaping and H.R. 8722 which would permit the FBI to investigate certain missing persons cases.

Witnesses testifying before the subcommittee will include Representative CHARLES E. BENNETT, author of H.R. 4191; Representative EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, author of H.R. 8722; John C. Keeney, Deputy Assistant U.S. Attorney General, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

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

FERROUS SCRAP EXPORTS

HON. HAROLD V. FROELICH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned that America's steel and ferrous casting industries are facing a serious shortage of scrap metals at reasonable prices. Many of these industries, large and small alike, rely on bulk scrap metal for 80-85 percent of their raw materials used in the production of final metal products and castings. The restricted availability of scrap, spurred on by escalating prices and exportation, has already resulted in shortages of reinforcing bars, baling wire, tubular steel and ferrous castings for machinery.

Industry leaders are publicly stating that unless some relief is provided soon, these shortages could approach the proportions of the current energy shortage in the United States. Already, hundreds of orders are backlogged because the domestic supplies of scrap metal are being exported and controlled final product prices have discouraged the investment in these industries which is necessary to expand facilities. It should be obvious to even the casual observer that a very serious situation is developing.

The United States is the only major industrial power in the world to allow bulk scrap metal exports. Our foreign competitors have long recognized that scrap ferrous metals are far cheaper to recycle than new metal is to produce and they are vital supplements to the supply of new ferrous ores as raw materials for industry. Japan, in particular, but other countries as well, have entered the U.S. scrap ferrous metal markets prepared to buy huge quantities at high prices. In fact, during 1973, bulk scrap prices were forced up nearly 100 percent by foreign competition. And, actual exports were 4 to 5 million tons more in 1973 than in 1972. There has been no visible change in this trend during the first 2 months of 1974.

Under normal conditions, the Congress might expect domestic industries to compete with foreign buyers in the marketplace for bulk ferrous scrap, but unfortunately, the economic stabilization program has completely disrupted economic conditions in the United States. Domestic bulk scrap dealers are not subject to domestic price controls under phase IV regulations, but domestic industries which rely on scrap metals as raw materials must hold down the prices of their final products to levels imposed by the Cost of Living Council. Unable to pass through increased costs for raw materials even on a dollar-for-dollar basis, domestic industries and foundries are unable to compete with the prices offered by foreign buyers for ferrous scrap. Low returns on investment in the casting industry have already discouraged further investments and the profit pinch caused by high scrap prices has reduced the attractiveness of these industries even further.

Equally important as the shortages caused by bulk scrap exports is the effect

that these exports have on the depletion of domestic natural resources and the unnecessary use of energy. For every ton of scrap denied to domestic industries, these industries must convert 1½ tons of new ore, 1 ton of coke and ½ ton of limestone into new metal for production. Continued exportation of scrap ferrous metals not only means continued depletion of our natural resources, but it also means in effect that we are depleting these resources for the use of our foreign competitors. That simply does not make good sense.

Exportation also contributes to the unnecessary use of energy and energy resources. Each ton of new ore used to replace exported scrap requires 12.5 million B.t.u. of energy for conservation in excess of the energy needed to process scrap. If the exports of scrap last year had been used in the United States in place of new ore, we could have conserved the equivalent of 25.5 million barrels of oil or 150 billion cubic feet of natural gas. Those would have been phenomenal savings.

Moreover, most manufacturers of tubular steel used for drilling oil wells rely upon ferrous scrap as their basic raw material. Foundries which produce the parts for oil rigs and other related machinery also rely on scrap metals for their production. At a time when expanded production of domestic energy resources is so vital, it seems senseless to promote shortages of those products which are vital to that expanded production. But, this is exactly what is being done by the U.S. Government.

Needless to say, it is time that we recognize ferrous scrap as an important resource for our domestic industries. I am introducing legislation today requiring the Secretary of Commerce to prohibit the exportation of ferrous scrap from the United States for 180 days after the enactment of this bill. In the meantime, the Secretary would prepare a report to the Congress including estimations of the domestic requirements for scrap during the next 3 years and the amounts, if any, that could be exported during this 3-year period without endangering domestic supply and demand.

I am convinced that this legislation will temporarily halt the drain on our industrial resources and provide the Congress and the U.S. Department of Commerce the necessary time to devise a commonsense policy for international and domestic trade in ferrous scrap.

While I recognize that the administration has taken steps to limit scrap exports, these limitations have been of minimal effect. Now is the time to take strong and effective measures to halt this problem before it causes even more serious hardship.

The text of the bill I have introduced follows:

H.R. 13034

A bill to prohibit for a temporary period the exportation of ferrous scrap, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the administration of the Export Administration Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall take such action as may be necessary and appro-

priate to prohibit the exportation of ferrous scrap from the United States during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the close of the one hundred and eightieth day after such date.

SEC. 2. Before the close of the one-hundred-and-eighty-day period referred to in the first section of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall complete and send to Congress a report setting forth his estimates of (1) the domestic requirements for ferrous scrap during the three-year period immediately following the close of such one-hundred-and-eighty-day period, and (2) the amount, if any, of such scrap which could, during such three-year period, be made available for exportation from the United States without adversely affecting the domestic supply of such scrap.

SOLZHENITSYN: ANOTHER VOICE THAT CANNOT BE SILENCED

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, recently the Soviet Union exiled its greatest living writer, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, giving to the rest of the world a glittering, priceless gift it could never have bought or produced otherwise.

For quite a while now, the word *détente* has been much in fashion among the literati, cognoscenti, and avant-garde drawing room crowds. To hear them hold forth, the Soviets had suddenly been transformed into agrarian reformers and peaceful factory workers.

Cocktail parties and society pages burst forth with gasps of praise and reams of copy regarding the new thaw and the fresh breath of togetherness between Russia and the West. Certain industrial and business types, who would sell their grandmothers into Arabian slavery, if they had any, crowded Washington to Russia flights, eager to stick their homburgs under the promised golden cascade of rubles. Magic factories and pipedreams of industrial complexes elbowed descriptions of 240 million muzhiks gulping Pepsi Cola and driving Fords.

Prophets of progress and boomers gushed over prospects of Soviet Chambers of Commerce and Rotary Clubs in the shadow of the Kremlin. It was enough to make coupon clippers swoon in the penthouses of Park Avenue and the suburbs of Dubuque.

Cold war? Over with. Slave labor? Nonsense. Growing military machine? Humbug. Czechoslovakia? Not any more, old boy. Finished with that stuff years ago. Hungary? Stuff and nonsense. Old history. ICBM's?

Disarmament is the word. Have some more caviar, my dear. And what do you think of that simply marvelous Russian art show?

Meanwhile, some lonely, virtually unnoticed voices were being raised from behind the still closed Iron Curtain. Only few bothered about them Why? Because they were only Jewish voices, and you know how those Jews are always making trouble. Never satisfied, those

people. All they want is more, and more and then more. They want to be free to be religious and free to educate their children and free to emigrate and travel to Israel. You know, all that nonsense.

For several years, 3½ million stifled Russian Jews cried out in their agony, and the world closed its ears to their cries, with notable exceptions. It was the same old story as before World War II. Everyone was perfunctorily sympathetic, but no one would really get upset.

There were honorable exceptions, I noted. The Jackson and Vanik amendments were produced and have been pushed, to the credit of their sponsors and supporters. But the State Department, as usual, deplored, and the large industrialists warned about losses of Russian trade. How many more wheat deals can we afford to lose out on. I wonder. And a major delaying action was fought to prevent further pressure from being placed upon the Soviets.

And suddenly the blinding genius of Alexander Solzhenitsyn burst like a new Sun upon the world at large, blinding the eye with its literary brilliance and flooding the mind with its ideological enlightenment.

We saw the slave labor camps. We saw the secret police. The midnight raids. The travesties of trials and procedures. The exile. The starvation. The torture. The deaths of body and spirit. We saw the horror that was Joseph Stalin and the devotion to his tradition that is so much a part of Soviet Russian life today, even as we sit here. We saw the face of tyranny and despotism, masquerading as a milder form of Bolshevism. And the scales dropped from many eyes.

Suddenly, certain columnists and media types became terribly indignant over the suppression of literary freedom. They waxed angry and outraged over persecution of a leading creative mind. Curious that previous to this little of the plight of the others being persecuted within Russia caught their eye or commanded their allegiance. But no matter.

Solzhenitsyn has joined with Sakharov to tell the world that Russia today is virtually as dark a tyranny over light as before. That the only peace known there to dissenters is that of the grave and that the only silence is that of the isolation cell. That genius, if it seeks iconoclastic paths, is in ever present danger of being trampled in the Earth and of never being heard from again. That books are still suppressed and burned in the Russia of Brezhnev, and others.

Alexander Solzhenitsyn is more than perhaps the world's greatest literary genius alive today. He is the symbol of the second soul of Russia; the soul that led the underprivileged masses rise up in many times past against oppression. It is the soul that dreamt a great dream in 1917, only to have it stolen and warped. A dream betrayed by Stalin and his minions.

Today, if we do not heed the voice of that writer and his friends in Russia, we shall have committed perhaps the worst mistake the West has ever made. Sakharov has warned that no meaningful détente and peace with Russia can be

made by the West until the Soviet system has undergone a meaningful, significant change. By this, he means that until men like him may protest, and until men like Solzhenitsyn may write and publish and until Jews may live as Jews and travel as they wish, then there can be no real détente, no matter how the foolish romanticize the phrase. Woe unto us if we ignore the lessons their devastating sacrifices offer the West.

OIL: THE INDOCHINA SIPHON

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, the current energy shortage is the last major economic legacy of the overall distortions brought about by a decade of direct U.S. adventurism in Southeast Asia. In addition, existing American support of repressive regimes in Saigon, Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand is diverting from domestic supplies as much as 65,000 barrels a day.

That information comes from a new—and revealing—study made by Bill Goodfellow of the Indochina Resource Center. Mr. Goodfellow's study presents an important perspective on both our commitment to Southeast Asia and on the energy shortage.

The report follows:

OIL: THE INDOCHINA SIPHON

(By Bill Goodfellow)

If the Defense Department were to curtail its fuel shipments to Southeast Asia and instead allocate that fuel to this country's over-the-road truckers, no fuel would have to be diverted from other sectors of the economy to satisfy the truckers' demands for 100 per cent fuel allocation. The US military presence in Southeast Asia requires an estimated 65,000 barrels per day of petroleum, all of which must be shipped from naval reserves in the United States by ocean tanker, which consumes additional thousands of barrels of fuel per day.

On February 7 the Federal Energy Office announced a change in their allocation program, making an additional 76,000 barrels per day of diesel fuel available to truckers. The Energy Office expects this new allocation to eliminate the current shortfall and fulfill 100 per cent of the trucker's current fuel needs. Although the energy office did not indicate where they would find the extra fuel, it will probably be diverted from supplies available to consumers, who are given the lowest priority in the allocation program.

The Pentagon's shipments of fuel to Southeast Asia are consumed by the six US bases in Thailand, where 35,000 US troops are stationed, and by the naval and aircraft operations of that part of the Seventh Fleet currently operating just off the shores of North and South Vietnam and Cambodia. The Thai bases consume approximately 26,000 barrels per day of fuel. This estimate is derived from the average daily consumption for the most recent month for which the Pentagon had data available, October 1973.

The 140 aircraft stationed on two of the Seventh Fleet's aircraft carriers cruising just off the shores of Indochina consume approximately 13,000 barrels per day of fuel, and the Seventh Fleet's naval operations in waters surrounding Indochina consume approxi-

mately 26,000 barrels per day of fuel. Until the Arab oil boycott, the Thai bases and the Seventh Fleet met their fuel requirements with purchases from Singapore and the Philippines. Yielding to pressure from their Arab suppliers of crude, the refineries in Singapore and the Philippines, including Exxon, cut-off all sales to US Navy ships and ships chartered by the US Navy. Sales to the US bases in Thailand were also curtailed.

The total bill for all this fuel going to Southeast Asia, using February 1 prices supplied by the Defense Supply Agency, is over \$700,000 per day, not including shipping costs from the United States to Southeast Asia. Calculated on a yearly basis, and provided the price of refined petroleum products climbs no higher, it will cost the United States \$256 million, not including shipping, to supply its forces in Southeast Asia with fuel.

In addition, US dollars from the Military Assistance Funded Program pay for the 18,000 barrels per day of fuel consumed by South Vietnam's military, and the Commercial Import Program, of the Foreign Assistance Act, pays for most of the 30,000 barrels per day of petroleum consumed by South Vietnam's civilian population. Cambodia's military consumes 1,100 barrels per day and its civilian consumption is almost 5,000 barrels per day, virtually all of which is purchased with dollars from US aid programs. Assuming stable petroleum prices for the next year, the United States will spend over \$200 million just to pay for Vietnam's and Cambodia's purchases of petroleum during calendar year 1974. Add to this the cost of the fuel consumed by the US forces in Southeast Asia and the total cost is well over \$450 million.

Last December the Pentagon announced that the United States was shipping 22,000 barrels of petroleum per day from "reserve stocks" to South Vietnam, and another 1,500 barrels to Cambodia, all for military use. No mention was made of the additional 65,000 barrels that since November was being shipped to the U.S. forces in Southeast Asia.

Even though the American people and the Congress were being misled about the actual amount of petroleum being shipped to Southeast Asia, the outrage was sufficient to prompt conservative Senator Norris Cotton, Republican from fuel-short New Hampshire, to introduce an amendment prohibiting the expenditure of funds from the fiscal year 1974 Defense Appropriations bill for shipping fuel from the United States to South Vietnam or Cambodia. The final Defense bill, as well as the final Foreign Aid bill, contained a provision stating "none of the funds contained in this act shall be used to furnish petroleum fuels produced in the continental United States to Southeast Asia for use by non-United States Nationals."

Upon passage of the amendment the military insisted that its shipments of fuel to South Vietnam and Cambodia were exempt from the prohibition since they come from "reserve inventories". However, since mid-October, according to Arthur I. Mendolia, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Installations, the Department of Defense, because of the Arab oil embargo, has had to make up its loss of over 300,000 barrels per day of foreign oil from domestic sources.

In the face of continuing criticism from the press and Congress, the Defense Department moved quickly to find another source for oil to ship to South Vietnam and Cambodia. On January 7th the Pentagon announced that South Vietnam and Cambodia were at that time able to meet "almost all" their military petroleum needs with commercial purchases from Singapore. These purchases, however, are still being made with U.S. dollars.

During fiscal year 1972 the Defense Department bought 48 per cent of its petroleum products from foreign sources, most of which

is now being denied as a direct or indirect result of the Arab oil embargo. Under the Defense Production Act the Pentagon has the authority to commandeer petroleum from civilian reserves. In December the Pentagon asked the Interior Department to order 22 major oil companies to deliver 19.6 million barrels of fuel and other petroleum distillates to the military by January 16, 1974.

Although the shipments of fuel from U.S. military reserves to Indochina remain high even today, an increase in hostilities in Vietnam and/or Cambodia would be accompanied by a further dramatic rise in fuel consumption for the entire region. According to the South Vietnamese Embassy's Vietnam Bulletin of January 1, 1974, South Vietnam's armed forces during the spring 1972 offensive used 3 times the amount of petroleum they are currently consuming. If the United States were to resume bombing anywhere in Indochina, a possibility about which Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger has been speaking in recent weeks, the increase in fuel consumption would be astronomical. Congressman Elwood H. Hillis (R-Ind.), in the Congressional Record of May 10, 1973, revealed that experts estimated the U.S. Cambodian bombing operations alone were consuming 3 million gallons of fuel per day. And in 1968, at the height of the Vietnam War, the Defense Department's share of the total national consumption of oil fuels had doubled, then totaling almost 8 per cent.

In light of the present fuel shortage in this country and the sacrifices Americans are making to conserve energy, the Defense Department's massive shipments of oil to Indochina seem excessive and unjustifiable. Furthermore, the presence of 35,000 U.S. troops and U.S. aircraft in Thailand, and the huge 77 vessel Seventh Fleet, a large part of which is operating just off the coast of Vietnam, not only tempt the U.S. military to again become directly involved in fighting in Vietnam and Cambodia, but also prolongs President Thieu's and Premier Lon Nol's reliance on the United States to bail them out should their military adventures backfire. Withdrawal of U.S. forces from Southeast Asia would not only save a significant quantity of fuel in the present, it might well prevent untold suffering and further bloodshed in the future, for Asians as well as Americans. It is time for a re-ordering of our priorities.

ACTION NEEDED TO THWART FUTURE TERRORISTS KIDNAPINGS

HON. L. A. (SKIP) BAFALIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. BAFALIS. Mr. Speaker, people all over America have expressed shock and dismay at the heartless kidnaping of newspaper publisher Randolph Hearst's daughter, Patricia.

In a desperate attempt to secure the release of his daughter, Mr. Hearst has met demands to establish a statewide food giveaway program. Although more than \$2 million has been spent and another \$4 million offered in this "good faith endeavor," the kidnapers still refuse to even discuss terms for Miss Hearst's release.

It is impossible not to sympathize with Mr. Hearst. He has done what any father, faced with the same terrible predicament, would clearly do. But his actions—

aimed at saving his daughter—will not prevent further terrorist activities and may, in fact, encourage them.

It is my grave concern that this tragic kidnaping could serve as a model for terrorist activity in the future. While we cannot prevent kidnapings and we cannot destroy small terrorists groups throughout the country, we can take legislative action which will hinder similar uncivilized demands in the future.

Today I have introduced a bill which would make it a Federal crime for anyone to accept food, money, or any other commodity made available as the result of a kidnaping. This crime would be punishable by a fine of not more than \$1,000 and/or a sentence of not more than 1 year. No one should be able to benefit from an act of terror and violence which brings tragedy and suffering to their fellow human beings.

The sole purpose of my bill is to prevent any repeat of the Hearst terrorist kidnaping. If no one can benefit from such a heinous crime without facing a stiff penalty, then we should go far toward preventing future kidnapings.

Strong action by the Congress of the United States in this regard is essential if we are to show those who would use these tactics that their demands cannot and will not be sanctioned by a civilized society.

LAND USE PLANNING LEGISLATION

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Americans have suffered a temporary and unexpected setback in the fight for sensible land planning, but the struggle will go on and I am confident we will get a good land use planning bill in this Congress.

Today's Rules Committee vote results from another and almost classic example of the kind of immoral White House double dealing we have come to expect on environmental issues.

First we hear a series of pious Presidential announcements about the need for land use planning; Mr. Nixon calls it his No. 1 environmental priority. The good guys of the administration are allowed up front to present the program to the Congress and Nation—decent, honorable men like Russell Train and Rogers Morton who believe in sensible land use planning and put their sincere efforts and reputations on the line.

Then, as passage approaches, some of the big interests who provided much of that \$60 million CREEP fund, go through the back door of the White House to make their case. All the sudden mealy-mouth equivocal statements begin appearing. The whispers begin: The President really does not support the bill: he really did not understand what he was getting into. Republican House leaders suddenly discover that the bill needs more study and, why yes, they favor the idea of land use planning, but the House cannot be trusted to vote on these im-

pulsive proposals emerging from the Interior Committee. That is, legislation molded and scrutinized over a period of 3 years, legislation that was approved in the Senate by 64 to 11 and in the House Interior Committee by 26 to 11.

The cynicism of all this ought to be apparent. It is a defeat for the quality of life, responsible planning for future energy needs, for the intelligent use of natural resources, for the next generation. The hysteria of a few right wing organizations and the selfish interests of a few industries have delayed a bill all Americans need.

REMARKS BY REV. W. GRAHAM SMITH OF ALEXANDRIA, VA.

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues excellent comments made by the Reverend W. Graham Smith at the Fairlington Presbyterian Church, Alexandria, Va., on Sunday, February 3, 1974, following the National Prayer Breakfast:

REMARKS AT FAIRLINGTON PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, ALEXANDRIA, VA., BY REV. W. GRAHAM SMITH, FOLLOWING THE NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Before we come to the sermon, there is a matter that I would like to mention to you. I would not do so had it not been for some reports that I read in the Press on Friday past.

Again this year Mrs. Smith and I had the privilege of attending the National Prayer Breakfast last Thursday morning, and it was a rich experience of the grace of God, and was Christ-centered from beginning to end.

What a joy it was to hear Senator Stennis give thanks to God for the amazing healing which he has experienced after the tragic shooting which almost claimed his life last year. The Senator spoke very earnestly about the power of prayer in his own life, and we rejoiced in that witness.

Congressman Dorn from South Carolina spoke on behalf of the House and told of his personal experience of Christ, and how he had endeavored to put the principles of the Christian life to work in the political arena to which God had called him.

Then we had the main address from Senator Hughes of Iowa. I have not heard such a challenging message for a long time. No one could ever be in any doubt as to what it means to be a Christian after hearing the ringing accents of Senator Hughes, who is himself a living example of the saving, renewing power of our Lord.

After a prayer of great humility and great power offered by the Vice President, President Nixon himself spoke, earnestly, quietly, and with great power and dignity, reminding us, among other things, of the prayer life of President Lincoln, and telling us of the influence upon his own life of his own grandmother, a Quaker lady of spiritual depth and power. She had taught him early in life that one great element in prayer is just to be quiet and listen to God, and hear what He wants you to do with your life.

The proceedings were concluded by a moving prayer offered by Congressman Andrew

Young of Georgia, in which he drew together every strand in the service, and committed us all, our country, and the whole fellowship of mankind to the grace and love of God.

The whole experience was one of spiritual refreshment and spiritual power, and we rejoiced in it.

What a tragedy, then, and with what surprise and sadness of heart, we read in the Press that this was a white Anglo-Saxon Protestant demonstration of middle-aged American folk religion! Well, if that was American folk religion, it was Evangelical, New Testament Christianity, and we need a lot more of it. But I become deeply disturbed, as I know you do too, when I witness such a blatant, inexcusable distortion of facts as we had presented to us in the Press in its reporting of this event. Indeed I fear that the Press of this country today, as one of the most powerful agents in the national life, can be a very definite menace to the whole political process at this present time. What a tragedy that people will prostitute their professional talents and dignity by descending to do things like this, and to make reports like this that are patently false and devastating to the whole national life.

Let us pray that the Press may be touched by the Spirit of God to write the truth. We have seen the way in which matters have been moving recently, and how gratifying it was to attend a gathering such as that on Thursday morning, and see Democrats and Republicans gathered together as brothers and sisters in Christ. I always rejoice to know of the Christians on the Hill who are seeking to put their Christian faith into practice in government which is the civil arm of God's Kingdom.

Then to call Thursday morning a WASP gathering was a crushing insult to the many black Christians who shared with us in that rich fellowship. Sitting next to me was the United Nations Ambassador from Liberia—one of the choicest Christian spirits I have encountered in a long time. He told me of his own prayer life and what Christ meant to him, and how the President of his country is a practicing Christian.

Let us continue to pray for our leaders as never before—for the President, and for the Members of the Congress, their staff and associates, the members of the Judiciary and all who engage in the difficult, responsible and thankless tasks of government. And let us be less ready to believe all that we read in the Press. You know the old saying—"If you believe all you read, you will eat all you see!"

MARYLAND STATE TROOPERS COMMENDED FOR ROLE IN WHITE HOUSE HELICOPTER INCIDENT

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, Troopers Louis W. Saffran and Don L. Sewell of the Maryland State Police were recently commended by Gov. Marvin Mandel and Col. Thomas S. Smith, superintendent of the Maryland State Police, for their role in protecting the White House and apprehending the pilot of the stolen helicopter that penetrated restricted airspace in Washington. Troopers Saffran and Sewell were also promoted for their heroic efforts in attempting to provide protection for the White House. I would

like to join the Governor and Colonel Smith in the commendation of these two fine young troopers.

Troopers Saffran and Sewell, after being notified of the approximate location of the stolen helicopter, followed the helicopter to the Washington Monument and tried to block access to the White House. After the helicopter was forced down at the White House, Troopers Saffran and Sewell who had landed their aircraft between the Army helicopter and the White House assisted in the apprehension of the pilot.

It is clear that Troopers Saffran and Sewell, at great personal risk and jeopardy, performed magnificently in their efforts to protect the residence of the President. Their sense of responsibility and attention to their duties deserve the respect and commendation of all American citizens.

COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY WEEK

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week—February 24—March 2—has been proclaimed "Community Action Agency Week" in my home State of Georgia. Because of the many significant contributions which the community action program has made in Georgia and throughout the Nation, I would like to take this opportunity to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following resolution.

In particular, I would like to commend the men and women who have made the program work effectively. An example of this type individual is Mrs. Virginia G. Barfield, who is executive director of the Lower Chattahoochee Community Action Agency in Columbus, Ga. Her creed is in terms of service to the poor on the local levels. This outstanding lady has very surely left her footprints in the sands of time.

The resolution reads:

PROCLAMATION—COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY WEEK

Whereas: Through offering self-help opportunities to the poor and attacking poverty and its attendant conditions, the Community Action Program in Georgia has helped reduce the poverty level in the State from 30% of the population to 20%; and

Whereas: Our citizens believe in the worth and dignity of all individuals, regardless of age, sex, race or economic status; and

Whereas: The Community Action Agencies strive to fill the economic, social and educational gaps which exist in our local communities; and

Whereas: Community Action Agencies join together all segments of the community—schools, churches, local governments, social agencies and individuals—in the attack on poverty and its related problems facing many of our citizens; now

Therefore: I, Jimmy Carter, Governor of the State of Georgia, do hereby proclaim the week of February 24—March 2, 1974, as "Community Action Agency Week" in Georgia.

PAUL F. CRAIG, DISTINGUISHED MANAGING EDITOR OF THE SPRINGFIELD UNION FOR 34 YEARS, 1896-1974

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House of the death last Wednesday, February 20, of Paul F. Craig, one of the most distinguished and competent newspaper editors in western Massachusetts.

Mr. Craig was managing editor of the Springfield Union for 34 years when he retired in 1965, and had worked on the newspaper as reporter, copy editor, suburban editor, assistant city editor, city editor, and news editor for 47 years.

A graduate of Wesleyan University in 1918, Mr. Craig joined the military immediately for World War I service and following discharge began his long and brilliant newspaper career. In World War II he took military leave as managing editor of the Springfield Union and reentered the Army for service in Europe as a major.

Mr. Craig was known throughout the New England area as an honest, courageous, perceptive, candid, and completely fair newspaper editor whose courteousness to all in our community underscored his reputation for being a patient and perfect gentleman. He was a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors and the New England Society of Newspaper Editors.

Long active in civic, charitable, cultural, and educational activities, Mr. Craig was a corporator and trustee of the United Fund of Greater Springfield and a corporator of Wesson Memorial Hospital, Wesson Women's Hospital, and American International College in Springfield, which conferred an honorary doctorate on him in 1957 in recognition of his efforts for community advancement.

Mr. Craig was a member, president, and director of the Springfield Adult Education Council where he was active in the movement that led to the establishment of the Springfield Symphony Orchestra. He was a member of the board of control of the Junior Achievement Foundation, the Connecticut Valley Foreign Policy Foundation, and the advisory board of the Springfield Aviation Council and the New England Trails Conference.

In 1966 Mr. Craig was named the 98th recipient of the highly coveted William Pynchon Award, one of Springfield's highest tributes to distinguished citizens. One of his fondest projects was the annual Christmas charity now known as the Toy for Joy Fund, sponsored by the Springfield newspapers, which Mr. Craig founded many years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to express my profound sympathy to Mrs. Louise M. "Garbe" Craig on the passing of her brilliant and accomplished editor husband, and include with my remarks editorials from the Springfield

Union and Springfield Daily News, and the tribute to Mr. Craig written by Horace Hill, retired associate editor of the Springfield Union and the Sunday Republican:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Feb. 21, 1974]

PAUL F. CRAIG: EDITOR, CITIZEN

An editor's responsibility goes deeper than supervising the gathering and organizing of news for public consumption. That was Paul F. Craig's firm belief, and it showed clearly in his 47 years as a newspaperman and community leader.

Gentlemanly, in its fullest meaning was the word for Paul Craig. This was said of him by those who knew him slightly or who were long and closely associated with him. His life was replete with the kind of deeds the word implied.

His death yesterday, three days short of his 78th birthday, could not impair the example he had set as a working newspaperman—first as a reporter, then by steps to the post of editor in chief of the Union, which he held for 34 years.

In the span of those years, he guided this newspaper through times of public crisis, technical change and challenges to the job of newsgathering, always insisting on thoroughness, accuracy and fairness in the Union's columns.

The files of the newspaper itself are a lasting, and perhaps the finest, tribute to Paul Craig's abilities in his chosen profession. Those who worked with him knew also his capacity for quietly evoking their best efforts.

His service to the community took various forms, too many to relate here in full. They ranged from the charitable to the cultural to the educational; some reflected a special personal interest but most were devoted to the betterment of the community.

For such achievement he received the highly-regarded William Pynchon Award in 1966. Earlier, in 1957, he was similarly recognized in the conferral of an honorary doctorate by American International College.

In every facet of his active life (including Army service in World Wars I and II) Paul Craig was an outstanding citizen and, as those closest to him knew best, a man of special human qualities. We mourn his passing.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Feb. 21, 1974]

PAUL CRAIG LEAVES VARIED MONUMENTS

Newspaper editors are tempted to indulge in the conceit that Paul Craig was a typical newspaper editor.

We should like to maintain that his interest in travel, education, ecology, music, history and foreign policy was only typical of the broad interests of all journalists.

We should also like to claim that his intense interest in his own newspaper and in journalism generally is commonplace among newspapermen.

However, those who knew him through his newspaper or through his active community life know that Paul Craig could never be described as average or typical. This was also true in the larger fraternity of journalism.

It is easy to illustrate Paul Craig's interest in his profession: He brought Ben H. Bagdikian and Tom Wolfe into journalism.

Bagdikian, who became the most proficient and most devastating critic of American journalism and is now national correspondent for the Columbia Journalism Review, was educated at Clark to be a chemist and came to Springfield to work for Monsanto. His interviewer was delayed en route from St. Louis, and Bagdikian wandered into the newspaper building to while away some time. He met Paul Craig and, in their conversation, mentioned that he had written for his college

newspaper and was therefore somewhat interested in journalism. Mr. Craig convinced him to change directions, and the man who came to Springfield as a chemist remained as a reporter for The Springfield Union. When he became national editor of The Washington Post, he himself told the story of how he was directed into the profession.

Even some who claim that they can understand Tom Wolfe say that he is the best journalist and best writer in the United States today. Long before he joined the Washington Post and the New York Herald Tribune, Wolfe was for three years a reporter for The Springfield Union. When he came here, he was thinking of beginning in another phase of the business, and it was Mr. Craig who hired him, put him at a typewriter, and encouraged him to illustrate his own material.

Paul Craig's many services to his readers and his neighbors are well known, but, as his obituaries are written, we should add that he also brought into American journalism sagacious critic and one of its most innovative writers.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Feb. 22, 1974]

TRIBUTE TO AN EDITOR: "ONE OF THE FINEST AND MOST COMPETENT"

(Horace Hill, who has served The Union and The Republican in various reporting and editing capacities over 50 years, most recently as an associate editor of the two newspapers, tells below of his personal association with the late Paul F. Craig, who was editor of The Union for 34 years.)

When I walked into the city room of the morning Union, on Jan. 24, 1924, to begin my first day's work as a reporter, the only familiar face I saw was that of Paul F. Craig.

He was then in the "slot" on the evening Union copy desk. Seeing him there helped give me confidence, because I had known him for years as the older brother of a school classmate, Donald Craig.

I had admired Paul Craig long before our newspaper careers brought us closely together. When I went to the Craigs' house as a grade-school student to visit Don, I would often see Paul, then in high school, studying diligently with big textbooks spread out on the dining room table.

I was impressed then, by his calm demeanor, his knowledge, his quiet courtesy, and his easy friendship—qualities that marked his whole life.

After Paul Craig became managing editor of The Union, following the death of Maurice Dickey, he gave me the opportunity to become news editor of the morning Union, when an opening occurred. I was still relatively young for such a responsible position, and I tried hard to justify his faith in me. Whether I fully did, I don't know. But from time to time he would say a word or two of appreciation. And to me, one kind word from him was the equivalent of volumes from almost anyone else.

Paul Craig was, in my opinion, one of the finest and most competent newspaper editors that this city has ever had in modern times. He was the only editor I ever knew who could do top-grade work every day, cope with every imaginable problem, give perfect directions to a whole staff of temperamental newspaper people, all with total poise, sound judgment, and complete fairness and sympathy.

Both as a newspaper editor and a private citizen, he was honest, straightforward, kind, generous, and courteous. Like every other human being, he could get upset occasionally when things went very wrong. But he never let this affect his fair and equitable dealings with his co-workers.

He was one of those relatively rare occurrences in the newspaper business—or perhaps in any other: a topnotch technician in his chosen field, and at the same time a perfect gentleman.

Paul Craig inspired affection, as well as loyalty and trust, in all the many people who worked with and for him. In nearly half a century, I never heard one single word uttered against him; but I heard countless thousands in his praise.

He was one of the very few men—perhaps a total of a dozen or so—for whom I have always held complete respect, regard and affection. If he ever did a small, mean thing, I never heard of it. But that he did innumerable fine things, I know.

When a prominent person passes away, it is somewhat customary to say the community has suffered a severe loss. In some cases, these may be empty words. But in the case of Paul Craig they are as true as anything possibly could be. Greater Springfield is a better place because he lived and worked here.

His contributions to the advancement and welfare of the community were numerous, both as a newspaper editor and a private person. And the affection and esteem that he inspired in all who knew him will continue to live, until their hearts, too, are stilled forever.

TWO OREGON STUDENTS AVOID SCHOOLBUS TRAGEDY

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud of the actions of two young people in my district who helped to have the lives of almost 40 students last month, and it is a very real personal pleasure for me to call their deeds to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

Mrs. Ruth Bond, a schoolbus driver for Josephine County in Oregon, suffered a sudden tragic heart attack while driving a busload of students up a mountain on the way from Sunny Valley to Wolf Creek in southern Oregon. Ten-year-old Jack Wytcherley, who attends Wolf Creek School, was sitting in the front of the bus when he saw Mrs. Bond fall from her seat. He demonstrated the remarkable presence of mind to immediately run forward, put on the brakes, and turn the key off, successfully bringing the bus to a stop. According to the State policeman who arrived on the scene a short time later, the bus was on a fairly steep grade and would have rolled back down the mountain if Jack had not brought it under control. Jack's ability to think clearly and quickly in such a dangerous situation insured the safety of all students aboard the bus and deserves our highest commendation.

Another student, 17-year-old Destiny Thomas, also showed great responsibility in the crisis by administering mouth-to-mouth resuscitation to Mrs. Bond in a vain attempt to save her life. She, too, deserves commendation for her efforts.

Apparently all of the students on the bus remained calm and stayed where they were until help arrived. They even set up emergency flashers on the expressway after the bus was brought to a halt.

It is always refreshing to learn of bright quick-thinking young people such as these. While their actions have been recognized and praised in the local com-

munity, I believe they deserve recognition here in the House of Representatives and I want to repeat how very proud I and others in the Fourth District of Oregon are of them.

CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT
OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. du PONT. Mr. Speaker, the following essay was submitted by the winner of the Delaware VFW Voice of Democracy Contest, Ms. Ellen Joseph of Wilmington, Del. It is an excellent speech that will be of interest to all Members.

I insert it in the RECORD.

The essay follows:

CITIZEN OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

I am a citizen of the United States of America. Almost 200 million people can say that, and do, every time they fill out a job or college application, an income tax form, or even a marriage certificate. Yet, I wonder how many of that 200 million people realize what that statement means or what it should mean.

To me it means that I am a part of the greatest nation on Earth—one whose history of liberty and justice for all is also a promise to be fulfilled. Yes, I am a part of this nation; and as a part of it, I have a responsibility to help insure that that promise continue to be fulfilled. This responsibility manifests itself in countless ways.

First and foremost, to fully obey the laws of this country—laws that are in existence to protect the individual, not to oppress him. If it happens that I disagree with a law, I should strive to change it through the proper means. These means are embodied in the United States Constitution and practiced by local, state, and national governments; the means of democracy: the government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Since this is my government, I am responsible for it, through working for, and when I am of age, voting for the candidates whom I think are most capable of leading our country in a responsible manner. In order to do this, I must be aware of what is happening in the Nation, both the problems and the triumphs, history to current events. In past years I have, and plan to do so in the future, worked for the candidates of my choice through active campaigning or simply debating with my peers about their political and social philosophies; and I try to familiarize myself with America's many aspects through studying courses of American History and social problems in school, and reading newspapers and news periodicals. As a result of this, I think I will be sufficiently prepared to fulfill my responsibility as an American voter.

Another responsibility I have as a citizen of the United States is to show the proper respect and love for my country. This is not to say that I am a flag-waving hardhat shouting, "love it or leave it;" but that I love my country while admitting its faults rather than pretending they don't exist. For only in America can one criticize the government or society and hope to profit by it. This type of love and respect I owe my country, the feeling which comes from seeing America as not a perfect nation but as the best man can create. Though this is not a physical responsibility but an intangible, emotional one, I feel it is a large part of living as an American citizen.

These three things, obeying the laws of the country, responsibility for and awareness of the government, and love and respect for what America stands for are what I consider to be the most important thing every American citizen owes to the United States and its society. I, as a young American, promise to strive to do all these. I accept the responsibility!

EXODUS '73

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Robert Abrams, president of the borough of the Bronx, has recently returned from a visit to the Soviet Union and he has written a very moving article about the plight of Jews who want to leave the country so that they may live in Israel.

He is personally involved in the struggle to assure free emigration and I wish to salute his untiring efforts in behalf of Russian Jewry. So that all my colleagues may share Mr. Abrams' insights and experiences, I am inserting his article in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Congress Journal, Dec. 14, 1973]

EXODUS '73

(By Robert Abrams)

As we approached the woman at the desk in the entranceway of Professor Levich's apartment house, Victor placed his finger over his lips to signal that conversation must come to a halt. I was warned that she would submit a report of my visit to the KGB in the morning. In the next few days I was to walk up many dark staircases in Leningrad and Moscow to meet with the Jewish activists who have been denied permission to leave the USSR. These men and women courageously continue to lead the struggle for freedom for more than one-quarter of the world's Jewish population trapped in the Soviet Union.

My Moscow contact for Prof. Levich, Victor Fiermark, carefully spaced the buzzer rings at the apartment door, alerting the family that a friendly caller was at hand. I was warmly greeted by Tania Levich, the charming and stalwart wife of the internationally respected physicist who was fired from his job as head of the Department of Chemical Hydrodynamics at Moscow University as soon as he filed for an exit visa. In the book-filled study I met the humble, soft-spoken, 55-year-old scientist. During several hours of conversation, we shared ideas and information about this chilling contemporary chapter in the history of the Jewish people.

There are more than 100,000 requests for exit visas pending, although Soviet authorities with whom I met disputed this figure. Each Jewish family takes a grave risk in applying for an exit visa: loss of employment, ostracism by co-workers, friends and sometimes even family, imprisonment for many, harassment by the KGB, and the blocking of young Jews from gaining entrance into the university. Prof. Levich reviewed the problems of members of academia who are refused the right to emigrate to the nation of their choice because this would represent a "security risk," despite the fact that their current work does not include a knowledge of sensitive matters.

Each member of the Levich family has felt the bruising power of a hostile Soviet government. Levich's oldest son, Alexander, 29, an engineer, was fired shortly after he applied for a visa. Levich's youngest son, Yevgeny, an astrophysicist, is the youngest per-

son in Soviet history to earn a doctorate (at the age of 20). Yevgeny's wife, Janna, displayed great stoicism while recounting her husband's abduction several months ago by the KGB and his placement in the army performing arduous physical labor in a camp in Siberia, despite ill health. Fearful of recriminations by the authorities for close association with the Levich family, relatives of Tania Levich failed to notify her of her sister's death because they did not want her to come to the cemetery for the funeral where she would be publicly seen with others in the family.

"The Jackson Amendment is very important to us," Prof. Levich said, referring to a measure pending in Congress which would deny "most favored nation" trade status to the USSR unless it honors a free emigration policy. Professor Levich passionately stated: "If the United States grants the Soviets economic benefits without insisting upon basic human justice and freedom—the right to emigrate, which is guaranteed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights—then my family and thousands like us are doomed. Emigration will cease, the Education Tax will be reimposed, scores will be imprisoned, and the level of persecution and harassment will be brought to new heights."

Levich expressed gratitude for all that Americans have done for Soviet Jewry, but also stressed that much is yet to be achieved. All of the activists pointed to America's increased leverage now that Russia needs our wheat and other goods, and because the Soviets must develop a friendlier posture toward the U.S. in light of their increasingly hostile relations with China.

When I speak to groups here at home, imploring them to protest pending trials or to write letters and send telegrams to Soviet authorities in behalf of the prisoners of conscience (who now number more than 40, some of whom are serving up to 15 years at hard labor), I am often asked whether such actions are worthwhile. The most cogent and dramatic responses to this inquiry are the words of Isaac Goldstein, a young, courageous Jew from Tbilisi, Georgia. "The prosecutor told me I was guilty of Zionist activities, which is against the interests of the state, and that I belong in prison. But, he said—you are a very lucky man because this stack of letters from the United States and other countries has saved you."

I spent many hours with Goldstein and his brilliant and attractive wife, Elizabeta, who is six months pregnant, expecting their first child. Isaac, 35, an author of 24 published works on cybernetics, has written letters to the highest Soviet authorities demanding the right to emigrate. He has participated in protests and hunger strikes, decrying severe penalties imposed on other Jewish activists, and has defied warrants confining him to Tbilisi. One day, upon meeting at our predetermined location, with Stars of David proudly and visibly displayed around Isaac and Elizabeta's necks and glistening in the sun, Isaac grasped my arm and said: "Look over there, do you see that man? He is a KGB agent from Tbilisi." Undaunted, rejecting my concern about our continued visibility together—which clearly imperiled their safety—the young couple completed their round of visits to Leningrad activists who wanted to inform me of the status of their cases and problems they were encountering.

Viktor Boguslavsky was not as fortunate as Goldstein. After the arrest of his friend in June, 1970, Boguslavsky, a young architect, wrote letters of protest to government officials. He was arrested, tried, convicted, and sentenced to three years at hard labor in Potma Prison. He had just been released when I met him. A young man with a beard, Viktor was still lean from a 3-year diet of less than 2,000 calories a day and eight hours daily of arduous physical labor. Innocently I asked, "What exactly was the crime you

were accused of?" The question was met with laughter. It was a face steeled with commitment that responded, "Openly identifying myself as a concerned Jew."

One of the objectives of my trip was to meet with Soviet officials to convey the strong feelings of Americans—Jews and non-Jews alike—on the Soviet Jewish emigration issue. Before I left New York City, I met with the Russian Ambassador to the United Nations, Yakov Malik, who assured me that I would be provided the opportunity to meet with ranking policy makers and administrators who would answer my questions. After some initial roadblocks in Moscow, I eventually got the opportunity to have an extended session with Vladimir Promyslov, Mayor of Moscow; Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs, Viktorov; Deputy Chief of the Department of Militia, General Shukayev; Deputy Chief of OVIR, Ovchinnikov, and Deputy Chief of the International Department of Foreign Affairs, Ulanov. We covered considerable ground, often generating sharp exchanges. Some of my specific inquiries in behalf of certain prisoners and applicants for visas were noted and I received a firm commitment that written reports would be delivered to me upon my return to New York City.

The thrust of the Soviet position was that life for Jews in the USSR is "peaches and cream." All who want to leave are allowed to go. Ninety-eight percent of all requests for visas are granted. Only 2,000 persons apply each month. The two percent who are rejected are people with government secrets who would endanger Soviet security by leaving the country. "How then do you explain the denial of Valery Panov's application?" I asked (Panov is the world renowned ballet dancer who was the star of the Kirov Ballet Company. The moment he made application to emigrate, he was fired.) After 15 minutes of questioning relating to Panov's case, Deputy Minister Viktorov said, "He will positively leave with his wife."

I wanted to convey this information to Panov personally. Through Jewish activists, I was able to meet Panov and his ballerina wife, Galina, in their apartment in Leningrad. On the walls were posters announcing his performances and photos displaying the spectacular grace and skill that won him worldwide acclaim. He was not as excited by my news as I had expected. Apparently, others in the past offered hope, but in the end, to no avail. It had been so long since he danced that he was in a state of melancholy. He first applied for his visa in March, 1972, and has been idle since then. "Life without dance for me is death," he said.

There were scores of others with whom I met and spoke. Some perhaps less famous, but none less courageous.

Thus, the world is witnessing another great chapter in the history of the Jewish people—another miracle! Notwithstanding a calculating, systematic attempt at cultural extermination, the Jewish spirit lives on in Russia and, indeed, is perhaps more vital today than at any time in this century, despite the fact that there are only 60 synagogues left in the entire Soviet Union (there were 450 in the 1950s), that only a handful of weddings, Bar Mitzvahs, circumcisions or religious burials take place each year in the USSR, that there are no yeshivas and that teaching Hebrew is prohibited and can be grounds for arrest under "anti-Zionist activity" statutes, there remains a strong feeling of Jewish identity and pride. The young Russian Jews—those who have been denied ritual practice and full understanding of Jewish culture—are the ones leading this revolution. It is young Russian Jews between 18 and 30 who are filing for visas and prompting their parents and friends to take this bold step.

I witnessed this embryonic revolution on my first visit to Russia in August, 1970, just

two months after the government's arrest of the Leningrad Eleven, relating to the alleged hijacking of an Aeroflot plane. The subsequent trials and sentences in December, 1971 crystallized a great deal of this latent sentiment. A spirit of resistance was percolating within the minds and hearts of young Jews spread throughout the massive Soviet continent. On my 1970 trip, in Kiev, after two hours of conversation with several young Russians about conditions in the USSR, one of them divulged the fact that he was a Jew. A few minutes later, I disclosed to this young man that I, too, was Jewish. An extraordinary thing occurred. His face flushed, his arms reached for me, and unabashedly, he embraced me. The next few minutes of conversation disclosed that he was the son of a high ranking member of the Communist Party in the Ukraine; he had not been circumcised, he had received no religious or Hebrew training, he was not Bar Mitzvahed, and indeed, he had never set foot inside a synagogue in his entire life. And yet, how remarkable, I thought, that a young man, totally cut off from all things that are Jewish, was able to have an emotional experience with another person whom he had never seen before, from a different society seven thousand miles away.

Upon reflection, it was clear that a spectacular phenomenon was taking place within the Jewish community. The Soviet government's attempt to destroy understanding and identification with the Jewish heritage and legacy would fail! Sure enough, the world has seen astonishing developments over the last three and a half years!

A year ago, I was in Israel at Lod Airport, watching an El Al plane taxi toward me. It was coming from Vienna, its seats filled with Russian Jews who had won their freedom. Indelibly etched in my mind is the sight of one of the elderly men who, as he emerged through the door of the plane, his hands full of packages and his worldly goods, lifted his head to the sky and uttered the *Shecheyanu*, the blessing for special occasions. As I stood at the bottom of the steps to the plane, I thought: "This is not only a special occasion for this man, but for Jews around the world."

The heroism of Russian Jews should serve as a clarion call for all of us who live here in a free society, to rededicate ourselves and redouble our efforts in behalf of those of our brethren living under the yoke of oppression. Each of us as individuals, and those of us who hold leadership positions in civic and communal organizations, in the world of business and politics, must chart for ourselves a specific agenda of concrete action which will have a direct impact on the Soviet Jewish dilemma. Groups should "adopt" individual prisoners of conscience and organize mail campaigns to authorities indicating interest in that particular prisoner. Some groups may want to focus on specific families who have been denied visas. Letter-writing campaigns have proved to be successful in the past in reversing negative Soviet action on particular cases. Telephone calls to activists at various points in the Soviet Union should be made on a regular basis so that Soviet authorities listening in and recording these conversations know that we care and have considerable current information relating to conditions. Public demonstrations and protests must be generated on a continuing basis so that the problem can be kept fresh in the consciousness of the general public.

In the words of Esfira Mofkova, who was quoted by Western correspondents as she stood in the frigid air of Moscow awaiting the result of the tribunal in one of the trials in December, 1970: "The world must make noise—it cannot stand by."

MEMORIES OF THINGS PAST

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, a host of good wishes honored the birthday of Winsted's most distinguished citizen on his coming of age. One hundred years of loving and living was the occasion of a birthday celebration that extended from the greetings of the President to the well-wishes of the Littlest Angel in the St. Joseph Day Feast in which Antonio Filli has played a major role. The chronicle of this happy event is recorded in the articles from the Winsted Evening Citizen and the Hartford Courant. I am proud to present this Connecticut vignette to my colleagues.

The articles follow:

ANTONIO FILLI IS 100 TODAY

(By Claire Vreeland)

WINSTED.—Antonio Filli of 24 Rock St., Winsted's oldest resident, is 100 years old today.

Filli sat erectly in his favorite chair today, spruce in a gray sports jacket, gray slacks and a blue and gold tie. He was happy to be receiving visitors but the big celebration will be Sunday, Feb. 24 at the Garibaldi Hall, when from 1:30 to 4:30 p.m., Filli will receive all his friends and relatives.

What are his thoughts as he receives visitors on his 100th birthday? "I'm thankful to be alive and to have my family to take care of me," he said. Mr. Filli lives in five downstairs rooms and his daughter, Mrs. Angeline Aquilino and family live in the same house at 26 Rock St.

He came to the United States in 1904, landing in New York City from St. Catherine, Sicily. He worked in New York City for three years, moved to Rochester, N.Y., then back to New York City. In 1911, he moved to Winsted and has remained a resident here ever since.

Filli said he is glad to live in Winsted where he knows so many people, and where everyone is so good to him.

"When he was ill a couple of years ago, the police came up and were ready to take him to the hospital. They treated him like a king," Mrs. Aquilino said.

Filli voted in the past town elections. "Town Clerk Russell Didsbury brought me the ballot," he said.

And he hopes to vote in the next. He takes a lively interest in everything that is happening in town.

To what does he attribute his longevity? Up until two years ago when he was struck by a car while out walking, Filli walked up to four and five miles a day. He attributes his good health to the long walks, a daily glass of wine with the noon meal, and to the fact that he does not smoke.

Filli used to walk to Highland Acres to visit residents at that home, and "way over north past the clock shop to visit another shut-in" Mrs. Aquilino said. "He used to walk up to the First National on South Main Street to get groceries," she said. (The First National building is now the college library.)

Formerly an avid walker, Filli now gets about with the help of a walker which he must use for support.

Filli has little interest in television shows but will not miss the televised news programs. He is concerned about inflation, the lack of gas, and current economic trends.

He enjoys reminiscing about the trip he took to Italy in August of 1970 where he received nationwide newspaper coverage.

A family trip to Miami, Fla., a few years ago is another of his favorite memories. "I remember driving a big boat along the canal near Biscayne Bay," he chuckled as he remembered.

And of course, he has many marvelous memories of life in Italy.

Filli for many years played the part of St. Joseph and read prayers in Italian at the annual Feast of St. Joseph in March at the Garibaldi Hall.

A cobbler by trade, Filli opened a cobbler shop on Main Street where he was self-employed for many years. He later located his cobbler shop in the Elm Street Block, formerly the Pete's Steak and Lobster House.

In his later years, Filli worked at the New England Knitting Mill and retired in the early 1950s.

His grandson, Joseph C. Barber, Democratic town chairman and a teacher at Irving A. Robbins Junior High School in Farmington said that Filli was deeply involved in music back in the days of concert and marching bands.

"He was a member of the Winsted Concert and Marching Band and has been well known for excellence on the French horn, which he still plays on occasion," Barber said.

Filli has three children: Mrs. Angeline Aquilino, Mrs. Salvatore Te, Tracy Avenue, Torrington and Samuel Filli of Meadow Street. He has 11 grandchildren, 17 great grandchildren and five great great grandchildren.

ANTONIO FILLI

(By John W. Parker)

WINSTED.—His handshake still firm and his smile still warm after a century of living, Winsted's oldest citizen greeted visitors at a public celebration in his honor Sunday in Garibaldi Hall.

Antonio Filli of 24 Rock St. reached the age of 100 Wednesday. More than 200 relatives and friends attended Sunday's birthday festivities.

Birthday greetings came from President and Mrs. Richard M. Nixon, Gov. Meskill, Senators Abraham Ribicoff and Edward Kennedy, Congresswoman Ella Grasso, State Attorney General Robert Killian, and Mayors Kingsley H. Beecher of Winsted and Frederick Daley of Torrington.

To the cheers and applause of guests, Filli played a tune on the French horn he has owned for nearly 50 years, recalling days when he performed with local marching and concert bands. Using a walker, he made his way to the buffet table and cut the first slice of a large birthday cake inscribed "Happy Birthday Grandpa." He beamed at the many children who came forward to greet him and once stooped to plant a kiss on the forehead of a young visitor.

MAYOR FOR LIFE

On a table near Filli's seat were many birthday tributes. Among these was a proclamation from Mayor Beecher naming Filli "honorary mayor of Winsted for life."

A plaque from the Garibaldi Society was inscribed with a dedication to Filli "for his interest in the 'Feast of St. Joseph' and his inspiration as a life member of the Young Garibaldi Society."

A letter from President Nixon wished Filli "the peace, joy and contentment you so richly deserve."

"Mrs. Nixon and I are delighted to join family and friends in helping you celebrate your 100th birthday."

Senator Kennedy's letter offered "warm personal congratulations," and Attorney General Killian, who attended the celebration, hailed Filli as "a great Democrat and a great citizen of Connecticut."

Filli received a bouquet from Valerie Cappello, Miss Connecticut. He posed for pictures

with her and with representatives of five generations of his family. He has three children, 11 grandchildren, 17 great-grandchildren and five great-great-grandchildren.

NOT TIRED

Filli arrived in Winsted in 1911. He opened a cobbler's shop on Main Street and later moved the shop to Elm Street. He retired in the early 1950's after a period of employment for the New England Knitting Co.

Until he was struck by a car two years ago, Filli often took a daily walk. But the accident has confined him to the home he shares with his daughter, Mrs. Angeline Aquilino, who cares for him. She describes him as alert and happy, sometimes receiving elderly visitors in his five-room, first floor apartment. "He says it would be nice to take a trip to Florida in the winter," Mrs. Aquilino said Sunday. "Maybe next year it will be possible."

Filli's alertness never flagged during Sunday's celebration. At one point his grandson, Joseph C. Barber, who arranged the festivities, asked Filli in Italian if he was tired. The guest of honor smiled and shook his head. "No," he said.

FOES DO NOT DARE RUN AGAINST POPULAR HBG

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I submit to you the fourth of five parts in a series of articles about Congressman HENRY B. GONZALEZ. My friend and colleague was featured in the San Antonio Express and News between January 7 and January 10 by Mr. Jim McCrory.

The fourth of five parts follows:

FOES DON'T DARE RUN AGAINST POPULAR HBG—WHAT MAKES HENRY B. RUN?

(By James McCrory)

With a whole stable of candidates for Congressman O. C. Fisher's post bunched at the gate, Professor Bill Crane urged candidates to fashion themselves after Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez.

Gonzalez, Crane noted, returns to the district nearly every weekend to mend fences and take the pulse.

Crane, it must be explained, is an unapologetic liberal, but there is evidence his picture of Gonzalez is shared to some degree by an increasing number of moderates and conservatives.

In 12 years in Congress, Gonzalez has logged more than 1.5 million air miles between Washington and San Antonio.

BUILDING FENCES

But Gonzalez more than mends fences when he returns. He builds new ones.

And that is why he has survived in a political climate that in recent years has seen such popular liberals as Sen. Ralph Yarborough, Sen. Joe Bernal, and Com. Albert Pena go own in defeat.

Gonzalez is the number one politician in Bexar County, and its top vote-getter.

A walk down the street with Gonzalez, or lunch or dinner with him, can be revealing. The cop on the beat, a city street employee, a passing citizen or two, will stop the congressman for a little conversation. Nine times out of 10 Gonzalez will know them by their first names.

A two-block walk could take 20 minutes.

In the dining room, a waitress may come over to thank Gonzalez for helping her with a pension matter, or the cook might come out to ask him for a favor or thank him for a favor, done.

CIVIC LEADERS, TOO

And now, with 20 years of consecutive public office behind him and a record of accomplishments at which to point, there is an added dimension to his support. Businessmen and civic leaders, some of whom would hardly give him the time of day in his earlier years, will stop by the table to converse with him.

In dealing with the humble, Gonzalez remains a humble man. He remembers his San Antonio beginnings.

Not that there is any false modesty about Gonzalez. He is not one to depreciate his own worth.

"He that tooteth not his own horn gets it not tooteth," he replies to criticism he is a headline hunter.

An indication that Gonzalez is as secure in his 20th congressional district as any man in politics can be is the decision of County Republican Chairman Van Henry Archer Jr. to run for Fisher's congressional post. Archer lives in Gonzalez's district.

Archer last year took a poll of County Republican Party leaders. He asked, among other questions, whether the GOP should oppose Gonzalez and Fisher. Fisher had not announced his future plans at the time, and the belief was he would seek re-election.

OPPOSITION SHY

Results of the poll are significant. Only 29 Republicans polled favored opposing liberal Gonzalez, while 59 favored opposition to conservative Fisher. A total of 48 said they did not favor fielding an opponent for Gonzalez, while only 16 said they did not favor opposing Fisher.

Realism, of course, played a part in the results of the Republican poll.

Latest figures reflect that the 20th district has 59.7 per cent Spanish-speaking population, the largest percentage of Spanish-speaking in any congressional district in the U.S. except Kika de la Garza's 15th district.

While the Republican Party wisely recognized Gonzalez's strength in his own district, militant Chicanos who consider Gonzalez a Tio Thomas have been equally wise in not running anyone against him.

HE WAS IN DALLAS

Gonzalez's language sometimes may get fluid, but it doesn't fly off into the range of violence.

In fact, Gonzalez saw more than enough violence to do a man a lifetime when President Kennedy was shot to death in Dallas Nov. 22, 1963.

Gonzalez, who had been complimented by the President for the warm reception he received in San Antonio the day before his assassination, was riding in the cavalcade in Dallas when Kennedy was shot.

It was Gonzalez who saw Mrs. Kennedy, caked with blood from her husband, bend over his lifeless body at Parkland hospital, kiss him on the lips, and take a ring from her finger and place it on Kennedy's finger.

Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield later was to use the "Ring from her Finger" theme for his funeral oration at the Capitol rotunda, but it was Gonzalez who witnessed it and passed it on to an Express and News reporter the night of the assassination.

And it was Gonzalez and several White House aides who carried the coffin from Parkland to the waiting ambulance for Kennedy's final voyage home.

CHICANO'S TARGET

Once a favorite target of the far right, Gonzalez now receives more criticism from militant Chicanos.

At a time when today's La Raza militants were playing before many of them were even born. Gonzalez was campaigning for unification of the race.

"A vote for Henry B. Gonzalez is one more step to the unification and defense of nuestra Raza," a La Prensa newspaper ad read in his 1950 campaign.

In a 1971 speech at Rice University, Gonzalez was to report:

"My citizenship is not in any way qualified—I am an American, plain and simple—and as it happens I am of Mexican descent."

DISTURBANCES

Twice now militant Chicanos have created disturbances at universities where Gonzalez was to speak. One, in 1970, was at St. Mary's University, and the other, last year, at the University of Colorado at Boulder. Outside influences motivated both disturbances, Gonzalez contended.

At Boulder, where the militant were successful in keeping the congressman from making his speech, the demonstrators were bused in. Only one was a student. Indicating they may not have been well prepared on their subject, majority of the demonstrators' signs against Gonzalez spelled his name Gonzalez.

In a series of speeches on the House floor, Gonzalez has denounced the MAYO approach to separatism and radicalism. One of the speeches questioned the Ford Foundation grants to MAYO, and resulted in a cutoff of foundation funds. He charged MAYO youth with "stereotyped thinking," and said "they shout La Raza but they can't speak Spanish."

LIMITED INFLUENCE

In a 1973 speech at Southern Methodist University, Gonzalez assessed that "the reach of La Raza Unida extends only to the limits of the personal influence of its leader, Jose Angel Gutierrez." The further one goes from Crystal City, the congressman added, the fewer party victories.

Gonzalez suggested that the 20th congressional district, with its heavy Mexican-American concentration, was the ideal spot for Raza Unida to test its theories.

Yet, he noted, Raza Unida gubernatorial candidate Ramsey Muniz lost the district to Gov. Dolph Briscoe, the Democrat, by better than 2-to-1 in 1972. Muniz edged Republican Hank Grover, who had refused to make a pitch for Mexican-American votes, in the district by less than 400 votes. Republican U.S. Sen. John Tower, in fact, ran 6,000 votes ahead of Muniz in the district, Gonzalez said.

RAZA'S FRIENDS

If Raza Unida hurt anyone in 1972, Gonzalez assesses, it was Democrats portrayed as being "favorably inclined" to Raza Unida. Both Com. Albert Pena and State Sen. Joe Bernal were defeated, with Pena losing to "a complete political rookie, and Bernal losing in a district he had drawn himself," Gonzalez said.

His Chicano critics, Gonzalez feels, use a double standard when judging him in relation to other elected Chicano officials.

NO CRITICISM

For example, Gonzalez said, he didn't hear any La Raza criticism of Pena when he supported David Carter against Bernal for the Texas Senate, nor any criticism of Bernal when he ran for State representative against Rudy Esquivel.

And what about 1974? Well, Gonzalez' name will be in the Democratic columns again for re-election to his seventh full term, and anyone inclined to test any new or old political theories against him will find room on the ballot.

BAN THE HANDGUN—XXV

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the widespread availability of handguns makes for needless deaths. Often, simple disputes result in injury and even death

when guns are present. The following article appearing in the New York Times, February 25, makes the point succinctly: **TWO MOTORISTS SHOT, ONE OF THEM FATALLY, AFTER ACCIDENTS**

Two men were shot, one fatally, early yesterday during arguments after two similar auto accidents in Brooklyn.

Earl Evans of 400 East 21st Street, Brooklyn, was killed by a bullet in the back of his head in front of 760 Nostrand Avenue near Sterling Place in the Crown Heights section shortly after 6 A.M., according to the police. The driver of one car, Ronald Brown of 569 Wyona Street, hit another car with six men in it. Apparently, one of the cars involved in the collision then struck a car parked nearby in which Mr. Evans was sitting.

According to the police, Mr. Evans, who was 25 years old, got into an argument with the six men and was shot after the group had dragged Mr. Brown from his car and beat him.

The other shooting took place around 3 A.M. at Kings Highway and Clarendon Road in the East Flatbush section. James Hands, a gypsy cab driver, told the police another car collided with his taxi. When Mr. Hands, who is 44 years old, jumped out and started toward the other car, its driver fired two shots, hitting him in the head and stomach.

Mr. Hands, who lives at 27 Spencer Place, Brooklyn, was reported in critical condition at Kings County Hospital.

COMMEMORATION OF ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, February 24 marked the 56th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Estonia, now under Soviet control. I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing the hope that the native land of this courageous and spirited people shall some day again enjoy the dignity of liberty and self-determination.

The history of the Estonian people is a history of repeated attacks upon their pursuit of political and cultural independence; yet conquerors of many ages have been unable to suppress the strong desire to be free, which is so characteristic of this great people. Their fascinating, expressive culture lives on not only inside Estonia, but in thriving communities around the world.

The Estonians belong to the family of Finno-Ugric nations, distinct from the Teutons and the Slavs both in race and language. They have inhabited the Northwestern shores of the Baltic Sea for some 5,000 or 6,000 years, establishing thereby longstanding and legitimate entitlement to self-determination. We commemorate the Republic of Estonia's short-lived independence, which began and ended in 1918, as the realization of that hard-earned autonomy.

Estonians take justified pride and satisfaction in everything they have been able to achieve both as a people and as a nation, and we look to Estonian Americans today as Americans whose heritage is rich, and merits our respect.

ENERGY DISASTER LOANS

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, on the 14th of this month, I introduced a bill (H.R. 12843) which calls for short-term, low-interest loans to provide operating expenses for small businesses which are seriously affected by our continuing energy shortages. I am sure that I am not alone in having received a countless number of pleas from small businessmen who seek our help in keeping them operating and protecting their investments. In the past year we have witnessed the closing of filling stations and auto dealerships across the Nation as a result of the hardships created by fuel shortages. However, the effects of this crisis extend far beyond the small, but, nonetheless, important group of gasoline station operators and auto dealers. We stand on the brink of a serious economic disaster for a wide variety and substantial number of businessmen who are unable to meet their immediate financial obligations during this period of uncertainty and adversity.

In this regard, I would like to share with my colleagues in the House, an article published in the February 16 issue of Business Week magazine. This article discusses the problems which confront big and small businesses alike, and the need for legislative action to provide relief for the more vulnerable of these people:

A DETOUR FOR ROADSIDE AMERICA

Last week Denver lost a \$3-million Shriners' convention that was to have been held there in September. And the Greenbrier, the posh executive retreat in White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., was no longer preparing to greet the top brass of J. C. Penney Co., who were supposed to arrive Feb. 28 to begin their quadrennial management conference. The Shriners and Penney executives explained that, like countless other Americans, they had to change their plans because of the gasoline shortage.

Indeed, the rippling effects of the fuel crunch are reaching well beyond the beleaguered service stations and suffering automobile showrooms into toll booths, shopping centers, parking lots, motels, diners, and other elements of roadside America. They are producing some winners as well as some losers, but mainly they are creating fundamental changes in the lifestyle of a U.S. public denied unlimited use of their automobiles, and headaches for businesses that cater to them.

The magnitude of the impact on roadside America is uncertain, but clues can be found in Labor Dept. statistics. They show that employment in the services sector, which had been rising at a lively rate of more than 25,000 per month through November, flattened out to a 2,000 increase in December, and actually fell by 17,000 in January.

Labor Dept. officials, not ready to say how much of this drastic swing can be attributed to a general softening of the economy, concede they show adverse effects of the gasoline shortage on service industries. Meanwhile, the Nixon Administration this week asked Congress to extend unemployment benefits in areas where jobs have been hardest hit.

The problems for businessmen have yet to reach the critical stage, except in such places as Orlando, Fla., heavily overbuilt with motels in unrealized expectation of an

overflow from nearby Walt Disney World. Business, to be sure, was off 20% for motels scattered along Florida's Sunny Isles Strip, north of Miami Beach, but none appeared ready to close. Traffic and revenues were off an average of 11% on toll roads and bridges last month in the Northeast, but Wall Street specialists said the drop-off would have to be much more severe—perhaps 25%—to affect their bonds.

Convention and conference hosts, admitting to scattered cancellations, claim that the automobile's role is not yet that clear. Denver, amply served by common carriers, shrugs off the Shriners' defection, because Shriners truck more gear, such as horses and motorcycles, than most conventioners. The Greenbrier, owned by the Chessie System, Inc., has both Amtrak and airport facilities nearby.

ERRATIC

Most troubling to large chain operators is the erratic nature of the pinch and the reaction to it. Brooklyn-based Abraham & Straus, for instance, did not feel the impact until last weekend, when business dropped dramatically at its shopping center stores in suddenly gas-starved New Jersey. At the Boston headquarters of Howard Johnson's, a spokesman says of recent occupancy figures: "One week they're up, and the next week they're down." Phoenix-based Ramada Inns has dips in occupancy ranging from 10% to 40%. The uncertainty has been strong enough for Howard Johnson to postpone indefinitely merger talks with Sirloln Stockade, an Oklahoma City chain of 80 steak houses.

Korvettes, the New York-based discount department store chain with 80% of its stores in suburban shopping centers, has observed at least one pattern in the pinch: Sales drop off markedly the last week of the month, when local service station gasoline allocations tend to run out.

Business geared to weekends and Sundays (a gasless day in many parts of the country) is also showing signs of drying up. In the Pacific Northwest, where sports fishing is a minor industry this time of year, fishermen are being warned by the Automobile Club of Washington to stay home this weekend or run the risk of being stranded.

Changing commuter patterns also have been having a marked effect in some cities. Eglin Garages, which operates a chain of parking facilities in mid-Philadelphia, notes a 15% drop in business since the fuel shortage hit. In San Francisco, Metropolitan Parking Corp. has watched revenues from all-day parking lots drop 25% since November, and night business is down 40% from normal, perhaps partly because of a recent crime scare in the city. But mid-city stores, hotels, and other businesses feel they may be regaining customers once lost to outlying shopping centers and motels.

URBAN SUCCESS

Among the fast-food chains, Heublein, Inc.'s Kentucky Fried Chicken (KFC Corp.) is in a particularly self-congratulatory mood for deciding more than 18 months ago to concentrate in mid-city and urban-residential neighborhoods. KFC's president, James H. Wille, estimates his average customer travels less than two miles to reach one of the 4,500 fried chicken shops. As a result, expansion plans are moving ahead of schedule, Wille says, and gasoline is a minimal problem.

Location, always vital to motel operations, is becoming even more important. Memphis-based Holiday Inns, Inc., disclosed this week that occupancy was only three percentage points off in December, when some other motels were suffering. "Airport and downtown locations have been stable," says a spokesman. "Those hurting the most are motels heavily dependent on auto traffic and which have done little to cultivate local customers."

CXX—276—Part 4

Similarly, shopping centers within easy reach of their customers are showing strength in the gasoline drought. Indeed, a Marlboro (Mass.) developer, Thomas W. Callahan, says he is convinced that "subregional" shopping centers, which he defines as drawing all the customers they need from within a 6-mi. radius, are an answer to a long-term cutback in automobile use. He is planning to start one at Marlboro next August.

Even in shopping centers that feel secure in the gasoline pinch, storekeepers are increasingly finding that the impulse buyer is fading from the scene.

"We're not getting the guy who swings by for a magazine, a cup of coffee, or cigarettes," says Richard Horn, manager of Lloyd Center of Portland, Ore., which houses 125 stores. Gas-conscious shoppers now come armed with shopping lists to insure they get everything they need in the first trip. "But we're experiencing a good average sale increase," notes Bert Williams, a general merchandising manager at the center.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, this dilemma is widespread; but the article discloses only a fraction of the difficulties that we will face if action is not taken. Fuel shortages have plagued large corporations and small businesses alike. But while the larger concerns have ample financial resources to tide them over, the small businessman is powerless. He is unable to raise the funds necessary to "keep his head above water" during this difficult period, until the supply-and-demand equation again becomes more balanced.

During the "Agnes" flood, Congress and the administration worked promptly together to aid those who saw their hard work and lofty dreams vanish as a result of a disaster over which they had no control. The situation which we face today is not dissimilar. The inability to attract customers, plus mounting inflation, and fuel and materials shortages paint a pessimistic and painful picture for much of the small business community. The Nation stands to lose a great deal if this trend is not halted.

If we are to be true to our commitment to the small business segment of free enterprise, and if we wish to avert a financial crisis of more crippling proportions in the future, we must respond to this need. I have written to my colleagues, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, and Representative WILLIAM WIDNALL of New Jersey, the committee's ranking minority member, in an effort to "set the wheels in motion" on this issue. It is my hope that others will join me—as some have already done—in drawing attention to the need for prompt and effective relief for those small businessmen now facing economic disaster as a result of the burgeoning energy crisis and the public reaction thereto.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 56th anniversary of Es-

tonian independence, which was established on February 24, 1918. At the conclusion of World War I the Estonians had to repulse an attack by Bolsheviks in order to preserve freedoms which were based on a constitution which was to a significant extent inspired by our own.

Estonia managed to remain free until August 1940, when it was annexed by the Soviet Union pursuant to a secret agreement between Hitler and Stalin. Except for 3 years of Nazi occupation, from 1941 to 1944, Estonia has remained under Soviet control ever since the annexation. For its part the United States recognized the free government of Estonia in 1922 and has never acknowledged the legitimacy of the occupation of the Baltic states.

The Estonian people have suffered profoundly under the oppressive rule of their Soviet captors. Many Estonians were either killed or deported while such a large number of people from other parts of Russia have been resettled in Estonia that the unity and integrity of the nation are seriously threatened.

As we mark this anniversary of Estonian Independence Day, let us strengthen our resolve to stand by the Estonian people and all other peoples who value their lost freedom and yearn for its restoration now.

SENATOR JOHN BRICKER: A
PROPHET IN HIS TIME

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, 1954, the Bricker amendment to the Constitution fell 1 vote short of achieving the necessary two-thirds majority in the Senate—60 yeas to 31 nays. This amendment, named after its original sponsor, former U.S. Senator John Bricker of Ohio, would prevent treaties and executive agreements from overriding the freedoms and safeguards found in the Constitution. It would also put constitutional safeguards on the use of executive agreements in conducting foreign policy.

Chief opponents of the Bricker amendment were liberals, who at that time were arguing that the President should have almost unchecked power in foreign affairs. Their victory on this vital issue led us into the Vietnam tragedy. Ironically most liberals now decry the excessive power of the Presidency. Senator John Bricker, a man who foresaw the potential abuse of Presidential power longer before his liberal colleagues, truly deserves to be called a prophet in his time.

Despite the passage of 20 years, the Bricker amendment seems as necessary today as when it was first introduced. Therefore during the last session of Congress I reintroduced this amendment. It now has 20 cosponsors including JOHN RHODES, Republican of Arizona, ROBERT TIERNAN, Democrat of Rhode Island, SAM DEVINE, Republican of Ohio, SAM STEIGER, Republican of Arizona, JOHN ROUSSELOT,

Republican of California, CLARENCE LONG, Democrat of Maryland, WILLIAM KETCHUM, Republican of California, JOHN CONLAN, Republican of Arizona, DAVID TREEN, Republican of Louisiana, ROBERT HUBER, Republican of Michigan, CHARLES THONE, Republican of Nebraska, STEVE SYMMS, Republican of Idaho, JOHN RARICK, Democrat of Louisiana, CLARENCE MILLER, Republican of Ohio, J. KENNETH ROBINSON, Republican of Virginia, JACK EDWARDS, Republican of Alabama, CLAIR BURGNER, Republican of California, ROBERT BAUMAN, Republican of Maryland, and BEN BLACKBURN, Republican of Georgia.

On this day, the 20th anniversary of the Senate rejection of the Bricker amendment, I call on all those of my colleagues who are truly interested in helping to restore a proper congressional role in foreign affairs to join with me in working to pass the Bricker amendment.

OIL: THE DATA SHORTAGE

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the "best kept secrets of the Energy Crisis," writes Julius Duschka, director of the Washington Journalism Center, is accurate data on just how much oil is available and what the actual extent of reserves are.

Once again I commend the Progressive magazine for an excellent article on the energy crisis. "Oil: The Data Shortage," concisely states where the "facts" come from—the industry itself—and why they are unreliable as primary sources of information for planning governmental responses to the energy emergency.

The need to thoroughly assess the information submitted by the oil and gas industry is one of the crucial motivations behind the sponsorship by nearly 70 of my colleagues of legislation to create a Select Committee of the House of Representatives to investigate all aspects of the industry.

In little more than a month, House Resolution 747, originally introduced by BILL LEHMAN and I, has attracted widespread and bipartisan support throughout this Chamber.

I earlier reported the endorsement of House Administration Committee Chairman WAYNE L. HAYS and Interior and Insular Affairs Committee Chairman JAMES A. HALEY of this legislation.

The sponsors are now proud to add names of cosponsors including a third committee chairman, the Honorable RAY J. MADDEN, JR., of the Rules Committee.

Chairman MADDEN joins B. F. SISK, CLAUDE PEPPER and SPARK M. MATSUNAGA as sponsors of House Resolution 747 from the committee which has original jurisdiction on the creation of Select Committees. It is the sponsors' hope that hearings can be held before the Rules Committee in the near future so that we may state our case for the need for a Select Committee which will not be confined by jurisdictional boundaries and

able, therefore, to investigate all aspects of the role of the oil and gas industry in the current emergency and report back to the Congress.

Among the new sponsors of House Resolution 747 reported for the first time in the RECORD are:

NEW COSPONSORS OF SELECT COMMITTEE BILL

Mr. Addabbo; Mr. Andrews, North Carolina; Mr. Badillo; Mr. Biaggi; Ms. Chisholm; Ms. Collins, Illinois; Mr. Dent; Mr. Derwinski; Mr. Edwards, California; Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Gialino; Mr. Green, Pennsylvania; Mrs. Hansen, Washington; Mr. Hungate; Mr. Ketchum; Mr. Long, Maryland; Mr. Martin, North Carolina; Mr. Minish; Mr. Mitchell, New York; Mr. Podell.

Mr. Roybal; Mr. Ryan; Mr. Snyder; Mr. Tiernan; Mr. Charles Wilson, Texas; Mr. Rinaldo; Mr. Litton; Mr. Madden; Mr. Sisk; Mr. Steele; Mr. Stokes.

We welcome additional sponsors.

OIL: THE DATA SHORTAGE

(By Julius Duschka)

Last October 12, when the Arab-Israeli war was beginning to raise fears of an Arab boycott of oil sales to the United States, White House petroleum expert Charles Di Bona said American imports of Arab oil had been averaging 1.2 million barrels a day. Eight days later, on October 20, the Nixon Administration was talking about U.S. dependence on Arab oil totaling 1.6 million barrels daily. Four more days passed, and on October 24 the Administration estimate escalated to two million barrels. By October 30 the figure was up to 2.5 million barrels, and then, early in November, the Defense Department, never to be outdone even by the White House, proclaimed a three-million-barrel-a-day U.S. dependence on Arab oil.

When estimates varied within a month all the way from 1.2 million to three million barrels, it was obvious that no one in the Federal Government knew with any accuracy how much Arab oil was being used in the United States. The problem isn't that Federal oil economists and statisticians can't count; it is rather that there are no reliable figures for them to count.

The statisticians do know that last September shipments of oil directly from the Middle East to the United States averaged 1.2 million barrels a day. However, U.S. petroleum experts believe—but have no way of knowing for certain—that as much or more Arab oil also got here after being transhipped or processed somewhere along the way, usually in the Caribbean.

Once crude oil from the Middle East or from any other area enters world commerce, its route is difficult to follow; oil bears no serial numbers or other distinguishing marks of manufactured goods. The Federal Government could be forgiven the wide variances in its estimates of Arab oil imports were it not for the fact that the Arab import statistics are symptomatic of the problem with most petroleum figures.

As everyone concerned with the oil crisis, from energy czar William Simon to Senator Henry M. Jackson, has quickly come to realize, the United States has all too few solid figures on oil and natural gas, and for what statistics are available the Government is almost wholly dependent on the oil industry itself.

Just as Arab import figures have jumped all over the place, so have Administration estimates of the dimensions of the overall U.S. oil shortage this winter. Early in November, when President Nixon first talked about a serious shortage, he put the likely daily shortfall at 3.5 million barrels. Since then estimates by experts within the Administration and on Capitol Hill have ranged all the way down to 1.6 million barrels; Simon came out at 2.7 million barrels at the news

conference late in December at which he outlined the Administration's standby gasoline rationing plans.

Whether the oil statistics are proclaimed by Simon's Federal Energy Office or by Jackson's Senate Interior Committee, almost all of the figures originate with the American Petroleum Institute, the trade association of the major U.S. oil producers.

The API's basic statistical document is its *Weekly Statistical Bulletin*, which purports to keep track of the output of U.S. refineries, available supplies of refined petroleum products, exports and imports, production of domestic oil wells, and gasoline consumption. Of these figures, the only up-to-the-minute ones are for refinery production and available supplies, and even these must be viewed with some skepticism.

They are, first of all, industry figures supplied on a voluntary basis, with no independent check on their accuracy.

Every Wednesday, refinery production and available-supply figures are made public for the previous week, and even oil industry critics agree that the statistics could hardly be produced much faster and still be put together with reasonable accuracy and cost.

Import and export statistics are based on U.S. Customs Bureau figures, with which no one quarrels much, except that the figures give no hint of the country where the crude oil was produced, or any indication of U.S. oil being exported and then re-imported under more favorable prices.

As for the domestic crude oil production figures, they are estimates based on the most recent statistics from the Texas Railroad Commission and the other regulatory agencies that monitor production in the thirty-one oil-producing states. The official state figures lag months behind, as do accurate gasoline consumption figures based on state and Federal tax figures.

Once fuel oil, gasoline, and other petroleum products have left refineries, bulk terminals, and pipelines, neither the API nor any Government agency keeps track of the products. How much gasoline is generally in the supply pipelines beyond the primary storage facilities of the refiners, the bulk terminals, and the big pipelines? How much No. 2 heating oil is in supply lines? How much oil and gasoline is kept in storage, or perhaps being hoarded, by large corporations and other heavy users of petroleum products? A recent *New York Times* survey indicated that major users of oil products have been building up their supplies, but there is no reliable statistical information available.

Oil pricing information is even scarcer. Not until last fall did the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics start collecting enough information on retail gasoline prices to come up with reasonably accurate figures on gasoline price trends throughout the nation. And there simply are no reliable figures on crude oil production costs, refinery costs, and costs on down the petroleum supply pipelines. There is more information on natural gas because most of its production and prices at the wellhead are still regulated by the Federal Power Commission, but the Nixon Administration has called for ending such regulation. And even data published by the FPC on natural gas production are heavily dependent on unaudited reports from the industry.

What government oil statistics there are come largely from the Interior Department's Bureau of Mines and Office of Oil and Gas. These are unchecked industry figures issued only monthly. To keep up with the fast-moving oil and gasoline situation, energy director Simon and his aides rely, however, not on the ponderous Bureau of Mines and Office of Oil and Gas, but rather on the API weekly bulletins. For it is true, as John E. Hodges, director of API's Division of Statistics and Economics says, that "if the Gov-

ernment didn't have our weekly statistical bulletin, it wouldn't have anything."

Oil is by no means the only industry for which audited statistics are hard to come by. American corporations jealously guard their figures—in part because of fears that competitors will use them to exploit market situations and in part because of the traditional feeling that the Government (and the public) have no right to pry into the affairs of private corporations, no matter how big or dominant they may be. Most Census Bureau figures, as well as statistics compiled by other government agencies, are based on uncheckered material submitted by industry sources. BLS and population figures are, of course, the Government's own.

But if oil production and supply statistics cause problems, figures on oil and natural gas reserves are even more difficult to weigh and interpret. The API and the American Gas Association are the only sources for systematic compilations of what oilmen call proved reserves. Such reserves are defined as oil and gas in the ground that can be efficiently recovered under current economic conditions in the industry, which means that reserves increase as oil prices go up.

Every spring API, AGA, and the Canadian Petroleum Association jointly publish a detailed compilation of crude oil and natural gas reserves in the United States and Canada. The figures are based on surveys made by geologists and others employed by oil and natural gas companies. It is generally assumed that the industry has a vested interest in underestimating reserves, but government oil experts cannot even agree on that. A recent Federal Trade Commission study concluded that natural gas reserves were overestimated, while a FPC study showed that gas reserves were being underestimated in at least one rich field.

"I wouldn't argue one way or another about the reliability of the oil and natural gas reserve figures," a Senate staff aide who has been immersed in the quarrels over oil statistics observes. "There's just too much guesswork in estimating reserves. The only thing that's clear to me is that we still have an awful lot of oil in the world, and are likely to find a lot more."

However unreliable figures on U.S. oil and natural gas reserves may be, there is general agreement even among oil industry economists that statistics on foreign reserves are hopeless. API's Hodges says flatly that there are no good figure on overseas reserves.

The United States thus finds itself groping for facts as it faces what appears to be the most serious fuel shortage in its history. But are things as bad as the Nixon Administration has made them seem? There is wide skepticism in Washington and elsewhere in the country—not only because of Nixon's personal credibility crisis, but also because of the uneasy feeling so many people have that the oil companies and not the Nixon Administration are in charge of whatever crisis there may be.

The oil industry certainly is in charge of whatever statistical evidence there is to back up the crisis atmosphere. And the industry obviously does not want the Government to get into the information-gathering business. Industry lobbyists fought against inclusion of a Government fact-gathering clause in the energy legislation that was shoved aside in the pre-Christmas Congressional adjournment rush. But Simon's energy office has set up a committee to review oil and gasoline statistics, and Simon himself told reporters at his late December news conference: "You're darn right we're going to get better figures."

Senator Gaylord Nelson has presented the Senate with a plan to establish a Bureau of National Energy Information in the Commerce Department to collect and verify statistics involving all aspects of energy. "We

have failed to manage energy because we have failed to manage energy information," Nelson says. "We are sitting in the dark because he have been making our energy policy in the dark."

"Beyond the energy crisis," Nelson continues, "the basic premises of this legislation are, first, that the power of giant corporations over the quality of life has become so great that such corporations must now be regarded as if they were governments, for govern they do; second, that governments—including corporate governments—derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; third, that consent, to be meaningful, even to be real, must be informed consent, fourth, that the free exchange and availability of industrial, as well as political information are therefore the lifeblood of a free society; and fifth, that the Congress has no higher duty than to provide channels and mechanisms for the exchange and availability of information about the holders and uses of government power."

It seems also but certain that out of the energy crisis will emerge audited government figures on the facts of oil and natural gas. It would be useful to know as much about the oil industry as advertisers know, for example, about television audiences. The fact that more information is available about how to influence television viewers than about oil says much about the haphazard ways of the American economy and the relationship of the Government to it.

HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, while we have rejoiced at breakthroughs achieved in treating and preventing major illnesses, we have yet to develop and implement effective treatment, care, and prevention of Huntington's disease. The hereditary nature of this affliction of the nervous system makes its occurrence and very existence even more tragic. The time is long overdue for a major effort to attack Huntington's disease.

Today, I am introducing legislation which is not new to this Chamber, but which does demand our attention and action. This legislation would amend the Public Health Service Act to provide Federal assistance for programs for the diagnosis, research in, prevention, and treatment of this cruel and ruthless disease affecting thousands of American families:

A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance for programs for the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of, and research in, Huntington's disease

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 "National Huntington's Disease Control Act".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSES

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds and declares—

(1) that Huntington's disease is a chronic, progressive, degenerative disorder of the nervous system. It is described in medical journals as a hereditary disease of the basal

ganglia and cerebral cortex characterized by the onset in adult life of choreiform movements and mental deterioration. The age of onset of the symptoms may be at any time from infancy but in the vast majority of cases it is first discerned between the ages of thirty and fifty years;

(2) that this debilitating, inheritable disease which makes its first appearance in the very prime of life already affects great numbers of Americans and will begin to afflict an even greater number as our young adult population expands;

(3) that the exact cause of Huntington's disease is still unknown. Although severity of the choreiform movements may be reduced by the administration of certain medication or treatment that has been developed, there is no known treatment that will influence the course of the disease;

(4) that efforts to prevent Huntington's disease must be directed toward increased research in the cause and treatment of the disease, and the education, screening, and counseling of carriers of the trait;

(5) that programs to prevent Huntington's disease must be based entirely upon the voluntary cooperation of the individuals involved; and

(6) that the attainment of better methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of Huntington's disease deserves the highest priority.

(b) In order to preserve and protect the health and welfare of all citizens, it is the purpose of this Act to establish a national program for the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of, and research in Huntington's disease.

AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

SEC. 3. (a) Section 1 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "titles I to X" and inserting in lieu thereof "titles I to XI".

(b) The Act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 682), as amended, is amended by renumbering title XI (as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act) as title XII, and by renumbering sections 1101 through 1114 (as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act) and references thereto, as sections 1201 through 1214, respectively.

"TITLE XI—HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE PROGRAM

"PROGRAMS RELATING TO HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE

"SEC. 1101. (a) (1) The Secretary may make grants to public and nonprofit private entities, and may enter into contracts with public and private entities, for projects for the establishment and operation, primarily through other existing health programs, of Huntington's disease screening, treatment, and counseling programs.

"(2) The Secretary may make grants to public and nonprofit private entities, and may enter into contracts with public and private entities and individuals, for projects for research in the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of Huntington's disease including projects for the development of effective tests which will identify those who have the disease or carry the trait.

"(3) The Secretary shall carry out a program to develop information and educational materials relating to Huntington's disease and to disseminate such information and materials to persons providing health care and to the public generally. The Secretary may carry out such program through grants to public and nonprofit private entities or contracts with public and private entities and individuals.

"(b) (1) For the purpose of making payments pursuant to grants and contracts under subsection (a) (1), there are authorized to be appropriated \$500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for each of the next two fiscal years.

"(2) For the purpose of making payments pursuant to grants and contracts under subsection (a)(2), there are authorized to be appropriated \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for each of the next two fiscal years.

"(3) For the purpose of carrying out subsection (a)(3), there are authorized to be appropriated \$25,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for each of the next two fiscal years.

"VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION

"SEC. 1102. The participation by any individual in any program or portion thereof under this title shall be wholly voluntary and shall not be a prerequisite to eligibility for or receipt of any other services or assistance from, or to participation in, any other program.

"APPLICATIONS; ADMINISTRATION OF GRANT AND CONTRACT PROGRAMS

"SEC. 1103. (a) A grant under this title may be made upon application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, containing and accompanied by such information, as the Secretary deems necessary. Each applicant shall—

"(1) provide that the programs and activities for which assistance under this title is sought will be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

"(2) provide for strict confidentiality of all test results, medical records, and other information regarding screening, counseling, or treatment of any person treated, except for (A) such information as the patient (or his guardian) consents to be released; or (B) statistical data compiled without reference to the identity of any such patient;

"(3) provide for appropriate community representation in the development and operation of any program funded by a grant under this title;

"(4) set forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this title; and

"(5) provide for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

"(b) In making any grant or contract under this title, the Secretary shall (1) take into account the number of persons to be served by the program supported by such grant or contract and the extent to which rapid and effective use will be made of funds under the grant or contract; and (2) give priority to programs operating in areas which the Secretary determines have the greatest number of persons in need of the services provided under such programs.

"(c) The Secretary may make a grant under section 1111(a)(1) for a screening, treatment, and counseling program when he determines that the screening provided by such program will be done through an effective Huntington's disease screening test.

"PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE FACILITIES

"SEC. 1104. The Secretary shall establish a program within the Public Health Service to provide for voluntary Huntington's disease screening, counseling, and treatment. Such program shall utilize effective Huntington's disease screening tests and shall be made available through facilities of the Public Health Service to any person requesting screening, counseling, or treatment, and shall include appropriate publicity of the availability and voluntary nature of such programs.

"REPORTS

"SEC. 1105. (a) The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before April 1 of each year a comprehensive report on the administration of this title.

"(b) The report required by this section

shall contain such recommendations for additional legislation as the Secretary deems necessary."

SOLAR HEATING AND COOLING DEMONSTRATION ACT OF 1973

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, because I was an original cosponsor of H.R. 11864, the "Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act of 1973," I have developed a deep and abiding interest in its progress. For this reason, I was very pleased to see that the bill had been quickly reported out of committee. I would like to express my gratitude to my colleague from Texas, OLIN E. TEAGUE for his competent and expeditious handling of this bill, and to my colleague from the State of Washington, MIKE McCORMACK, who also worked hard on this bill.

We all realize that the current energy crisis will continue for an indefinite period of time. Commonsense requires that alternative sources of energy be developed. One of the more practical and economical of the various alternatives is solar energy.

The early demonstrations of the use of solar energy for heating and cooling purposes could help relieve the ever-increasing demand on existing energy supplies. The development and use of solar heating and cooling equipment in the home and offices possesses other advantages as well. For example, it will benefit the environment, improve our balance of trade, and eliminate our dependence upon foreign energy sources.

With this in mind, I would like to review the provisions and benefits contained in this major piece of legislation.

The bill is to demonstrate within 3 years, using current technology, the practical use on a large scale of solar heating technology and to develop and demonstrate on a large scale within 5 years, the practical application of combined solar heating and cooling technology.

The bill provides \$50 million over a 5-year period for commercial demonstration of solar energy for the heating and cooling of residential and commercial buildings. The bill accomplishes the very important and timely "next step" required to implement large scale, knowledgeable use of solar energy in the near future. So far only 30 solar heated buildings have been constructed in the entire world. It is obvious from this fact that the knowledge necessary for large scale implementation of this technology does not yet exist. With this fact in mind, we must realize that a commercial demonstration of the economic feasibility of solar heating and cooling is imperative for attaining our goal of becoming self-sufficient in energy resources.

The bill further provides for a two-step demonstration program. NASA will

be in charge of the initial phase which will consist of contracting for the research, development, and manufacture of solar heating and combined solar heating and cooling equipment.

The second phase of the bill will be under the jurisdiction of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This agency will be responsible for the installation and monitoring of the necessary equipment. In order to assure continuing public benefit from this program, HUD is required to implement programs that would provide disclosure and distribution of all pertinent data produced under this demonstration program. HUD is further expected to establish a solar heating and cooling information bank, the purpose of which will be to collect, review, process, and disseminate information on solar heating and cooling in order to support the goals of the bill.

Finally, HUD is charged with investigating and reporting on ways to amend building codes and zoning ordinances in order to facilitate and encourage widespread use of solar energy for heating and cooling of buildings.

The bill also respects the precarious financial position of the homeowner in that it raises the ceiling on federally assisted mortgage loans, in order to compensate for the increased cost which will result from installation of solar heating and cooling systems.

In conclusion, I believe that this bill "legislates for the future." The effects of this bill are far-reaching in nature. The bill strives to insure that the energy needs of this and future generations of Americans will be met. The potential of solar energy is still unclear, but this prudent bill is the first step to testing that potential.

WHIO-TV IN DAYTON MARKS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to note that WHIO-TV in Dayton, Ohio, has passed the quarter century mark.

Television is now ubiquitous in the United States and is an integral part of our communications system, our culture, and our very way of life. It is difficult for many of our citizens under the age of 30 to comprehend that television is really a relatively new development and that radio itself is not much older.

During the 25 years of its existence as part of the Cox Broadcasting operation in Dayton, WHIO-TV has distinguished itself as a responsive, concerned member of the community. WHIO-TV has compiled an enviable record particularly in news and public affairs programming, reflected by its large news staff, and the presence in Washington of an excellent news bureau.

As the first television station in Dayton and the Miami Valley, WHIO-TV

has been acknowledged as a leader in the industry and a tough competitor by the area's other television stations. WHIQ's operation is a credit to its employees and corporation.

I am happy to extend my congratulations to the staff and management on this auspicious occasion.

POLITICAL PRISONERS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, critics of the Government of South Vietnam have focused an attack on the prison system in that country and have charged that the government in Saigon has held thousands and thousands of political prisoners. The most popular figure which has been used is 200,000 prisoners, a charge repeated by the Vietcong representatives in Paris. It appears that this figure was a misquotation by Western journalists of an estimate of prisoners held throughout Indochina including prisoners held in all of North Vietnam and Communist-controlled areas in South Vietnam.

This estimate was made by Amnesty International. Even the Vietcong representatives, who could cite no evidence for this high number, finally reduced their own figures to 100,000 and then to 50,000. The impossibility of the claim has been exposed since all the prison facilities of South Vietnam, if filled to capacity, would hold no more than 40,000 individuals.

Although their system may differ from the one in the United States, we must remember that the prisoners in South Vietnam—both civil and criminal prisoners and the Vietcong—are entitled to certain legal and constitutional safeguards, for example, a formal indictment, a public trial, and the right to a defense lawyer.

We should consider that in contrast to the open society in South Vietnam, North Vietnam is a closed society where the citizens of North Vietnam can be arbitrarily arrested and sentenced to prison without the basic guarantees of due process which we have come to expect in societies based upon a rule of law. We should recall that between 1954 and through the first part of 1973, a total of over 67,501 South Vietnam citizens were kidnapped by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong agents. Yet, the Communists have claimed that they have only 637 prisoners. In investigating the question of prisoners, we may ask North Vietnam what has happened to the over 67,000 people abducted. Were they assassinated? Did they die in captivity? Are they still prisoners?

The prisoner question has illustrated the differences between these two societies. The prisons in South Vietnam are

open for inspection. The prisons in North Vietnam are closed to inspection.

One of the prison areas in South Vietnam is the prison camp on Con Son Island, an island located off the mainland of South Vietnam near Saigon. The island contains almost 6,000 prisoners including 500 Vietcong prisoners. The prison has been visited by various newspapermen throughout the world. A report of one of these visits appeared recently in the San Diego Union of February 3, 1974. It provides a thorough and balanced view. I would like to enter the article in the RECORD:

[From the San Diego Union, Feb. 3, 1974]

POLITICAL PRISONERS: A MATTER OF DEFINITION

CON SON ISLAND, VIETNAM.—The faces crowded against the cell door were stark, drained, peering through the bars at the strange group of visitors from the United States.

Other black-clad figures moved and shuffled in the gloom of the damp cavernous chamber behind.

Almost on signal a young prisoner moved forward and began to answer questions in halting English:

"I am 27 . . . I was caught Feb. 13, 1969. Yes, I want to go back to our revolutionary government . . . our life is very miserable . . . we have not enough rice . . . in two months we eat fish one time . . ."

"We have many diseases . . . I am in very bad health . . . I have tubercular disease . . ."

The visiting Americans were face to face with the most serious charge that has been raised against the South Vietnamese government—that it has imprisoned, tortured and abused 202,000 of its own citizens who are guilty of no crime other than opposing President Nguyen Van Thieu.

The prisoners talked to were hard core Viet Cong, jailed for widely varying offenses ranging from terrorist murders to carrying guns or working with the Communist infrastructure against the Saigon government.

Whether this properly places them in the category of "political prisoners" is a matter of definition and political outlook, although presumably, if there are political prisoners, they would be among this group.

Likewise it is equally impossible to sort out the truth or falsity of the many charges that swirl around the issue. Many men of good will have already broken lances over the elusive facts involved.

But it is possible to relay impressions and observations after a rarely-permitted day-long tour of this most infamous of Vietnam's prison facilities, and extensive conversations with government officials and highly informed members of the U.S. embassy staff in Saigon.

Those impressions are a mixture of both good and bad.

Con Son Island, 65 miles off the southeast coast of Vietnam, is unexpectedly large, fertile, well watered and semi-tropical. Formerly a French penal colony dating back to 1862, it has been operated by the Vietnamese since 1954.

The greatest number of prisoners ever held here was 7,000 in 1969. Now the prison population is down to 5,739, all civilians, including 500 Viet Cong awaiting exchange for South Vietnamese civilians held by North Vietnam whenever arrangements can be completed.

At the time the Vietnam peace agreement was announced a year ago, 5,081 Viet Cong were held throughout all of South Vietnam. Of these, 1,575 have been returned and 3,506 remain, including the 500 on Con Son.

The Con Son prison, under Col. Nguyen

Van Ve, 52, operates five prison farms, a brick factory, a pig farm and a workshop.

More than 3,000 of the prisoners are trustees. They work on the farms or in one of the other facilities under relatively relaxed conditions, in the open air and under minimum guard.

The other 2,000 including the Viet Cong, have refused to work. Classified as "uncooperative" they are kept in stark 50-man cells, fed 570 grams of rice (1 pound 4 ounces), daily compared to 650 to 700 for the other prisoners, and are brought out twice daily for exercise.

Ve says they can change their status any time by agreeing to work and undergo rehabilitative indoctrination. Only 10 per cent of the Viet Cong have done so.

And standing there at the cell door, talking to the VC spokesman, it appeared very few more have any intention of changing. Some said they had been kept there 10 years.

The prisoners were lean but showed no evidence of starvation, and were obviously well organized. One suddenly produced a neat, handwritten letter and shoved it through the bars toward me. A prison official seized and opened it. The basic thrust of its contents, in French, was that the prisoners were being mistreated solely because of their political beliefs, that they did not have enough to eat, and needed medical attention.

The poignancy and heart rending impact of the scene, of men, regardless of past misdeeds, being caged like animals was inescapable. It was underscored further as the Americans moved on while Viet Cong in other cells shouted desperately in English, "Come back! We want to see you!"

In a nearby building stood the now empty, double row—30 to a side—of 60 "tiger cages," where obstreperous and unruly prisoners were held until 1970.

To an outsider they appeared, if anything, less oppressive than the 50-man cells. Contrary to popular belief, fostered by a series of sensational articles on the "tiger cages" three years ago, they are above ground, are well ventilated and relatively spacious if only two to three prisoners were held there at a time as claimed.

They were built in 1941 by the French, not the Vietnamese.

The "cages" are five feet wide, approximately 10 feet long and 12 feet deep. A door opens into them through an outside wall of the building. There are bars across the top.

In testimony given by a battery of witnesses before the House Foreign Affairs subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs last September it was charged that until 1970 prisoners were shackled to the floor in the "cages," or handcuffed to a bar, were starved, beaten and often emerged paralyzed.

Such cases were cited as typical of treatment meted out to all of the 200,000 "political prisoners" in Vietnam.

To this, one can only reply there are no signs now that leg irons were once attached to the floor. And if previous inmates were handcuffed to the only bars in the cage—those across the top—they would have been suspended 6 feet in the air, an obvious impossibility.

The Vietnamese government also charges that paralyzed "tiger cage" prisoners, portrayed in widely circulated photographs, were actually Saigon street beggars who were rounded up, paid to pose and claim they were victims of the Con Son cages.

The real truth of this crossfire may never be known. But one aspect of the political prisoner issue is ascertainable with some degree of accuracy—the numbers involved.

Most of the figures have come from an anti-government, Catholic-activist priest, Father Chan Tin. Tin a quiet, French-educated man, deeply concerned about human problems, heads a group called "the

committee for the improvement of prison conditions in South Vietnam."

He has made his own survey and claims there are 202,000 "political prisoners" in South Vietnam. He says 60 per cent of them were arrested for no reason, 25 per cent for their non-Communist dissident activities and only 15 per cent for Communist activities.

Because his and similar charges of others have created such a stir in the U.S. Congress, the U.S. embassy in Saigon made its own study of the South Vietnamese prison system.

After an exhaustive survey, aided by intelligence agents, the embassy concluded there were only 35,130 persons held in the South Vietnamese prison system, and that this was the system's total capacity, even with overcrowding.

Father Tin, it was charged, had been "swayed by his sources, some of whom may be less scrupulous than he . . . they appear to have either an ax to grind or an emotion-clouded concept of the numbers that can be held in some of these prisons and detention centers.

To this can only be added that the South Vietnamese prison system is obviously far from exemplary. It is stark, grim and depressing, as are all prisons. Treatment of prisoners who are willing to work seems relatively humane under the conditions that prevail in a war-torn nation.

Treatment of prisoners who refuse to work is strict, perhaps even harsh. But it is highly questionable that very many of the men in this category are being held solely because of their political beliefs.

And finally there is the statement of U.S. Ambassador Graham Martin, made after the embassy survey was completed.

"We have not been able to identify a single person put in jail for the sole purpose of opposing the Thieu regime," he said. "All would be in jail if they had committed the same type offense in the United States or elsewhere."

JEFFREY ALLAN JONES—A LIFE
SAVER

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, it has recently been brought to my attention that a young boy in my congressional district was instrumental in saving the life of his baby sister. The boy is 5-year-old Jeffrey Allan Jones, of Sturtevant, Wis.

He and his 1-year-old sister were bathing together when the little girl suffered a convulsion causing her head to go under water. Jeffrey quickly pulled the child out of the tub first and then went to call his mother. I have been told that without his quick action the baby would probably have died.

I would like to commend Jeffrey for his intelligent and quick-witted action, and also the Sturtevant Volunteer Fire Department for their help in saving this child.

The Jones can be very proud of their young son. It is obvious that he is on the way to becoming a very responsible young man.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, SARAH VAUGHAN

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, it is with much pleasure that I take this opportunity to say a few words in tribute to a great lady, who I am happy to say, is now a California resident. She is a legendary figure in the entertainment world, one who bridges gaps—generation and otherwise—incorporating into every performance a special warmth and rare depth of feeling which can only be accomplished by one who is blessed with "soul."

I am, of course, referring to Sarah Vaughan whom many call "The Divine Sarah." Scarcely a year passes without honor after honor being bestowed upon her. Not only is she a consistent winner in polls conducted among the public, but she is also an acknowledged favorite in surveys conducted among her musical peers.

It is my pleasure to report to you that on March 27, 1974, this giant of the music industry—this lovely, talented lady—will mark an important milestone in her life—the celebration of her 50th birthday.

Sarah Vaughan in those 50 years has consistently provided the world with the very best in entertainment. For many years she has been an official ambassador of good will for the United States; sharing her joyful gift of talent with people in the Orient, in Europe, in South America, in Australia—indeed, just about wherever people walk on this Earth.

I am sure that all of us in this forum have been deeply moved and thrilled by her brilliant musical interpretations of every type of music; from gospel to jazz, from semiclassical to contemporary. I am sure I speak for all of us in wishing Sarah at least another 50 years of doing her "thing" here on this Earth.

Sarah Vaughan has been called "the greatest singer in the world" by Tony Bennett and many other greats of the entertainment world. If music is, indeed, the universal language, "The Divine Sarah" is a linguist without peer. She is not merely a vocalist; she is a brilliant interpretative musician able to improvise, leave her audience breathless with her fantastic versatility, whether in person or via her many recordings.

Speaking of her versatility, this summer, in addition to touring on foreign soil, Sarah Vaughan will star in concert with the Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra at the Hollywood Bowl—an event that none of us who has the opportunity to be in California will want to miss.

In conclusion I would like to go on record as saying that in giving this long-overdue tribute to a great lady I am certain that after all of us, and even she, herself have passed from this Earth, people throughout our world, and by then perhaps on other worlds, will listen to her

recordings and continue to applaud the talent and genius of this great entertainer.

Happy birthday, Sarah Vaughan.

SAVE OUR PRESIDENT

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Paul B. Lowney, 1808 40th Avenue East, Seattle, Wash., which has been referred to me by an outstanding constituent of mine:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 8, 1974]

SAVE OUR PRESIDENT

Our President should not resign. Instead, the biased national news media should resign—resign themselves to a philosophy of fairness, objectivity, and unslanted news reporting.

If the American public is losing confidence in the President, it was inevitable, once the biased national media decided that Watergate, finally, was the issue they could keep alive indefinitely with headlines until they weakened and destroyed the President. Watergate is more of a crisis by media than a crisis by deed.

The gradual evolution in this nation of a grossly biased think-alike, sound-alike national news media—capable of immediate and direct access to the minds and emotions of virtually our entire population—poses a serious threat to our republic's vital system of checks and balances. The national news media—devoid of competition in social and political philosophies—constitutes a powerful monopoly of ideas. By using this monopolistic power, they can mold public and lawmakers' opinions in the image of media philosophies. In the final analysis, the national news media—elected by no one—can control our national Government. Their success in the Watergate matter proves it.

This coalition of the biased national news media and media pets in Congress should call a moratorium on pummeling the Administration with the Watergate affair, and should focus national attention on the normal business of government and critical problem solving.

This short-sighted coalition sees only one evil—the Administration. It is trying to investigate this country to death. During Colonial times, there was a medical practice known as bleeding. Bleeding was supposed to be good for the patient. Only, sometimes it was so good for the patient, it killed him. Whom are they trying to kill with endless investigations and headlines?

Foreign capitals are bewildered by our national masochism. Under a headline, "Masochistic America," a Parisian journal, *Valeurs Actuelles*, stated: "The destruction of President Nixon is nonsensical, both constitutionally and politically. This is revenge."

The monolithic national news media continue to use this trite rationale: "We are only the messengers. Blame the people who make the bad news. If this was true under the old-style objective journalism, it is not true anymore under the new advocacy journalism. The "Big Brother" national news media, with their enormous investigative and opinion-making powers not only deliver the news,

they create the news! They decide for us—depending upon their own biased political and sociological philosophies—who will get a "good press" and who will get a "bad press"; who is a "good guy" and who is a "bad guy"; what is a crisis and what is not a crisis.

Commenting on the power of the media, Pulitzer prize-winning author-historian Theodore H. White, in his new book, "The Making of the President—1972" aptly noted: "The power of the press is a primordial one. It sets the agenda of public discussion; and this sweeping political power is unrestrained by any law. It determines what people will talk and think about—authority that in other nations is reserved for tyrants, priests, parties and mandarins."

England's author-philosopher Malcolm Muggeridge said on a recent U.S. talk show that he wondered how any government in this nation could survive, if all its deficiencies were constantly magnified and paraded on national television. Jack Paar, in an article in *Look* magazine a decade ago, pointed out the basic problem of a power source, which has no check and balance on its power, when he wrote: "The American press has always been in the position of wielding the whip, never of being lashed by it."

Historical perspective will prove that the issue of Watergate is primarily a media issue rather than an issue of mortal importance. Good men, and great men, are capable of misdeeds. But one must balance, with realism and pragmatism, the importance and benefit of good deeds against the harm of bad deeds. Despite Watergate and related matters, Richard Nixon is a good man—a man of wisdom, courage and strength, who, fortunately, for our nation's survival, has a keen sense of global perspective and national direction.

But, unfortunately, Mr. Nixon does not have the special style, charisma and the super-liberal philosophy to earn the love of the national news media. He is simply not their man. In Watergate, the national news media found a mini-issue, and employing McCarthyism tactics, blew that mini-issue into crisis proportions to destroy the President. They uncovered a germ and spread it into a national disease.

The misguided coalition of the national news media and media pets in Congress has wrong priorities. Attacking and investigating the Administration is not our most vital business. Any far-sighted view of the basic problems affecting our daily lives, and the unfolding events in foreign lands, would prove that these are the issues toward which we should direct our national energies: 1) Striving for world peace, and insuring America's military and diplomatic ability to survive on this planet in peace; 2) solving the energy crisis; 3) Freeing our cities from the fear and repression of violent crimes; 4) Improving our national health and living conditions; 5) Maintaining ample national resources; 6) Maintaining a healthy economy.

But these issues do not seem to overly concern this coalition. It is too obsessed with plaguing the public consciousness with its national pastime—searching out and publicizing anti-Nixon minutiae in a campaign to destroy him.

KIDNAPING

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of San Francisco involving the

daughter of publisher Randolph Hearst, and now the more recent shocking news of the kidnaping of the editor of the Atlanta Constitution, Mr. Reg Murphy, dramatically underscore the need for a get-tough policy with those who brazenly abduct innocent citizens and subject their families and the community at large to untold mental and physical anguish.

Accordingly, I am today introducing legislation to restore the death penalty in certain instances in kidnaping cases which come under the jurisdiction of Federal law. Although I personally believe that kidnaping itself is an act heinous enough to be worthy of the death penalty, nevertheless, the seriousness of the crime can be increased in those instances when the kidnaping victim suffers injury or death. Therefore, to deter the temptation of the kidnapers to dispose of or to inflict bodily injury upon the victim, my bill would provide that—

In case a victim is not returned physically unharmed, whoever violates this subsection shall suffer death.

Again, it is my belief that kidnaping is an offense worthy of the death penalty. Unfortunately, Congress recently amended the law to provide a penalty of "for any term of years or for life," which means that it is entirely possible that a convicted kidnaper or conspirator never see the inside of a jail. For this reason, my bill also toughens the penalty for the act of kidnaping where no harm comes to the victim by providing that the sentence shall upon conviction be a minimum of 10 years up to life imprisonment, and that "no term of imprisonment imposed under this subsection shall be reduced by suspending the sentence, probation, or parole."

Mr. Speaker, the family of Patricia Hearst is enduring unspeakable agony, and our sympathy and prayers are with her for her safe return, just as Reg Murphy has been returned. If the Congress really feels a sense of remorse and grief over these senseless and barbaric kidnapings, let us demonstrate our resolve to discourage similar actions in the future and to strengthen the chance that victims will be returned unharmed, by taking quick action upon my bill. No Member of this body would want his or her loved one to exchange places with Patricia Hearst; it is my prayer that we will not wait to take prompt action before such a possibility becomes a reality.

PROPOSED DECONTROL OF REGULATION OF NATURAL GAS COULD INCREASE INDUSTRY'S SALES INCOME BY \$12.5 BILLION ANNUALLY

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago President Nixon proposed Federal decontrol of natural gas prices.

The President said that this would be one of his top priorities in dealing with the energy crisis.

However, an article published in the current issue of the *Progressive*, written by Stephen E. Nordlinger, Washington correspondent for the *Baltimore Sun*, reports that removal of Federal control of natural gas prices could increase the industry's sales income by \$12.5 billion per year.

The natural gas industry is dominated by big oil giants such as Exxon, Shell, Amoco, Gulf, and Phillips. We have heard much about the windfall profits these companies already are reaping at the expense of the American people.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this important matter, I place the article in the RECORD:

TAKING THE LID OFF NATURAL GAS

(By Stephen E. Nordlinger)

One day in 1956 the late Senator Francis Case of South Dakota rose in the Senate to inform his colleagues that an out-of-state oil company had attempted to give him a cash contribution of \$2,500. A wild controversy was raging at the time over the oil industry's tactics in pressing for an end to the Federal regulation of natural gas prices. Senator Case, who had been in the sure column, switched and voted against deregulation. But the bill passed, only to be vetoed by President Eisenhower in the uproar that followed the Case disclosure. Since then, over the last eighteen years, the major oil companies, which produce the bulk of America's natural gas, have sought with varying degrees of intensity to persuade Congress to remove controls from natural gas prices. All attempts have failed; the issue seemed far from urgent while the nation went on its way consuming a third of the World's power with no fear of scarcity.

Just a year ago, as awareness of a coming fuel shortage increased, the situation changed abruptly. President Nixon, the beneficiary of \$5 million in 1972 campaign contributions from oil executives and principal shareholders, took a firm stand in favor of Federal decontrol of natural gas prices. It became one of his top priorities in dealing with the "energy crisis." To rally public support, the industry itself started publishing newspaper advertisements with such headlines as "The Unnatural Gas Shortage" and "The Unnatural Gas Shortage Revisited." A full-scale campaign began on Capitol Hill. In the Congressional climate of acute concern over fuel scarcity, the industry pressed for approval of the trans-Alaska pipeline and for a relaxation of restrictions on offshore drilling and construction of deep-water ports for supertankers. But gas deregulation was placed at the top of the industry's legislative agenda.

Enormous amounts of money are at stake. If all contracts between gas producers and pipelines were to be renegotiated on the basis of unregulated rates in present market conditions, the industry would receive an estimated additional \$12.5 billion a year in sales income. If decontrol were to be applied only to contracts that expire this year, the added annual income would be \$1.5 billion. For each penny per thousand cubic feet above the regulated rates the industry receives about \$220 million. It is small wonder, then, that oil lobbyists roam the halls of Congress intent on mustering support for various versions of gas bills, all of which have the purpose of removing controls from the wellhead price that the Federal Power Commission has regulated for the last twenty years.

The industry—buttressed by the Admin-

istration and the Commission itself, all of whose five members are Nixon appointees—maintains that regulation has kept prices artificially low, thus encouraging demand beyond the willingness and ability of gas producers to provide the needed supply. The result, according to the industry, is a critical shortage of gas, which meets a third of the nation's energy requirements. Diminished supplies of gas have, in turn, contributed to increased demand for oil. Compounding the problem, at a time of environmental constraints, is the advantage of natural gas as a "clean" fuel with a low sulphur content.

Under the classical rules governing a competitive market system, the industry's remedy should be appropriate: Higher prices would, presumably, dampen demand to some extent and encourage expanded production to the point where a new equilibrium would be established. Few experts doubt the existence of huge supplies of natural gas in the ground to be explored and developed; potential gas reserves amount to 2,100 trillion cubic feet—about 100 times current annual levels of consumption.

The central question at the nub of the controversy over deregulation is how to get these resources out of the ground and into the market at a price that adequately compensates the producer and, at the same time, protects the interests of the consumer. The oil industry argues that if the Federal lid were taken off the wellhead prices, they would rise until they reached the price of level of competing sources of energy.

This theory, however, disregards a crucial aspect of the natural gas business: Contrary to all of its contention, the industry is not workably competitive. An increase in its prices, therefore, will provide no assurance of new supplies. Under competition, producers would respond to higher prices and enter the market, increasing supplies as their rewards rose. But under the monopolistic and oligopolistic situation prevalent in the gas industry, which blocks the new entry of independent-producers, higher prices beyond those that cover costs and bring a fair rate of return could merely generate windfall profits. Supplies to the consumer could well remain inadequate as the producers capitalized on the shortages. They would merely sit on their gas reserves as prices spiraled, waiting for their highest return.

The realities of the industry, dominated by such giants as Exxon, Shell, Amoco, Gulf, and Phillips have been vividly described by members of the Office of Economics of the Federal Power Commission. While the Nixon appointees on the Commission have been busily advocating deregulation, the economists on the FPC staff have developed detailed information that points to a gas industry marked by interlocking relationships among major producers and between these producers and pipelines; joint bidding combines for offshore leases; bank director interlocks among major oil companies; and dual roles for producers as buyers of gas within the producing states and sellers of gas in the interstate market.

When eight corporations in one industry hold more than half of the sales in a market, economists are ready to contemplate the possibility of monopolistic concentration of power: Studies by the FPC's economists show that between 1965 and 1970, eight companies controlled between sixty-one per cent and eighty-six per cent of supplies in Southern Louisiana, seventy-six and ninety-four per cent in the Permian Basin of New Mexico and West Texas, and seventy-two and ninety-nine per cent in the Gulf Coast. In terms of anticipated future supplies, eight companies controlled gas from about seventy per cent of all three combined wildcat offshore Louisiana lease sales in 1970 and 1972. The offshore lease sale in the Texas Gulf

Coast last June reflected an eight-company concentration of eighty-seven per cent.

Against these facts, the industry cites the existence of 3,218 corporations, 35,738 individuals, and 10,795 partnerships in the producing business as evidence of competition. This large number, it is argued, precludes the possibility of effective combination to any significant extent. Even the joint bidding for leases of public lands promotes competition by allowing companies with limited financial resources to participate. Nationwide, it is said, the eight largest producers account for about forty-five per cent of total sales, short of the fifty per cent benchmark.

But the relevant figures, as the FPC economists point out, are not aggregates nationwide, but concentrations of control over new supplies and measurements of company activity in separate producing areas. On these points, concentration of more than fifty per cent is strongly indicated.

The pipeline companies that buy from the producers might be expected to inject competitive price restraint as they did for supplies, but this has not happened. According to David S. Schwartz, assistant chief of the FPC's Office of Economics, "all major pipeline purchasers have producing affiliates." In these circumstances, there is obviously no incentive for a pipeline to bargain vigorously with producers for lower prices.

In fact, any meaningful bargaining between producers and pipelines is frustrated by such vertical integration. Any increased prices paid by a pipeline for gas can be used as a basis for paying equally higher prices to its producing affiliate, thus enhancing the profits of the parent company. In addition, any price paid by a pipeline is considered a legitimate cost of doing business by the FPC, and the pipeline can simply pass the cost along in higher rates. It is not to be expected that the pipelines will fight for lower prices; it is reasonable to anticipate just the opposite.

There was a time when gas consumers could look to local public utilities to exercise some restraint on prices through their opposition to unwarranted increases before the FPC. A new development of major significance may doom even this control, Schwartz notes: As shortages mount, these utilities are forming affiliates to search for and produce gas, or to participate in joint ventures with established producers for the same purpose. In consequence, he observes, "Of late the opposition of private gas distributors [utilities] to escalating producer price requests at the Commission level has evaporated." Maximizing profits dictates the opposite course. In the absence of Federal regulation, and with minimal resistance, if any, to higher producer prices from pipelines or utilities, what is likely to happen to the price paid for gas by forty-three million customers who have no alternative source of energy? The answer is not too difficult to calculate, given the FPC's propensity to soften controls and, in fact, to deregulate prices on an "emergency" basis even without authorization from Congress.

Last September, the Commission allowed emergency purchases under 180-day contracts without Federal approval of the prices. The Commission's so-called "area rates" now average thirty-five cents per thousand cubic feet, but prices in an "emergency sale" in South Louisiana rose to sixty-five cents, in the Permian Basin of New Mexico to sixty cents, and in Oklahoma to seventy-five cents. Should all contracts nationwide be renegotiated at the seventy-five-cent level, the added annual return to the producers would reach \$12.5 billion.

Calculated on another basis—and an equally reasonable one, judging from industry comments—the new return to producers could reach \$18 billion. This is the price at which gas is selling in the intrastate mar-

ket—the market within the states where gas is produced—which falls outside Federal regulatory jurisdiction. Such sales are currently in the price range of eighty cents to \$1 per thousand cubic feet. At eighty cents, the income gain would be \$13.5 billion; at \$1, it would total \$18 billion.

In pressing for deregulation, producers often cite those figures as the true "market value" of gas—the level at which it should be selling in the interstate market to elicit the necessary supplies. But are the prices arrived at under "emergency" contracts or in the intrastate system competitive? The evidence points in the other direction. These prices are not based on the cost of finding and developing the gas plus a fair rate of return, but rather on the power of the producers to exploit their monopolistic position.

Proponents of deregulation also refer to the high prices of imported liquefied natural gas, which range from \$1 to \$1.25 per thousand cubic feet to as high as \$2 for limited purchases. The industry contends that there is no justification for paying Algeria or other foreign sources such prices while keeping domestic prices artificially low. However, the foreign price level is no more reliable a guide to true market value than is the intrastate price. Both reflect monopolistic control—one by a foreign government and the other by the oil corporations.

In determining whether FPC price regulation has been a major factor contributing to the gas shortage, as the industry alleges, it should be noted that in the twenty years since the famous Supreme Court decision in the Phillips case that required the FPC to regulate the wellhead price of gas, prices of natural gas have been allowed to rise by 125 per cent. Over this period, the Consumer Price Index has risen fifty-seven per cent.

It makes no sense, then, to attribute the gas shortage to price regulation. Rather, it is clear that the industry deliberately decided to hold down drilling and production for two reasons: first, because the relatively low cost of gas, compared to oil, poses a threat to maximizing the profits of the major companies that produce both fuels, and second, because it has been hoped that the regulated price ceilings would be removed. The more President Nixon and the members of the FPC have spoken of deregulation, the less advisable it has appeared to produce. With each passing day, the gas in the ground has become increasingly valuable. According to George L. Donkin, industry economist with the FPC's Division of Economic Studies, there were 743,000 acres in gas-bearing offshore Louisiana Federal land that companies had "shut in" as of January 1973. The U.S. Geological Survey reported last August that there were 943 shut-in wells in the Gulf of Mexico. The industry reports these facts, but the detailed explanations, verified by the Government, are lacking.

The controversy over whether the industry is holding back on production, thus contributing to a contrived gas shortage, is closely related to growing suspicions that the producers have understated their underground reserves to gain higher prices. The lower the amount available for the market, the greater the price the companies can expect to be allowed to charge by the FPC.

The Government depends on industry to supply the reserve figures, but their accuracy is open to serious question. The subcommittees of the American Gas Association, the trade group that submits the statistics, is made up exclusively of employees of the petroleum companies in the various areas surveyed. Only aggregate information is passed along. Furthermore, doubt has been raised about the FPC's recent attempt to verify the industry's figures.

Howard William Pifer III of the Harvard Business School, who served on the staff that prepared the data for the inventory of proved

reserves for the FPC's National Gas Reserve Survey, says the report, issued last July, failed "to meet the criterion of an independent evaluation" of the gas industry. He said that two-thirds of the members on the supply study group were affiliated directly or indirectly with the producing industry or Government. It is little wonder, in these circumstances, that the survey reported even lower gas reserves than the AGA had claimed.

The Commission also sent questionnaires recently to producers to obtain information on their uncommitted reserves available for sale. In response, some companies reported either zero or negligible reserves. Nonetheless, only a few months after the reporting date, the Commission received filings showing substantial new commitments.

In testimony before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, John W. Wilson, former chief of the FPC Division of Economics, said that the vagueness of the questionnaire allowed for "semantic juggling" in calculating reserves which rendered the resulting numbers "meaningless."

Rather than run the risk of having this information, no matter how incomplete or ambiguous, fall into public hands, a staff member of the Commission ordered that the documents be destroyed. They were torn up and stuffed in a burn bag, but the incinerator failed to function. Senator Phillip A. Hart, chairman of the Antitrust Subcommittee, discovered their existence and subpoenaed them. Subsequent hearings by Senator Hart disclosed the deep antagonism between some of the top members of the FPC staff and the Commission economists who oppose deregulation. An effort had been made to change the status of the economists to a noncivil service classification so they would serve at the pleasure of the Commission chairman, thus subjecting them to political influence.

These developments—the contradictory reports of reserves, the loosely worded questionnaire, the attempted burning of documents—point up the high stakes involved in the deregulation issue. Rates for the half of the American homes that use gas might double over a relatively short period if controls were removed. Furthermore, such increases would remove competitive restraint, causing higher prices for oil, coal, and other fuels. The lid would be off.

What steps, then, could be taken to increase supplies without penalizing the consumer? A key improvement would be the Federal regulation of intrastate gas. As Lee C. White, former chairman of the FPC, had said, it is a "national scandal" that prices remain unregulated within the states that produce the gas. A third of the nation's supplies are consumed in those states—Texas and Louisiana primarily—and a lot is wasted as boiler fuel, a much less economical use than for residential heating. In recent years, these states have virtually monopolized new gas supplies. As a national resource, this gas should be made available to the entire nation under controlled prices.

To inject competition into the industry, the Government's method of selling offshore leases should be radically changed so that the smaller producers of gas as well as oil get a better chance to win some of the acreage. The present 5,000-acre blocks should be scaled down. The royalty rate, now 16.5 per cent, should be raised, but the initial acquisition cost of the "cash bonus system" should be scaled down or eliminated so as to avoid the hundreds of millions of dollars now needed to acquire some leases. Leases should also be forfeited if there is no full production within a prescribed, limited period to be determined by the physical characteristics of the reservoir, so that smaller producers could enter the market and allow supplies to increase. Now, for as little as \$15,000 a year, producers can delay actual production indefinitely.

CXX—277—Part 4

The procedures of the FPC should be streamlined to speed up the processing of rate increases, some of which have taken years to complete. Gas rates may go higher, but they should be based on costs plus a fair rate of return.

Finally, a new oil and gas corporation patterned on the Tennessee Valley Authority, which some Congressmen—most notably Senator Adlai Stevenson, Illinois Democrat—have been promoting, should be formed to explore for gas on Federal land and, most importantly, to set a yardstick against which the industry's actual costs of production could be measured.

Congress is being asked to make some historic decisions in this session, and growing numbers of Americans wonder whether the lawmakers are capable of measuring up to their responsibilities. Watergate has eclipsed such questions as gas deregulation, but on these issues, too, is the measure of Congress taken.

THE SENATE'S SLOW LEARNERS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that House consideration of the energy conference report has been delayed at least until Thursday since there is some confusion and difficulty involved in the final proposed bill involving legislative technicalities which are clearly violated.

In hopes that the Members will have time to thoroughly and objectively study the measure and the economic glaring deficiencies, I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Thursday, February 21, issue of the Wall Street Journal.

The editorial follows:

THE SENATE'S SLOW LEARNERS

If nothing else, the four months the Senate has spent thrashing around on the "emergency" energy bill should have resulted in the education of a few Senators. Alas, four months is not long enough. By a 67-to-32 vote, the Senate Tuesday finally coughed forth the fruits of its deliberations, one that qualifies at least 67 members for a course in remedial economics.

We say at least 67 because a number of those who voted against the package, Mr. Abourezk of South Dakota for one, believe nothing short of a government takeover of the oil industry can solve the energy crisis, a state of mind that remedial studies would not improve.

The slowest learner of the bunch, however, is Sen. Henry Jackson of Washington, still fixed with the notion that the United States can make itself independent of foreign oil producers by holding down the price of domestic oil. A barrel of foreign crude fetches about \$10. So does a barrel of crude from new domestic fields or from stripper wells, those wells that had been abandoned in years past because the going price for crude was so low that it was uneconomic to pump them. Oil from these two sources has been exempt from price controls.

Mr. Jackson's contribution to the energy bill is a "rollback" of all domestic oil to the government-set price of \$5.25 the barrel for "old oil." His measure would permit the President to raise this to \$7.09, but no higher. In effect, it would take away authority the President now has to decontrol crude oil prices entirely.

For some time, Mr. Jackson has been arguing that freeing new wells from price controls has produced an "oil loophole"; that is, to take advantage of the higher prices of uncontrolled oil, an oilman can cleverly dig a new well and presto, he has some more unregulated oil. Teams of Senators from the oil states took turns trying to explain to Mr. Jackson that if this were true it would be good, not bad, because oil therefore not being produced would be produced, and eventually find its way into the gas pumps of Spokane, Flatbush and Elizabeth, N.J. But to no avail.

Nor was Senator Jackson moved by Senator Gravel's lucid argument that if world oil is at \$10 and U.S. oil is held at \$5.25, U.S. producers will not be able to compete with the rest of the world in buying "anything they need to drill for oil. . . . are we talking about an embargo on steel pipe, or the technology, or an embargo on the cybernetics?" Mr. Jackson's retort is that \$5.25 a barrel is plenty.

Meanwhile, the whole Northeast corridor is suddenly outraged to find there is plenty of foreign gasoline around, and legislators in New Jersey and Connecticut are running around the Federal Energy Office to broker shipments that run to 50 cents a gallon and up. This roughly translates into \$20 a barrel. In other words, at the very moment U.S. Senators are attacking the crisis by voting to halve the price of new domestic crude, state politicians are attacking the crisis by going out and finding foreign-produced black-market oil at double the world price. Of course, if the Senate's energy bill becomes law, X number of domestic wells would shut down and more state legislators would have to get into the business of brokering foreign gasoline at speculative prices.

Fortunately, it now appears the legislation will pass into oblivion. In its wisdom, the House Rules Committee yesterday reported the bill, but refused to waive points of order. The House thus has a chance to vote separately on the rollback provision as well as the title that authorizes gas rationing. If either provision is deleted, the bill will be dead. And if the House, too, has learned nothing about the law of supply and demand in the last four months, and agrees with the Senate, surely Mr. Nixon will veto the bill.

Before the Congress returns to its deliberations on "emergency" energy legislation, a process likely to take another four months, it would be nice if it took time out to adopt a simple measure energy czar Simon has requested. Mr. Simon would like to eliminate the crude-allocation program, which Congress forced on him at the beginning of the emergency. The program is discouraging the importation of perhaps a million barrels of crude oil every day, an amount the folks in Spokane, Flatbush and Elizabeth, N.J., would be pleased to get their hands on. When it comes to learning things, Mr. Simon is well ahead of the folks on Capitol Hill.

LOUISE OWENS ADDRESSES LIONS CLUB

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, Henry Adams once stated:

A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops.

I can think of no finer example of the truthfulness of this statement than that

of one of my constituents, Miss Louise Owens, a retired history and government teacher in LaGrange, Ga., who, prior to her retirement in 1971, was named to receive the Teacher Hall of Fame Award.

On January 22, Miss Owens addressed the members of the LaGrange Lions Club—which is, incidentally, the No. 1 Lions Club in the State of Georgia. The president of the LaGrange Lions, Mr. Frank E. Hurst, has written to me—

Miss Owen's teaching of history and government has had great influence on our young people strengthening their faith in our State and Nation and their desire to be responsible citizens.

After having reviewed a copy of Miss Owen's speech—and as a former teacher myself—I can certainly understand why she is held in such high esteem.

Mr. Speaker, I commend herewith to the attention of our colleagues the text of Miss Owen's most excellent speech. The speech reads:

UNCLE SAM IS SINKING IN THE QUICKSANDS OF APATHY, AFFLUENCE, AND MATERIALISM

(Prepared by Louise Owen)

You may be expecting a former government teacher to mention Watergate, Energy Crisis, the Middle East and Impeachment. They have been mentioned—just remember that impeachment does not mean removal from office and we will close the book on those issues for the time being, at least.

Do you like to think? Few people do, but it is always interesting to try to challenge people to think. All of you are familiar with the statement that "History repeats itself." How many of you would agree with Hegel's statement that "History teaches us that man learns nothing from History"?

For the past 24 months Americans have been shocked by the corruption in high places in our country, but how many have stopped to realize that reports on corruption in high places together with the sequential results may be found throughout the Old and New Testaments, as well as, secular history. If you are doubtful, lay your sports page and your Wall Street Journal aside for a brief period and read the book of Jeremiah or Joel.

All students of history are aware of the fact that the rise and fall of great civilizations have followed a rather definite sequence. History does prove that it repeats itself but few people in the 1970's are willing to accept the fact—it can't happen here! Time does not permit a resume of history, suffice it to look at the developmental sequence of the great civilizations:

From Bondage to Spiritual Faith;
Spiritual Faith to Great Courage;
Great Courage to Liberty;
Liberty to Abundance;
Abundance to Selfishness;
Selfishness to Complacency;
Complacency to Apathy;
Apathy to Dependence; and
Dependence back to Bondage. (Copied from Congressional Record.) Western civilization and the United States are right here between Apathy and Dependence.

In 1787, that great American, Benjamin Franklin said, "We have given you a Republic, if you can keep it". During the last four decades that last phrase has become increasingly important. "... If you can keep it", because Uncle Sam has been slowly sinking in the quicksands of apathy, materialism, and affluence. It is alarming to note how rapidly this great Republic is slipping toward a welfare state—a state of dependence. Why? Because, despite the fact that we are

the most affluent nation in recorded history, more and more individuals are looking to the government for more and more things, including fixed incomes—work or no work. People in general are striving to accumulate more and more things for "Me, My Wife, My Son John, His Wife, Us Four and No More".

May I take one phrase from the causes of the Fall of the Great Roman Empire and use it as a spring board for what I really want to say . . . "the decay of individual responsibility" (Edward Gibbons)

Individual responsibility has been abandoned to a very great extent in every phase of American life. Individuals are more interested in getting more and more money than they are in the basic values of life, such as: faith in God, faith in one's fellowman, faith in self, honesty, dependability, self-discipline, every privilege has a corresponding responsibility, relative freedom, sanctity of the home, morality, and a recognition of the sovereign power of God.

Affluence and materialism have almost completely overshadowed the responsibility of an individual to do a job to the best of his or her ability, no matter how small or how gigantic. In the "throw-away" culture that has developed in the last two decades, too many individuals feel that it is useless to build anything or do anything that has lasting value because tomorrow we shall discard the present and do something else. Basic values never change.

The men who established this great Republic were willing to get involved, to study, to think, to work, to die for what they wanted for today and for tomorrow—Liberty. They were a self-disciplined group, they were a minority group, they were a group dedicated to a cause—the cause of Freedom. One of those men, Thomas Jefferson said, "The price of liberty is eternal vigilance". As a people, we seem to have by-passed this admonition and feel that we have very little responsibility in maintaining a strong Republic.

What are Americans dedicated to in the 1970's? Don't be offended, present company is excepted and the exceptions throughout the nation may well be the salvation of this great nation. An increasing number in the present day are dedicated, either consciously or unconsciously, to unadulterated selfishness—making a fast buck, no matter how, shoddy work, cheating, stealing, robbing, killing, keeping up with the Joneses—there must be a three car garage now because Johnny or Susie must have his or her status symbol—pleasure seeking, being a spectator rather than a participant . . . my rights, to hell with the rights of everybody else . . . give me things, things, and more things. Affluence, materialism and apathy.

The minority group who laid the foundation for the United States believed in God and they wrote that belief into the early documents. They believed in basic values. They were leaders with convictions and the guts to stand up for those convictions. They built the foundation for a government that would have written guarantees that the people would govern themselves and written guarantees against the development of a dictatorship. Such a foundation was laid but the responsibility for the success of the written law lay within the people themselves.

The nation has had its ups and downs, its depressions and its prosperity, its successes and its failures, and its growing pains of progress, but, only during the last four decades, since 1933, have the people demanded more than they were willing to give. For a short period in the 1940's the people rallied to the call of patriotism in support of men who faced death to preserve freedom for those whom they loved. Since that time there has been an increasing mockery of love of country and pride in one's homeland. Why? The rejection of individual responsibility for keeping our country strong. We had best find

time to do some serious thinking and work in order to nurture the little bit of freedom that we have left, lest it be swallowed up. When we become dependent on the government for most things, we are only one step away from bondage and being servants of the government. Remember that the opposing ideologists have said that on our 200th anniversary, they will replace Old Glory with the Hammer and Sickle. My blood ran cold yesterday afternoon when I read the following quote in this week's issue of the U.S. News and World Report:

The Bicentennial Center for the District of Columbia, the nation's capital, was dedicated on January 14 by the Mayor of Washington. A representative of the White House was there. So were other dignitaries.

Looking down on the occasion was a new mural, done for the Bicentennial office by an artist named H. H. Booker II. Among the personages depicted—

Karl Marx, the father of Communism.

Friedrich Engels, Marx's associate.

Joseph Stalin of the Soviet Union.

Mao Tse-tung of the Chinese Communists.

For extra measure, the muralist included a caricature of President Nixon wearing a mustache and clad in the costume of a movie gangster. He sketched the President's daughter, Tricia Nixon Cox, with an Afro hairdo. He included a portrait of Angela Davis . . . It is . . . a desecration of everything truly American from 1776 to today. Go back to your office and get this week's U.S. News and World Report, read the whole editorial and see if your blood doesn't run cold. (January 28, 1974)

The opening words of the United States Constitution places the responsibility for a strong government, not on the President, not on Congress, not on the Supreme Court, but on "We, the people . . ." That responsibility is just as relevant in the 1970's as it was in 1787. The last purpose stated in the opening paragraph says, ". . . to secure (that is to protect) the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity (those who come after us)." Just suppose that the generations who preceded us had done no more to uphold that purpose than individuals in the 1970's are doing to uphold it for succeeding generations—what of the future? "We have given you a Republic, if you can keep it."

Time does not permit even a resume of the safeguards written into the United States Constitution, but those safeguards provide for the power of the government to be determined by the people. When individuals renounce the exercise of such powers as guaranteed to them, those powers are lost. When "We, the people . . ." fail to protect our guaranteed powers, then a thief steals them away in the night and many have been stolen simply because "We, the people . . ." have gone to sleep on the job. We have always enjoyed freedom, we have not worked to get freedom, it will always be here because it always has been, so far as we are concerned . . . apathy, apathy, apathy.

I simply cannot resist calling this to your attention—Were you among the 243 who went to the polls and participated on the first Wednesday in December 1973? If you were not among that 243, you have no right to open your mouth regarding any decision made by our very fine Mayor and Council. Many of you may disagree with me but that is my firm conviction and I will stand on it. Registered voters who are spectators have never won an election and have never lost an election. Hundreds of thousands of Americans do not accept the responsibility of voting but let one privilege be abridged ever so little and those same non-voters will howl to the high heavens.

The United States Constitution has expressly stated the powers to be exercised by the Congress, the President and the Supreme

Court. In order for the document to be flexible, provisions were made for implied powers to be exercised but each had to be related to an expressed power. During the past four decades, "We, the people . . ." have permitted these implied powers to be stretched beyond recognition. The constitution provides for emergency powers to be given to the President by Congress. Since 1933, these emergency powers have been doubled and tripled until in the 1970's, the tail is wagging the dog. No one individual can sit behind a desk in the White House and protect or preserve freedom in the United States—only when the people of the United States are willing to accept the responsibility and go to work to restore lost freedoms and keep America free can we remain a free country. Have you considered the possibilities that exist in letting one individual have control of the current energy crisis? Almost overnight, this country could grind to a screeching halt. If, during the past six months, 535 legislators in Washington had had to climb over mail bags filled with letters from their constituents, in order to get to each of their desks, many things currently in the headlines could be different. 1974 is an election year and few of those legislators want to lose the approximate \$150,000 a year that each receives in benefits and salary.

What I am about to suggest is an impossibility and I recognize that, nevertheless, I wish it were possible. I wish every individual who has an income of any kind had to add up all the taxes that he or she pays—Income, property, sales, gasoline, luxury, excise, et cetera, et cetera—for one year, then divide the sum total by 365 to determine how much tax he or she pays each day. And that is not all, I wish each individual had to deposit that daily amount in a meter before he or she could get out of his or her house to do anything. If this utterly fantastic idea could become a reality, I guarantee that the interest in government would blow the roof off. Have you ever figured your income tax on that basis? It might startle you.

The awakening of the "great silent majority" in America is long overdue, because there is an increasing number screaming for absolute freedom which is nothing short of anarchy. It is imperative that the "great silent majority" wake up and get into action. Edmund Burke said, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing". Alexis de Tocqueville said, ". . . if America ever ceases to be good . . . America will cease to be great". It is my firm conviction that the gates of Pax Americana are beginning to swing closed and if we as individuals do not accept the responsibility of keeping them open they will close—and, where will your grandchildren be?

Ere now, you have probably decided that I am a confirmed pessimist. Your decision would be wrong, because I believe there is hope, if individuals will accept it. During the period of apathy, affluence, and materialism in the reign of King Solomon, God said, "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin and heal their land".

I challenge you as individuals to do your part in helping to pull Uncle Sam out of the quicksands of Apathy, Affluence, and Materialism.

An anonymous writer said it this way and I concur:

"I am only one,
Yet one is 100% more than none.
I cannot do everything but I can do something.
That which I can do, I will do.
So help me, God!"

RUSSIANS HAVE NEGOTIATED ACCESS TO WASHINGTON AIR SPACE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while Pentagon officials express concern over the current Soviet arms buildup in Peru, including tanks, planes, and advisers, they have expressed little or no concern over the announced plans to allow the Soviet Union's international airline, Aeroflot, to begin weekly flights into Washington, D.C. Presumably, the planes will be provided with flight plans and other data concerning the air space over the Nation's Capital and the surrounding area, which includes some of our most sensitive defense complexes, as well as the Pentagon itself.

Aeroflot is also planning to open offices in downtown Washington to conduct its operations. It should be remembered that the FBI estimates that about 50 percent of the Soviet representatives in the United States, including trade officials, Tass correspondents, et cetera, are actually agents of the KGB.

The new Moscow-Washington flight plans were quietly arranged during last summer's visit from Communist Party boss Brezhnev. This latest result of "détente" may raise questions by many Americans as to what other "arrangements" were also made during that historic meeting.

I insert the related newsclippings at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Star-News, Feb. 25, 1974]

SOVIET ADVISERS MOVE INTO PERU

(By Fred S. Hoffman)

U.S. intelligence sources say Russian military advisers have moved into South America for the first time.

They report that Russian technicians have arrived in Peru to train Peruvian soldiers in the use of T55 medium tanks bought from Russia last year.

Soviet military advisers have been present in Cuba for about a dozen years, but they have never been accepted by a South American nation.

Peru's purchase of Russian tanks and other military hardware has alarmed Chile and other neighboring countries. The appearance of Russian military advisers is certain to deepen that concern, U.S. military officials said.

American intelligence is uncertain how many Russian tanks and advisers have reached Peru. The Peruvian government has bought as many as 200 medium tanks, heavy artillery and other arms, and may be planning to order small SA7 antiaircraft missiles from the Soviet Union.

Russia has been trying for some years to gain an arms sales foothold in South America.

Moscow concentrated on Chile until the overthrow of the leftist Allende government by a rightist military junta last fall. Despite offers of low-price, low-interest, long-term arms deals, Russia was not able to open up a market there.

Then the Soviet Union switched its focus to Peru, and Peruvian President Juan Velasco acknowledged two months ago that his gov-

ernment had bought tanks and other weapons from Russia.

This was followed by reports that Chile's new military rulers were negotiating with the French for the possible purchase of more than 40 AMX30 medium tanks, which the Chilean army regards as comparable to the Russian armor bought by Peru.

Meanwhile, Chilean officers asked for American tanks and planes, arguing that these new armaments are essential to maintain an armed balance with Peru.

The Chileans have been telling American diplomats and military men that the Peruvians might use their new military muscle to try and take back territory lost to Chile in the War of the Pacific nearly 100 years ago.

U.S. officials appear to take little stock in talk of a new Chilean-Peruvian war, but they are disturbed at what is shaping up as an arms race in Latin America.

Ecuador, another neighbor of Peru, reportedly has indicated to American officials recently that it wants to buy arms from the United States. This came after it was reported that Peru is planning to form a new army division, and possibly an air force wing, to be stationed in a region bordering Ecuador.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1974]

SOVIET AIRLINE PLANS DULLES-MOSCOW FLIGHT

(By Jack Egan)

Aeroflot, the Soviet Union's international airline, will begin weekly direct air service between Washington and Moscow on April 5.

The new air service was part of a bilateral agreement negotiated last summer between President Nixon and Communist Party Secretary Leonid Brezhnev.

As part of the agreement, Pan American World Airways—which flies a once-a-week service between New York and Moscow—was given the rights to serve Leningrad from New York.

A Pan American spokesman said plans to fly to Leningrad are "in limbo," adding that the airline itself did not seek the agreement.

Aeroflot currently operates two flights a week between New York and Moscow which will be continued. The new flight from Washington will leave each Friday at 8:10 p.m. from Dulles International Airport and will arrive in Moscow at 3:30 p.m. the next day, after a two hour stopover in Paris.

Aeroflot will use a 138-passenger Ilyshin 62 for the service linking the two capitals, according to spokesman Alexander Manyanin. The round-trip fare for the service will be \$742 during the winter travel season and \$932 in summer.

Aeroflot is also seeking to open an office in Washington around 16th and L streets, Manyanin confirmed.

IS A TEAPOT DOME SCANDAL BREWING IN THE OIL SHALE LANDS OF COLORADO?

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months, I have raised a number of points about questionable practices and improprieties in the conduct of the Federal oil shale lease program.

Oil shale is an enormous national treasure.

The oil shale deposits of the Rocky Mountains contain hundreds of billions of barrels of oil and most of the deposits are on public lands. The Department of the Interior has begun a program of leasing these lands so that the production of oil from these deposits may be available within the next few years.

I support the development of this enormous mineral wealth. But I fear that the public's interest is being ignored in the present lease process.

During the past few weeks, I have commented on the fact that the oil companies are being permitted to use public lands free of charge. I have released a GAO report on the leasing program which raises serious questions about the validity of many of the Department's actions. And most recently, I pointed out that there is a tremendous disparity between the per barrel bid value of the first lease and the second lease. If the public had received the same per barrel value on the first lease as it received on the second lease, the Treasury would have received an extra \$400 million.

On Monday, February 25, I reported that the Office of Oil Shale is being quietly disbanded. While I have not been pleased with the work of the Office, it at least has provided some semblance of coordination. Now even that is gone and the old line, pro-oil-company Federal agencies are back in full control. It is incomprehensible that during this time of constant talk of energy crisis, the administration is actually disbanding the one office which has attempted to deal with oil shale.

Now, information has just reached me of a very peculiar, noncompetitive, lease of land in the oil shale area. Ten thousand acres were leased last October for the mining of a low-value sodium salt called nahcolite. The companies who will be mining this mineral will also be digging up enormous amounts of oil shale. Under the terms of the lease, they will not use this shale—estimated to contain a billion barrels per square mile—but will simply store it—receiving a storage fee from the Federal Government. I simply cannot believe that these leases will be limited to the mining of this sodium salt. I believe that the way has been opened, improperly, for future control and processing of this oil shale by the companies involved. Mr. Speaker, something is fishy about this program. I fear that with hundreds of billions of dollars of oil at stake, the public is being taken for a ride. The oil shale program could well be turning into the Teapot Dome Scandal of the 1970's.

Congressional oversight and review of this entire program must be intensified.

I would like to enter into the RECORD at this point a copy of the letter which I sent to the Secretary of the Interior on February 25, 1974, as well as a copy of the press release containing my comments on the disbanding of the Oil Shale Task Force:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1974.

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In October, 1972, the Bureau of Land Management leased four tracts of Colorado land, allegedly for the commercial recovery of a sodium salt, nahcolite. Totalling about 10,000 acres, the land is located in the center of the Piceance Creek Basin, just to the east of "C-a" prototype tract that has already been leased for \$210 million for commercial recovery of shale oil. Government evaluations have estimated that at least one billion barrels of shale oil are contained in each square mile of land in that region.

There is every indication that the leasing of these lands was nothing but a backdoor attempt to allow the eventual recovery of the shale oil, and not the nahcolite.

It is my understanding that:

a. The leases were let *non-competitively* on a "preference right" basis. The leases were made for the recovery of sodium salts despite the very obvious and proven value of the shale oil located on the lands.

b. The sodium salts in the leased areas are in the form of *scattered crystals* interspersed throughout the massive beds of oil shale. A member of the Oil Shale Task Force told my staff just last week that this was the exact reason the C-a and C-b tract prototype lessees would *not* mine the associated minerals—implying that only a *continuous bed* of nahcolite would be economically harvestable.

c. The BLM leases allow mining only at the "sodium horizons" (the various strata where sodium is located). The large amounts of shale oil that must be moved to reach the nahcolite still belong to the government, but the lease provides that the government must pay equitable "storage fee" to the miners for the mined shale ore. This arrangement will apparently allow a large part, if not all, of the sodium mining, to be financed with the receipts from the "storage fees." At the same time, the relatively crushed shale oil will be brought to the surface for later easy processing by private individuals.

d. No environmental impact statement has ever been filed to evaluate the repercussions of the mining or the subsequent storage of what would be huge amounts of oil shale ore.

e. After the initial leasing of the four separate sodium leases, the Department of the Interior allowed the leases to be consolidated into a *single* lease, because it "wasn't economical" otherwise. This provision apparently violates the Mineral Leasing Act's limitation on leased tract size. Additionally, the lessees were required to prove that the sodium salts were the *more valuable* resource in order to accomplish the consolidation.

f. Four *more* such sodium leases are quietly pending.

g. The ownership and names of the lease holders have changed frequently since preference rights were first filed in 1964. Companies with a demonstrated interest in shale oil have apparently been among the holders. (Current holder is Advance-Ross Corp.)

All of these facts seem to confirm the questionable nature of the sodium lease-oil shale relationship. I am highly doubtful that these leases were purchased so the lessees could mine and sell only the sodium salts. Instead, what is at stake are billions of dollars of oil shale and control over the future development of that recoverable oil. There is every indication that another federally sanctioned abuse of the public's interest is in the works in the area of shale oil development.

I would appreciate you explaining this entire situation to me; what is the future of this oil shale-sodium situation.

How can the Department of the Interior ensure that the public is not, again, the eventual loser in another abuse of their interests? Will you release to the public the sodium leases themselves and any BLM studies or evaluations that have examined the sodium lease arrangements?

Can you assure the public that the leases are a *bona fide* transaction, and not a subterfuge to allow the further exploitation of public oil shale land?

I would appreciate your early reply.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. VANIK,
Member of Congress.

VANIK OPPOSES INTERIOR DEPARTMENT DISBANDING OF OIL SHALE TASK FORCE

Congressman Charles A. Vanik (Ohio-D) today criticized the Department of the Interior for its current policy disbanding the Oil Shale Task Force, an agency within the Department of the Interior that has overseen the planning and initial implementing of the Federal Prototype Oil Shale Leasing Program.

Functions of the Task Force are now to be spread out among several Interior offices that were involved in the program: the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Mines, and the U.S. Geological Survey.

None of these agencies has the capacity to undertake the responsibility for proper oil shale development during the Nation's present energy crisis, according to Vanik.

"I cannot imagine how Interior can expect such a disjointed, decentralized, and uncoordinated assemblage of musty, old-line groups to effectively complete the Federal Oil Shale Program," said Vanik. "It is unrealistic to expect these agencies to carry on with this vital program that is estimated to have huge domestic energy potential."

"How can Administration officials and the Department of the Interior stimulate proper oil shale development as part of the solution to national energy self-sufficiency, while at the same time they are breaking up the only office that devotes *full time* to that development?" Vanik asked.

"I am informed that such disbanding of Interior agencies is not unusual," Vanik said, "but it is certainly not logical to break up the coordinating agency before its program is fully and successfully implemented."

Two prototype oil shale tracts have already been leased; four remain still to be bid on. Substantial problems have arisen already in the Federal program. These include plans by the Bureau of Land Management to allow dumping of waste shale residues on other, non-leased public lands, *at no cost to the oil companies*. In addition, there is a huge disparity in the amount of money per barrel that the public will receive in "bonus bid" payments from oil company operators of the two tracts already leased.

Said Vanik, "The Bureau of Land Management appears to be a 'Bureau of Mismanagement' if the handling of recent bids can be used as an example."

"Despite this poor record," Vanik said, "there is no indication that this quiet dissolution of the Task Force will result in anything but an even worse operation of the Federal Oil Shale program."

"A scattering of responsibility for management and use of the oil shale lands which belong to the American people can only precipitate an assault on the integrity of the program and serve to erode and destroy the public's confidence. Public confidence is the cornerstone on which a successful shale oil program must be built.

"I hope that the Department can explain

to the public why this policy of scattered responsibility is warranted," Vanik said. "Who is to be 'in-charge' of the overall Federal oil shale program now? Who can be held accountable if the public domain is violated? Or is it simply left up to the apparently uncoordinated responses of a handful of offices?"

DRINAN SUPPORTS REGULATION OF NATURAL GAS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 22, the Washington Star-News carried an article wherein for the first time since becoming a Commissioner of the Federal Power Commission, Don S. Smith discussed the regulation of natural gas. In particular, he discussed his recent vote at the FPC which provided the swing vote for a 3-to-2 decision in favor of raising the price of natural gas to an unprecedented \$0.55 under a contract between a producer and a pipeline company.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken out before about the bad effects which I believe this particular February 1 decision of the Federal Power Commission will have. I urge my colleagues to pay the closest attention to the regulation of natural gas, and submit the following article for their consideration:

MORE GAS REGULATION?

(By Stephen M. Aug)

Federal regulation of major natural gas production companies covering not only the interstate market but the currently unregulated intrastate market may help moderate sharply rising natural gas prices, the newest member of the Federal Power Commission believes.

Don S. Smith, a former Arkansas utility regulator who joined the FPC in mid-December, said in an interview last night—his first as a commissioner—that "regulation of intrastate sales of large producers may become necessary not only for the interstate market, but may become advantageous to the intrastate market."

The FPC has been regulating well-head prices of natural gas since a Supreme Court decision in 1954 ordered it to do so. The intrastate market—gas produced, sold and used within a single state—has been exempt from federal regulation.

Prices in the unregulated intrastate market have soared to five times the ceiling prices set in recent years by the FPC. This has happened because the economies of certain Southern states are based almost entirely on natural gas as an energy source, and users are willing to pay virtually any price to get fuel.

One result is that producers are not willing to sell gas in the interstate market at prices of 22 to 25 cents per thousand cubic feet when they may get perhaps \$1 per thousand on the intrastate market.

This activity, Smith said, is in accordance with what he terms "Sutton's principle." The term, he explained, refers to the bank robber Willie (The Actor) Sutton, who was asked why he robbed banks. Sutton's answer, Smith said, was, "That's where the money is."

Smith added that "a producer, as any businessman, will choose a market where he gets the highest returns."

Smith pointed out that in the last quarter of 1973 only about 8 percent of all new gas

that was sold in the interstate market was brought in under the FPC's longstanding area pricing procedures under which so-called "just and reasonable rates" were determined after lengthy hearings. Nearly all of the rest, he said, was brought in under so-called "emergency" procedures—short-term sales of natural gas under perhaps six-month contracts, compared with contracts as long as 10 to 20 years under other procedures.

As a result, he said, "the very large majority of gas coming into the interstate market came in with no real inquiry being made as to whether a just and reasonable rate was being charged."

The basic inquiry by the commission in cases in which limited-term commitments of gas are made, Smith said, concerns "the existence of an emergency on the buyer's system (a natural gas pipeline) and whether those higher prices were justified because the buyer needed it so badly."

In his first vote as a commissioner on Feb. 1, Smith cast the swing vote to break a month-long stalemate among the other four members and authorized a 55-cent price for natural gas under a new contract between a producer and a pipeline company. The vote has hurt Smith's reputation among consumer groups as a pro-consumer commissioner.

Smith, a Democrat, had wide consumer backing when he was nominated to the agency after the Senate rejected a California Democrat for the post because he had served for a number of years as a lawyer for an oil company.

The 55-cent price was the same amount the company involved had sought from the commission. The FPC staff had recommended the gas be sold at 35 cents; an administrative law judge had recommended 50 cents and the two-member minority—which included FPC Chairman John N. Nassikas—had recommended 41 cents.

Smith did not want to comment directly on the case because an appeal is pending. But he believes that the staff's 35-cent estimate was based on an outdated estimate of the costs of drilling a gas well, while the administrative law judge's 50-cent figure resulted from a miscalculation. He believes the 55-cent price to be fully justified under today's costs of drilling new wells.

The decision was made under a controversial FPC program called "optional pricing." This allows producers to charge virtually whatever price they wish—even above FPC ceiling prices—providing they can justify it to the commissioners.

The theory behind it is that the policy will allow higher prices, which will encourage development of more gas supplies.

Consumer groups don't like the policy precisely because of the higher prices which they believe will lead to windfall profits for gas producers, who will drill wells and simply cap them while they wait for prices to rise.

Smith believes the optional pricing procedure is currently the best of several options for bringing gas to the interstate market because it provides the commission with an opportunity to determine whether the higher prices are justified. In emergency sales, he noted, the commissioners do not rule on the price, and producers can charge whatever the market will bear although only for a limited time.

18-YEAR-OLD MEMBERSHIP, H.R. 12380

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced H.R. 12380, which would amend the Organic Act of Guam to lower

the age qualification in the Guam Legislature from the present 25 years to 18 years of age.

My action in this matter has the support of the current Guam Legislature which recently enacted a resolution calling upon Congress to authorize this timely change in Guam's Organic Act.

I call the change "timely" in the best sense of the word. Our young people on Guam are much like young people throughout the world. Their interests are rapidly changing. They are taking a much greater part in their society than did the young people of just a decade ago. While 18-year-olds in Guam are not prone to civil disobedience—a fact which we older folks on Guam are proud to note—they are not complacent either. They know that Guam is undergoing the greatest sociological and economic change in its history. And from the letters I have received in my office and from the discussions I have had with young men and women on Guam, I have been extremely impressed with their desire to be an active part of the process of change.

I appreciate that there are some who say 18-year-olds are too young to participate in government; that they lack the experience age has given their elders, and, that 18-year-olds are too occupied with the pleasures of youth to be truly concerned with the hard facts of governing.

These same arguments have been used time and time again to withhold the franchise from the young. As one who is regrettably past his 18th birthday, and as a parent of eight children, I recognize that 18-year-olds are not as preoccupied with the grueling necessity of earning a living and raising a family as are those of us who have assumed these responsibilities.

But today's technology with its ability to instantly bring the world into our living rooms via television has changed the process of growing up. Whereas it took young people in my day years to acquaint themselves with the world around them, this generation is far more worldly. The understanding of government that took my generation years to gather now seems almost an integral part of their surroundings. To a remarkable degree, the young people of today possess an almost startling comprehension of what makes a government operate. And, to a remarkable degree, they have all too quickly acquired the cynicism about politicals which one usually associates only with an older generation, grown more callous and expecting less.

These young people are the leaders of tomorrow. If we expect them to honor and respect the cherished practices of democracy, I believe it is crucial that we afford our young people the widest possible opportunity to participate in their government at all levels.

My belief in this matter goes back a number of years to when I was speaker of the Guam Legislature. At that time, the minimum voting age on Guam was 21. After considerable reflection, I felt that this was too high and successfully sponsored legislation to lower the voting age on Guam to 18.

Then, as now, there were voices raised in opposition to giving 18-year-olds

greater participation in government. I am proud to state, however, that Guam, which was the first American area to give the vote to 18-year-olds, has never regretted the move. Our young people have taken their franchise seriously, consistently showing up at the polls and voting their conscience.

Lowering the eligibility age for the Guam Legislature will not, I am confident, result in a mass displacement of older members in the next election. To the contrary, it is quite possible that some years may pass before an 18-year-old is seated as a member of the Guam Legislature. I do not believe that young people will vote for a candidate solely on the basis of age and the major factor in their political allegiance will be that candidate's overall qualifications.

But, if we expect our young people, 18 years or older, to lay down their lives for our country on the field of battle, then can we continue to deny them the right to play a role in the legislative branch of their government?

I, and the majority of the membership of the 12th Guam Legislature, believe not. I support their resolution calling for a change in the law, and I call on my colleagues in Congress to support my bill, H.R. 12380.

ENERGY CRISIS IS REAL

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, in recent trips to my district on the north coast of California, I, like many of my colleagues, have attempted to observe and assess the social and economic impacts of the current fuel shortages on my constituents. In discussing the shortages with local government officials, representatives of business, industry and labor, fuel distributors and service station dealers, small businessmen and working men and women, I find that a lack of believable information about the energy "crunch" has led to confusion, frustration, and anger.

People are being literally "bombarded" with conflicting news accounts and statements from public figures which are often based on half-truths and speculation, and if pollster Lou Harris is to be believed, the credibility of the administration, the Congress, the business and industrial community and virtually every other institution in American society, has dropped dramatically in the last year.

In the hope of setting the record straight concerning what in my judgment is a serious and very real energy crisis facing our Nation, I am taking this opportunity to include the following article, entitled "About Energy" by Erwin D. Canham, which appeared in the January 28, 1974 edition of the *Christian Science Monitor*, in the RECORD:

ABOUT ENERGY

(By Erwin D. Canham)

A conference mainly of American business executives which we have been attending gives a fair indication of the intense con-

cerns of the business community. These men sought to be informed about the energy situation, and they listened to first-rank authorities. Here are some of the salient points, familiar perhaps, but stark:

Any notion that the crisis is "phony" is tragically untrue. It is in many respects the most challenging economic problem many Nations in the world have ever faced.

Any notion that it will be solved by a resumed and large-scale flow of Middle Eastern oil is equally false. Indeed, such a resumption—if it aroused false confidence—might do grave harm.

The world will never again have cheap energy in the terms it has recently enjoyed.

The United States will not become self-sufficient in energy by 1980; indeed its need to import oil may increase steadily in this decade and might go from the present 12 percent to perhaps 50 percent.

The American oil companies are in very bad public-relations trouble. Not only is it difficult to justify their enormous profits, or the holding back of oil from the market to obtain higher prices, but they face stringent taxes to recapture or divert their profits, and even the grim threat of nationalization or its equivalent.

MUCH TO DO

Against the background of such urgencies, there are many things Americans must do. And there are far greater challenges to other peoples, such as the Japanese who are so overwhelming dependent on oil. Moreover, huge societies such as the Indians have scarcely any foreign exchange with which to pay for their minimal desperate needs.

For private Americans, an earnest continuation of conservation measures is essential, and it is more than a mere stopgap. But the programs which will bring other sources of fuel into effective production are mostly very long range. Coal may most quickly help. But it would not be nearly enough to achieve more than a modest supplement. It takes from five to 10 years to bring atomic plants into production and they have grave problems even now.

EXOTICS NOT ENOUGH

The various exotic ways of getting energy, like fusion, shale oil, wind or sun or tides, are in no way near to providing practical and sufficient supply. They must be explored and researched, no doubt with expensive and massive programs. They are far down the road and some of them will probably never yield significant amounts of energy.

All these points may seem elementary to people who have been following the energy situation closely. But there is much evidence that the general public is confused at best, cynical at worst. Its understanding of the challenge is vital. For it is ordinary people, all of us, who will have to do much of the acting in the face of a major energy revolution.

It is plain that that much-discussed change in our ways of life is essential. Economy is the watchword. It is far from adequately perceived or acted upon.

The tremendous escalation of almost all prices which the unavoidable boost in energy costs brings about may itself do much to change our consumerist practices. Unemployment is already hitting hard. Shortages are widespread. The depth of the challenge no doubt will come home to all of us.

A PRICE TO PAY

Farther down the road, beyond the ken of most of us, is the problem of how to pay for imported gas and oil at moderately projected rates in the years ahead.

One authoritative calculation expects that the United States would need to pay \$108 billion a year by 1985 for imported fuel. Such a sum could not be heaped on top of the United States' balance of payments. It could not be absorbed by the producing countries. Such looks into the future lead to total

absurdity, and suggest fundamentally different arrangements will have to be worked out.

In a word: energy and the economy, now and in the years ahead, are a challenge such as the concerned nations have never before faced. It can be mastered, and in the end 20th century society may be much the better for it.

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN O. HENDERSON

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 22, 1974, I joined the family, friends, and colleagues who filled Holy Trinity Lutheran Church of Buffalo to capacity in paying final tribute to New York Federal Court Chief Judge John O. Henderson.

It was a sad occasion as we mourned the loss of a fine man and a fine public servant. It was a remarkably warm occasion, too, as those who knew him best reminisced about his outstanding personal and public characteristics.

Dr. Ralph W. Loew's invocation set the dignified tone of the service of remembrance, and tributes to a friend were paid by Federal Court Judge John T. Curtin; Manly Fleischmann, former law partner and close friend of many years; and Anthony Cardinale, newspaper reporter and admirer of the judge's courtroom skills and humanity.

Judge Curtin, who is in line to be the next chief judge, told of his relationship dating back to the time when Judge Henderson served as district attorney, and took staff member John Curtin under his wing. He related stories of the wise and kind guidance of the district attorney, and of how that help and friendship flourished through the years and into their service in the U.S. court system.

Tony Cardinale related his memories of John Henderson, and wrote a sorrowful and fond remembrance in the *Buffalo Evening News*, speaking of the judge's "irrepressible sense of humor" and "his enormous sense of outrage over injustice or dishonesty." Both the anecdotes and the private dedication to public service were integral parts of his personality, and were sympathetically recounted.

I think the qualities of the man John O. Henderson was are aptly expressed in the eulogy of Manly Fleischmann, and as part of my remarks it is my privilege to insert it in the RECORD:

IN MEMORY OF JOHN O. HENDERSON

Said the English poet John Donne:

"Any man's death diminishes me because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

The bell tolls for all of us today; for a beloved wife and daughter; for men and women across the land, some in high places and some in modest circumstances; for a countless legion of friends whose lives have been touched and enriched in small or great measure over a period of many years by the character, the matchless personality and the public example of integrity of this unique man to whom we say a sad farewell today. It is a paradox of life that we are all the lesser today by his passing, yet we are all better and larger because he lived and worked among us and because we shared his friendship.

Our ceremonies here today are brief, as John would have wished it. No one in this company needs to be reminded of the distinguished contributions he made to the community, the nation and to the judicial institution he adorned. Instead, I think, let us remember that parting is *in fact* sweet sorrow; we should not let the day pass without recalling some of the many facets of John Henderson as a warm, wise and witty man that endeared him to all of those gathered here to do him honor. For my own part, this can only be a personal memoir of a deeply satisfying friendship that extended over more than forty years, quite unbroken by occasional separations of time and geography.

That friendship began in 1931 when we were both students at the University of Buffalo Law School, though it is not to be claimed that all of our time was dedicated to the pursuit of that jealous mistress, the law. Even in those early years it was perfectly clear that John Henderson was cut from no ordinary mold and that in fact he often seemed to march to a distant drum, not always audible to his comrades.

One small example was John's extraordinary empathy with the animal world—a two-way street if there ever was one. It is pleasant today to remember my first visit with John to the Buffalo Zoo. We had hardly entered the gate when it became apparent that the animal equivalent of "passing the word" was taking place—birds were screaming, elephants trumpeting and bears dancing, all to welcome the return of a native son bearing gifts of popcorn and peanuts, and striding down the paths to an unbelievable cacophony of animal approval. So it was only a matter of small surprise when I met him on Main Street a few days later bundled up in a great coat, facing a Buffalo wind; hearing noises emerging from the middle of the six foot four bundle, I investigated and made the acquaintance of a baby racoon riding warmly and happily on the broad Henderson chest.

Well, law school days ended and we each went our separate professional ways for a time.

The war years intervened and John made a predictable though unusual ascent from private to colonel; I started nearer the top but ended without comparable recognition of my martial capabilities. Along the way, we spent an unusual evening at our home in Virginia. We were both in boot training at the time; in any event at approximately 3:00 A.M. it suddenly seemed essential to us both that we should have a foot race through the forest that lined the Potomac River. The contest ended when I was felled by a blow in the eye from an overhanging branch; it was always my claim (a disputed one) that I was in the lead at the time.

Some time after the war we became law partners and here too were happy days to remember. Our firm was long on talent, I like to think, but short on clients and capital. One result was that the first partner to arrive in the morning found himself in a commanding position with respect to the occasional check received in the mail. It is my recollection that John's fine physical condition and habit of early rising stood him in good stead in those impecunious days.

The years rushed along and recognition came to John inevitably; a new career began for him in the Courts, first as United States Attorney and finally as Senior Judge of the United States Court. We have had distinguished judges in this district, but Judge Henderson had few peers in that proud history. He was first of all a lawyer's judge, mindful of his kinship with our profession, sensitive and understanding of our problems, generous in his praise and mild in rebuke. Of equal importance, he was a people's judge, a wise, tolerant and humane man who knew and sympathized with the fragile nature of the human condition.

I return finally to what was completely unique about this great man—his gift for friendship. Here, if ever, was a boon companion, humorous and gentle, brave and resolute! I shall ever be grateful that I enjoyed the previous privilege of that companionship—in the law school and law office, in the courts and in our homes, even on the trout streams that he loved so well. He was indeed, to borrow Lord Cecil's statement of the British opinion of President Truman:

"A good man to have on a tiger hunt."

Thus, what was written by Robert Willington of Sir Thomas More might serve as a fitting epitaph for our beloved friend:

"He is a man of angel's wit and singular learning. I know not his fellow. For where is the man of that gentleness, lowliness and affability? And as time requireth, a man of marvelous mirth and pastimes; and sometimes of as sad a gravity; a man for all seasons."

Farewell, John Henderson—you shall be sorely missed and warmly remembered.

A WATERSHED YEAR FOR U.S. NATIONAL DEFENSE

HON. JOHN B. CONLAN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Speaker, the latest Mideast conflict told us a great deal about the advanced state of Soviet weapons technology.

The Arab belligerents were heavily armed with Russian-built Mig-25 Foxbat aircraft, large numbers of sophisticated long-range SAM-6 and SAM-7 anti-aircraft missiles, self-propelled radar-assisted 23-mm cannon, T-62 tanks, and other modern weapons.

Defending Israeli forces, on the other hand, were armed with much older American weapons. It was only because of extraordinary human skill that the Israelis were able to hold their own against the quality and quantity of Soviet arms assistance to Egypt.

The Soviet Union is now ahead of the United States in every category of military equipment, according to military experts. The Russian Air Force and Navy passed us about 4 years ago, and the Soviets have always been stronger than us on the ground.

A pervasive antimilitary bias among too many in the Congress has helped to prevent the Pentagon from obtaining necessary rearmament funds since the end of our Vietnam involvement. This has left us 8,500 aircraft short, 300 fewer ships than a year ago, and woefully behind in developing new weapons.

In addition, defense experts have repeatedly warned us that U.S. surveillance, interceptor aircraft, missiles, and missile defenses are inadequate, making us vulnerable to enemy attack from almost anywhere in the world.

This is aside from the fact that free world forces depend heavily upon modern American weaponry for their own ability to survive attack. Without American strength and defense know-how behind them, our allies are dangerously susceptible to Soviet mischiefmaking, raising the danger that we might be dragged into a shooting war at any time

even though our own national security might not be directly at stake.

Mr. Speaker, the current defense budget calls for expenditures of more than \$90 billion—almost a third of total Federal spending. Much of that spending is necessary to replace wornout and obsolete weapons, and to develop and produce new-generation weapons, such as the high-priority supersonic long-range B-1 bomber.

Modern weapons systems require a tremendous length of time to develop. And the forces we have 8 or 10 years from now will be determined by decisions we make today. It is because we did not make such a commitment to force modernization and buildup 10 years ago, when Soviet arms buildup was moving forward with considerable momentum, that we have been left so far behind and susceptible to Soviet attack today.

Defense has accounted for a steadily decreasing portion of total Federal spending since the mid-1960's. When adjusted for inflation, defense outlays this year add up to the lowest level since 1940.

This is in spite of former Assistant Marine Corps Commandant Gen. Lewis Walt's recent warning about the tremendous disparity between the United States and the Soviet Union in missile strength:

The U.S.S.R. is decisively surpassing the U.S. in virtually all aspects of military strength. Four years ago, Russia had 550 ICBMs—today they have over 1,600, including over 300 monstrous SS-9s with 25 million ton TNT equivalent warhead explosive capability.

Four years ago, the U.S. had 1,054 ICBMs—today we have 1,054, the largest having less than one-tenth of SS-9 power.

Add to this the fact that Soviet missiles now have multiple warheads, otherwise known as MIRV's, increasing the number of individually targetable Soviet warheads by somewhere between five and six times. And defense experts warn that in a few years the Soviets will have 7,000 to 8,000 nuclear missile warheads in the megaton range, as against about half that number of U.S. warheads in the kiloton range—that is, 1/1,000th the destructive power of a megaton.

Despite this ominous nuclear imbalance, we can nonetheless expect defense critics to demand even further cuts in the 1975 budget. But as the Arizona Republic wisely observed in a recent editorial, which I would like to include in the Record at this point, Congress will do well to ignore such demands. The time is short for corrective action.

The article follow:

[From the Arizona Republic, Feb. 5, 1974]

THE MILITARY BUDGET

The American taxpayer should brace for an all-out wave of anguished rhetoric from the liberal lobbyists against military spending. This will take the form of arm-waving in Congress, weeping in the Washington press and ugly distortions by career Pentagon antagonists.

Their target is President Nixon's \$87.7 billion request for defense spending in the new \$304.4 billion budget for fiscal 1975. The request is up \$7.1 billion over the current budget, or about 9 per cent.

It is at this point, and this point only, the antimilitary clique will equate the increase to the new warmongering by the United

States. Don't expect the Washington media to challenge their arguments.

But a high school freshman mathematics student can see holes in the arguments by simply looking at the overall tilt in government spending.

Despite the 9 per cent defense increase, military appropriations have dropped another percentage point as a part of total spending—from 29 per cent in the current budget to 28 per cent in the new budget.

While this is happening, the so-called "social" spending by the federal government spurts upward with dizzying speed.

The "social" agencies are gaining a percentage point as a portion of the total budget—going up from 45 per cent of the budget to 46 per cent—with a new dollar record of \$142.7 billion compared to \$125 billion this year.

Unemployment pay, for example, is up 25 per cent to \$7.1 billion. Food stamps and other assistance are up 22 per cent to \$14.5 billion. Social Security is up 15 per cent to \$64 billion. Medicare is up 13 per cent to \$26.3 billion. And so on.

Not only is the military increase defensible, it is utterly necessary. As successive congresses have knuckled to pressure groups to whittle military spending from 52 per cent of the federal budget in 1960 to a new low of 28 per cent. Russia and Red China have plowed more and more of their national resources into modern naval fleets, air forces and missile arsenals.

In all statistics, the United States now ranks second in the world in military armaments. Some of the same congressmen who helped disarm the United States prior to World War II and prior to the Korean War were the first to shriek with alarm when the U.S. military warehouses were discovered to be barren of any fighting equipment. Heaven knows, history can repeat again.

Not only has the all-volunteer armed forces concept pushed personnel costs to nearly 60 per cent of the total Pentagon budget, the armed forces must also replace equipment lost in Vietnam and rushed to Israel during the recent Mideast war.

Detente is illusory. It works so long as Russia receives favorable trade deals, excels at outfoxing the United States in arms limitation talks and gets its way in the Mideast. Yet, the Soviet Union's armament factories still hum 24 hours a day producing new-generation fighters and bombers, bigger and more lethal missiles and arms for satellite armies.

For its own security, the United States cannot afford to be any worse off than second best.

THE CASE FOR A FEDERAL OIL AND GAS CORPORATION—NO. 1

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, an article in the February 13, 1974, issue of the New York Times reported that Gulf Oil Co.'s profits for the fourth quarter of 1973 were up an unbelievable 153 percent over the comparable period for 1972. This is merely one of the most recent indications that a competitive market does not obtain in the petroleum industry. Gulf surely would have encountered some competitive checks before realizing this unprecedented increase, if the other major oil firms had been engaging in any kind of genuine price competition.

The prospects for future competition appear even bleaker. A study prepared for the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Economic Progress revealed a total of 3,222 joint ventures involving the major international oil companies; many of these ventures involve future production in areas like Alaska and the Outer Continental Shelf. A Federal Trade Commission antitrust complaint filed last summer reported that the largest 20 oil corporations control 70.21 percent of the Nation's domestic crude oil production, and 93.55 percent of the country's proven domestic reserves—confirmed future sources of petroleum. So the major companies already dominate the lion's share of oil, but they stand to increase their position of dominance even more.

To reverse this trend, which portends increasing problems for our efforts to control the prices the major companies charge while still inducing them to produce sufficient oil, I have introduced legislation to establish a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation. The Corporation would operate within the petroleum industry with an aim of increasing competition, not extending a Government monopoly in place of the present private oligopoly.

I believe the need for the Government to enter into the production sector of the petroleum industry is imperative. The Corporation is intended to operate primarily on public lands, which contain enormous supplies of oil and natural gas. For example, the U.S. Geological Survey estimates that the oil industry could recover 160–190 billion additional barrels of oil from the Outer Continental Shelf alone. This is approximately twice as much petroleum as the oil industry has produced domestically in its entire history of operation. In my own mind, there are considerable environmental and economic problems to be considered before any decision to commence OCS development along the Atlantic coast can responsibly be reached. But if development does go forward there and on other undeveloped parts of the shelf, it should not be monopolized by the oil "majors." Independent producers and a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation must take part in such economic activity as well.

The cause of competition within the oil industry will also be served by the requirement that the Oil and Gas Corporation give preference to independent refineries when it sells its crude oil. Presently the 20 largest oil companies control 86.15 percent of the country's refining capacity. If we are to reverse the "integrated" nature of the oil industry, we must increase the strength of independent businessmen in its refining sector. Yet independent entrepreneurs will not be willing to sink the huge amounts of capital required into refinery construction until they are assured that the major companies, which dominate crude oil production, do not have the power to deny them petroleum. This past year, the major companies have in fact used the shortage of crude oil to reduce deliveries to independent refineries and favor their own operations.

In contrast, the Federal Oil and Gas Corporation would be an assured source

of crude oil supply. And since independent refineries in turn sell a large proportion of their refined products to independent marketers, the Corporation would be the originator of ripple effects which would serve to increase competitive activity in all sectors of the industry.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I insert into the RECORD the February 13 article in the Times describing the increased profits accrued by Gulf in the latest quarter of 1974:

GULF OIL PROFIT ROSE 153 PERCENT IN FOURTH QUARTER (By Ernest Holsendolph)

The Gulf Oil Corporation yesterday announced operating results for 1973. The report indicated a 153 per cent gain in fourth-quarter earnings. Net income for the full year climbed to \$800-million, ending a four-year slide in profitability.

Gulf, the nation's fourth largest oil company, did not announce earnings for the last three months. However, subtraction of the first ninth months' earnings from the full-year figure showed a fourth-quarter profit of \$230-million, compared with \$91-million in the 1972 quarter.

Earnings in all 1973 totaled \$800-million, or \$4.06 a share, up 79 per cent from 1972's \$447-million, or \$2.15 a share, before an extraordinary writeoff of \$250-million that year.

Gulf's revenues last year climbed 29 per cent. Like most other major oil companies, Gulf said the bulk of its earnings growth came from overseas operations rather than domestic.

In a year marked by high profits in the oil industry, Gulf's results outshone most other large companies in terms of a percentage increase over 1972.

The Pittsburgh-based company's record 1973 performance ended a decline since the previous high in 1968—a slide relieved only by a slight increase in 1971.

Gulf said its earnings last year "represent a profit of 8 cents per dollar" on revenues, compared with 5.8 cents a year earlier.

Approximately \$480-million was earned in Gulf's petroleum operations in the United States, a 14 per cent increase over 1972. Foreign petroleum operations showed earnings of \$560-million compared with the year-earlier \$150-million, the company said.

Gulf said the rest of its operations showed an aggregate loss of \$124-million, largely because of the continued high cost of establishing the company's nuclear power generation facilities.

The company's 1973 earnings represent a return of 11.7 per cent on employed capital, from 6.8 per cent in 1972, according to Bob R. Dorsey, chairman of Gulf.

Mr. Dorsey said that "in normal times" the company's improved showing would be hailed as a reflection of an improved economy and indication that Gulf's programs to increase efficiency were working.

Instead, he said, the accomplishments were a reminder that there remains "the challenge to provide adequate energy supplies" as well as "the challenge to provide insight and understanding to our fellow countrymen on the facts of the oil business."

Mr. Dorsey said domestic oil operations were more profitable because of higher prices for Gulf crude and a 12.3 per cent increase in the volume of refined products sold.

Even though the production of crude declined by 37,000 barrels a day, this was more than offset by refinery runs that reached 96 per cent, made possible by "significant increases in crude oil imports," he said.

As to foreign operations, Gulf said rising overseas profits were made possible by higher product prices in the fourth quarter, an unanticipated 6 per cent increase in Euro-

pean sales and increased capacity of the company tanker fleet that reduced dependence on the charter market.

Gulf, which is less dependent on Persian Gulf production (primarily in its Kuwait holdings) than most other multinational companies, said its production of foreign crude dropped only 1.4 per cent.

Increased volume from Ecuador, Venezuela, Canada, Nigeria, and Gabinda (in Africa) made up for most of Gulf's shortfall of foreign crude from the Middle East.

Gulf's domestic chemical operations showed a profit increase of \$13-million, the company reported, largely because of improved results in the plastics division and an increase of \$39-million in foreign activities—made possible because of the decline of start-up costs.

GAS SHORTAGE CRITICAL IN SOUTH FLORIDA

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gas shortage in south Florida was horrendous 2 weeks ago, and all indications are that the situation is not getting any better. Dade County's estimated gasoline shortfall is 38 percent, taking into account both growth factors since the 1972 base allocation year, and already implemented conservation measures. At this rate, by March Dade County should have a shortfall of 41.3 percent. The people in south Florida have tightened their belts as much as they can—much more of this diet may result in starvation.

Ninety three percent of Florida's energy comes from petroleum and natural gas, and over 50 percent of the energy end-use in Florida is for transportation, compared to 15 percent nationwide. Furthermore, Dade County has seen a 17.1-percent increase in motor vehicle registrations since 1972.

A year ago this month, Florida used 344 million gallons of gasoline. This month, February 1974, the State is using only 280 million gallons. With Florida's estimated established need for gasoline at 382.5 million gallons, Florida's shortfall is 27 percent.

At this point, refineries are moving to increase the percentage of their crude stocks going to gasoline from 42 to 45 percent. This is a normal increase for this time of year, in preparation for the greater amounts of travel done in the summer months, and probably won't provide much relief.

There are two problems in particular in south Florida. First, the mandatory allocation formula fails to consider population growth. According to the 1970 census, the 13th District has seen a 35.1-percent increase in population since 1960. Census Bureau estimates for 1971 and 1972 indicate that Dade and Broward counties have gained more new residents than any other counties in Florida. Between 1971 and 1973, Dade County's population has increased by 6.9 percent.

Second, the distribution of gasoline within the State must be more equitable. Portions of Florida are having little diffi-

culty getting enough gasoline, while south Florida is being seriously short-changed. General Hutchinson, who is administering the program in Florida, has indicated that the additional 5.86 million gallons of gasoline now being pumped into Florida will be distributed on the basis of each county's present allocation, with priority given to hard-pressed businesses. Although I can appreciate the difficulty of allocating gasoline on a spot-by-spot basis, this route may well be necessary to alleviate the severe shortages in certain areas of the State.

I have sent telegrams to Governor Askew and William Simon, Administrator of the Federal Energy Office, on the serious situation, and urging greater allocations of gasoline. Last weekend, I met in Atlanta for 3 hours with Kenneth Dupuy, Administrator of the FEO regional office, to discuss the severe hardships in south Florida. At present, I am organizing a community effort, that will include organized labor, business leaders, consumer groups, civic organizations, and the county energy office, to provide assistance to gas station operators in completing and expediting the paperwork on form 17 that is necessary for them to get greater gasoline allotments. The various groups plan to meet together on Thursday, February 28, at 2:30 p.m. in the county energy office, and I will report any further information or developments that result from this meeting.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, a young high school student in my district, Steven B. Russo of Santa Clara, Calif., recently won the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy speech contest for the State of California.

I am inserting his speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, believing it to be worthy of careful attention by our colleagues and the public:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

On the morning of July 24, 1973, I was sitting in my living room watching on television what had become the most newsmaking event of the year—the Senate Watergate Hearings. Before me sat the Ervin committee with its distinguished group of inquirers and the witness of the day Gordon Strachan, the young former aide to H. R. Haldeman.

As the committee was just about to break for lunch the stately Senator Montoya of New Mexico then asked of the witness this vitally important question: "Mr. Strachan", he asked "What advice would you give to other young people like yourself who wish to come to Washington to work for the government?"

Strachan, showing great emotional strain answered in sincere, almost sobbing tones: "Stay away!"

And in accordance with the prevailing post-Watergate rationale many people are doing just that—staying away. Not just young people either, but people of all ages and all walks of life are beginning to ignore the very political system which has made our

country great. Having witnessed men at the highest levels of government come under suspicion, many Americans are experiencing a growing disenchantment with politics, patriotism, and citizenship. Some have even gone so far as to refuse to vote because they believe this nation is so corrupt that their actions no longer count.

But as Adlai Stevenson once said: "as citizens of this democracy you are the rulers and the ruled, the lawgivers and the lawabiding, the beginning and the end." No, ignoring one's role as a citizen is not the answer. Apathy is what creates the problems. There will always be corrupt individuals who will seek to misuse the reigns of power, the danger lies where there aren't enough people around who are involved enough to stop them.

That is why my responsibility to citizenship is to get involved. To get involved as an active participant in the way of life we call democracy.

I intend to do this first through involvement in my government, for that is the means by which the will of the people is fulfilled. But getting involved in government means more than just voting for the candidates of my choice. It also means being informed about the issues of the day and expressing my views on these issues to those officials I do not vote for. Further, involvement means such things as sitting on jury duty, paying my share of the tax burden, and serving in the military when called upon to do so. In these ways I can try to see to it that my government remains a government of, by, and for the people, instead of just a government over the people.

But there is much more to responsible citizenship than just getting involved in the government. I also have a responsibility to get involved in my community as well. For the community is the foundation of society. As such I have a stake in preserving its natural environment. Further, I have a duty to help the people of my community to live better lives by supporting worthy charitable organizations. My cooperating with law enforcement officials is also a crucial part of participation in the community. But more importantly I must promote a better understanding among the various community members as peaceful and harmonious communities are critical to the task of a great nation.

Ultimately, however, I have a responsibility to get involved in the betterment of myself for a nation can only be as great as the people who inhabit it. This is why to be a responsible citizen I must also be a hard-working, lawabiding citizen as well. I must strive to get a good education and school myself in wisdom.

Finally, I must better establish my moral principles to live by them more thoroughly. For the crisis in America today find their roots more than anywhere else in the failure of key individuals to distinguish right from wrong and to live by that distinction.

By doing these things I intend to fulfill my responsibility to citizenship through involvement in my government, in my community, and in the betterment of myself.

But just I alone keeping my responsibility to citizenship means next to nothing unless all of you are willing to keep your responsibilities to citizenship as well. For we are living in a convulsive and crucial age. More than ever before the future of nations is being determined by the will of their people's to meet the challenges they face, and overcome them.

This makes it imperative that we the citizens of the United States of America be actively united as never before to accomplish our purpose of preserving liberty for all. If we fail to do this, undoubtedly freedom and we as her caretakers are doomed. But, if we stand together strong as a great people must,

freedom cannot help but reign for generations.

So instead of staying away from the affairs of the state as Gordon Strachan suggests, let us get involved as responsible citizens that future generations may continue to know as we have, what it is like to be free.

PROBLEMS IN THE FUEL OIL INDUSTRY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, I held an informal hearing in New York on the problems that have developed in the fuel oil industry. This statement is the second in a series I am making in the RECORD in order to share with my colleagues the testimony received at the hearing. Mr. William F. Kenny, Jr., of the Meenan Oil Co., Inc., presented the views of the Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association, of which he is a vice president. His statement, which includes recommendations for correcting the two-tier price system, follows:

MEENAN OIL CO., INC.,

New York, N.Y., February 8, 1974.

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLFF: I am grateful for the invitation to testify at your hearing to be held on February 8th at 10:00 A.M. at 26 Federal Plaza, New York, N.Y.

Our Company operates in the counties of Nassau and Suffolk in New York, in the state of New Jersey, and eastern Pennsylvania. We serve over 70,000 homeowners and also sell at wholesale to other fuel oil dealers.

The opinions of our Company in relation to two-tier pricing and the petroleum price regulations as put forth by the Federal Energy Office are expressed in the attached comments of the Independent Terminal Operators Association of which I am a Vice President.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. KENNY, JR.,
Chairman.

STATEMENT OF INDEPENDENT FUEL TERMINAL OPERATORS ASSOCIATION

The Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association is deeply disappointed at the continuing delay in meeting the two-tier pricing problem. Each week that passes costs the consumers of the Northeast millions of dollars in added fuel costs and weakens the competitive position of hundreds of independent retail fuel oil dealers. The Federal Energy Office has known of this problem for more than a month; our Association presented a solution nearly 4 weeks ago. Our proposal involves a simple, one-time adjustment in the inventories of the few terminal operators who have high priced foreign oil in those inventories. No windfall is involved; the resulting lower costs will immediately be passed on to the dealers and consumers in the form of lower prices.

Instead of acting on our plan quickly and solving the problem, the Federal Energy Office has come up with a proposal that will go into effect much too late, will simply not do the job, will disrupt the national fuel oil distribution system, and will impose upon the oil industry a massive new set of controls, regulations and reports.

The current Mandatory Allocation Program

is working well; there is no need to disrupt and destroy it, which is what the new rules would do.

INDEPENDENT FUEL TERMINAL OPERATORS ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D.C., January 31, 1974.

Subject: Comments on petroleum allocation and price regulations.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT,

Federal Energy Office,

Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: On behalf of the Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association, I am pleased to submit comments with reference to the "Petroleum Allocation and Price Regulations," Federal Energy Office, Federal Register, January 15, 1974, (F.R. Doc. 74-1425).

The Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association is composed of 18 companies who operate deepwater oil terminals along the East Coast from Maine to Florida. None is affiliated with a major oil company. Members market No. 2 fuel (home heating) oil, No. 6 (residual) fuel oil and gasoline at the wholesale and retail level. Members of our Association market at wholesale 25% of the No. 2 fuel oil consumed in District I (the East Coast from Maine to Florida) and 40% of the No. 2 fuel oil consumed in New England. Members also market more than 70% of the No. 6 fuel oil consumed, exclusive of utilities, in the New York-New Jersey area and more than 65% of the No. 6 fuel oil consumed in New England.

This submission is divided into two parts—the first containing our general comments and the second dealing with specific proposals for amendment.

A. GENERAL COMMENTS

The regulations issued and implemented on January 15 are a distinct improvement over the proposed rules published for comment on November 27 and December 13. The organization is much improved, the language is more understandable, and many of the changes reflect comments filed by our Association. Mr. Simon and his staff are to be highly commended for producing a first-rate job, dealing with a complicated problem, under the pressures of a short deadline.

We are pleased at the emphasis on company-to-company cooperation in seeking solution to problems and hope that all suppliers and purchasers will adopt a constructive attitude toward the new allocation program. In brief, we believe it can work, if the Federal Government and industry are determined to make it work.

However, there are five general aspects of the new regulations which need review and correction.

1. Price and discrimination provisions

The price and discrimination provisions of the original middle distillate program have been deleted.* These provisions are essential in preventing serious abuses and discriminatory actions by refiner-suppliers against independent wholesalers and retailers. Despite assurances to the contrary, we do not believe that the Mandatory Petroleum Price Regulations deal effectively with this problem. Examples of such discrimination have been referred to the General Counsel's office, and we are awaiting a ruling as to whether a refiner-supplier is permitted to charge a terminal operator (i.e. cargo buyer) a higher price than is charged the wholesale purchasers (i.e. rack buyers) of that same refiner-supplier.

2. Base period obligation

Serious confusion still surrounds the suppliers' obligations under the allocation pro-

*Section 8 and 14, "Mandatory Allocation Program for Middle Distillate Fuel," effective November 1, 1973 (EPO Reg. 1, 32A CFR, Ch XIII, 38 FR 28660, as amended).

gram, particularly relating to middle distillate fuels. This requires prompt attention and clarification, and, if necessary, enforcement measures directed at refiner-suppliers who are not in compliance.

The base period obligation for middle distillate fuels is 100% of the actual base period deliveries to a wholesale purchaser—that is the quantity actually delivered during the corresponding month of 1972. Reduction below 100% is only permitted when the refiners' supplies are less than those available during the base period.

Some refiners have confused the standard of the 100% of base period (1972 consumption) which governs the supplier-wholesale purchaser relationship with the 85% of current (1974) consumption which governs wholesale purchaser-end user (home-owner) relationship. As a result, some refiners have established the middle distillate allocation fraction or percentage at 85%, on the mistaken assumption that this is the allocation level required by the allocation rules.

This misinterpretation must be corrected immediately; refiner-suppliers must be required to establish allocation percentages of 100%, unless their supply situation warrants a reduction.

3. Reporting requirements

The reporting requirements of the January 15 regulations are a distinct improvement over those proposed in December. However, as indicated in our more specific comments, below, care must be taken to insure that wholesalers and retail dealers are not required to maintain voluminous—and essentially useless—records. This is more a matter of interpretation of the existing rules rather than specific amendment of those rules.

4. State set-aside procedure

Here again, the January 15 rules are a distinct improvement over earlier proposals, but interpretation and clarification is required to avoid needless and costly disruption of customary supply patterns. We are particularly concerned that oil in transit through a state (i.e. delivered to a terminal operator by a refiner for storage in one state but for resale in another state) not become part of the set-aside available to that state.

5. Reduction of electric and natural gas consumption

A major failing of the Federal Energy Office has been the lack of a sustained, effective program to insure reduced consumption of electricity and natural gas, particularly for home heating. The major burden of conservation has been borne—and borne most commendably—by the homeowner who has oil heat. The homeowner who burns oil is being discriminated against; he is being asked to bear the full burden of the cut-back in energy consumption. No similar sacrifices have been asked or expected of homeowners who heat with gas or electricity, despite the direct impact of gas and electric consumption on oil supplies. As a result of the failure of the FEO to seek full cooperation from consumers of other fuels, the conservation performance by home heating oil consumers has been in excess of any other.

Further, natural gas utilities are permitted to make massive cut-backs in interruptible service to industry facilities in order that those utilities may take on new residential business. This discriminates against the marketers of fuel oil, and even worse, causes unnecessary shut-downs in many industrial operations.

B. SPECIFIC COMMENTS

1. General provisions (subpart A)

a. § 211.13 Adjustments to the allocation program

The adjustment procedures specified in paragraph 211.13 provide necessary flexibility and delegate a number of essential allocation

decisions to the supplier. We endorse this concept but have some concern that the procedures may be used by some refiner-suppliers to increase their share of the market by discrimination against independent wholesale purchasers. While suppliers are prohibited from such discrimination (§ 211.13 (g)), FEO must be alert to this difficult problem and must vigorously enforce anti-discrimination rules. In fact, the President is required to report monthly to the Congress on any changes with respect to aggregate market shares in accordance with Section 4(c)(2)(A) of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973.

b. § 211.51 General Definitions

Wholesale Purchaser. The annual gallonage cutoff level (e.g., 50,000 gallons per year for multi-family residences) used to define a whole purchaser is much too low. The lower the cutoff points, the greater the paperwork, and dealers and distributors are already overburdened by paperwork. Federal designation of an apartment building operator as a wholesale purchaser does not improve his service or his rates; it does increase the paper burden on the supplier.

We strongly recommend: that the wholesale purchaser gallonage cutoff be increased for all categories of end-users who are wholesale purchasers to 300,000 gallons per year.

c. Guide to the Petroleum Allocation Regulations for Petroleum Products Supplies (Suppliers Guide).

This is an excellent document; it sets forth in a simplified form the procedures to be used by suppliers. However, two changes to the Suppliers Guide are necessary:

The prohibition against the supply of wholesale purchasers not served in the base period (second sentence, paragraph IIA) is quite inconsistent with the allocation regulations. The regulations, for example, direct that suppliers shall accept new customers, but the Suppliers Guide prohibits supply of new customers. We must assume that the regulations are correct and urge that the Suppliers Guide be made to conform with the regulations.

The detailed workload imposed in the Suppliers Guide in connection with the "Suppliers Monthly Allocation Worksheet" (Form 22) is intolerable. Suppliers simply cannot afford the time, or the money required for such unnecessary paperwork—unnecessary because every supplier already has an acceptable system for recording deliveries to his customers. The instructions must be modified to permit the use of normal records for each customer and the aggregation of customer requirements by end-user category.

2. Middle Distillate (Subpart G)

Prior to the implementation of the Petroleum Allocation and Price Regulations, on January 15, 1974, there was in effect as of November 1, 1974, a mandatory middle distillate program which showed good promise of success; it was simple, clearcut, and easy to work with. The current regulations have introduced some unnecessary complexities that make the program difficult for the average fuel oil distributor and dealer; in addition, parts of the regulation are subject to misinterpretation which can be advantageous to refiner-suppliers. Comments on these complexities and other related matters follow:

a. § 211.123 Allocation Levels

While we do not take issue, at this time, with the priorities established, we are quite concerned by the complexity of computing recording, and reporting by end-user the authorized allocation levels for all of the various categories of users. Although there remains some doubt as to where certain end-users fit into the scheme, it is clear that every end-user is to be allocated by some special rule. The Suppliers Guide published

by FEO infers that each individual account be recorded on some special new form for possible Federal audit. The typical dealer who follows such an inferred reporting scheme will find it difficult to keep up with his deliveries.

It is vital, therefore, that the operational procedures be simplified to the greatest extent possible. It must be made quite clear that records kept by individual dealers in this regard be only those normal records required for proper business bookkeeping purposes.

Ideally, as we suggested in our earlier comments priority categories should be treated as guidelines for suppliers rather than as a detailed reporting device.

b. § 211.124 supplier/purchaser relationships

The requirement that suppliers supply all of their purchasers of record in the base period expresses the fundamental goal of the program but is an incomplete statement of the suppliers responsibilities. For example, subparagraph 211.124(a) does not cover customers assigned by FEO under the November 1 program; it does not cover new customers, nor does it specify the level at which customers shall be supplied.

Subparagraph 211.124(b) specifies that supplier-purchaser relationships are set forth in paragraph 211.24. The statement ignores paragraphs 211.13, 211.25, and possibly others.

Paragraph 211.124 does not require, as does paragraph 211.11(b), that:

"Suppliers shall allocate their total allocable supply among their wholesale purchasers in proportion to their wholesale purchaser's base period volumes, or adjusted base period volumes, where applicable." (Emphasis added.)

This omission has led to confusion and misinterpretation stemming in part from space heating reductions which are perceived by some as requiring an allocation level of only 85%. The net result is that, as we have indicated above, some major suppliers have arbitrarily and erroneously (but probably in good faith) cut allocations back to 85% when in fact larger supply levels of distillate are now available.

It is essential that the middle distillate regulations be revised to conform with § 211.11(b) so that total allocable supply will be made available.

c. § 211.125 method of allocation

The recording and reporting difficulties of the regulated delivery method have been discussed above in comments on § 211.123.

There does not appear to be a need to specify such a detailed delivery system when simpler solutions which could better accomplish program objectives.

FEO goals would be better served by introducing additional flexibility into the program. For example, delayed deliveries (rather than reduced gallonage) will achieve a specified heating reduction with greater simplicity. Many dealers are already equipped to achieve the Federal goals by increasing the time span between deliveries.

Further, the regulations must be amended to free wholesale purchasers from liability from any damage to homes or equipment resulting from compliance with the program (i.e. pipes that freeze and break in a home where fuel oil has been cut off).

3. Residual fuel oil (subpart I)

a. § 211.161 Scope

Subsection (a) should be amended to read: "This subpart applies to the mandatory allocation of residual fuel oil produced in, imported into or sold for importation into the United States." (additions underlined)

This amendment will extend coverage of the program to sales by American companies abroad to other American companies during the base period. Given the severe shortage of residual oil, every effort must be made by the

Federal Energy Office to insure cooperation by the major American refiners and maximum participation by those refiners and the importers they sold to during the base period in achieving the objectives of the Mandatory Allocation Program.

b. § 211.163 Allocation Levels

The comments pertaining to middle distillate allocation levels pertain also to residual fuel levels.

c. § 211.165 Method of Allocation

It is not clear how the FEO will determine the portion of total supply for non-utility use and the portion of total supply for utility use. Most importantly, it is impossible to perceive what these announced portions or percentages will mean both to non-refiner suppliers and to refiner suppliers.

If 80% of total supply were specified as the amount of supply for non-utility use, what allocation factor would be applied to a distributor already at an 85% allocation level? The hypothesized percentages of 80 and 85% are "apple and orange" numbers.

The Federal Register notice, dated January 26 and published January 30, did not announce, as required by the regulations, the portions of total supply for utility and non-utility use. This failure on the part of FEO is quite practical and is clear evidence that paragraph 211.165(b) should be changed to conform with the practical actions taken by the FEO.

Respectfully submitted,
ARTHUR T. SOULE,
President.

CONSTITUENT OFFERS PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS MUCH FOOD FOR THOUGHT

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, while we in Washington may think at times that we have a firm grasp of the problems that plague our Nation, it is more often than not the folks back home who have the real perspective on the situation. I wish to share with my colleagues a letter to the President from a constituent which poses some questions that should make us all justifiably uncomfortable. I hope we as a Congress can likewise meet the challenges he sets forth. The letter follows:

JONESBORO, ARK.,
February 10, 1974.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am a loyal citizen of this great nation, proud of my heritage, love, freedom and pray that we will continue to be the greatest nation on earth. I was reared on a small farm, have worked with civic organizations, served as mayor of a small town and now work for a large corporation, therefore, might be considered an average citizen.

My great concern now lies in the apparent inability of our government (executive and congressional branches) to function with positive programs. We have committees who make endless studies with little or no results. We have bureaus which spend great sums of money with little or no purpose. We are investigating, studying, and discussing ourselves into nothing.

We deserve and must have honest and truthful answers to questions that affect our welfare. We have a government "by the peo-

ple." Does this mean professional politicians who only have concern for their own achievements? Elected officials are to be "for the people." Is this certain segments or organizations? Can we place men on the moon, yet are unable to determine whether we have sufficient fuel without rationing? Will we believe that data cannot be accumulated as to our oil supplies? Are we unable to stop price gouging and unfair profits yet able to get the Arabs and Israel to cease fighting?

The people of this nation want and deserve an answer to the above and many other questions. We look to our elected leaders for these answers. Are we so weak that we cannot stand the truth? Are we afraid to face the consequences of the truth? This was not so in the past. Men fought and died because they believed in this nation and we still believe today but we must have a leadership who will accept this faith. We are a people, not perfect but willing to accept and forgive imperfection, not quitters but runners to the end, not afraid but willing to face any problem or foe at hand. Our confidence has been shaken but is not lost. Our faith has wavered but can be renewed. We beg for assurance and know it will come. How long must we wait?

You are our elected leaders, we expect leadership. We can follow but we must follow with pride.

Yours respectfully,

B. C. KENNON.

COURT DECISION SHOWS NEED FOR CUYAHOGA VALLEY PARK

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, legislation is now before the House Interior Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation to create the Cuyahoga Valley National Historical Park and Recreation Area between Akron and Cleveland, Ohio. The Cuyahoga Valley is the last large expanse of open space between these two heavily industrialized areas. The valley is rich in natural, cultural and historical resources. It is a sleepy, rural area—a remarkable, almost magical, contrast to the nearby bustling cities.

Thus far, with the help of the State and local governments, the valley has yet been spared from heavy development. The valley is located on a flood plain, and the steep slopes along the river make development precarious. But the threat is there and growing. Already, despite the protests of the citizenry, a huge sports coliseum is being built on the valley's edge, and developers are eyeing the land as the suburbs of Akron and Cleveland spread even closer. Immediate Federal help is vital if the valley is to be preserved in its present natural state.

An example of the intense pressures on the valley is a recent attempt by the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.—CEI—to construct a high voltage power-line directly through much of the valley. The towers supporting the cables would have ranged from 145 to 260 feet high. They would have destroyed the scenic values of the landscape and could have severely damaged the environmental and ecological values of the entire valley. CEI persisted in its efforts, despite the fact

that alternative routes were available and despite the protests of the State of Ohio, the Akron and Cleveland Metropolitan Park Districts and local citizens.

Suit was filed against CEI in the Court of Common Pleas in Cleveland by Frank and Matilda Scapell of Brecksville, Ohio. In addition the city of Independence, Ohio, joined the city of Brecksville and the State of Ohio in seeking a temporary and permanent injunction against the CEI enjoining the construction of the power line. The Court ruled against CEI and granted the permanent restraining order. In making his decision, Judge Ralph S. Locher spoke forcefully on the need to preserve this precious and fragile resource and on the potential of the valley as a proposed national park.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to introduce portions of Judge Locher's decision for the RECORD. I think his eloquent remarks speak for themselves, and demonstrate the growing recognition of the need to create the Cuyahoga Valley National Historical Park and Recreation Area:

THE WELFARE OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC

... The State and the Park District possess the power of eminent domain. Objectors, the State of Ohio and the Cleveland Metropolitan Park District are, therefore, insurmountable obstacles to the proposed CEI line and towers over the route chosen through the Cuyahoga River Valley.

The Cleveland Metropolitan Park District and the State of Ohio are inextricably intertwined with the general public for whom they exist and whom these bodies corporate serve. If the line is not congruent with the welfare of these public entities, it perforce is not consonant with the welfare of the general public.

What . . . the cases tell us is that where there exists a paramount public interest—the existing as well as the embryo park—that interest is preponderant and will prevail over the proprietary interest of the electric company. The priceless health and welfare of the 3,000,000 Ohioans to whom the park is accessible defeat the right of the utility to appropriate through eminent domain.

Now in so far as the Cuyahoga Valley Park is concerned, the 345 KV line should be discussed in conjunction with the equities of a park and the aesthetics which are indigenous to it versus the emphasis and preoccupation with the engineering and commercial aspects of the utility. Natural beauty, relatively unspoiled, is challenged by man's need for material and secular fulfillment with resulting violation of the park. Individual and collective commitment is called for.

Our nation is presently faced with an energy crisis. Those who espouse the theory that the United States of America should adopt a zero growth rate, thereby avoiding the problems of further industrialization are not realistic, in this Court's view. It is evident that the demand of the future upon the environment will not lessen. Rather, they will escalate dramatically as great numbers of people cluster in urban centers imposing greater and greater burdens upon all our resources demanding their wise use, conservation and preservation, including the land itself. Judicious planning of high tension rights-of-way go hand in hand with sound land policies.

To illustrate the magnitude of the problem—in 1970 approximately 6,000 square miles constituted the aggregate of power line rights-of-way, an area slightly smaller than the State of Hawaii. By the year 2,000 with increased power demands, the area required for rights-of-way and the towers will occupy land equal to the combined areas of the

States of New Jersey and Connecticut. Something to ponder over, particularly when the earth's surface under the lines and towers is rendered partially sterile.

These statistics should persuade the power companies and the regulatory agencies that they have resisted too strongly, too predictably the alternative of undergrounding in selected areas of the transmission facilities. As the state of the art of undergrounding advances, and it had advanced in recent years, the disparity in cost between overhead and undergrounding reduces itself.

Physical progress must be respectful and sensitive to life and to the rapidly diminishing area still open and available for wilderness, parks and recreation. Conversely, conservation and preservation measures must be in tune with the admitted need for enlarged, adequate electric energy supplies.

How do we accommodate the good life, its superabundance of material goods and services with the soul of man which has very significant, almost insatiable psychological needs which only Nature can satisfy? The city dweller longs for solitude and beauty, the trees—the sycamore, the cottonwood and sumac, the lovely flowers and the sturdy weeds, the birds and their light music and graceful flight. Were the intangibles, these perishable resources and the millions of Ohioans who will draw refreshment and renewal from the Cuyahoga Valley Park given their day in Court? Obviously, they were not in the courtroom; however, dedicated volunteers championed their cause by taking the witness stand and portraying the historical, botanical and cultural wonders of the Cuyahoga Valley encompassed by the proposed park.*

These stewards sense a mandate to preserve, to conserve; they envision an exodus of tired, nature starved people streaming into the park to enjoy the wonderful mysteries of nature in an uncluttered surrounding.

The Court feels that to place the ecological issues in proper perspective we must conceive not in terms of decades or lifetimes but in terms of ages of ages. We must form an awareness of the long run, not the immediate, for once the high voltage line has violated the park, it will be there forever. And then it's too late! The presently existing intrusions should be systematically removed and the natural beauty and the wonders nature holds must be preserved for all time.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1974

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, people of the ancient nation of Lithuania celebrated the 56th anniversary of their declaration of independence.

On that day the nearly 23,000 Americans of Lithuanian descent living in the State of California, and millions of expatriate Lithuanians throughout the world, were reminded once again of their friends and relatives for whom "free-

* "Each life is precious—unto itself—
from the tiniest insect
to the greatest tree . . .
Vigorously it must protect
its right to be—
—and to become . . ."

"To Those Who See" by Gwen Frostic

dom" and "liberty" and "self-determination" are no longer living ideas but handed down, hollow memories.

The Los Angeles Chapter of the Lithuanian American Council commemorated the occasion with a resolution of sovereignty, the text of which I would like to introduce into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

RESOLUTION

We, the Lithuanian Americans of Greater Los Angeles area, assembled on this 17th day of February, 1974 at Marshall High School, Los Angeles, in order to commemorate the Lithuanians Independence Day hereby state the following:

Whereas on February 16, 1918 the ancient Lithuanian nation after a long struggle proclaimed itself as a free democratic Republic of Lithuania and was recognized as such by all the nations and was installed as a full member of the League of Nations:

Whereas the Soviet Union after forming mutual assistance pact with Hitler and on June 15, 1940 broke all her agreements and treaties and forcibly occupied Lithuania, and even now this Stalin-Hitler pact is still in force and Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia are occupied by Russian Communist government;

Whereas the Soviet Union through a program of mass deportation, labor camps, resettlement of the peoples and importation of new settlers from Russia continues to change the population and its ethnic character and commits the genocide of this small but ancient nation;

Whereas these occupants after more than 30 years of persecutions and constant acts of terrorism were still unable to suppress the religion and aspirations of these peoples to be free as shown by the fact of the 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics under threat of severe punishment had the courage to sign a petition to the Secretary General of the United Nations charging Soviets with the religious persecutions;

And whereas there is still no free communication between Lithuania and other countries including United States. Only 5 days visits by special permits are allowed in one city in the assigned hotel which is under surveillance as not to permit to visit the country and relatives in their places of living. Furthermore, the gift packages to Lithuania are charged prohibitively high duty as to the most unfavored country and so to exploit this sad situation, therefore be it resolved

That the American of Lithuanian heritage demand that the Soviet-Hitler pact at last be terminated, permitting the Lithuanian

people to exercise their sovereign rights. We also deplore the fact that this occupation and terrorism was permitted to exist for more than 30 years and thousands upon thousands of lives were lost.

That knowing the methods and modes led by Moscow, we consider the cultural exchanges in present form as one way exchange, benefiting the red propaganda in the entire United States with failure to represent the American way of life there.

We believe that human consideration between the nations and people must take precedence over trade benefits or political concessions.

We are watching with utmost gratitude all the endeavor of President E. M. Nixon and of the members of both Houses to stop red aggression and bring peace.

We also trust that the President will recognize these facts and will take a firm stand during pending negotiations and also instruct his representatives in Security Conference at Geneva to do the same.

As we approach the end of the 20th Century we are ashamed that our civilization is able to tolerate conditions where police states with their slave camps and "hospitals" are allowed to exist.

We beg all the freedom loving peoples to unite and use their means to repeal the brutality rule over peoples and nations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, February 27, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Whatever is true, and honorable, and just, and pure, and lovely, and gracious . . . think about these things.—Philippians 4: 8.

O God, our Father, amid the difficulties of these disturbing days, we turn to Thee seeking the quiet peace of Thy healing presence. In Thy strength we would be made strong, with Thy wisdom we would be made wise, and by Thy love we would be made loving, too.

As we enter into the portal of Lent and live through this period of prayer and self-denial, give us grace to accept the call to moral discipline the mind to develop inner life of the spirit and the desire to increase our faith in Thee which will enable us to lead our Nation in the ways of peace and justice and good will.

"God save America 'mid all her splendors;

Save her from pride and from luxury.
Enthroned in her heart the unseen and
and eternal;

Right be her might and the truth
make her free."

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.

APPOINTMENT TO TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT BOARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a), Public Law 92-484,

the Chair appoints as a member of the Technology Assessment Board the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Esch, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR LOANS TO SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS AFFECTED BY THE ENERGY CRISIS

(Mr. EVINS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, urgently needed, to aid and assist American small business concerns affected by the present energy crisis. This proposed legislation is being cosponsored by every member of the House Committee on Small Business—19 in number—and by Representative ALBERT H. QUIE.

Specifically, the bill provides for amendment of the Small Business Act to authorize financial assistance to small businessmen who are seriously and adversely affected by the shortage of fuel or raw or processed materials resulting from the energy crisis.

The permanent Select Committee on Small Business of the House has for a period of several months investigated and studied problems involving our energy resources. With the introduction and passage of this bill, our committee believes some relief to American small business can be provided during this energy crisis period.

WHEN CAN THE AMERICAN PEOPLE EXPECT ACTION TO ELIMINATE THE BLOCKS-LONG GASOLINE LINES?

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, from all evidence and data available to me, it has become obvious that unless major alterations are made immediately in the FEO gasoline allocation program, the State of Maryland will again in March be at the low end of the stick in terms of getting its fair share of available gasoline supplies. To date, we have received promises and more promises that the allocation program would be adjusted, and that additional factors would be cranked into the allocation program. Promises are simply not adequate. In the words of the poet, we still have "miles to go," assuming of course that there is enough fuel to take us there.

We have been told, time and time again, that the system FEO has established can work if we all cooperate and be patient. The public and the Congress has been patient to the extreme.

I must pose a question to FEO. When can the American people expect definitive action to eliminate the blocks-long gasoline lines?

If the allocation system cannot be made to work, then it, and perhaps the FEO itself, should be scrapped.

AN ATTEMPT TO CONTROL EXCESSIVE FEDERAL SPENDING AND OTHER GOVERNMENT POLICIES SHOULD BE MADE

(Mr. ARMSTRONG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, unless Congress enacts a further extension of the so-called Economic Stabilization Act, wage-price controls will soon expire.

This expiration should be a cause for national celebration.