

Mark G. Williamson Gary F. Wines  
William J. Williamson Charles D. Wise  
David L. Willis Larry V. Wise  
Cornell A. Wilson, Jr. Merton T. Witham  
Eugene S. Wilson, Jr. Donald E. Wolf  
Larry S. Wilson Thomas V. Wolf  
Edward D. Wilt Douglas K. Wood

Douglas L. Wood Steven C. Wry  
Johnny A. Wood Stanley G.  
Michael S. Woodson Wylazowski  
John A. Woodward Patrick D. Wynn  
Larry K. Worthington Stephen M. Yoakem  
Lee A. Wright Stephen T. York  
Roger J. Wright Paul M. Young, Jr.

Robert L. Young Paul E. Ziegler, Jr.  
Stewart G. Young Robert R. Zimmerman  
Kenneth W. Zebal Andrew D. Zinn  
Joseph M. Zelmetz David A. Zucker  
George E. Zhookoff

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### PRESIDENT NOTES 165TH ANNIVERSARY OF LINCOLN'S BIRTH

#### HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, each year throngs of Americans and foreign tourists in Washington pay tribute to our Nation's most revered President, Abraham Lincoln. No visit to the Nation's Capital is complete without stopping at the impressive Lincoln Memorial.

As many of our Presidents have done before him, Richard Nixon also paused on February 12 to honor this great American and most famous citizen of my State of Illinois.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include President Nixon's tribute delivered at a wreath-laying ceremony at the Lincoln Memorial on the 165th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth:

#### REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT A WREATH-LAYING CEREMONY ON THE 165TH ANNIVERSARY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S BIRTH

All of the distinguished guests on the platform and ladies and gentlemen and our guests who are listening on radio and television:

As I was reading about the Lincoln Memorial before coming down here this morning, I found that of all the great historical sights in the Washington area, the Lincoln Memorial is visited more often than any other by far.

As a matter of fact, I have learned, I will say to Mr. Walker of the Park Service, that the Memorial has been visited so often and has received so much wear and tear that it perhaps is going to have to have some substantial work done to build it back up so that it can take all the traffic.

The question that I would like to address briefly this morning on Lincoln's birthday is why, why is Lincoln, of all the American Presidents, more revered not only in America but in the world?

There are several reasons that come to mind. He freed the slaves. He saved the Union. He died of an assassin's bullet just at the height of his career at the end of the War between the States.

Then there are other factors which come to mind: The Lincoln character which has been described in so many, many hundreds of books, much better than I can describe it in a few words, the humility, the humor, the feeling and kindness for people, but perhaps more than anything else the strength, the poise under pressure.

When we examine the American Presidents, it is quite clear that no President in history has been more vilified or was more vilified during the time he was President than Lincoln.

Those who knew him, his secretaries, have written that he was very deeply hurt by what was said about him and drawn about him, but on the other hand, Lincoln had that great strength of character never to display it, always to stand tall and strong

and firm no matter how harsh or unfair the criticism might be.

These elements of greatness, of course, inspired us all today. The particular factor that I would like to address, however, is one that Mr. Whitaker has alluded to in his gracious introduction. It has to do with Lincoln's vision about America's role in the world.

What we sometimes forget is that Abraham Lincoln was a world statesman at the time that America was not a world power. Here on these walls are inscribed many of his very familiar usages. One from the second Inaugural comes to mind when Lincoln said, "To do all that we may to achieve and to cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and between all Nations." This is Lincoln 110 years ago.

When America, torn by civil strife, and when America, even after it was united with both the North and South working together to build a greater country could not and would not even play a great role in the world for years and years to come, and yet Lincoln with that mystical sense of destiny and vision saw it all ahead when he said, "Ours is earth's last, best hope."

And now we come to today, 110 years later. Even Lincoln would have marveled if he were living today. This Nation now, the strongest Nation in the world, the richest Nation by far in the world and a Nation greatly respected all over the world, and the question he would have asked, as we must ask ourselves is, how will history look back on our time? What did we do with our strength? What did we do with our wealth? Did we use it only for ourselves, or did we recognize as Lincoln recognized that we had a destiny far beyond this great Nation, looking out over the whole wide world.

These thoughts come to mind that Lincoln might well have advised us: One, that in this period of time that America was never petulant simply because we do not get our way in the world councils every time, that America did not bully weaker nations simply because we were stronger, that America always used its strength, certainly in this century at least, used its strength to defend freedom and never to destroy it, to keep the peace and to defend the peace and never to break it.

I think Lincoln also would have had this admonition to his fellow Americans on such an occasion as this in this particular period in our history. He would have hoped that America with its strength and its wealth would not turn away from greatness despite the fact that some other nations in the world turn inward failing to assume their responsibilities for building a peaceful world.

Lincoln would have said, a great nation, a strong nation, a rich nation and a great people will use their strength and their wealth to build a world in which peace and freedom can survive for themselves and for others as well. This, I think, is the Lincoln heritage for today. It is the Lincoln admonition for tomorrow and I would trust for the next generation and perhaps for the next century.

I do not suggest all of this in any sense that America wants to dominate any other country, because we do not. I do not suggest this because America wants strength simply because of the jingoistic idea that we must be number one. That is not the reason.

I do suggest it because I know, as Lincoln would have known, that in today's world without America and its strength and its will and its respect and its determination, peace and freedom will not survive in the world. What a great challenge for a great people.

I conclude simply by paraphrasing what Lincoln said so many years ago so much more eloquently, we could meanly lose what is mankind's last best hope for peace and freedom, but we could also nobly save it.

Abraham Lincoln, who saved the Union, would say to us today, let this great Union, North, South, East and West, now save the cause of peace and freedom for the whole world.

Thank you.

### DISTURBED CHILDREN: THE RIGHT TO LEARN

#### Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, in my continuing effort to inform my colleagues of the need to provide meaningful Federal resources to educate and treat our handicapped children, I am inserting an article from the Washington Post of February 22, 1974, by George F. Will of the successes of special schools in educating schizophrenics, psychotics, and autistics.

Beleaguered parents trying desperately to find education for their handicapped children have been turned away because State laws refused to provide educational services to those they considered uneducable. Now, after some successful class action suits, States are being forced to acknowledge the basic right of all children, including those children who are severely handicapped, to publicly supported education. What is developing is a constitutional principle that says that basic State services, like education, must be afforded citizens despite the expense involved. As Mr. Will points out:

An insufficiency of funds will not be allowed to bear more heavily on handicapped children than on normal children.

I am hopeful that the Developmental Disabilities Act of 1970, which is presently being considered by the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, will recognize these same concepts and assure that the new Developmental Disabilities Act of 1974 provides for a full range of services to all children who are severely handicapped due to a medically determinable physical or mental impairment.

The article follows:

### DISTURBED CHILDREN: THE RIGHT TO LEARN (By George F. Will)

New York.—Appearing anywhere, the advertisement would have been jolting. Ap-

pearing in the New Yorker magazine, among advertisements for Japanese liquor and Florida condominiums and limited edition porcelain birds, it had special impact.

It featured a shattering picture of a sloe-eyed boy in a straitjacket. The large print asked: "What do you do with a 9-year-old schizophrenic?" And the text read: "Lock him away? Sentence him to life imprisonment in a mental institution? There has to be a better answer. And we think we've found it."

They have found it, and in doing so they have furthered a constitutional revolution for millions of young citizens. The people who have found it are the men and women of the Manhattan School for Seriously Disturbed Children. The school is an inspired and inspiring example of how to give "equal protection of the law" to the kind of children the law rarely protects.

The success of this and a few similar schools in educating schizophrenics, psychotics and autistics is giving momentum to a series of "right to education" class action suits. States are being forced to acknowledge a basic right: the right of mentally ill or retarded children to publicly supported education. The suits challenge the practice of excluding such children from public education programs.

For example, until recently a state law relieved the Pennsylvania school system of the obligation to educate children certified as "uneducable." Then an organization representing retarded children sued, arguing that the "equal protection" clause of the Constitution requires that when a state offers a service, like education, to an entire class, like children, it may not arbitrarily exclude any portion of that class, like retarded children.

The crux of the matter is: What exclusion is arbitrary? Some state laws stipulate that the state has no responsibility for children "unable mentally or physically to profit from attendance at school." The danger is that suits on behalf of handicapped children will be declared nonjusticiable for lack of "manageable standards" regarding the educational needs of the approximately 5 million such children in America.

This is where the incredibly tough (as well as tender) professionals of the Manhattan School come in. Together they and the children, in heart-rendering daily acts of patience and heroism, are demonstrating that even the most disturbed children can benefit from attendance at the right kind of school.

And if you don't think this is a heroic enterprise, look through the glass door panel as a petite teacher working with three terribly disturbed children—one hyperactive, one nearly catatonic, one just bewildered—performs the small miracle of getting them settled at a table for an orderly lunch together.

Most of the children at the school are so disturbed that they cannot cope with time and space; they cannot order their lives. Lacking such a school they would be consigned to institutions, or left at home with desperate and hopeless parents. But these children are lucky to be in New York, where public funds largely support the Manhattan School. Some of them will make enough progress—albeit excruciatingly arduous—to live as adults in the community. Meanwhile, they all live at home.

The officials at the school know that the most efficient way to advance the legal rights of handicapped children is to demonstrate that they can be helped by education. In the process, the school must show that it is not enough for the state just to provide a warehousing operation for the handicapped—a "classroom" and an untrained custodian. A ratio of one real teacher for every three pupils is necessary to meet the pupils' educational needs.

The cost per student of such education is more than the cost for normal children. But

the developing legal doctrine is that constitutional rights must be afforded citizens despite the expense involved, and an insufficiency of funds will not be allowed to bear more heavily on handicapped children than on normal children.

Some day Americans will look back on the long denial of educational rights to handicapped children with the mixture of embarrassment and incredulity that we now regard the long denial of educational rights to blacks. Thanks to the Manhattan School and others like it, that day has been hastened.

Before the school ran that jolting advertisement in The New Yorker it had run two tame and utterly ineffective advertisements picturing cute, happy, normal looking children. The advertisement picturing the bewildered, bound boy sparked a wave of interest—and some contributions. Americans seem ready to face the problem, and their responsibilities; And that, really, is why the law is changing.

#### NEW LEADERSHIP VITALLY NEEDED IN GOVERNMENT

**HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have felt for some time that it will be necessary for us to impeach Richard Nixon if our Republican colleagues are unable to persuade him to resign in the near future. Our beloved Nation simply cannot continue to tolerate the strain which is imposed upon our citizenry by the various illegal and immoral activities which have become the hallmark of the Nixon administration; we in the Congress must not follow the example of the Romans nearly 2,000 years ago who watched Nero fiddle while the city burned.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the ill effects of Watergate and the various other scandals associated with this administration will not simply disappear with the impeachment and conviction of the current resident of the White House; they will be with us for some time to come. One of the worst of these effects has been a tremendous increase in the cynicism felt by most of the public toward the people they have elected to represent them in public office. Those of us who serve in public office are aware that some of this cynicism is deserved, since there are dishonest men and women in politics, just as there are dishonest bankers, engineers, plumbers, and doctors—frankly, it would be hard to imagine an occupation which has not been used by dishonest persons to further their own interests at one time or another. The sad thing about this indiscriminate cynicism toward politicians, however, is the fact that the very persons who could do the most to improve the situation—the bright, young, honest, and idealistic men and women who demonstrated both their abilities and their concern for our country in the various humanitarian movements of the 1960's—these people are, for the most part, unwilling to involve themselves in the formal political process simply because they see it as so corrupt. And so the problem feeds upon itself: those who could best increase the quality of representation at

every level of government are generally unwilling to run for office because they do not want to be called politicians, with all the connotations that name carries with it.

Fortunately, there are some who are willing to involve themselves in the political process, regardless of what it does to their reputations, to try to work for the principles which the Founders of this country—such politicians as Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and so forth—have left us as the legacy of every American citizen. There are still those who are not satisfied with complaining about hypocrisy and deceit, who will not stop at writing letters to the editor about corruption, who feel that protesting injustice is not enough. These are the people who will be running for office themselves in the months and years to come. These are the people who keep me optimistic in what certainly is not America's finest hour.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention a few of these new leaders from time to time, as I become aware of them, in order to increase the general public awareness of their existence and, hopefully, to encourage other dedicated people to enter politics. Perhaps my modest contribution may even minutely hasten the day when "politics" will no longer be a dirty word in the mind of the average American.

One of these young patriots is Dr. David Lopez-Lee of Los Angeles, Calif. David Lopez-Lee is the Nation's only full time Mexican-American professor of public administration. He was born and raised in Boyle Heights, the barrio section of Los Angeles, and has been active for years in various community and humanitarian programs and projects. Dr. Lopez-Lee has been a counselor with the Lincoln Heights-East Los Angeles Teen Post, research director with Project Arriba and with a local delinquency prevention program, director of a food caravan to the Delano farmworkers, and chairman of the Committee for a Better Los Angeles.

David Lopez-Lee received his Ph. D. from UCLA in 1969 and currently is a professor at the University of Southern California. He serves as a consultant to the Association of Mexican-American Editors and is general editor of the Journal of Comparative Cultures. He is the author of at least 36 published articles that I know of, and is widely respected as an expert in several diverse fields. In the course of his work he has been granted security clearance by the U.S. Government. And to top it all off David Lopez-Lee is one of the hardest working individuals it has ever been my pleasure to meet.

Dr. Lopez-Lee is currently in the middle of a very unusual campaign for a seat on the Los Angeles City Council—unusual in several respects, but perhaps most of all for the fact that he has very little money and is hoping to win, therefore, not by the usual billboards and computer mass mailings, but rather by personally visiting and talking with as many of the individual residents of Los Angeles's 14th Councilmanic District as he possibly can. He has already visited literally thousands of these citizens, and—while I realize that it is hard to



beat opponents who can outspend you several times—I have seen Dr. Lopez-Lee's dedication, and I fully expect him soon to be sitting on the council.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that many of the citizens of Los Angeles are Mexican-American, including about two-thirds of the residents of the 14th District, yet none of the 15 members of the city council has been a Mexican-American since our esteemed colleague and my own good friend the Honorable Mr. ROYBAL was elected to Congress more than a decade ago. Dr. Lopez-Lee's election will therefore be an inspiration and a cause for celebration throughout the currently unrepresented Mexican-American community of Los Angeles.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is essential that we reach the other outstanding young potential leaders throughout the country who are not currently involved in politics and persuade them of the need for their talents and dedication in public office. Without their active participation in the people's business of government we would soon see the moral collapse of our Nation. I am sure that we have all heard the 179-year-old line, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." That sentence rings as true today as it ever has, although I am sure that Edmund Burke would not mind if I reflected today's increased sensitivity in one area by amending his statement slightly to read that the only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men and women to do nothing.

I hope, in the midst of the seemingly endless discussion of Watergate, that we will all take a little time to encourage good men and women against despair, for in these desperate times they are sorely needed here in the Halls of Congress and throughout the country at every level of government. And perhaps, out of the ashes of Watergate, there will arise the phoenix of a new group of office-holders, honest, idealistic, and able to overcome the cynicism that threatens to tear our country apart.

#### GREAT AMERICANS FOR 1973

### HON. SAM NUNN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, as many of my colleagues are aware, Dixie Business magazine recently named Senator and Mrs. Herman E. Talmadge to receive its distinguished "Great Americans for 1973" award.

In the winter edition of Dixie Business which honors the Talmadges, editor Hubert F. Lee has included the letter of a 12-year-old Indiana girl who has selected Senator TALMADGE as her great American. Her ambition is to be a U.S. Senator and she has chosen as her model, Senator HERMAN TALMADGE.

I ask unanimous consent to have her letter printed in the RECORD.

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

THE EDITORS: Since November is the month

of Thanksgiving, I would like to give my thanks to the great State of Georgia.

I am a girl, 12 years old, and in the 7th grade and my ambition is to become a U.S. senator.

In the past few months I have managed to write to all 100 U.S. senators. I think they are all wonderful and love them all, but a few are exceptional. The greatest exception of all is why I'm writing.

I would like to give my thanks to the people of Georgia for having the good taste and good judgment to elect Sen. Herman E. Talmadge to the U.S. Senate.

I am not too young to see that people all over the country are losing faith in our government. I believe it's because most of the people haven't had a chance to get to know the really great men—the honest, good men who love their country with all their hearts—men like Sen. Talmadge who can be admired by the younger generation and can give them inspiration, not shame and bad examples.

I will pray for God to bless the people of Georgia for giving Sen. Talmadge to our government, but mostly for giving him to our people. Now I have a dream.

JAMIE DIANE SCHAEFER,  
Crown Point, Ind.

#### SET IT STRAIGHT

### HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, the last of four editorials by Mr. William K. Mollenhour from the Warsaw, Ind., Times-Union, which I want to include in the RECORD is entitled "Set It Straight." It attempts to summarize and to rectify the disproportionate emphasis which has recently been placed on actions committed by some members of the executive branch. I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

#### SET IT STRAIGHT

We have devoted this entire week, editorially, to try to set the record straight, place the proper weight—not hysteria—upon the incidents that have caused us so much distress in the past year. We believe it to be of vital importance that the American people quit acting like spectators in a Roman Coliseum, gleefully watching Christians being fed to the lions. That is exactly what we have been doing for more than a year. Our thirst for blood and scandal is insatiable. It has colored our judgment of what is real, what is unreal, what is important and what is political film-flam.

What is perhaps worse, we have applied a double standard to our judgment of events and people, excusing some while crucifying others. We have sold the accomplishments of our nation down the river while nit-picking at nonessentials. The rise of the dollar abroad while we were apparently having troubles at home, proves foreigners have a better opinion of us than do we ourselves.

It is a sorry state of affairs for which each of us must bear a portion of the blame. At first we enjoyed the show. It is only human nature to be a bit gleeful as the mighty fall. Then we sickened of the long drawn Watergate hearings. The storm subsided momentarily and it appeared we had crawled back into our heads and gotten our minds and values in order. Then something happened to 18 minutes of tape out of hours, days and months of tape. By the resulting uproar, revival of indictment, impeachment and resignation talk, you would have thought someone swiped the remaining gold at Fort Knox! Led by some Democrats seeking political

advantage and some weak-kneed Republicans trying to follow the crowd, cheered on by television commentators, we again joined the wolf pack in full cry after someone's jugular!

We conveniently ignored the fact that other saints such as Ralph Nader's attorney had become sinners also, that during the same period of time our nation found peace for the first time in a decade, that our balance of payments was brought back into line, that the good offices of the United States stopped the fighting in the Mideast.

We whooped it up in the Coliseum and lived it up at home, fascinated by the public washing of our dirty linen, while the energy shortage crept up on us. When we, instead of the mighty, feel the pinch, we holler.

Our effort to review the real state of our nation this week has not in any way intended to excuse anyone or anything, but rather to put the state of the nation into proper perspective. This we must do, for to lose faith is to lose our way of life and our freedom.

We've been hypnotized by the snake charmers until we almost forgot that for all its faults and failures, The United States is the greatest nation on earth, the best place to live and our system really does work. Imagine trying to raise such a ruckus in Russia!

#### THE 56TH ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

### HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the prayer in the House of Representatives this morning was offered by Rev. Philip Tammaru, the pastor of the Estonian Evangelical Lutheran Congregation in Seabrook, N.J. This occasion is particularly significant since yesterday, February 24, marked the 56th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia.

Approximately 300 Estonians reside in the town of Seabrook, which I am privileged to represent. Most of them are employed by the great Seabrook Farms—one of the largest vegetable producing companies in the country. I am greatly impressed by the sincerity of these people. Through years of hard work, they have raised their families and have contributed substantially to the development of the community. We can learn a great deal from these people. Their love of country and their respect for law and order is outstanding.

We recall Estonian Independence Day each year to reaffirm our friendship and support of the people living in Estonia for whom freedom is both a memory and a dream. The Estonians proclaimed their independence after the tsarist government fell, and from 1918 until 1940, when their country fell to the Communist forces, they enjoyed a period of freedom and progress. The Estonian people were able to enjoy their freedom for merely two decades. Those people are still among the captive peoples of communism, and this great day in their history cannot be celebrated in their homeland, because of the tyranny of their Communist rulers.

The resistance to Communist domination that these courageous people display

should serve to inspire free people everywhere. Dictators can enslave people, but they cannot destroy a people's spirit or desire for freedom.

The heritage of the Estonian people is indeed one of which to be proud. They are a strong, hard-working, freedom-loving nation who have always defended the dignity of man and his right to live in a free society.

The Estonian people, who have known freedom and slavery before, will know freedom again. I can only believe that history is on the side of the just and that one day a free and independent Estonia will prevail again. We must dedicate ourselves to continued efforts to see that freedom is restored to those proud people and all other captives of communism.

At this time, I urge the Congress of the United States to join with Estonians everywhere in saluting their 56th anniversary of freedom and to commend them for their great contribution to the growth of our country.

#### MEDIA RESPONDS TO THE ENERGY CRISIS

#### HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the severity of the energy crisis is particularly apparent to my constituents in Rhode Island. Edwin W. Pfeiffer, vice president and general manager of WPRI-TV, Providence, conceived and launched an awareness program involving industry, media, and citizens of all ages in Rhode Island and nearby Massachusetts.

Recognizing the appeal of hand symbols such as the black power clenched fist, the Churchill "V" for victory—later the peace symbol in the Vietnam war, Mr. Pfeiffer had WPRI-TV Art Director Joseph Rezendes adapt the three-fingers-up hand signal to a stylized device to be used on all the "I am an energy saver" campaign material.

Fifty thousand copies of an illustrated 16-page booklet filled with timely information and tips on energy conservation was combined with colorful red, white, and blue bumper stickers, buttons, and window display cards to kickoff a massive public awareness campaign over WPRI-TV. Prizes were offered to those displaying bumper stickers and window cards, and the effort received enthusiastic acceptance.

WPRI-TV advertisers solicited by Mr. Pfeiffer shared in the cost and acted as distribution centers for the material.

The "I am an energy saver" campaign is a laudable example of media taking the initiative in enlisting the support of business and the people. It is Mr. Pfeiffer's hope, and indeed, mine, that other broadcasters throughout the country will follow WPRI-TV's leadership and get behind the "I am an energy saver" campaign.

#### SENATOR EASTLAND CALLS FOR STRONG RESERVE PROGRAM

#### Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, the senior Senator from my home State, Senator EASTLAND, recently gave the principal address at the dedication of the new U.S. Army Reserve Center in Jackson, Miss. In the course of his remarks, Senator EASTLAND made a very strong case for the continuation of a viable Reserve component program. He called for public recognition and support of the National Guard and Reserves for the important role they have played in America's national defense in the past and the important contributions they have to make in the future. Because of the significance and timeliness of Senator EASTLAND's remarks, I commend them to my colleagues in the House:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JAMES O. EASTLAND

(Dedication Ceremonies, U.S. Army Reserve Center, Jackson, Miss., February 3, 1974)

Governor Waller, my colleagues in the Congress, General Pepke, General Woody, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

It is a high honor for me to participate in today's ceremonies dedicating this new and modern armory, which has been designed and constructed to aid the mission of the U.S. Army Reserve in Jackson.

This splendid building which was erected at a cost of \$606,000 will provide excellent training facilities for the 300 officers and men of the following army reserve units: 3390th USAR School; 365th Service and Supply Battalion; 894th Quartermaster Company.

On this fine occasion I would like to share some thoughts with you on American security—and on our active—guard—and reserve forces.

What is the proper approach to the defense of our Nation?

In my view—the only approach was outlined by the new Federal Energy Administrator with reference to the fuel shortages which are facts of life today. Administrator Bill Simon said that we should hope for the best—and prepare for the worst.

Let's apply that sound concept to the world—not as we would wish it to be—but as it is.

Peace is the best—peace that reaches around this small and fragile planet—in our time—and for all time.

The worst is so terrible that the mind wants to turn away from contemplating the certain result of nuclear warfare.

Woodrow Wilson stated the desire and the goal of every American in these words: "There must be—not a balance of power—but a community of power—not organized rivalries—but an organized common peace."

Sadly—Wilson's eloquent plea remains a dream. In 1974—on this earth—there is a balance of power. There are organized and dangerous rivalries. There is no organized common peace.

In the face of those harsh facts of life I submit that we have no choice except to structure our defense to hasten the day of the best—and to insure that the worst is never visited on mankind.

I—along with each of you—welcome what is styled detente between us and those who choose to make themselves our adversaries. I applaud and support any action that moves us for confrontation to consultation.

I—along with each of you—want us to seek solutions at the conference table—not on the battlefield.

Detente is far better than hot or cold war. It is a hopeful step toward the goal that men sought for ages—and that America has pursued for almost two centuries.

Detente—however—in our context of facts of life—is not an instant answer to the problems of the world.

It has not stopped the bitter fighting in Indochina.

It did not prevent further bloody conflict in the Middle East—a war that brought us to the edge of yet another confrontation with the Soviet Union.

It has not removed the Russian missile submarines which are on-station off our coasts—targeted against our cities and installations.

We live—day by day—with danger in many forms. One sensible step we take is to insure our lives and property. Every person in this audience owns insurance policies—and no person present can afford to be without them.

I suggest that our Defense Establishment is the largest and most expensive insurance policy in history. It costs an astronomical sum of money. But—again—we cannot afford to be without it because we are insuring the right to liberty—the right to life itself.

Now—what form does our huge insurance policy take?

We are dedicating a part of it here today. It protects us in the skies—on and under the seas—and on the land.

It is made of strong—versatile—balanced military forces in the United States and in strategic locations across the earth.

What we need—indeed—what we must have is a top quality team composed of manned and Ready Active—Guard—and Reserve Forces.

None of us deny that top quality costs money. When we speak of defense we are talking about billions of dollars.

But—in our consideration of facts—let's look at military trends in the recent past.

Since fiscal year 1968 the Army has been reduced by six and two-thirds divisions.

The Navy has been reduced from 976 to 523 ships—and—for the first time—the number of major surface combatants of the Soviet Union exceeds that of the United States.

With respect to air power—there are 47 fewer fighter squadrons than 5 years ago.

Military manpower has declined from 3.6 million men to 2.2 million. That cut puts us 400,000 men below the pre-war level.

Listen to my close friend—Senator John McClellan—who chairs our Appropriations Committee—and I quote: "today—the defense share of the U.S. gross national product—of the labor force—and of the Federal budget is lower than at any time since 1950." Unquote.

I am convinced that—between John McClellan and our own John Stennis—defense dollars will be properly used to pay for the insurance policy our people deserve.

I will support every effort launched to modernize and strengthen our Active Forces with special emphasis on 3 critical items:

First: We must continue with our programs to increase the accuracy of our missiles.

Second: Our Trident new generation submarine must go forward on schedule—and—

Third: We must develop and put in service the B-1 bomber to replace our aging B-52's.

Now—let me turn to our Guard and Reserve Forces.

Earlier this month, the Brookings Institution, an organization which has considerable prestige, issued a report urging that we reduce our Active Forces by 62,000 men and our Reserve Forces by 309,000 men. This, the report stated, would result in a saving of



\$618 million for the Active Forces and \$628 million for our Reserve Forces. According to the Brookings Institution, we could save all this money without in any way impairing our military capabilities.

In the case of the major cut recommended in our Reserve strength, the study argued that the value of a large military reserve had become questionable because of the fact that in any conflict between NATO and the Soviet forces, the issue would almost certainly be decided long before major reserves could be brought into play.

The prospect of saving a billion and a half dollars, I know, sounds attractive. I am personally in favor of examining our military budget critically and effecting savings wherever they can be effected without impairing the national security. But I am strongly opposed to the massive cuts in our Reserve Forces recommended by the Brookings Institution. The Brookings study, I am afraid, simply fails to appreciate the many different ways in which a large—and Ready Reserve, with many different capabilities, enhances our security and helps to keep the peace.

The purpose of our reserve forces is not simply to help us meet the demands of a crisis confrontation with the Soviet forces on the central European front.

It can be taken for granted that this administration, or any administration that will succeed it, will do its best to stay out of limited war situations similar to the Vietnam situation. On the other hand, we have to face up to the possibility that a combination of circumstances may involve our vital national interests so irresistibly that—against our will—we may again find ourselves fighting a limited war in some part of the world. The worldwide alert of American forces at the time of the recent Arab-Israeli conflict was a somber reminder of the possibility.

To prevent such a confrontation from developing into a total war situation, it may be necessary over a period of several weeks or even months for all the NATO countries to beef up their military establishment in the central European sector: the inability to do so might conceivably bring about the world conflict we are trying to avoid by persuading the Soviets that we do not have the guts or the determination to resist them.

Going beyond this, it has always been a fundamental rule of the art of diplomacy that, to deal effectively with determined adversaries, one has to have a military establishment strong enough to discourage them from engaging in any adventures. This is what Churchill meant when he said, "we arm to parley."

This basic rule has, if anything, been reinforced by the history of our dealings with the Soviet empire since World War II. Indeed, in the world in which we live, an adequate defense establishment can have the deterring and stabilizing capability essential to the keeping of the peace—while an inadequate defense establishment is an invitation to disaster. And when I talk about an adequate defense establishment, I mean a defense establishment in being and not one that may be created at a future date.

This is all the more imperative because, in the case of the Soviet Union, we are dealing with an adversary who is not merely determined and aggressive but who maintains the most massive armed forces in peacetime history, in a state of instant readiness.

Let me give you a few facts which have got to be pondered before we start cutting back our active and reserve forces.

We have, under the SALT agreement, conceded to the Soviets a 3 to 2 advantage in numbers of ICBMs and a 3 to 2 advantage, roughly, in Polaris submarines.

While the matter of "throw weight" was not covered by SALT, it is generally conceded that their missile force has approximately a 4 to 1 advantage in payload capacity.

In Central Europe the Soviet military buildup, still in progress, certainly offers no encouragement to peace of mind. A white paper put out by the West German Defense Ministry of January 14 points out that, against NATO forces totaling 29 divisions and 6,200 tanks in Western Europe, the Warsaw Pact has 64 divisions and 17,000 tanks in Eastern Europe—that is, East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary—backed up by another 30 divisions and 6,800 tanks at the ready just inside the Russian frontier. In combat aircraft the Soviets are credited with at least a 2 to 1 advantage over NATO in that area.

Since no nation in the Western world could possibly think of attacking the Soviet Union, we have got to ask ourselves what the Soviets are doing, or what they intend to do, with all of these divisions and tanks and aircraft. And before the free world reduces its forces any further, we have got to ask ourselves what impact such a reduction might have on the already precarious deterrent capability of our sadly out-gunned armed forces.

There is absolutely no doubt in my own mind that if we ever cut our active and reserve forces by the figures recommended by the Brookings Report, we would be seriously undercutting Secretary of State Kissinger's efforts to preserve the peace while defending the free world, and we would be encouraging the extremist elements in the Kremlin.

Big nations should never be too proud to learn from small nations. When it comes to the importance of large combat-ready reserves, I think that all of us have a lot to learn from the example of Israel. The Israeli army is essentially a reserve army which can be mobilized on 48-hour notice.

On three occasions now the existence of this Reserve Army had made the difference between victory and total defeat for the Israeli people. And I truthfully don't think it's exaggerating one bit to say that the existence and effectiveness of our own reserve forces may be just as important in the future to our own survival as a nation.

Consequently, the men of our reserve units, simply by belonging to their units and attending to their training, are making a vital contribution to the security of our nation, and the peace of the world. And I say to the critics: Let's not undercut them. Let us, on the contrary, strengthen them. Let us provide them with ample supplies of modern weapons. Let us find the funds to enhance their training and increase their combat readiness. But let us above all give our reserve forces the recognition and public support to which they are entitled.

My friends—as we dedicate this splendid facility—I suggest that we rededicate ourselves to the labor of transforming detente into supervised disarmament—of following the tentative steps we have taken with Russia and China along the road which leads us to a just and lasting peace.

Until we attain that great goal—I want this nation we love to maintain strong and ready active—guard—and reserve forces to guarantee the right of every American to rest easy in his bed by night—and to walk about by day without fear.

Thank you so much.

#### ESTONIA INDEPENDENCE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, February 24 marks the 56th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia, which is now occupied by

the Soviet Union. This occasion should remind us that everyone is not able to enjoy the freedoms which we consider so important.

Despite Soviet occupation, the people of Estonia, an area the size of New Jersey, Connecticut, Delaware, and Rhode Island combined, have continued to have a strong national identity. An exceptionally high educational level and an original and colorful folklore are two of the manifestations of this strong identity. The desire of the Estonian people for self-determination and freedom of speech remains strong.

The continued colonization of Estonia, like the case of Alexander Solzhenitsyn, should make us appreciate the freedoms we cherish and reaffirm our commitment to self-determination for all people. We all hope that someday the people of Estonia will be able to enjoy the basic human freedoms.

#### PROPOSED PANAMA CANAL GIVE-AWAY CAUSES CONCERN

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, concern is rising over a proposal by the administration that greatly affects the Panama Canal and U.S. control of the canal.

Secretary of State Henry Kissinger has signed an agreement in principle with Panama, and many fear that this could lead eventually to a give-away of U.S. ownership, sovereignty and control of the Panama Canal. I strongly oppose any surrender of sovereignty and control over this important facility and the Canal Zone.

An article written by Mr. Robert S. Allen, a columnist with the Publishers-Hall Syndicate, and published in numerous newspapers across the Nation, including the Knoxville Journal, very clearly describes the concern and fears of many people over the administration's proposals for the Panama Canal.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place the article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

#### PROPOSED PANAMA CANAL GIVE-AWAY CAUSES CONCERN

(By Robert S. Allen)

WASHINGTON, February 16, 1974.—The Administration is unhappily running into a hornet's nest of vehement congressional opposition to the plan to give up U.S. control and operation of the strategic Panama Canal and Zone.

So widespread and intense is this bipartisan hostility that there isn't a chance this Congress will approve the scheme.

As far as the overwhelming majority of this Congress is concerned, that fanfare "agreement in principle" ceremoniously signed by Secretary Kissinger in Panama last week isn't worth the paper it's written on. That grandstanding event may have made headlines in ultra-liberal publications, but it also triggered a storm of irate denunciation in Congress—particularly in the House.

Significant highlights of this barrage of disapproval are:

\* \* \* Introduction of three resolutions vigorously demanding there be no "surrender of U.S. sovereignty" over the Canal and Zone "except by treaty authorized by the Congress and duly ratified by the United States"—in other words, no give-away by White House edict or State Department fagaling.

Sponsors of these militant declarations are three leading legislators who have long been directly interested in the Panama problem—Representative John Murphy, D-N.Y., senior member of the Panama Canal Subcommittee for 12 years; Mrs. Leonor Sullivan, D-Mo., chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; and Daniel Flood, D-Pa., Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman.

Not a single member of the House has said anything in favor of the hooped "agreement in principle." In striking contrast, there has been an anvil chorus of harsh bipartisan dissent. Foremost among the castigators are Representatives Gene Snyder, R-Ky., Joe L. Evins, D-Tenn., Frank Stubblefield, D-Ky., John Rarick, D-La.

With two exceptions, there has been a similar silence in the Senate. The exceptions are Senators Edward Kennedy, D-Mass., and Gale McGee, D-Wyo.—both noted for their fervent internationalism and pronounced penchant for supporting large-scale foreign aid and other give-aways.

Graphically illustrative of their self-righteous attitude was Kennedy's statement that while he is "conscious of the controversy surrounding every aspect" of this highly explosive issue, he nevertheless feels that the "era which produced the original treaty has long since passed; that in today's world that treaty is an embarrassing anachronism."

#### PLAYING WITH FIRE

Representative Murphy, West Point graduate and former chairman of the Panama Canal Subcommittee, flatly challenged this contention with the blunt warning:

That the iron-fisted dictatorial regime of Panama strongman Omar Torrijos and the leftist cabal surrounding him is highly unstable and its continuance in power extremely uncertain. Says Murphy, "It might be overthrown tomorrow."

Two "plots" are underway to oust this military dictatorship—the 59th government Panama has had since 1903. Notes Murphy sardonically, "Some of them lasted only a few days; a turbulent history in anyone's book. During the same period, the U.S. had 12 Presidents."

So shaky is Torrijos' regime that to avert a military coup, he has sought to make a deal with ex-President Arnulfo Arias—whom Torrijos deposed in seizing power. The dictator proposed to restore Arias as president if he would support Torrijos' continuance as strongman—indignantly rejected by Arias with the message, "I will only return to Panama when you leave the country permanently."

The Torrijos regime is deeply involved in the "narcotics traffic."

There can be no new treaty with Panama without direct consideration by the House of Representatives. Any attempt by the Administration to bypass the House will be vehemently resisted. Declared Murphy on this key point:

"The authority of the House of Representatives is required before real and other property paid for from appropriated funds is given up or conveyed by treaty as the executive branch apparently is seeking to do in the proposed treaty with Panama. I am firmly serving notice that it is the unswerving resolve of those of us in the House who will insist that this body play a proper role vested in us by Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States."

Echoing this blunt challenge, Representative Gene Snyder, a ranking member of the Merchant Marine Committee, declared:

"The striped-pant dreamers of the State Department apparently are willing to turn over control of the Panama Canal despite an unbroken history of governmental instability in the Republic of Panama. The American people will not stand for any outright ceding of the Canal to Panama, so the State Department is in the process of doing that in a series of piecemeal concessions."

But as Representative Daniel Flood remarked forebodingly:

"If they are looking for trouble, they will get it—and plenty of it. The Administration may propose a give-away Panama treaty, but we will do the disposing—in the wastebasket, where it belongs."

#### MY HERO

### HON. ANDREW J. HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, once in a great while a truly touching tribute emerges above the hundreds directed to a famous person upon his death.

While Murray Chotiner was in the hospital fighting for his life, his stepdaughter thought to cheer him up by showing him a composition she had prepared on October 13, 1973, for her Flint Hill High School English class. The teacher had asked the students to write a paper on their hero. She passed up the usual heroes who occupy the thoughts of the average 16-year-old and wrote the tribute quoted below. Her grief at this untimely death did not prevent her from reading it at the funeral services which included President and Mrs. Richard Nixon and many other distinguished persons and family friends:

#### MR HERO

I have sort of an odd hero. His name is Murray Chotiner—my dad!

Actually he's my stepfather, but I consider him my real father and hero.

He's had an interesting life, and has been active in many things. I could ask him just about anything on any subject and he'd give me a very logical answer—or very wise advice.

The subject I think he knows most about, besides law, is politics.

Politics is one subject that interests me greatly, and I hope to get involved with it someday. He's been very involved in politics, and it is through him that I've been able to see what it's all about. And the fact that he's been in such close contact with the government, that he knows what is going on inside the government—is also important.

Since he and my Mom have been married, I've been active in the Presidential Election, local elections, the Inaugural and, most important to me, my job on the "Hill" last Summer.

I've learned so much in the past two years of my life that, I know, will be an asset to me someday.

My father has also been a long time friend, counselor and campaign aide to President Nixon; and I know he will defend and do anything in his power to advise and aid him—no matter what happens.

My dad has very many great traits about his personality. He is fun! And he is fair, in everything and anything—even when I get in trouble and he sets a punishment for me).

He's honest, and I know if he were ever in an investigation for any reason, no one could possibly find any bit of dishonesty.

His secretaries say that though he's hard to work for sometimes, he is the fairest and most honest man that they have ever worked for.

These to me are his two best traits.

The only bad thing that I can think of to say about him is that my dad has a very bad memory, especially for names! And if he didn't have my Mom around at social functions, he'd really have problems!

As you've probably gathered from this paper, I respect my dad greatly. He is my hero, and I think he is one of the best men around!!

Mr. Speaker, I join with the many who are saddened at his passing from this earthly life. His accomplishments in his chosen profession of the law and his deep interest and participation in the field of politics will not be soon forgotten. However, I believe Murray Chotiner would be preferred to be remembered by his friends and associates as his family remembers him—a loved and respected father and husband—and a fair and honest person.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of the Lithuanian Independence Day, I would like to enter into the Record a resolution unanimously adopted by the Phoenix Chapter of the Lithuanian-American Community of the U.S.A., Inc. It is as follows:

#### RESOLUTION

We, Lithuanian-Americans of Phoenix, Arizona, at a meeting held on February 17, 1974, commemorating the 723rd anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian Kingdom in 1251 and the 56th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania in 1918, unanimously adopt the following resolution:

Whereas in 1918 the Republic of Lithuania was established by the free exercise of the right of self-determination by the Lithuanian people; and

Whereas by the Peace Treaty of July 12, 1920 Soviet Russia officially recognized the sovereignty and independence of Lithuania and voluntarily renounced forever all sovereign rights and claims by Russia over Lithuanian soil and her people; and

Whereas from 1920 to 1940 Lithuania was a fully independent and sovereign nation, a member of the League of Nations, and a signatory of numerous international treaties with the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Soviet Union during June 15-17, 1940 invaded and occupied Lithuania by overwhelming force of arms, and subsequently, forcibly annexed the Lithuanian Nation into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has systematically conducted a policy of colonization, ethnic dilution and Russification within Lithuania; and

Whereas the United States Government maintains diplomatic relations with the government of the Free Republic of Lithuania and consistently has refused to recognize the seizure of Lithuania and forced incorporation of this freedom-loving country into the Soviet Union; and



Whereas the people of Lithuania to this very day are risking and sacrificing their lives in defiance of Communist regime in seeking political and religious freedom, as demonstrated by the Lithuanian sailor, Simas Kudirka, the self-immolation of Romas Kalanta, and the subsequent demonstrations of thousands of young Lithuanians, and the petition of 17,000 Lithuanian Roman Catholics to Kurt Waldheim of the United Nations; and

Whereas the 89th U.S. Congress unanimously passed House Concurring Resolution 416 urging the President of the United States to direct the question of the Baltic Nations status at the United Nations and other international forums, focusing attention on the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic people; now, therefore be it

Resolved, that we, Lithuanian-Americans will urge the President of the United States, members of Congress, and the United States Department of State to publicly reaffirm the United States Policy of non-recognition of the forceful annexation of the Baltic States by Soviet Russia, and to maintain that policy during all negotiations with the Soviet Union, especially, those concerned with the new Detente policy; and further

Resolved, to request the President of the United States to vigorously implement House Concurring Resolution 416 to the fullest extent; and further

Resolved, that copies of this resolution be forwarded this day to the President of the United States, the United States Secretary of State, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the United States Senators from Arizona, Republican and Democratic leaders in the United States Congress, the Lithuanian Minister in Washington, D.C., and the Lithuanian Consuls in New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles, and the press.

#### BAN THE HANDGUN—XXIV

### HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on February 10 a young man armed with a .32-caliber pistol shot and killed his father, his mother, a neighbor, a 2-year-old boy, and wounded two others. Unless strict gun control legislation is enacted, this kind of senseless carnage will continue.

The attached article appeared in the New York Post, Monday, February 11:

**TELLS COPS HE KILLED PARENTS AND TWO**

NEWTON, N.J.—A man who walked into a police station and confessed to a quadruple slaying has been sent to Trenton State Prison for a psychiatric examination after being arraigned and held in \$255,000 bail.

Frederick L. Carragher, Jr., 24, was charged with killing his father, his mother, a neighbor, and a 2-year-old boy yesterday, and with attempting to kill the boy's mother and another man.

All four victims had been shot once each in the head with a .32 cal. automatic pistol, state police said. They said the woman who was not killed was grazed in the head with a bullet, and the man survived because Carragher's gun misfired.

Carragher turned himself in to Newton police, who then told state police where to find the victims, police said.

CXX—260—Part 3

The victims included Carragher's father, Frederick Sr., 60, and his mother, Evelyn, 58, with whom he lived in their home on Flat Brook Road in Sandyston Township, the Sussex County prosecutor's office said.

County Prosecutor George Daggett said Carragher shot his parents about 10:30 a.m., then went next door and killed Isabel Catalo, 65, who lived alone.

The prosecutor said Carragher then drove to Newton, picked up Beverly Guernin Owens, 24, and her 2-year-old son Kristian, at her home, took them to a friend's house in Lake Lenape, N.J., and shot them. He then drove to Newton police headquarters and turned himself in.

#### COSTLY CONGRESSIONAL INDECISION

### HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, as I said in introducing an energy-related bill last week, there is an air of unreality around here these days—a growing feeling that Congress, as an institution, is becoming very adept at "fiddling," but totally incapable of doing its part in quenching those numerous "fires" that threaten to break out all around us as the energy crisis goes on, and on, and on.

Our delay in fashioning any legislative response to that critical situation—other than year-round daylight saving time which more than half our constituents seem to want repealed—has now gone beyond all lengths of reason, let alone all lengths of explanation or excuse.

Little wonder, then, that pollster Louis Harris finds the public assessment of Congress fallen, now, to an historic low of 21 percent—while the President which that self-same Congress is considering impeaching, holds on to a 30-percent rating which, while negative, is nevertheless 9 percentage points better than Congress. It may come with some bad grace for me to be as critical as I am, since I have announced—the decision stemming from near-equal parts of frustration and fatigue—my intention to leave Congress at the end of this year.

But, Mr. Speaker, I love this House—I had great ambitions for it, before the unexpected honor of becoming a Member of it, and those ambitions will live on in my heart and mind long after I have left it. The U.S. Congress has, in the past and with good reason, been called the "greatest legislative body in the world." I, for one, think it still is—or could be—although goodness knows it has not been living up to that image of late.

It would currently appear that the Emergency Energy Act—or by whatever name that much-battered vehicle is now known—is, if not dead, then in dire straits and headed, possibly, for the executioner's ax in the House tomorrow or the next day. It may well be that such is the fate it deserves, even though I have not yet decided how I shall vote on it—indeed, how can I with the parliamentary situation currently so confused?

But if that vehicle thus is killed—whether it be at the hands of the House or the hand of the President who now threatens a veto—let there be, Mr. Speaker, no more of this "Who-killed-cock-robin" business.

Of course, the President has been hurt by Watergate, and all that words connote; and he may well not be able, during the balance of his term, to recapture what I would call the "moral imperative" of national leadership.

But, Watergate or no Watergate, it is neither a very persuasive argument—nor of much help to a badly befuddled country—for those in leadership positions in this Congress to complain, as they often do these days, that Congress cannot legislate effectively because Mr. Nixon has lost so much of his power to "influence" Congress.

Come on, my colleagues—you know better than that.

You know—if the public is only gradually coming to understand it—that, under our political system, Congress is a coequal branch of Government along with the Presidency. You also know that, under our Constitution, it is the duty of the Congress to make the laws of the land—and it ill behooves a political party which has controlled that same Congress for 38 of the past 42 years, and during all of my tenure in this House, to use a weakened Presidency as an excuse for congressional impotence.

Mr. Speaker, it has been, literally, a crying shame for us to have held the separate bill creating the Federal Energy Administration "hostage" for the Emergency Energy Act—and to have thus left Bill Simon, a convenient target for abuse as an overworked but hard-trying energy "czar", with no office, no payroll of his own, and no opportunity to really get organized during one of the most critical economic times of our whole history, if not that of the world, but allowing him, as it were, the advantages of "twisting slowly in the wind."

My frustrations with many things have become such as to dictate my retirement from public life. But I shall be a Member of this Congress for all the balance of this year, and will do what I can—and say what I must—to try to get it back on the track for responsibility or, at least, of a shared responsibility with the President.

Our course would, therefore, seem to be clear: If that omnibus Emergency Energy Act is no longer a viable vehicle for action—and, more likely, it never was—let us move, at once, to consider, in separate, specific pieces of legislation, its integral and necessary parts. Let us, particularly, have an "up" or "down" vote on that question of gasoline rationing—which I tend to think would be preferable, if only as a temporary thing, to the chaotic condition we now have whereunder service station operators, for good and sufficient reasons, are threatening to stop bearing the brunt of public inconvenience and unhappiness. Let us encourage the Ways and Means Committee—which, all along, has been the proper forum for developing "excess profits" legislation—to finish that particular job and let us, then, vote on that. Let us, also,

give Bill Simon and the President the authority they asked for, months ago now, to institute those energy-conservation measures our present dilemma dictates; and, above all, let us establish that Federal Energy Administration so that it can get itself organized and utilize the staffing monies provided for it in last years' final supplemental appropriation bill.

By these remarks, I point the finger of blame at no one in particular—those among us who sought to lead us have done so with the best of intentions.

But, by trying to lump too much in together—the controversial along with the noncontroversial, and the less urgent along with the urgent—in an effort to show the electorate that Congress could, indeed, rise to the occasion, we have only botched the whole job, and very badly.

The cost is almost incalculable—to the Nation, and to its citizens; but the greatest cost, Mr. Speaker—and you must see this—is to the credibility, and the collective capacity, of the institution of which we are both a part: The Congress of the United States which, at this moment, is on trial every bit as much as is the beleaguered President of that same great Nation.

#### STOP CRIMINALS, DO NOT DISARM THE LAW-ABIDING—PART I

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader of Wednesday, January 2, 1974, entitled "Gun Controls—a Cheap, Ineffective Shot at Crime" asking the very meaningful question, "When will we hear the outcry against the criminal?"

Too often we observe the easy way out is taken by well meaning, but misinformed people. Their position might be summarized simply: Take the guns away from the law-abiding citizens and crime will abate.

The comments by Mr. Gordon N. Johnson, chief of police in Minneapolis, Minn., make an effective answer to this unfortunate position:

WHEN WILL WE HEAR THE OUTCRY AGAINST  
THE CRIMINAL? GUN CONTROLS—A CHEAP,  
INEFFECTIVE SHOT AT CRIME

(By Gordon N. Johnson)

Concern for appropriate firearms legislation in the country is often misdirected, and for reasons of importance to all citizens, I'll briefly discuss what I think are the right and wrong approaches and I will be specific.

I tend to view the issue from a civil libertarian standpoint. This kind of concern we've been highly sensitized to civil rights arrests by police, in citizen and student protests, suspect's searches and confessions, and the like.

First, society's concern should be focused on the misuse of firearms. A minor form of misuse is reflected in the firearms accident rate, which is, incidentally, a small fraction of the motor vehicle rate. The 1972 National Safety Council report shows an accidental

death rate of 27.2 per 100,000 for motor vehicles; 8.4 for falls; 3.6 for drowning; 3.3 for fire and burns; 2.6 for poison; 1.9 for suffocation, and 1.2 for firearms.

Every firearms accident is regrettable, but this comparably modest rate could best be lowered by a continuation and expansion of existing firearms safety courses, and by implementation of such courses where now there are none.

The most obvious misuse of firearms is in crime, although the percentage of firearms so used is very small. Concerning handguns, a comparison of ownership estimates made by the Eisenhower Commission with handgun crimes reported in the F.B.I.'s annual Uniform Crime Reports typically shows that only a fraction of one per cent of handguns are used in crime. Common sense thus dictates that our laws should be directed toward the criminal use of firearms rather than to restrict the overwhelmingly legitimate use by the citizenry.

Laws should be commensurate with the problem, directed specifically rather than generally, considerate of civil rights and enforceable. I have little patience with attempts to enact unrealistic legislation to physically prevent a crime from taking place. Placing safety higher than freedom, benevolent totalitarians want to insulate us from all dangers. (Soon they'll want a crash helmet, seat belt, and knee pads on every toddler on a tricycle. Because of the risk of seeming ridiculous, let me say that what I mean is that even as children we must become aware of danger.) We must be able to recognize the point of diminishing returns when allocating efforts, funds, and police man-hours that might be better spent on something else, for example, the prevention and detection of crime, and apprehension of criminals.

For realistic enforcement, we must recognize that laws perceived (or misperceived) as violating the rights of tens of millions of firearms owners may well be popularly nullified. The government cannot legislate out of existence that which a substantial number of citizens believe to be among their rights.

All police are concerned with the armed criminal. An armed criminal is an incipient killer and must be dealt with accordingly. A substantial mandatory and consecutive sentence, without parole, should be imposed upon criminals who are convicted of any crime involving firearms or other weapons. Such mandatory sentence would allow the much needed time to rehabilitate the criminal while at the same time protecting society from him.

The mandatory sentence would serve as a deterrent to some types of criminals who might otherwise carry weapons.

I welcome any properly directed mandatory sentencing bill, including the limited measure for recidivists now pending in the Minnesota Legislature.

It grieves me to think of the number of police officers who are shot by recidivists. From 1963 through 1972, 59 percent of 1,084 persons involved in police killings had been convicted on a prior criminal charge. If those "gun control" proponents who so glibly beg the question about "saving one life" would help pass mandatory sentencing laws, more than one life would be saved.

With tens of thousands of firearms laws already on the books, the country does not need a flood of new laws. Present federal regulation of dealer sales is adequate. The record-keeping requirements allow us to trace firearms from manufacturers down to the owner or owners without registration, i.e., the recording of information on the owner and his firearm in a central governmental source.

(Of course, when the present advocates of registration speak of tracing firearms, they

probably want a centralized system that can be used effectively for confiscation.)

Licensing of all present firearms owners would be a waste of time and resource better allocated in starting at the right end of the problem with judicious discovery and treatment of the mentally deranged and drug addicts and alcoholics, all of whom are a seriously potential danger to society, even without regard to firearms.

I support a license to carry a firearm upon the person in a municipality, but laws of this type should not be directed toward raising barriers against the legitimate carrying of firearms. The law should give minimal supervision over the carrying of firearms and afford the opportunity to arrest criminals who could not pass the qualifications, saving law enforcement officials and prosecutors the embarrassing problem of dealing with illegally-armed citizens who break up robberies, or foil assaults, for example.

There should be a minimal safety test and a background check for the specific legal disability of felony convictions or adjudication as a mental incompetent, drug addict, or alcoholic. These conditions met, the license should be granted.

I cannot support a permit system in which most citizens cannot qualify because of subjective discretion as to need or character as assessed by the issuing authority. This kind of discrimination in civil rights matters is unconstitutional and should be ruled such, when any of the usual sufferers ever find the money to appeal a case, or a group of attorneys who specialize in civil rights violations decides to handle such a case.

Minneapolis has a new firearms review board worthy of emulation. The board is charged with intelligently disposing of confiscated firearms and weapons. The five member board has representatives of the city council, the police department, the Minnesota Weapons Collectors Assn., the Minnesota Rifle and Revolver Assn., and the Minnesota Historical Society.

Meeting at least once a year, they decide by majority vote disposal of firearms in police custody to (1) the police department for identification, testing, or display; (2) other law enforcement agencies for similar purposes; (3) the Minnesota Historical Society; or (4) sale to federally licensed collectors.

Firearms "of recent manufacture" and "mechanically or structurally unsound" may be ordered destroyed by the board. Mechanically unsound collectors items are designated as part's guns and sold as such.

Another provision of the ordinance prohibits transfer of federally defined "destructive devices" to federal jurisdiction without first giving the Minnesota Historical Society an option to acquire them at no charge.

(The need for clarification of procedures became apparent to me when I was about to transfer a rare Lewis machine gun to the state historical society. At the very time I was planning the transfer ceremony with the society's director, the gun was sold to an appropriately licensed dealer. We believe that the new procedures will provide the degree of discrimination necessary for optimal disposal.)

I find myself at wide variance with those who do not believe that legislation should be focused on the criminal use of firearms. Somehow they have come to the conclusion that firearms ownership itself is the cause of crime and, in that curious Watergate mentality, anything goes toward a good end.

Beginning with the arrogant assumption that they and they alone represent the public interest, they propose repressive legislation directed broadly at firearms ownership. Such legislation is called "gun control," a term concocted by outsiders, not firearms owners. "Gun control" is a cheap shot at crime, attractive because of its simplicity



and its avoidance of a close and objective look at crime causes.

Once started down the path of repressive legislation, "gun control" proponents never learn from experience. Failure to defeat crime is invariably attributed to weak or incomplete laws. The answer is always additional and increasingly repressive laws until we get to the final solution of confiscation, first of handguns, then of other firearms. (Having themselves taken this path, the British government is now proposing confiscation of autoloading and pump action shotguns.)

This misguided approach stems from a consensus, not a conspiracy, a consensus involving much of the news media and a willingness to use questionable tactics in the anything-goes-against-crime approach.

REXFORD S. BLAZER

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, last month Rexford Blazer, former president and board chairman of Ashland Oil Co., of Ashland, Ky., an area and regional leader as well as a very decent gentleman and industrialist, died. Perhaps the one thing I could say that typified him the most was that any and every worker or fellow resident of Ashland could and did call him "Rex." He is and he will be missed.

News items follow:

REXFORD S. BLAZER

Rexford S. Blazer, former president and board chairman of Ashland Oil Inc., achieved world prominence in his oil industry career that saw him rise steadily from a salesman in 1928 to president of the Ashland-based firm in 1951.

He was a man totally dedicated to his work and to his community. While he had gained recognition from the industry for helping to build Ashland Oil into one of the giants of America, his community activities too often went unrecognized.

But while Mr. Blazer was following his star to the pinnacle of the industry, he continued his basic philosophy stated pointedly by one senior Ashland executive:

"His success, I think, stemmed from the fact that he liked people and they liked him."

It was with a glow of friendship that employees would greet him not as "Mr. Blazer" but with a cherry, "Hi, Rex."

In an interview published in October, 1973, by the Courier-Journal, Mr. Blazer commented: "Looking back, I have no regrets. It has been a good life and still is. I hope it can last a while longer, but in any case it has been fine."

Rexford Blazer's life was one crowned with achievement. After graduating from the University of Illinois, he joined the sales division of Allied Oil Co. in Cleveland in 1928. Ten years later, he became vice president of Allied and was elevated to president in 1948.

Allied Oil merged with Ashland Oil and Mr. Blazer became a director of the Ashland-based firm. He was encouraged to come to Ashland by Ashland Oil's founder and his uncle, Paul Blazer, and he succeeded to the presidency of Ashland Oil in 1951. He became board chairman in 1957.

Under his leadership, Ashland Oil expanded, moved into new areas of production and sales, and provided jobs for 23,000 people.

Its revenues reached \$1.8 billion. Mr. Blazer's greatest pride was in the number of jobs provided by his company. He said the jobs were "good jobs paying men a living, offering them a future."

He provided strength and wise counsel for younger executives of Ashland Oil.

Rexford Blazer's life was a good life. His quiet strength for the good of this community will be missed.

BLAZER'S CAREER "STORYBOOK CASE IN DRIVE FOR SUCCESS"

Rexford S. Blazer's career in the petroleum industry spanned 45 years, during which time he rose to the top of the Allied Oil Co. in Cleveland to the leadership of Ashland Oil Inc. during the years in which its sales advanced to make it one of the top firms in the nation, and to wide-ranging activity and leadership on the national scene among oilmen.

The story of Rex Blazer's career is a storybook case in the drive for success. As the familiar story goes, he came to Ashland in 1928 after his graduation from the University of Illinois looking for a job.

Paul G. Blazer, his uncle and founder of the then fledgling Ashland Oil Co., refused him a job, saying if he succeeded it would look like nepotism and if he failed he would have to fire him, a move that would cause trouble in the family.

So with a \$20 loan from his uncle to go to Cleveland to see about work, Rex Blazer moved to the presidency of Allied Oil Co. and at the age of 44, after Allied's merger with Ashland, became president of Ashland Oil & Refining Co.

"Rex Blazer was a man of great warmth," Robert E. Yancey, president of Ashland Oil Inc., said this morning.

"He had friends everywhere in the oil industry, but his efforts and contributions weren't confined to business activities. Rex did great things for his adopted state, especially in education. His work with beneficial associations, such as the heart association, and with his church, will be sorely missed," Yancey said.

Rex Blazer's involvement with education was immense. He was active with his alma mater, the University of Illinois, and was trustee of the Kentucky Independent College Foundation from 1952 to 1954. He was also involved with the University of Kentucky Development Council, among other activities.

"He was a very loyal supporter of the Ashland chamber and state chamber and never refused anything that the chamber has ever wanted," L. W. Pilstl, executive secretary of the Ashland Area Chamber of Commerce, said.

"He was very cooperative and worked with us very closely. It will be a great loss to the community and to the chamber," Pilstl said.

In addition to his activities with the local chamber, he served as president of the Kentucky Chamber of Commerce and, earlier, as a director of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce.

G. B. Johnson Jr., president of the Second National Bank and a close friend of Mr. Blazer, said Ashland residents "were fortunate that a man of his capability lived in our community." He noted that Blazer's community and business efforts were motivated by a desire to "make this the best."

S. J. MacMullan, manager of Armco Steel Corp's Ashland Works described Mr. Blazer as "a great force in the community, his industry and the nation."

Johnson also viewed Blazer's death as a loss not only to this community, but elsewhere. "The oil industry has lost one of its great leaders," he said.

John W. Woods Jr., president and trust officer of the Third National Bank where Blazer was a director since 1952, said Mr. Blazer was a strong leader in the oil industry who also "took a tremendous interest in

community affairs and affairs all over the Commonwealth."

He said the oil executive "had a particular interest in further education. He was liberal in his contributions to educational needs."

"He was very helpful to us in many ways. We are all going to miss him a great deal."

Pilstl also echoed this view of Mr. Blazer by noting that his contributions to the community were "too many to mention. He never got credit for much of his community work."

The Rev. John Thomson, rector of Calvary Episcopal Church where Mr. Blazer was a vestryman and senior warden, the highest church office attainable by a layman, described Rex Blazer as "a beautiful person. My ministry and our parish were greatly blessed by him."

The Rev. Mr. Thomson said that while he was visiting with the Blazer family Wednesday night, there was comment about how a person of such magnitude in the business world still had so much time for his church.

"He was the kind of person we could always count on to be there, to be helpful, to see deeply into the situation at hand and offer suggestions and solutions that just might not be obvious to other people."

"His generosity was never known, but was done quietly through the church. He served as an instrument of the church and had great compassion and deep understanding of what church is all about," the Rev. Thomson said.

Ashland Mayor James J. Webb called Mr. Blazer's death a "great loss to the community. He was a great man."

DEMOCRAT'S DEFENSE OF NIXON

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I include an open letter written by my colleague, the Honorable Otto E. Passman, of Louisiana, and addressed to "My Fellow Americans" in the RECORD today. The letter was reprinted in the Lafayette, Ind., Journal and Courier, and it was taken from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. I think the words of Representative PASSMAN bear repeating once again at this time:

DEMOCRAT'S DEFENSE OF NIXON

(By Congressman OTTO E. PASSMAN)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following was written recently by Rep. Otto E. Passman (Dem.), Louisiana, in the form of an open letter addressed to, "My Fellow Americans.")

The radical elements of the news media can, when they so determine, take the greatest public official in America, put him in the gutter and convince a majority of the people that he is a crook. The same segment of the news media can take the biggest phony in America and make him appear superior to a combination of Einstein and Solomon. We are seeing this happen in America today. Let us look at the record:

When it was reported that certain segments of the Democratic party (and there is available information to support this contention) stole the election from Richard M. Nixon in 1960 by the manipulation of the votes in New Mexico, Illinois and probably Texas, did the Republicans try to impeach and destroy President Kennedy for the actions of certain segments of the Democratic party? The answer is no!

Of course, as unpleasant as it is to mention the episodes of Billy Sol Estes, Bobby Baker

and others, I cannot find where the Republicans exploited these issues in trying to destroy Democratic candidates for any public office. Therefore, it is wrong to try to destroy our President through innuendo and false accusations about incidents which he had nothing to do with.

I say without equivocation or mental reservation that in my considered judgment, President Richard M. Nixon's integrity is unimpeachable. His greatness has been established—so much so that certain segments of the Democratic party, of which I am a member, and for political reasons, are trying to destroy his greatness. Does it not appear that there are prejudiced judges who, through a subconscious urging, may be making themselves a party to the scheme to destroy President Nixon, and acting as prosecutors rather than judges?

When Mr. Nixon was sworn in as President, we were in the midst of one of the most destructive and expensive wars our nation had ever been engaged in. Evidently, President Johnson could not develop a formula to conclude the war so he left the White House a broken-hearted man, and I believe President Johnson felt he was turning the nation over to a man who had the ability and determination to conclude this terrible war that was claiming 300 precious American lives weekly. Could this have so embarrassed the Democrats they are trying to blot out this great accomplishment?

When Mr. Nixon was sworn in, there were 543,000 troops in Vietnam; the cost of the war was running at \$32 billion a year; and there were no plans to conclude the war. However, Mr. Nixon quickly formulated a plan to conclude the war that started under a Democratic Administration. Not only did he live up to every promise he had made and reduce the number of troops in Vietnam from 543,000 to zero, he secured the release of all of our prisoners of war who were deteriorating in dungeons in far-off lands. My, my, but what an accomplishment for a great American President.

When Mr. Nixon was sworn in as President, crime was running rampant in this country we love so much. He is slowly but surely bringing crime under control. Will this trend be reversed by present-day court decisions? What is the explanation for a judge to sentence a man to 35 years in prison for the Watergate break-in, a crime that was not an act of personal violence, and in the same city or perhaps in the same court, a prejudiced judge released those who have confessed to armed robbery, rape and arson, maybe with the trial judges blaming society for the criminal acts. Where is justice?

When Mr. Nixon was sworn in as President, the Supreme Court was so distorting the Constitution by erroneous interpretations, that they were turning our nation into a socialistic state. Mr. Nixon is replacing such Justices with men who render opinions based upon the Constitution, and such a court will ultimately benefit all Americans.

Mr. Nixon is trying hard to put our fiscal affairs back on a business basis, but somehow without exception, every time he moves in that direction the liberals and socialistic-minded try to embarrass him and stop him, and in too many instances they have been successful.

May I refer you to the infamous Daniel Ellsberg, who no doubt should have been convicted of treason for stealing top-secret documents and passing them along so that they came into the possession of the Communists. He peddled them to the left-wing press and doubtless others. Instead of being convicted of treason, what happened? A liberal judge set him free without a completed trial. Where has he been recently? In Washington, appearing before a Senate committee receiving almost a hero's welcome.

We are in trouble in this country. We are being misled, and some of our best people are having their minds slowly but surely shaped by prejudiced commentators, and the radical segment of the news media. From experience, I can tell you that America's national broadcasters are obliterating anything favorable to our President, spending their time clouding issues, making false accusations and, in some instances, downright misrepresentations. Listen to some of these broadcasters for verification of this statement.

I do not condone what some of President Nixon's aides have done, but remember that they did not break into Democratic headquarters looking for silver or gold. It was a political act. Doubtless, they were looking for political information. Without attempting to defend their actions, these actions did not involve the security of our country. I am thoroughly convinced that President Nixon had no knowledge whatsoever of the Watergate break-in. Let us prosecute the guilty, but not involve our President when there is no indication that he had any knowledge of their actions.

Now, how about Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox. He is a liberal Democrat. He was Solicitor General in the Cabinet of President John F. Kennedy.

When the U.S. Court of Appeals sustained the lower court, in effect it said to our President, comply with the decision or offer an acceptable compromise. As we read the record, we see where Senator Ervin, Senator Baker, the Attorney General and the President had reached a compromise and had prepared to submit it to Judge Sirica. We are also led to believe that Judge Sirica would have accepted the compromise, enabling the President to protect the confidentiality of the Presidency, but then this liberal, vindictive Democrat, Archibald Cox, balked. In effect, by his actions, he said I am after a full bucket of blood, nothing less. So, the President had to fire him.

May I say again I believe deeply, based upon facts, that President Richard M. Nixon's integrity is unimpeachable. It is almost unbelievable that this great man has been able to accomplish so much for America with the prejudiced commentators, the radical element of the news media, the Communists and other left-wingers out to destroy him. President Nixon's troubles began when he started fighting Communism and with his success in putting that all-time Communist, Alger Hiss, in jail.

I could have remained silent during this crisis had I been a political coward thinking only of the Democratic party and my personal political interests. Certainly I would have been spared some criticism, but to have been silent would have violated every principle by which I have lived my life. I sincerely believe that in the end right will prevail—if not before man—certainly before God, and I am just as convinced that in the end the position I have taken in support of my President will be the correct one.

Repeating, at no time has President Nixon been in non-compliance with the laws of our land. However, our great President, because of public pressure and the misunderstanding of the American public, including some members of the judiciary, is on the verge of being forced to violate his obligation by revealing highly sensitive and confidential information. It is to be regretted that some members of the judiciary do not look at executive privilege in the same manner as lawyer and client privilege, confidential audience between priest and parishioner and highly confidential conversations between man and wife. Again, where is justice and reason, and how far will the lunatic fringe go to destroy a great President? I am a lifelong Democrat, but I am an American first. I shall support right as I understand it. I am proud that my

President has the courage, wisdom and determination to do what is right, knowing well that his greatness will shine as a bright example to generations yet unborn, and when finally he has gone to his reward, hundreds of millions of people throughout the world will know that this world is indeed a better place in which to live for President Nixon's having lived in it.

## OREGON WINNER OF VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD of today's proceedings a thought-provoking speech by a young woman from Redmond, Oreg. Her name is Roberta Eggleston, and she is this year's winner of the statewide Voice of Democracy Contest in Oregon. A senior at Redmond High School, she is a resident of my congressional district, as were the last two winners of Oregon's Voice of Democracy Contest.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of this young woman, of what she has accomplished and of what she has to say. She neither seeks to pour soothing oil on the troubled waters of our Nation, nor to place herself at a safe distance in order to criticize our much-publicized national failings. Instead, she asks us to make a simple commitment which is the universal test of all citizenship. I salute her, and ask that her speech be printed for all to read.

### MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN (By Roberta Eggleston)

"Let the word go forth,  
from this time and from this place,  
that the torch has been passed,  
to a new generation,  
a generation of hope and peace,  
a generation that will not fail."

Thirteen years ago, this nation inaugurated its youngest president, John F. Kennedy, a man who held aloft a torch, shining a light for everyone to see. In the tragic aftermath of his untimely death, the generation that he spoke of, the generation of hope and peace, found that its legacy from that man was to be his torch, a torch that must not be dimmed in a fog of apathy, violence nor dissension. We are the people to whom John Kennedy entrusted his torch, we are the generation that will not fail, but we are a generation different from any other that this nation has ever produced. We have rocketed men to the moon, we have developed the most sophisticated and successful war on disease and poverty this nation has ever seen, even as we endured the longest war of our history. We have grown to be a nation of complicated, diverse, strong citizens over two hundred million strong. Through it all, we have not wavered nor stumbled. We have held that torch aloft, and we have found that it is our responsibility as citizens to see that our legacy of that torch remains aloft, that everyone may see that we are proud to be American citizens.

But pride in American nationality contains within it manifold duties and responsibilities. Unless we fulfill our responsibility we cannot hope to enjoy our privileges.

The duties and responsibilities that we as citizens must fulfill are unique and original, for no other group of people enjoy as much freedom or independence.



Because we have so much, it will take much, from each and everyone of us to maintain it. More than voting or writing to our Congress people, a country like ours needs the one thing that only we, her citizens, can freely give to her. We must willingly give her our love.

When we look back on how much our country has given to us, we can always draw upon such all-encompassing words as freedom and independence, but let us delve more deeply. Our country gives us the right to choose our education, our political affiliation, where we go and who our friends are. Our country gives us the opportunity to learn of widely divergent philosophies and governments, of our past mistakes as well as our glories. Our nation functions on the idea of free enterprise, based on the idea that competition, free and aboveboard, is the best way to get things done. Because of all this we find that we have the right to choose from 27 different brands of chicken noodle soup, from 6,000 institutions of higher learning and from nineteen different political parties.

Our country gives us this much, yet what can we return? As in any other relationship there must be give as well as take. Our country needs our love. She needs her citizens to make sure that her environment is unpolluted, to make sure that her government remains open and free, accountable to the people, to make sure that she remains loyal to her allies abroad and a leader to her people at home, to make sure that all she is and all she can be, is not destroyed upon the reefs of apathy, to make sure that our nation's flaming torch of liberty is never extinguished by the lack of her people's love.

Our most basic responsibility, our highest honor and our most cherished ideology must be our love for our country. Let us maintain our nation, our freedom, our democracy. Let us hold aloft our torch flaming with a love for our country, and pass it on to generations untold, that they may enjoy all that we have, and more.

That flaming torch of love for my country is my responsibility as a citizen.

#### AMENDMENT TO PENSION BILL

### HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2, the pension reform bill, will be on the floor Tuesday and Wednesday of this week. The rule makes in order H.R. 12781 and H.R. 12481 as substitutes for H.R. 2, and permits amendments to be offered to section 2001 of H.R. 12481.

I shall offer an amendment striking the proposed increase in the Keogh plan deductions for retirement savings by self-employed individuals. The text of my amendment follows:

#### AMENDMENT

Section 2001 of H.R. 12855 is amended—

(1) at page 120, lines 9 through 17, paragraph (1) of subsection (a), to read as follows:

"(1) Paragraph (1) of section 404(e) is amended by striking out 'subject to the provisions of paragraph (2)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'subject to paragraphs (2) and (4)'."

(2) at page 120, lines 18 through 21, paragraph (2) of subsection (a), by striking out the paragraph and renumbering subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

(3) at page 121, lines 8 through 15, subsection (b), by striking out the subsection and renumbering subsequent subsections accordingly.

(4) at page 128, line 4, paragraph (3) of subsection (e), by striking out "\$7,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,500".

#### LITTLE KNOWN FACTS ABOUT METRIC SYSTEM

### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as this Nation prepares to convert to the metric system, a recent Gallup poll showed that 57 percent of the British people oppose the system 6 years after that Nation converted to the new system. The poll further revealed that two-thirds of the British people still do not fully understand the metric system.

This poll was brought to my attention by Mr. Wilson S. Johnson, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, which represents the small businessmen throughout the Nation.

Mr. Johnson advises that legislation requiring an American conversion to the metric system is based on a study that the General Accounting Office reports has employed questionable methodology and neglected to report its negative findings.

Mr. Johnson also advises that the major portion of the \$45 billion to \$100 billion in estimated conversion costs will be passed on to the consumer, already burdened with inflation and higher living costs.

The National Federation of Independent Business has listed problems which may arise from conversion to the metric system.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place the list in the RECORD herewith.

The list follows:

#### LITTLE KNOWN FACTS ABOUT METRIC

All retail gasoline pumps in the U.S. would have to be recalibrated or replaced. This would foreshadow even higher gasoline prices.

Approximately 60% of the U.S. population does not know the first thing about the metric system. Less than 20% know the correct relationship between metric and traditional units. (N.B.S. Metric Study—A Metric America)

Standard plumbing and electrical fixtures would be obsolete. Metric bathtubs would not fit standard drains and standard bathtubs would not fit metric drains. This would force suppliers to maintain costly dual inventories.

The N.B.S. study, *A Metric America*, "falls far short of the clearly expressed Congressional intent . . . and does not fulfill the Congressional Mandate which requires that small business problems and the practical difficulties associated with possible changes be identified and the means to overcome them be recommended." (House Report No. 92-913)

In the construction industry metric means modules and modules mean that all standard doors, windows and frames would be obso-

lete. Metric doors, windows and frames simply will not fit current or past construction, making replacement more difficult and costly.

*The fallacy of the metric argument* "The notion that the U.S. is losing exports to metric countries because its products are not designed or manufactured in metric units appears to be ill-founded." (N.B.S. Metric Study—A Metric America)

All municipal building codes and regulations would have to be changed to metric.

Metric conversion would make the U.S. domestic market more accessible to foreign goods. Increased imports would threaten American jobs. "Our examination . . . showed that imports . . . would have been increased by \$100 million." (GAO Report on N.B.S. Metric Study, March 27, 1973)

Favorite recipes might never be the same again. Cookbooks and measuring devices will be changed to metric. Your stomach might just have to make an adjustment.

Conversion to the metric system would actually make U.S. exports more costly and "place these products at even more of a competitive disadvantage vis-a-vis the products of foreign firms that are already metric." (GAO Report on N.B.S. Metric Study, March 27, 1973)

All temperature measuring devices, including thermometers and thermostats, will have to be converted. This could be frustrating. "When body temperature registers as 37.5 degrees (centigrade), is that good or bad? Just multiply by 9, divide by 5, add 32 and you'll know." (Newsweek)

The National Bureau of Standards ignored or subordinated findings that would have detracted from its recommendation in favor of metric conversion. (GAO Report on N.B.S. Metric Study, March 27, 1973)

Contrary to popular belief, American business is not rapidly converting to the metric system. Only 3% of the firms responding to a special NFIB survey undertaken for the National Bureau of Standards reported that they had any plans to change over.

England is experiencing serious difficulties with metric conversion in consumer goods. Adverse consumer reaction and resistances have forced it to reassess its planning and schedules.

All OSHA standards and regulations will have to be converted. These rules are complex and difficult for the small businessman to understand. Metric would make them totally incomprehensible.

Water and gas meters in every building across the country will have to be converted to metric.

Metric conversion would force the recalibration of the approximately 300,000 commercial scales at a cost of about \$1,000 per scale.

The bottling industry would have to replace 200 billion returnable bottles now circulating through the economy. They represent 38% of its total capital investment. Filling and capping requirements would prohibit their gradual replacements.

The National Bureau of Standards omitted any mention in its report that the Defense Department declared that it could not guarantee national security during the conversion period. (AFL-CIO)

All road signs would have to be changed to reflect metric distances.

All maps would have to be changed to reflect metric distances.

Metric road signs and maps would be useless and confusing unless all automobile speedometers and odometers are changed to measure in metric.

World wide capital investment in traditional units (feet, pounds, etc.) has exceeded investment in metric units over the last several years. This means that the use of traditional units is growing at a faster pace than metric units.

Conversion will make evaluation of farm productivity the domain of Ph.D.'s. Instead of bushels per acre, the farmer will calculate his crop in hectoliters (2.84 bushels) per hectare (2.47 acres).

Unit pricing is just becoming effective. Metric conversion would only confuse the consumer and tend to negate the progress that has been made.

The grid system of land measurement used in the U.S. would be discarded. Measurement by hectares would be substituted for sections, square miles and acres.

All deeds and property descriptions in legal documents would have to be changed. Descriptive terms like acres, yards and feet would be obsolete.

Metric conversion, because of the economic advantage enjoyed by large firms, could hasten the undesirable trend toward industrial concentration.

For those out of school the psychological impact of metric conversion could be staggering. "Those who have studied the matter in other countries suggest that children take to the change like a shot . . . but older people are likely to be thrown badly by the distortion of familiar dimensions." (News-week)

Metric conversion, at a cost of \$45 to \$100 billion, simply does not rank very high as a national priority.

#### OVERWORKED, UNDERPAID?

#### HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Washington Star-News of February 11, 1974. No further comment is needed except to say that in the 14 days, February 11 to and including this day, February 25, the foot-dragging in Congress has continued, the energy crisis is still with us, but the pay raise for the "overworked" Members seems almost within their grasp.

The editorial:

#### OVERWORKED, UNDERPAID?

Well, let's see. Congressmen came back to work January 21, and assuming they showed up at the office every day—an assumption that is on exceedingly shaky ground—House members put in 14 working days as of Thursday and senators put in 15 as of Friday.

That certainly entitled them to a recess from their arduous labors, especially since they only got a month off during the Christmas-New Year season. Never mind that the country has an energy crisis that gets more chaotic every day and that emergency legislation to deal with it has been tied up since December. Never mind that the nation is in the throes of a debilitating truck tieup. Never mind that there is a list of other business longer than the longest congressional arm.

No sirree. Those Lincoln Day speeches have to be made. And those constituents back home could hardly bear it if they had to wait another day to gaze upon the face of their man in Washington. Abraham Lincoln, who epitomized the work ethic, probably turned over in his grave when the House voted itself a six-day recess last Thursday and the Senate (which must have worked harder the past three weeks) voted itself a 10-day holiday.

No doubt the Senate and House members will recover enough of their strength during

their February rest to resist any effort to kill the pending congressional pay hike. After all, it should be obvious to anyone that the Congress is overworked and underpaid.

#### "ELECTRIFYING" NEW VEHICLES DESCRIBED BY OTIS ELEVATOR PRESIDENT, RALPH A. WELLER

#### HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, recently Ralph A. Weller, president of Otis Elevator Co., which not only is the world's largest producer of elevators and escalators, but also is the largest supplier of electric vehicles in the United States, gave the keynote address at the Third International Electric Vehicle Symposium and Exposition in Washington.

This event and Mr. Weller's remarks were of particular interest to me because a good many of Otis electric vehicles are produced by its special vehicle division, headed by James Munn, and located in Stockton, Calif., in my district. Overall supervision of Otis vehicle operations is under Robert Bry, vice president of diversified operations at Cleveland, Ohio.

During the symposium here, I enjoyed viewing the display of 14 diversified Otis electric vehicles for industrial, recreational, and municipal uses, including the electric delivery van that is being test-driven for postal service in Stockton.

As a leader in this "electrifying" industry, which has gained sudden impetus from the fuel shortage, urban transportation problems, and environmental concerns, Mr. Weller's speech is highly authoritative and should be of interest to our colleagues, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, I would like to include the speech as an extension of my remarks:

#### REMARKS OF MR. RALPH WELLER

I welcome the opportunity to be with you today to exchange ideas on transportation and electrical propulsion. In fact, I look forward to sharing ideas on these vital subjects with more enthusiasm than you may imagine. The reason for my interest is that our company's basic business is transportation and electrical propulsion.

For the past 100 years we have focused on opportunities in transportation, and in the last five years we have been working systematically to help shape the future of electrical transportation. The ideas we will exchange over the next three days together will do much to make that future eventful for the electric vehicle industry. I assure you, I approach this symposium with great expectations.

Like each of you here, we have been trying to make the unexpected and unpredicted come to pass. We realize that trying to control the future is risky, but much less risky than just coasting along with the times, believing that nothing is going to change. As we look at the ominous patterns of the Energy Crisis, the Pollution Crisis, the Urban Crisis, we can all say that we have been rational in the purpose of our work.

Otis' long-range planning in the fields of electrical propulsion and transportation could not have been geared to eliminate all the risks and uncertainties of the future.

As mortal men, we know that the future cannot be known. However, recent events indicate that we are on the right path, that we have anticipated the future, and that we are focusing on bright, new opportunities.

Specifically, what we—all of us here—have done is:

We recognized the fuel shortage, the choking threat of pollution, and the fact that our cities were becoming unlivable before these events made their full impact on our society. Second, in the time span between our recognition of these coming events and their full impact, we took action. We offered new ideas and new solutions. Specifically, electrical vehicles. So today we can measure the results of our actions, and exchange new ideas that will shape the impact yet to come from change that is happening right now.

After these next three days, I believe we will be better equipped to decide what ideas we want to forge into reality with new systems, new products and new institutions.

Our presence demonstrates that we fully accept the responsibility—and opportunity—to shape the future.

Our commitment and our efforts to bring about tomorrow's solutions must be sustained, for tomorrow will come and it too will be different.

To underscore our commitment at Otis, I should like to tell you a little about us.

In 1882, we began moving people in devices driven by electrical energy. Today, every day, 400 million people are moved in Otis elevators and escalators. In an eight-day period that equals the total population of the earth; and we do this throughout the world, as many of you know, in 46 countries with 473,000 installations.

Our company now concerns itself worldwide with short-distance movement of people and goods. Less than 20 years ago, we entered the material handling business through the acquisition of a small electric fork truck company, Baker-Raulang of Cleveland. Founded in 1853, this company was a leading manufacturer of electric cars from 1895 to 1919. Our material handling business prospered and rapidly diversified into a much broader range of equipment. Today, Otis Material Handling Division is 10 times its original size and a considerable factor in our corporation.

Using this operation as our base, we expanded our diversified activities to include eight new "moving" businesses. Our company today is the nation's largest manufacturer of electric vehicles. Our products include electric lift trucks, personnel carriers, golf carts, delivery vans, small electric "urban" cars, electric buses and urban Personal Rapid Transit Systems.

One of the reasons for our growth in this field is, I believe, our management philosophy. We choose to look at today's problems—today's crises—in terms of our own ability to solve them. We attempt to focus on opportunities, not problems.

Three of our greatest concerns—the energy crisis—the pollution crisis—the urban crisis—are also real opportunities for building a better future. The ideas which can provide the answers are in your factories, in your laboratories and in your minds.

Only a few months ago, the world awoke to find a severe energy shortage on its doorstep. Most of us here were fully aware that energy sources are finite and do not replenish themselves long before the impact of their shortages were felt. Most of us had already realized the energy crunch was not some temporary shortage of fuel caused by political upheaval in the Middle East.

The role of electrical energy in providing long-term solutions has been well defined. Unless man is going to walk instead of ride and unless he is content to carry heavy loads instead of transporting them, electrical pro-



pulsion devices will find greater use today and in the future.

The facts speak for themselves. An electric fork lift uses less than half the energy of a gas-driven truck in eight hours, doing the same work. An electric bus uses less than one-third the energy of its diesel counterpart on a city transport route. And, an electric delivery van will use one-fourth less energy than a gas-driven vehicle.

*These vehicles are here, now!* They not only utilize today's resources more effectively, but will prove the most effective tomorrow.

Compared with petroleum, the earth's reserves of coal and uranium are plentiful. These resources—plus the research being done to make coal conversion cleaner and place breeder and fusion reactors on line—give us confidence that electric power generation will play a dominant role in future years.

Additionally, and of great interest to Otis, electrically-powered vehicles do not require the emission control devices of gasoline vehicles because they do not foul the air we breathe. Further they can be operated more quietly and, therefore, do not contribute to another of today's problems—noise pollution.

At Otis, we see pollution standards not as a road-block to growth and development, but rather as an opportunity for new markets while we work to protect the quality of life on our earth.

And what about our cities—what about the urban crisis?

Significant changes in the U.S. occurred at the turn of the century, partly as a result of migration to urban centers. In 1900, 50 per cent of the U.S. population lived in rural areas. Today, more than 80 per cent of our population make their life in metropolitan areas.

This occurrence is not unique to the United States. The history of the world is virtually a history of cities—Peking, Alexandria, Athens and Rome. Throughout history the shift from a rural to urban society has continued. It continues today.

Our large urban areas are fueling economic growth in a post-industrial society. Urbanization offers the centralized ability to innovate, promote and finance new products and services. With the so-called Urban Crisis come the diversity that contributes to stability, that generates new employment and a greater overall choice of economic opportunity for our people. Put simply, people come to cities because there is more opportunity to work, to earn and to experience.

Since our cities and metropolitan centers are so vital, it is essential we maintain a high quality for this environment. If we permit the environment for our future economic strength to decay, we will certainly weaken our ability to meet competition in the world's marketplace.

And yet, our cities are experiencing decay at the core, people and investments are being pulled out of the central city to the competing suburban fringe. Why? I believe this decay is the natural result of focusing on problems, of merely being carried along with the times rather than trying to control events.

In many areas, the focus on problems and the desire to remain unchanged has left the core city with vast, unused investments. Tragically unused are the investments in people, as are investments in the physical infrastructure that represents billions upon billions of dollars in public money.

Otis' basic business, elevators and escalators, comes from the cities—and in most cases, from the inner cities. I believe that our cities can not only survive, but can be given new prosperity, a new lease on life. I believe we can rebuild our cities into growth centers. But it can't be done using old shopworn approaches to problem solving. These

approaches would lead only to more high-speed automobiles, more super highways. The future will be created by making our cities more attractive and livable for people. And positive change can be made only if we view our cities as opportunities, not problems.

*New transportation ideas*—most probably in the form of electrical systems—can penetrate core city. Low-polluting, highly mobile systems can shuttle passengers and goods from core city fringe to core city center.

Unified building concepts—"mega structures", which will be blocks long and contain housing, schools, recreation and supporting services—can become part of tomorrow's revitalization of our cities.

I believe that all these changes will require "horizontilators," *new horizontal transportation devices*—electric-powered transportation.

You here today are not only in the forefront of these developments, but have the capability to make them happen. You hold the keys to the technology, planning and timing.

In our company, we manufacture and service a wide variety of electrical transportation products and systems. But we need your help, your ideas, your creativity to help bring about the change I am talking about.

We look to those in the power generation and distribution field for more rapid development of plant, equipment and processes to more-effectively utilize coal and uranium resources:

We look to the battery industry for technology breakthroughs which will provide mobile DC power at a reasonable cost and lighter weight;

We look to our regulatory agencies to reconsider some of the requirements which now limit broader use of electric vehicles on our city streets;

And we look to the Federal Government to stimulate private investment in transportation technologies and products, and to consider tax incentive for this timely investment.

Our meeting here provides an outstanding opportunity. While The Electric Vehicle Council is young—this is just our third annual meeting—we are a vigorous organization. We have here, in this room, ideas that can take advantage of the greatest opportunities that face us today. The dimensions of the challenge, in my opinion, are extraordinary.

Charles Abrams, a wise experienced observer of the urban scene in America, wrote: "The history of civilization from Memphis, Egypt to Memphis, Tennessee is recorded in the rise or demise of cities."

Unlike the citizens of early Egypt, however, we are conscious of this truism. We understand the changes that have taken place; we can feel their effects everywhere. And we know that the future will be far different from what exists now, and from what we expect today.

The question we face is whether, in light of this knowledge, we will coast along with change, our minds idle, watching our civilization corrode away, or whether we will have the foresight and courage to control the future by thinking and acting differently now, while we still have the opportunities to build our cities and our society.

To meet this challenge we must ask: What do we really want to see happen that is quite different from today?

We must look beyond our products to our ideas. We must stretch our minds to bring forth the answer.

I hope that at the end of three days, our commitment will be stronger, our ideas more plentiful, our direction clearer and the solutions nearer.

Let us begin now. The future won't wait. Thank you.

## PRESIDENTIAL ORDER CONFIRMS THAT AGENCIES HAVE BEEN VIOLATING THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the President today published an Executive order in the Federal Register instructing department and agency heads to "take appropriate action to assure their ability to comply" with the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Clearly, no knuckle-rapping by the White House would be necessary if the executive branch had been making more of an effort to comply with the act in the nearly 14 months it has been in effect.

Ironically, today's Register also contains advisory committee notices from the Corps of Engineers and the Federal Energy Office which show why the President's order is needed. These two and another example from 5 days ago illustrate how agencies nullify the public meeting and timely notice requirements of the law in their handling of environmental, energy and consumer advisory committees.

The law says that meetings of these 1,400 citizen panels shall be open to the public unless it is determined that a meeting is concerned with matters which the Freedom of Information Act exempts from mandatory public disclosure. And it requires that timely notice of these meetings be published in the Register.

Today the corps announced that its Chief of Engineers Environmental Advisory Board will meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow and Wednesday at Fort Belvoir, Va.—such short notice that persons who might otherwise attend the public portions of the meeting are effectively prevented from doing so. The corps says certain portions of the meeting will be open but waves a wand of secrecy over the rest, simply saying "the balance of the meeting will be subjects" entitled to nondisclosure. The corps does not identify the subjects or specify the FOI Act exemptions it apparently believes apply to these subjects.

The tipoff that the corps is not complying with the act lies in its use of the murky explanation that these subjects "fall within policies analogous to those recognized" in the FOI Act. That cumbersome phrase stands out like a dye-marker and reveals the corps is quoting an Executive order on advisory committees that was issued in June 1972, and expired when the Federal Advisory Committee Act went into effect. The corps should realize it is expected to comply with current law.

Not to be outdone, the FEO today published same-day notice of a meeting of its Retail Dealers Group "of highly qualified independent businessmen engaged in the retail sale of gasoline and diesel fuel," on such important and newsworthy matters as pricing adjustments, reduced allocation, preferential treatment, mini-

mum/maximum sales, and hours of operation. Anyone wishing to attend this nominally public meeting will no doubt be glad to learn that it began at 10 a.m.

Finally, the Consumer Advisory Council, which advises the Director of the Office of Consumer Affairs, met Thursday, February 21, to discuss consumer interests in health insurance proposals, energy programs, international trade in textiles, and metric conversion. The announcement of this public meeting, signed by Virginia H. Knauer, Executive Secretary to the Council, was published in the Register only the day before, Wednesday, February 20. These advisory committees deal with policy questions that can mean millions of dollars to consumers. That is why so many of these meetings are supposed to be held in the open. I cannot think of a better way to discourage attendance at a supposedly public meeting than to give either no notice of it or short notice. Apparently the bureaucrats in the executive branch are not going to get the message about the Federal Advisory Committee Act until they are hit over the head with it.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include the President's order and the three meeting notices at this point:

THE PRESIDENT: EXECUTIVE ORDER 11769, ADVISORY COMMITTEE MANAGEMENT

By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States by the Constitution and statutes of the United States, including the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App. I (1972 Supp.) (hereinafter referred to as the "act"), and 3 U.S.C. 301, it is ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. The heads of all executive departments and agencies shall take appropriate action to assure their ability to comply with the provisions of the act.

SEC. 2. The Administrator of General Services shall prepare for the consideration of the President the annual report to the Congress required by section 6(c) of the act.

SEC. 3. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall:

(1) perform, or designate, from time to time, other officers of the Federal Government to perform, without the approval, ratification, or other action of the President, the functions vested in the President by the act;

(2) prescribe administrative guidelines and management controls for advisory committees covered by the act.

SEC. 4. Executive Order No. 11686 of October 7, 1972 is hereby superseded.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 21, 1974.

[FR Doc. 74-448 Filed 2-21-74; 1:43 pm]

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, CORPS OF ENGINEERS,  
CHIEF OF ENGINEERS ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY BOARD

#### NOTICE OF MEETING

Notice is hereby given in accordance with Pub. L. 92-463 that the quarterly meeting of the Environmental Advisory Board of the Chief of Engineers will be held on 26-27 February 1974, at the Conference Room of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, Kingman Building, Fort Belvoir, Virginia, beginning at 0930 each morning.

The meeting will be open to the public at the following times:

FEBRUARY 26, 1974

1400-1615, Strategies of American Water Management and Policy and the Relationship to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

FEBRUARY 27, 1974

(1) 0930-1100, Discussion of presentation delivered afternoon, February 26, 1974.

(2) 1500-1545, Examples and Problems on Nontraditional Approaches to Flood Plain Management.

(3) 1545-1615, On-going Evaluations Downstream of Dams.

The balance of the meeting will be subjects that fall within policies analogous to those recognized in section 552 (b) of title 5 U.S.C. and as such are exempt from public disclosure.

Persons desiring further information should contact LTC John F. Wall, Assistant Director of Civil Works, Environmental Programs, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Forrestal Building, Washington, D.C. 20314, telephone (202) 693-7093.

RUSSELL J. LAMP,

Colonel,  
Corps of Engineers Executive.

[FR Doc. 4416 Filed 2-22-74; 8:45 am]

#### RETAIL DEALERS GROUP

##### NOTICE OF MEETING

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, 86 Stat. 770) notice is hereby given that the Retail Dealers Group, established under the authority of section 212(f) of Economic Stabilization Act, as amended; Executive Order 11748; section 4(a)(iv) of Executive Order 11695, and Cost of Living Council Order No. 47, will meet on Monday, February 25, 1974, at 10:00 a.m. in the Cost of Living Council Auditorium, 2nd floor, 2000 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

The Group was established to advise the Administrator, FEO, with direct and timely access to the technical knowledge possessed by a wide range of highly qualified independent businessmen engaged in the retail sale of gasoline and diesel fuel. The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

#### I. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Member Reports and Recommendations.
1. Pricing Adjustments.
2. Reduced Allocation.
3. Preferential Treatment; Minimal/maximum sales.
4. Hours of Operation.

#### II. NEW BUSINESS

A. Discussion of rules and regulations.  
The meeting is open to the public; however, space and facilities are limited.

The Chairman of the Group is empowered to conduct the meeting in a fashion that will, in his judgment, facilitate the orderly conduct of business.

Further information concerning this meeting may be obtained from Dino G. Pappas, Office of Policy, Planning and Regulations, Federal Energy Office, Washington, D.C. 20508, Area Code 202-254-7696. Minutes of the meeting will be made available for public inspection at the Federal Energy Office, Washington, D.C.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on February 21, 1974.

WILLIAM N. WALKER,  
General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 74-4546 Filed 2-22-74; 12:08 pm]

#### CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL

##### NOTICE OF MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Pursuant to Pub. L. 92-463 of October 6, 1972, notice is hereby given that there will be a public meeting of the Consumer Advisory Council to the Office of Consumer Affairs, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which will commence at 10 a.m. on February 21 in Room 5104, New Executive Office Building, 17th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C. 20506, and continue on the morning of February 22 in the same location.

The Consumer Advisory Council was established under Section 5 of Executive Order No. 11583 issued February 24, 1971, to advise the Director of the Office of Consumer Affairs with respect to policy matters relating to consumer interests, the effectiveness of Federal programs and operation which affect the interests of consumers, problems of primary importance to consumers and ways in which unmet consumer needs can appropriately be met through Federal Government action.

The meeting is open to the public with the number of persons admitted subject to reasonable limitation according to space available. The agenda will include official swearing-in of new Council members, and discussions of the consumers interests in health insurance proposals, energy programs, international trade in textiles, and metric conversion.

Signed in Washington, D.C., this 12th day of February 1974.

VIRGINIA H. KNAUER,  
Director, Office of Consumer Affairs  
and Executive Secretary, Consumer  
Advisory Council.

[FR Doc. 74-3984 Filed 2-19-75; 8:45 am]

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to acknowledge, at this time, the 56th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, which took place on February 16 of this year.

Some may think it odd that a country conquered and controlled by the Soviet Union since 1940 would continue to pay tribute to an independence that lasted only 18 years. But to those Lithuanians who live in that country and those who have emigrated to this and other countries, the spirit of independence still lives. Such a spirit should be applauded by all Americans, particularly since we are only 2 years away from celebrating 200 years of their own independence.

On this 56th anniversary, Lithuanians, along with the rest of the world, have witnessed another dramatic event in the continuing story of desire for freedom from Soviet tyranny in: the exile of a Nobel Prize winning author Alexander H. Solzhenitsyn. All people who admire such great courage as his in the face of oppression rejoice that he was not harmed or imprisoned and that he is now free to write as he wishes. But in that rejoicing there is also disgust that such things can happen at all, and we are reminded again of the same tyranny which forced Lithuania and other nations into submission.

Before this Congress is the opportunity to demonstrate to the Soviet Union that this country, the largest in the free world, will not aid in giving that nation's economy any strengthening with our trade, and remind them at the same time that human liberty is more important to us than their trade. I commend my colleagues in the House of Representatives for voting through a trade bill denying the Soviet Union most favored nation status as a penalty for their emi-



gration policies, and I urge our colleagues in the Senate to vote their approval of that bill as well as ask that the President give his signature when and if it goes to his desk.

The trade bill is an American tribute to the plight of oppressed people everywhere, and a particular show of support for Lithuanians and what their nation stands for.

#### WRITINGS ON REINHOLD NIEBUHR, 1972-73

### HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, few Americans have made such remarkable contributions to our understanding of the fields of religion and politics as the late Reinhold Niebuhr.

At a time when the Nation is engaged in serious reflection on and criticism of the institutions of our society, I suggest that the thinking of Reinhold Niebuhr can afford us much profound assistance.

I was, therefore, interested to learn that Prof. Ronald H. Stone of Pittsburgh Theological Seminary has recently completed a review of writings about Reinhold Niebuhr during the last 2 years.

Professor Stone has made an effort over a short period to survey all the works published in the United States on Reinhold Niebuhr in 1972 and 1973 generally, excluding reviews and "in memoriam" writings.

I insert at this point in the RECORD Professor Stone's summary of writings on Reinhold Niebuhr during these years, a summary made available by the Fund for the Reinhold Niebuhr Award.

I should also note here that there is shortly to be published a book of Reinhold Niebuhr's sermons and prayers, "Justice and Mercy: The Faith of Reinhold Niebuhr," edited by his widow, Ursula Niebuhr.

Mr. Speaker, the summary of writings to which I have made reference follows:

#### WRITINGS ON REINHOLD NIEBUHR, 1972-73

##### INTRODUCTORY COMMENT BY PROFESSOR STONE

Reinhold Niebuhr's typewriter is sorely missed in a day when national scandals call for political analysis and moral wisdom. His essays and editorials taught a respectable part of a generation how to think about moral reality and political illusion. Now we write about him. It is appropriate to honor him in our essays, as appropriate as it was for Plato to write about Socrates. Hopefully in our writing about this "laughing lion" that was among us, we will illuminate the traumas and meanings of our own time.

His many-faceted perspectives tempt us to try to claim him for our own ideological perspective or even, in some cases, to represent him as responsible for the use or misuse of his ideas by others. Fortunately we have what Plato and Aristophanes lacked; we have texts of his work, and our own interpretations can be checked by reference to his work. However, in a day when rigorous scholarship is still a little suspect and imagination and fantasy are honored in the academic marketplace, writers occasionally forget to check the record, either praising or

condemning Niebuhr for positions which misrepresent his thought. The passion of the writing and the polemical style of much of it do honor to the importance of his contribution, even when the exact meaning of his position is abused.

##### THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY

Early, Tracy. "Reinhold Niebuhr for the 70's," *The Christian Century* (June 14, 1972), 688-690. Early finds the balanced realism of *Moral Man and Immoral Society* a wise guide to the problems of the seventies. His article argues that Niebuhr's work in the thirties may be more applicable to the seventies than the work of the intervening decades. Early tends to be less critical of *Moral Man and Immoral Society* than Niebuhr himself was.

Hiltner, Seward. "Kinsey and the Church—Then and Now," *The Christian Century* (May 30, 1973), 624-629.

Hiltner returns to a debate he had with Niebuhr twenty years ago over the Kinsey report. He is correct in that Niebuhr's method in discussion of sex ethics was different from his form of argument on other ethical issues. Twenty years after the dispute, the differences between Hiltner and Niebuhr seem insignificant, but Niebuhr seemed more aware in the fifties of the disintegrating influences on the nuclear family than did Hiltner using the Kinsey material.

Stone, Ronald. "The Responsibility of the Saints," *The Christian Century* (September 12, 1973), 881-883.

Juergensmeyer, Mark. "The Unfinished Tasks of Reinhold Niebuhr," *The Christian Century* (September 12, 1973), 884-887.

Middleton, Robert G. "Hubris in Camelot," *The Christian Century* (September 12, 1973), 887-888.

These three articles furnished the central contents for the September 12 issue of the *Century*. Stone's piece was an abridged version of his memorial speech for Niebuhr in November, 1971. Juergensmeyer's article represents the wisdom of one who knew Niebuhr as a person and who wants to avoid the reification of his ideas. Professor Juergensmeyer seems correct in everything he affirms and wiser than some writers discussed below who neglect the historical perspective which he celebrates. Juergensmeyer's plea for a revival of Niebuhrian spirit combined with his rejection of academic courses on Niebuhr seems odd. Did he mean to imply that something in Niebuhr's style prevents his thought from being taught creatively? Why not courses on Niebuhr as well as on Rauschenbusch, Bonhoeffer, Tillich and King? Robert G. Middleton's "Hubris in Camelot" insists that Niebuhr was wiser than his critics or some of his disciples who, on the one hand, wanted to regard sloth and not pride as the primary problem and, on the other hand, tried to make his politics work without his theology. All three essays agreed in the continuing viability of the style or spirit of Niebuhr in analyzing politics and criticizing pious complacency.

##### CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS

Williamson, George, Jr. "The Pentagon Papers and the Desecration of Pragmatica," *Christianity and Crisis*, 32 (May 1, 1972), 99-104.

*Christianity and Crisis* continues its tradition of using less selectivity in articles critical of its founder than on other subjects. The thesis is that *The Pentagon Papers* reveal the amoral calculation of planners and that this stance is dependent upon pragmatism. Reinhold Niebuhr is seen to be a defender of pragmatism along with Thomas Hobbes, John Dewey, Aristotle, Machiavelli, et al. "Pragmatica" is a myth, and so the desecration of its supposed supporters does not require careful exegesis or even reading the writings of realists on Vietnam. Probably Williamson's central error is that he never understood what contribution the term

Christian made to Niebuhr's "Christian pragmatism" or Christian realism.

Harrison, Beverly; Bennett, John C.; Shaull, Richard. "Response," *Christianity and Crisis*, 32 (May 1, 1972), 104-109.

The responses to Williamson by Professors Harrison and Bennett leave the reader wondering why Williamson's piece was printed. Perhaps the reason rests in a Christian realist conviction that criticism of one's own assumptions needs to be honored. Harrison's response helpfully distinguishes between ideas and their functions; social functions are not inherent in the ideas per se. She too is interested in transcending Christian realism, but she has an acute understanding of the wisdom available in the tradition. Bennett's reference to the "appalling abstraction of 'Pragmatica'" summarizes his attack upon the essay. Professor Shaull, on the other hand, apparently appreciates the myth of "Pragmatica." As he sees it, "Pragmatica" and its theological underpinnings as represented in Niebuhr's works lack not only morality but also historical consciousness. Professor Shaull either intended to say he disagrees with Niebuhr's historical consciousness or he has forgotten that he ever read *Human Destiny*, *The Self and the Dramas of History*, *The Irony of History*, etc.

Sanders, Thomas G. "The Theology of Liberation: Christian Utopianism," *Christianity and Crisis* (September 17, 1973), 167-173.

Alves, Rubem A. "Christian Realism: Ideology of the Establishment," *Christianity and Crisis* (September 17, 1973), 173-176.

The Liberation Theology/Christian Realism dialogue in *Christianity and Crisis* reminds the reader of discussions in its predecessor, *Radical Religion*. Sanders and Alves reveal both how far apart realist and liberationist can be and how unnecessary that distance is. An example of their essential closeness is Rubem Alves' closing shot: "Christian Realists should read *Moral Man and Immoral Society*." Perhaps neither writer had adequately perceived how religious influence in high places has moved from Morningside Heights to the White House Chapel. Christian realism is perhaps less responsible for the Nixon malaise than Alves believes and less politically important today than Sanders would hope.

Bennett, John C.; Plank, John; Brown, Robert McAfee; Quigley, Thomas; Kozub, Jacques; Wilde, Alexander. "Continuing the Discussion: Liberation Theology and Christian Realism," *Christianity and Crisis* (October 15, 1973), 197-206.

These writers confirm the conclusion that the two theologies in dialogue are very fruitful. The influence of Gustavo Gutierrez's work on the respondents is obvious, and the Christian realists in their more hopeful moments seem very similar to the liberationists in their more sober political judgments.

##### COMMENTARY

Novak, Michael. "Needing Niebuhr Again," *Commentary*, 54 (September, 1972) 52-62.

Novak sees Niebuhr's caution against moralism as perhaps his most important contribution to political/ethical analysis today. However, his assertion, "Beware the children of light is, perhaps, the fundamental Niebuhrian imperative," goes too far. Particularly in the fall of 1972, the cynics were doing much more harm to the Republic than the children of light. Despite a few biographical inaccuracies (e.g., his teaching post in 1928, date of his strokes, etc.) the article is one of the best on Niebuhr.

##### DAEDALUS

Coles, Robert. "Review of *The Nature and Destiny of Man*," *Daedalus*, 103 (Winter, 1973), 97-104.

Coles chose to review *The Nature and Destiny of Man* for this special volume of *Daedalus* on twentieth century classics. In-

terestingly, it was the only volume of theology selected for inclusion in the list of sixteen classics. Coles' interest is primarily in the appreciative but sceptical interpretation Niebuhr gave to Marx and Freud. It was Niebuhr's capacity to place those interpreters of history in historical perspective that solicited Coles' admiration of the book. In his twentieth-century interpretation, the two nineteenth century critics of Christianity were placed in theological perspective, and the prophet interpreted the prophets.

#### THE JOURNAL OF RELIGION

Griffin, David. "Whitehead and Niebuhr on God, Man, and the World," *The Journal of Religion*, LIII (April, 1973), 149-175.

A very careful essay which clearly delineates the many points at which Whitehead and Niebuhr are in essential agreement. Valuable to the student of Niebuhr for both its motif comparisons and for the analysis of specific references by Niebuhr to Whitehead.

*The Journal of Religion*, under the leadership of Nathan Scott, Jr., a member of the Reinhold Niebuhr Committee, is planning an issue which will include pieces by Langdon Gilkey, Martin Marty, M. M. Thomas, Roger Shinn, et al. for fall, 1974.

#### THE NEW LEADER

Schlesinger, Arthur, Jr. "Prophet For a Secular Age," *The New Leader*, LV (January 24, 1972), 11-14.

Schlesinger's essay is a moving tribute from a secular thinker to a religious thinker who shared his political-social wisdom with a nation badly in need of it. Schlesinger's piece is one of the best surveyed in this period; it was originally given as his address at the Niebuhr Memorial Service in Riverside Church in November of 1971.

#### RELIGION IN LIFE

Smylie, James H. "Reinhold Niebuhr: Quadragesimo Anno," *Religion in Life*, XLII (Spring, 1973), 25-36.

Smylie's essay is a celebration of Niebuhr's *Moral Man and Immoral Society*. In his examination of the critical reviews of the book, he tends to side with the author against the critics. He concludes, "He trusted in God, and he did what he could, in God's name, to change man's collective life for the better. Reinhold Niebuhr's *Moral Man and Immoral Society* is still one of the great books in the history of the social passion—forty years after."

McFaul, Thomas R. "Reinhold Niebuhr: An Alleged 'Individualist,'" *Religion in Life*, XLII (Summer, 1973), 194-205.

McFaul argues correctly that the charge of individualist leveled in different ways by Walter G. Muelder, Dan Rhodes, and Marvin Cook is misplaced. The article points out that Niebuhr's perception of the self as a social self owes less to modern sociology than does his brother's concept and emphasizes the need for more discussion of this topic.

#### WORLDVIEW

Bennett, John C. "Realism and Hope After Niebuhr," *Worldview*, 15 (May, 1972), 4-14. John C. Bennett and Reinhold Niebuhr together gave Christian realism its meaning. The two learned from each other, but they were more independent of each other than has generally been recognized. Bennett now writes, "I have used the phrase Christian Realism many times, but now I want to be free from it because of the static stereotypes that it suggests." The static quality is not found in the writings of Niebuhr, however, without a balance of attention to open, hopeful history and politically reforming action. Bennett's reservations about the theology of hope stem from his greater political acuteness and the degree to which his ethics are grounded in the love commandments. After he has articulated his wise reservations about the theology of hope, he again sounds like a Christian realist.

Raines, John. "Theodicy and Politics," *Worldview*, 16 (April 1973), 44-48.

Raines' thesis, that Christian realism was a religious reflection of liberalism at a transcendent level, contains important truth. The thesis, however, is presented in a less than dialectic way, and in Niebuhr the liberal politics in the American situation are as much a projection of Niebuhr's religious faith as a projection of his liberal politics. In any case, the sense in which Niebuhr was a political liberal needs to be expounded in terms of his critique of many culturally held liberal assumptions. It is also true that liberal-pragmatic politics for Niebuhr were only a post-World War II phenomenon and there is nothing in Niebuhr's theology that makes impossible the conclusion that in a different, post-Vietnam War situation he might have sounded like a Christian socialist again. His own distinctive type of Christian socialism, of course.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. "Germany," *Worldview*, 16 (June, 1973), 13-18.

A brilliant analysis of Germany, prepared for publication in 1962 and now published in *Worldview* for the first time. It is must reading for admirers of Reinhold Niebuhr. Beneath the reporting on Germany is a dialogue with an important part of his own heritage.

Stone, Ronald. "The Realists and Their Critics," *Worldview*, 16 (June, 1973) 19-24.

McCollough, Charles. "Up to Our Steeples in Realism: Ethics After Vietnam," *Worldview*, 16 (June, 1973), 24-28.

McCollough's article is strongly anti-Niebuhr and usually his polemical interest gets in the way of his scholarship. Though his article reveals familiarity with some of the current critics of Christian realism, the following charges are false: 1.) "There is one overriding reality in a realist's world—that reality is power." 2.) "For Realism, power is seen almost solely in terms of political-military power." 3.) "For the realist power is the end, and all else is a means to it." 4.) "Realism views policies, procedures, products, tasks as morally neutral." 5.) "Realism ignores sin and salvation." 6.) "Realism falls into both [Manichean and Pelagian] heresies."

#### A.D.

Brown, Robert McAfee. "Interpreters of Our Faith: Reinhold Niebuhr," *A.D.*, 2 (February, 1973), 31-36.

Robert M. Brown finds the term prophet the most appropriate title for Reinhold Niebuhr in his one-page introduction to the excerpts from *Beyond Tragedy* which follow his comments. The essay, "The Test of True Prophecy," reminds a troubled nation of how numerous are the false prophets and how even a true prophet stands under God's judgment, relying on mercy.

#### BOOKS

Siegel, Seymour. "Reinhold Niebuhr: In Memoriam," *American Jewish Yearbook*: 1972, 73 (New York: The American Jewish Committee, 1972), 605-610.

This deserves mention as it emphasizes more profoundly than do any of the other essays Niebuhr's friendship and love for the Jewish community. Siegel concludes his tribute: "Niebuhr's great achievement was to relate the realm of the here and now to the realm of ultimate mystery. In measure unequalled by any other man of American religion, he succeeded. He will be sorely missed."

#### BOOKS

Bingham, June. *Courage to Change* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972).

Stone, Ronald. *Reinhold Niebuhr: Prophet to Politicians* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972).

In addition to the above essays, two books on Niebuhr were published in 1972. June Bingham has added a postscript to her ex-

cellent *Courage to Change*, first published in 1961 by Charles Scribner's Sons. The volume is indispensable reading for those seeking an acquaintance with the vitality of the man. Ronald H. Stone's intellectual biography with a focus on his political philosophy was also published in 1972 by Abingdon Press. Space does not permit discussion of the many reviews which greeted the publication of the two volumes, but one exception may be made: Robert Coles' "The World and the Devil," *The New Yorker*, October 7, 1972, is not only a review of Stone's book but also an appreciative account of Niebuhr by one of America's wisest and most humane psychologists.

Fishman, Hertz. *American Protestantism and a Jewish State* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1973).

While the book is concerned to document the inadequacies of the Protestant response to Judaism and Israel, it expresses a positive evaluation of Reinhold Niebuhr's understanding and intellectual defense of Zionism and Israel.

Hamby, Alonzo L. *Beyond the New Deal: Harry S. Truman and American Liberalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1973).

This book covers much of Reinhold Niebuhr's political activity, with many quotations from him on events of the period. Also many references to, and quotations from, a number of those whom Niebuhr influenced, including Joseph Rauh, Jr., Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., James Wechsler, and James Loeb. The analysis is critically friendly to the Niebuhr politics of non-Communist liberalism.

Vanderpool, Harold Y.; Johnson, Roger A.; Wallwork, Ernest; Green, Clifford; and Santmire, H. Paul, editors. *Critical Issues in Modern Religion*. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973).

Harold Y. Vanderpool has written a thoughtful, scholarly chapter on Niebuhr. The book is designed for use in college class work and the essay on Niebuhr deals in general terms with his contribution to social criticism. The argument of the book regards Niebuhr as an alternative to Marx, but the authors indicate their preference for a more radical Niebuhr, perhaps the Christian-Marxist of the thirties rather than the Christian realist of the sixties.

Miller, William Robert, edited. *Contemporary American Protestant Thought, 1900-1970*. (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1973). Pages 359-407.

William Miller provides a brilliant essay on Niebuhr to introduce four essays he has selected as representative of his work. Miller's essay and selections from Niebuhr are twice as long as his introductions and choices from any other twentieth century writer. His enthusiasm for Niebuhr is obvious. The only question is whether his introduction, "Reinhold Niebuhr, Dialectical Pragmatist," is sufficiently dialectical in its assertion that Niebuhr "owed nothing to Barth, Brunner, . . ."

Woollard, A. G. B. *Progress: A Christian Doctrine?* (London: S.P. C.K., 1972). Pages 14-25.

The chapter on "The Legacy of Reinhold Niebuhr" in this volume on progress does not distinguish between a doctrine of moral progress, which Niebuhr rejected, and a recognition of technological progress, which Niebuhr, of course, recognized. Niebuhr's point was that the increase of man's capacity increased his power for both good and evil. Consequently, Mr. Woollard's assumption that Niebuhr believed there was progress toward open liberal societies is unwarranted.

#### DOCTORAL THESES ON NIEBUHR, 1970-1972

Boulton, Wayne Granberry. "Ethics and Vision: The Role of Myth in the Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr," Duke University, 1972.



Coffey, John William, "Realist Social Thought in America: Reinhold Niebuhr and George Kennan," Stanford University, 1971.

Daugherty, James Dale, "The Concept of Community in the Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr: An Analysis of Niebuhr's Political Realism and Its Relationship to the Achievement of Community With a Special Emphasis on the American National Community," Graduate Theological Union, 1971.

Greenlaw, William Allen, "Reinhold Niebuhr as Theologian: A New Interpretation," Duke University, 1971.

McFaul, Thomas Ray, "A Comparison of the Ethics of H. Richard Niebuhr and Reinhold Niebuhr," Boston University Graduate School, 1972.

Martin, Thomas Michael, "Reinhold Niebuhr and Charles Chaplin: A Comparative Study Through the Ironic Ingredients of Niebuhr's Thought," Syracuse University, 1972.

Mayers, Ronald Burton, "The Problem, Meaning and Function of 'Transcendence' in a Social Ethic With Particular Reference to the Social Ethics of John Dewey and Reinhold Niebuhr," Syracuse University, 1972.

Rizzo, Robert F., "Christian Vision and Pacifism: A Study of Charles Earle Raven With a Comparison to Reinhold Niebuhr," Catholic University of America, 1971.

Shaner, Donald Wayne, "The Marxian Doctrine and Practice of Race Relations in the Light of the Theology of Reinhold Niebuhr," Drew University, 1970.

Shaw, Lionel Earl, Jr., "The Political Theory of Reinhold Niebuhr," University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1971.

#### ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, being the 24th of February marked the 56th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Estonia.

For two decades—1918-39—the ideals of democracy, unfettered by Communist oppression, were allowed to flourish in Estonia. This era, which has been described as the Golden Age of Estonia, came to a crashing halt with the forthcoming of World War II. From that time forward and unfortunately even until this day the Estonian people have been forced to live under an imperialistic Russian regime. Although the ideals of democracy are no longer free to exist in practice, they will always exist in the hearts and minds of all Estonians.

To the people of the free world and especially to the people of the United States this day carries a message which we sometimes take for granted.

It is a message of great fortitude, courage, and hope that has become a way of life for the oppressed Estonian people in their struggle to regain their cherished ideals of democracy and self-determination.

Regretfully, the joy which this occasion should have generated has been denied the Estonians, once again, this year, but where joy is lacking, pride is prevalent.

Therefore, I feel, that it is indeed fitting to commemorate both the day

and the Estonians, the world over, and to reassure them that we stand behind them in their endeavors and await the day when their lives are returned to normalcy and their nation's freedom is restored.

#### FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN REDUCING THE COST OF LIVING

### HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the problems facing an average American family today are staggering. Spiraling food prices, fuel costs, and the gasoline shortage have reached unbelievable levels. The average amenities of 1 year ago are now luxuries. The economic forces in this country are seriously out of balance, and seem to be getting worse every day.

The administration's controls have been effective in restricting wage increases, but have not seriously attempted to restrain prices. The results are explicit—inflation may be out of control. Only strict price and dividends controls could be effective if wages are allowed to rise for a short period of time until we regain some equilibrium.

The Banking Committee will shortly be considering an extension of the Economic Stabilization Act. I strongly believe that this is the time for the Congress to force the President's hand in administering across-the-board price controls. Just as Congress must now take an offensive role in regulating our national energy policies, we must assert the needs of people across the country for Federal assistance in reducing the cost of living.

The following letter from one of my constituents is the most eloquent and persuasive argument I have seen for assistance in a time of difficulty. We cannot ignore the plea:

ALAMEDA, CALIF.,

February 12, 1974.

MY DEAR MR. STARK: A true picture of a day in the life of a middle-class, part-time working, wife and mother. Maybe, just maybe, you don't know what it's like for us hundreds of thousands.

I walk out of my house, which I couldn't afford to buy today considering the incredible cost of housing, and get into a \$5,000 midsize Ford station wagon, which has never run right, and consumes gasoline at the rate of 10 miles to the gallon.

My first stop is the grocery store, one of the week's most frustrating chores. Today, one loaf of bread cost 52¢, the other, 74¢, a package of split peas, 62¢, cross rib roast, \$1.59 per pound. Then it's a wait in line for half an hour for the pleasure of spending \$79 for little more than the basics for a week to feed a family of four.

On to the gas station. Fuel is down to just under half and it's Thursday—today's signs for getting gas. I was eighth in line to pay 52¢ a gallon for ethyl. Why ethyl? Because the car won't run well with less octane!

Now it's onto the freeway. Approaching it, I remind myself that the speed limit is 55 mph, so keep an eye on the speedometer (if works)!

At 55 mph, I'm passed on both sides by trucks, buses and cars, so immediately in-

crease my speed to 58 mph with the same results. At 61 mph I'm staying with the majority of the traffic and begin to feel safer.

This was a necessary trip to a city 15 miles north in order to deliver the high school team's cheerleaders for an inter-school game. The school district has no funds for such school-sponsored activities. Of course there's no money for quality academic education either!

During the course of my wifely chores, I was approached by a well dressed man of about 30, who screamed wildly at me about looking for and finding God. I ignored his strange behavior, but was somewhat frightened. Only the night before in San Francisco, there was a rampage of four murders and two attacks which surely must have been committed by maniacs.

To top off this frustrating (routine) day, I was able to get home in time to hear President Nixon's State of the Union Message. It was the bitter frosting on a stale cake.

My days are only frustrating, but can you ever begin to imagine how terrible it must be for so many others without income, jobs, education, white skin, health, or just a little leave to ease the helplessness of it all?

Yours very truly,

MS. ARILEE BROGDON.

#### RECRUITING AN ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

### HON. ABRAHAM KAZEN, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, friends in the Texas Air Force Association have called my attention to an impressive leaflet prepared by the Air Training Command and titled "Report to Stockholders 1973." Lt. Gen. William V. McBride and his personnel wisely have taken the position that all citizens are shareholders in the Air Force's national defense mission and have provided a concise summary of last year's activities.

The Training Command has responsibility for Air Force recruiting, and is properly proud that it has exceeded all quotas and maintained quality standards for men and women, with special emphasis on minority officers and medical doctors. The Air Force has expanded its own educational program, with significant accreditation of its community college and the six ATC technical schools and computer assisted instruction for individuals.

The end of our participation in the Southeast Asia fighting caused reductions in pilot training but with navigator training maintained at past levels, the ATC topped the Air Force Commands in flying hours and General McBride reports improved methods are in use.

Race relations, drug and alcohol problems, and other rehabilitation needs are special targets, we shareholders are informed, and the report notes the need to adjust personal attitudes and resources to the energy shortage.

I commend my colleagues' attention to this useful summary of the Air Training Command's continued progress:

REPORT TO STOCKHOLDERS 1973

RECRUITING AN ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

The end of the draft as an enlistment motivation brought new challenges to Air

Training Command's task of recruiting men and women for the Air Force during 1973, but hard work, fresh enlistment inducements, and intensified advertising and promotional campaigns helped recruiters to meet or exceed all recruiting quotas for the year with some 80,000 young men and women entering the Air Force. Although skepticism had been voiced in some quarters about being able to maintain a quality force in an all-volunteer era, quality of recruits remained high throughout the year, whether measured by pre-entry aptitude tests or by the percentage of enlistees who are high school graduates (currently 95%). Recruiting efforts focused on offering increased educational opportunities, and more recruits were guaranteed their choice of skill training at time of enlistment. Recruiting of women received more emphasis as the Air Force announced plans to increase the numbers of women in uniform from the current 18,000 (a 129% increase over the past five years) to more than 48,000 by 1978. The diversity of job opportunities for women also expanded, as such technical skills as maintenance, engineering, computer sciences, weather, space systems, and communications—electronics were opened to women applicants. A vigorous minority recruitment program for the officer corps was pursued, as recruiters moved toward the 5.6% minority officer goal sought by the Air Force by the end of 1978—a figure which will match the projected percentage of minority college graduates in that year, and will more than double the current minority officer strength of 2.5%.

In October, Recruiting Service took over the responsibility of recruiting medical doctors for the United States Air Force. Twenty-three medical recruiting teams composed of medical officers, noncommissioned officers and civilians were formed, trained in recruiting skills, and located in those areas of the country containing a high density of medical schools.

#### COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF THE AIR FORCE (CCAF)

During 1972 and 1973 the Community College of the Air Force and ATC's six technical training schools were accredited by their regional accrediting associations (the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools), the same agencies which validate the quality of civilian institutions of higher learning. The Community College of the Air Force itself was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in mid-December, 1973. Accreditation brings wider recognition of the compliance of Air Force technical education with regional and national standards of educational excellence, and vests the CCAF transcript with greater acceptability to civilian educational and professional institutions throughout the country. Through the end of November, more than 18,000 transcripts had been issued to individuals and to more than 600 civilian colleges and universities. The monthly demand for CCAF transcripts grew from less than 1,000 in January to more than 5,000 by November.

In August, more than 60,000 copies of the CCAF general catalogue were distributed to civilian educational and Air Force locations throughout the world.

Also in August, CCAF awarded its first Career Education Certificate, which represents completion of an educational program equivalent to that required by junior colleges for an associate degree.

Official certification and endorsement of several of CCAF's 77 Career Education Certificate study programs were announced by such diverse agencies as the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education; the Texas Commission on Fire Protection Personnel Standards and Education; the Federal Aviation Administration; the National Association of Church Business Administrators; and the Texas

State Department of Health, to name but a few.

#### TECHNICAL TRAINING

While the Community College of the Air Force brought a new dimension to the value of technical training for airmen during 1973, efforts to update and modernize teaching methodology and technology continued throughout ATC. The principles of Instructional System Development (ISD) had been applied to well over 100 of the command's resident courses by the end of the year, systematically applying instructional technology to the design, conduct, and management of instruction.

The further development of Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) during the year spotlighted the advantages of self-paced, individualized instruction as a more desirable alternative to the traditional "lockstep" approach long associated with military training.

Also under development is computer-assisted simulation that facilitates teaching of complicated functions without the major expenses associated with actual first-line hardware items being used as training aids.

Throughout 1973, ATC personnel were deeply involved in the planning, design, and evaluation of maintenance and avionics training which will be required to support the F-15 Eagle air superiority fighter and the still-under-development B-1 bomber, as well as several other advanced systems now in the planning or prototype stage.

ATC continued to participate in an Inter-service Training Review Program during 1973, which has already saved over \$300,000 by consolidation of training courses once conducted separately by each armed service, and promises even greater savings in the future.

Support of Reserve and Air National Guard (ANG) activities continued during 1973, as reserve forces assumed their expanded responsibilities under the Total Force Policy. ATC personnel, for example, assisted in training ANG personnel for conversion from F-100 aircraft to the A-7D. ATC also provided facilities for training of more than 500 air reservists from 20 aerial port squadrons during annual active duty training, in addition to providing training for guardsmen and reservists in a variety of skills and specialties at all technical training centers on a continuing basis.

#### FLYING TRAINING

Supporting the many facets of pilot and navigator training throughout the command, ATC programmed more flying hours than any other command in the Air Force during 1973.

While undergraduate pilot production reduced slightly to about 3,000 per year, the annual undergraduate navigator production rate held at about the 1,400 mark.

Dramatic developments in flying training technology and methodology highlighted the year, including the following:

The Fighter Screening Program, using the prop-driven Cessna T-41, was consolidated at Hondo, Tex., Municipal Airport in May. The program, designed to screen prospective pilots prior to entry to jet flying training in the T-37, formerly was administered at each of ATC's nine undergraduate pilot training bases. Other screening studies underway are aimed at predicting, through psychological testing, the flying aptitude of officer trainees.

Progress is being made in moving toward increased use of simulation in the flying training program, an increasing sophistication of simulator design and implementation, both in pilot and navigator training, respect to syllabus content, self-pacing programs are underway at Williams AFB, Ariz., Craig AFB, Ala., and Columbus AFB, Miss., in respect to syllabus content, self-pacing procedures, and new approaches to synthetic trainer instruction.

At Mather AFB, Calif., navigator training officials have accepted the first delivery of the T-43, a medium-range jet navigation trainer which is the military version of the Boeing 737. A fleet of 19 T-43s will replace most of the 22-year-old prop-driven T-29s, which will leave Mather after establishing in 1973 a record of 10 years of flying without a major accident. The T-43s will provide the capability of flying more students farther at higher speeds and altitudes with more up-to-date equipment—at lower operating and maintenance costs. Used in conjunction with the T-43 will be a ground-based simulator complex, the T-45, designed for "whole task" training, digital radar land-mass simulation, and digital computer control of air navigator training missions.

Also accepted at Mather AFB during 1973 was a digitally controlled simulator which will permit a nonflying program for training of electronic warfare officers. When fully implemented, the "no-fly" program will eliminate the need for 12 aircraft.

Realignment of Department of Defense activities during the past year included the closure of Laredo AFB, Tex., home of one of ATC's undergraduate pilot training wings. Thanks to closely coordinated cooperation between the base and the civilian community, the closure was accomplished in an orderly manner, with little or no disruption to the outstanding spirit of friendship which for so long had marked the mutual relationships of Air Force personnel and the people of Laredo.

While ATC annually has more programmed flying hours than any other command, during the past year its cumulative flying accident rate of 1.3 at the end of the year was one of the lowest in the Air Force.

#### OPERATION HOMECOMING

When airmen held in captivity during the Southeast Asia conflict were returned to U.S. soil in February, ATC played a major role in the operation. Of 10 primary Air Force processing centers throughout the country, ATC operated three: Sheppard and Lackland AFBs, Tex., and Keesler AFB, Miss. Seventy returnees were reunited with families and other kin at those locations and received medical care, career development briefings, and legal counseling, to mention only a few services made available to them. Additionally, 25 ATC instructors on the Survival School staff at Fairchild AFB, Wash., served as Homecoming debriefers. Later in the year, ATC initiated requalification training for returned pilots and navigators on a personalized, self-paced basis at Randolph AFB, Tex., and Mather AFB, Calif.

#### THE HUMAN DIMENSION

There is more to Air Training Command than military and technical training. With its population of more than 118,000 military and civilian personnel, there are also the challenging human concerns that reflect the complexities of the American society at large. Dealing with these challenges in a realistic manner, while preserving the essential framework of military discipline and mission effectiveness, is of paramount importance in the all-volunteer era.

About 50,000 ATC personnel completed the command's 18-hour race relations program during 1973, including all commanders and key staff. Approximately 50,000 people also completed a 2-hour Drug/Alcohol Education program during the calendar year.

More than 21,000 ATC people contributed just under 780,000 volunteer hours in community service programs throughout the command during 1973, in projects ranging from tutoring disadvantaged children to building or repairing community recreational facilities.

Air Training Command's 1974 Combined Federal Campaign (CFC), conducted for the most part in conjunction with local United



Way drives, ended with a record-breaking total of \$1,870,507. Contributions from the 15 ATC bases represented 136% of the command's established goal and surpassed the 1973 CFC total by nearly \$300,000.

For those Air Force members who have had difficulty adjusting to military life, or who have been convicted for serious infractions of the law, ATC has operated special facilities at Lowry AFB, Colo., for the past 21 years. During 1973, Air Force professionals trained in psychology, medicine, and the social sciences have assisted in the rehabilitation and retraining of those who are recommended for another try at succeeding in military society. The Lowry achievement of better than 70% returned-to-duty has attracted professional scrutiny and study by civilian penal and rehabilitation institutions across the nation and throughout the world.

#### CHALLENGES AHEAD

Despite the accomplishments of the past year, 1974 will present problems and challenges of its own. Recruiting and training a quality force in the all-volunteer era will continue to be a demanding task. For the Air Force and ATC as well as the civilian world, the energy crisis will necessitate adjustments in personal attitudes and management of resources.

We recognize that one of our most important jobs in the year ahead will be to help further confidence and trust in the military.

We are confident that we will continue to perform our mission in a manner that will encourage public confidence and trust. But we approach the tasks involved with the conviction that the Air Force and ATC need public understanding and support of basic, fundamental truths regarding the national defense.

With that support by the American people, together we can work toward furthering a sense of national unity and purpose—and reaffirming faith in our future.

### GONZALEZ NEVER FORGETS— JUST ASK ONE FOE

#### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I submit to you the third in a series of five 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.

This particular article features an incident most of us that served in these Chambers in 1963 will remember.

The third of five parts follows:

[From the San Antonio News, Jan. 8, 1974]  
GONZALEZ NEVER FORGETS—JUST ASK ONE FOE  
(By James McCrory)

If the proper disposition for a politician is knowing when to remember and when to forget, Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez is indisposed.

Ask former U.S. Rep. Ed Foreman. Gonzalez helped make him a former congressman—twice, and from two different states.

#### HOT EXCHANGE

Gonzalez and Foreman engaged in a heated exchange in 1963 in the House, and Gonzalez, 47, invited Foreman, 29, outside.

There, Gonzalez either punched or shoved the Odessa Republican, depending on which eye-witness describes the incident.

Gonzalez, who spent World War II as a

civilian cable and radio censor under Army and Navy Intelligence, said Foreman had called him a "pinko," and questioned his patriotism.

Foreman denied the charge, but reiterated accusations that Gonzalez's "ultra-liberal left wing voting record was a disservice to the Constitution of the U.S. and furthers the Socialist-Communist cause."

#### TWO THINGS

In refusing to shake hands with Foreman after tempers cooled, Gonzalez observed:

"There are two things I never do. I don't drink and I don't shake hands with a SOB."

In the following election in 1964, Gonzalez invaded Foreman's West Texas district, and helped Democrat Dick White unseat him.

"The best time to kill a rattler is when he begins to wiggle," Gonzalez said of his efforts to keep Foreman from returning to the House.

#### SECOND TIME

Foreman subsequently was elected to Congress from New Mexico, and in the 1970 election Gonzalez moved in again to assist Democrat Harold Runnels to unseat him in his reelection bid.

His skirmishes with Foreman are indicative of a number of monumental battles that Gonzalez has engaged in over the years. The battles involved not only individuals, but issues.

Significantly, the majority of the opponents were men of money and/or position, and the issues usually were the hottest of the day.

#### DEFENDER

As a man who has campaigned all his political life for the common, ordinary, little man, as articulator for the inarticulate, Gonzalez just does not joust with the poor, the deprived, and those unable to defend themselves.

Besides never forgetting, Gonzalez also never desists.

Ask former Federal Aviation Administrator Najeeb Halaby, a high-handed bureaucrat who mistook himself for the king of the people, instead of their servant.

#### FRESHMAN

When Gonzalez questioned a Halaby decision to move the air route traffic control center from San Antonio to New Orleans in 1961, Halaby referred to Gonzalez as "a freshman congressman acting like a freshman."

The freshman congressman said he would remain a freshman all his life if Halaby was an example of a sophomore.

Between Aug. 6-17, 1961, Gonzalez made 10 floor speeches denouncing Halaby for his arrogance and rudeness to San Antonio civic leaders and raising questions on the proposed move itself.

He protested to President Kennedy, who had appointed Halaby (Halaby had raised funds for Kennedy in California), and he took his fight to the Bureau of the Budget, the Comptroller General, the General Services Administration, and congressional leaders.

#### HGB WINS

Gonzalez delayed the move, and on April 26, 1965, President Johnson announced a new FHA administrator.

The night before he made the appointment public, President Johnson called Gonzalez to tell him of Halaby's removal and he indicated that Gonzalez was partly responsible.

#### ATTACK ON CBS

A polished television and radio performer who makes weekly reports to his constituents on both media, Gonzalez launched a fullscale attack on CBS after its national show, "Hunger In America," in the late '60s.

The so-called documentary depicted an infant in a San Antonio hospital supposedly dying from malnutrition on camera.

Congressional investigators and the U.S.

House Agriculture Appropriations Committee found the claim was false.

The investigators also found other assertions in the film were false and misleading, not only as far as San Antonio was concerned but nationally.

#### ALBERT FUENTES

And it was Gonzalez who first blew the whistle on Albert Fuentes Jr., former special assistant to Small Business Administration Administrator Hilary Sandoval, and Eddie Montez, a former liaison man for Gonzalez.

The sensational charges that the two San Antonio men were involved in a conspiracy to take 49 per cent of a San Antonio businessman's ornamental works company in exchange for a \$100,000 SBA loan rocked the SBA and the new administration of President Nixon.

It was the first scandal to rock the administration after President Nixon took over. Fuentes had served as chairman of the Viva Nixon organization during the 1968 campaign.

Both men were convicted and sent to a federal correctional institution.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS

Perhaps Gonzalez's most noteworthy contribution over the years on the City Council, the state Senate, and the U.S. House of Representatives was in the field of civil rights.

Civil rights, he believes, is a moral issue, not subject to honest differences of opinion by reasonable men.

As a boy, Gonzalez knew discrimination, was called "greaser," and was barred from places reserved "For Whites Only."

#### FAMILY BARRED

As a City Councilman in San Antonio, he and his family had been barred from use of a public facility in New Braunfels.

And, as a councilman in the '50s, Gonzalez had moved, unsuccessfully, to have two blacks, State Rep. G. J. Sutton and Valmo Bellinger, appointed to the council.

But it was the state Senate which gave him the forum to drive his points home, and he struck forcibly at every discriminatory measure which came before the Senate in his five years there.

#### CHICK KAZEN

He had an ally in most of those civil rights battles in the person of then-State Senator, now-Congressman Chick Kazen, an American of Lebanese ancestry. The pair provided two of the most powerful lungs in the Senate.

Gonzalez and Kazen combined to filibuster against two of 10 "race" bills in the 1957 session of the Senate, holding the floor for 36 hours and two minutes. Their stand attracted international attention.

Warning of the ultimate perils of segregation, Gonzalez said the bills could be used against Mexican-Americans as well as blacks.

#### HATE FIGHT

"It may be some can chloroform their conscience," Gonzalez said in his 21-hour and two-minute floor stand. "But if we fear long enough, we hate, and if we hate long enough, we fight."

The other eight "race" bills weren't even brought up after the Gonzalez-Kazen talkathon.

Gonzalez filibustered against segregation for 11 hours, and shortly after the Little Rock, Ark., school crisis he filibustered for 20 hours against a bill giving Gov. Price Daniel authority to close Texas schools where there was a threat of violence and possibility of the use of federal troops. The bill passed.

The filibusters' effect is hard to measure, but it is known that the Senate thought twice before going further on the segregation route.

They delayed hasty action, gave senators time to regain the use of reason, provided key amendments, and killed entire sections.

Almost as important, they directed public attention to one of the most crucial issues of the day.

And after much of the sound and fury had died down, his fellow senators respected Gonzalez for his stands, whether they all agreed with him or not.

#### SENATE PRAISE

That is why, in an action unprecedented, the state Senate unanimously passed a resolution memorializing him after he went to Congress expressing the pride of the Senate in Gonzalez's service to the state.

In Congress, he was a consistent supporter of measures against segregation. He voted for the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and after the church bombing in Birmingham, Ala., in 1963, he obtained a special order from the Speaker to address the House on civil rights.

#### ESTONIAN FREEDOM

### HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join our Estonian-American friends in commemorating the 56th anniversary of the Estonian Independence Day. The historic declaration which established the independent Republic of Estonia on February 24, 1918, temporarily brought to an end a long history of subjugation and bondage under the rule of foreign powers. For more than 1 million Estonians, the establishment of an independent, peace-loving nation marked the fulfillment of their greatest hopes and aspirations.

Unfortunately, the joy of independence was short lived for the Estonian people. Although the small nation grew steadily and registered numerous economic achievements from 1918 to 1939, its military power was insufficient to prevent yet another foreign takeover. Through the nonaggression pacts between Nazi Germany and Communist Russia, the Soviet Union gained a sphere of influence over the Baltic area. Military arrests and mass persecutions followed, and Estonia was overrun. Tens of thousands of Estonians who resisted Soviet collectivism and fought in the underground for reestablishment of their beloved nation were deported. After the Nazi occupation during World War II, the Soviet Union again regained control of Estonia.

Since that time, the fate of Estonia has been controlled from the Kremlin. The harsh and brutal repression of the Soviet regime has come to be a fact of life for the Estonian people. Excessive prison sentences and forced exiles have accompanied a Soviet effort to destroy the Estonian sense of nationalism, and those of us who enjoy freedom cannot help but sympathize with these brave people in their hopes to once again gain independence.

The recent deportation of Nobel prize-winning author Alexander Solzhenitsyn by the Soviet Union is another dramatic example of the repressive measures employed by the communist regime. In the very work which ultimately led to his arrest by Soviet authorities, "The Gulag Archipelago, 1918-1956," Solzhenitsyn

spoke highly of the Estonians with whom he shared the fate of the Soviet prison camps. The great Russian author especially valued the Estonian devotion to democracy and the principles of self-determination.

Thus, the Solzhenitsyn affair once again focuses our attention to the plight of those who have been subjugated by the Soviet Union into positions of literal slavery. Free men cannot remain quiet while other men are denied their liberties, while families are massacred, and cultures destroyed. I hope that each Member will today take a moment to reflect upon the fate of small nations such as Estonia, and join in their hopes of reestablishment to their rightful place among the nations of the world.

Yesterday's commemoration of Estonian Independence Day was indeed a hollow celebration. Let us hope and pray that the Estonian people may again enjoy the freedom which is democracy's lifeblood.

#### PARENTS ARE THE KEY TO OUR MORAL CRISIS

### HON. JOHN B. CONLAN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are seriously concerned that our country faces a moral crisis of an aggravated kind.

This crisis has manifested itself in a variety of ways: Permissive lifestyles and drug use are widespread; a tide of pornographic filth has invaded magazines, television, and motion pictures; cheating and deception are common; senseless violence and terrorism against innocent citizens by advocates of social or political causes disrupts whole communities; and disintegration of traditional family life has been encouraged by the pervasive influence of secular humanism.

Especially disturbing is the widespread neglect by many Americans of moral standards themselves. Many people fear that if this moral anarchy continues unchecked, tomorrow there may be no moral code at all to distinguish us from common animals.

I am often asked what we can do to help turn the tide—to restore decency, honesty, and hard work as a guiding force in society. My response is that our people, as individuals, must recommit themselves to the spiritual values that are the heritage of the Judaic-Christian world. And we must all do as much as we can to bolster standards of good behavior in our own families and communities, remembering that nothing has invalidated the hard-earned moral wisdom of the ages.

Government itself cannot save our moral order. Neither can our schools or our police, per se. They can do much to prevent contributing to the general moral breakdown and the strain on family life, but only individual citizens personally reconciled to God can foster positive attitudes about acceptable civilized behavior that will be passed down to future generations.

The view that a portion of today's moral crisis is the direct result of parent failure and can be overcome in part by God-fearing parents was well-stated in an article 2 years ago by William V. Shannon, a member of the New York Times Magazine editorial board. Entitled "What Code of Values Can We Teach Our Children?" his article was later condensed by Reader's Digest.

I would like to include it at this point in the RECORD.

#### WHAT CODE OF VALUES CAN WE TEACH OUR CHILDREN?

(By William V. Shannon)

Let self-doubting parents remember: nothing has invalidated the hard-earned moral wisdom of the ages.

American children today are suffering from widespread parent failure. By their words and actions, many fathers and mothers make it clear that they are almost paralyzed by uncertainty. Old standards of behavior no longer seem to apply. Many parents are in conflict as to what their own values are. Others think they know, but lack the confidence to impose discipline in behalf of their values. Worst of all are those parents who doubt their right to structure a child's attitudes, beliefs and conduct.

Ironically, these difficulties have developed during decades when more reliable information has been acquired about children, and the formation of character, than at any other time in history. What is lacking is not information but conviction.

What values are relevant for tomorrow's world? We can answer this question if we imagine our children as young adults and ask a more personal series of questions about them: Do they tell the truth to one another and to themselves? Do they do their share of whatever work has to be done? Can they articulate and channel their aggression? Can they show tenderness and compassion toward other people? Can they be trusted—with a confidence, with a job, with money, with responsibility for another person's welfare? Given their particular talents, are they making use of them?

Every father and mother knows the answers he and she would like to give to these questions. If there is agreement on the goals to be reached, then there is no profound disagreement about values. How a child develops into an adult depends in part, of course, on heredity. But in greater part it depends upon whether parents care enough about their children to assert and defend the necessary values. It also means putting home responsibilities first. Rearing our children is by far the most important task that most of us will ever undertake. To accomplish it successfully requires placing it above one's career. Fathers as well as mothers have to be homemakers.

A successful home is a school for love. If children are not loved from infancy through their growing years, they cannot learn to love others and to become happy adults.

But love is not enough. Children need discipline if they are to develop competent, self-confident personalities. In the imposing of discipline, only a humorless martinet would fail to have occasional doubts about the right course. But doubt is one thing, and abdication is another. Those parents who do not persevere in rearing their children according to their own convictions are not leaving them "free" to develop on their own. Instead, they are letting other children and the media, principally television and the movies, do the job.

On basic issues of right and wrong, the essential values are what they have always been. Nothing has invalidated the hard-earned moral wisdom that mankind has accumulated since Biblical times. To kill, to steal, to lie, or to covet another person's possessions still leads to varying degrees of misery for the victim and the perpetrator.



The 20th century has not found a way to repeal the Ten Commandments. "Thou shalt not commit adultery" may sound old-fashioned, but restated in contemporary terms—"Do not smash up another person's family life"—it still carries a worthwhile message.

Some modern parents are already so defeatist on sexual issues that they are having their 14-year-old daughters fitted with diaphragms or given prescriptions for the pill. But the powerful emotions surrounding the sexual act cannot be screened out as easily as the sperm. There are those who argue that sex can be completely pleasurable even if one barely knows, or loathes, one's partner. I suggest that most young people are not so tough or neurotic. Whatever they may protest to the contrary, their feelings are engaged in the sexual act and their feelings are bruised when it leads nowhere.

Children of both sexes have to be taught what wise mothers have always told their daughters: that an intimate and important experience is cheapened when it is divorced from love. In sexual relations as in other areas of life, Americans have to relearn the satisfaction of self-denial and anticipation. It would do no harm to 16- and 17-year-olds boys and girls to know the facts about sex and yet not engage in intercourse. A certain amount of frustration and tension can be endured—and with good effect. Only modern Americans regard frustration as ranking higher than cholera in the scale of human afflictions.

For probably four fifths of American children, the affluent society is an overpowering reality that neither they nor their parents have learned to manage. No children in the history of the world have been so inundated with junk or have become so accustomed to the idea that a high level of material goods is essential. This breeds an unattractive materialism. It destroys a child's time-scale and sense of proportion. A material object which should be cherished at age 16 because it has been earned by odd jobs on Saturdays is nowadays a broken castoff when a child is half that age.

In our family, there are no gifts when Father returns from a trip, no casual, impulse buying at the supermarket or the drugstore. The gift that is earned by performing a few chores or that is made at home out of simple materials is preferable, because it is within a child's natural range of experience and not borrowed from a false adult world of money and advertising.

The hippies and flower children of the 1960s were inevitable. As members of the first generation to grow up in the TV age, they were the rebels against the materialism and hedonism which television advertising inculcates. Sick of excessive stress on toothpastes and deodorants, they grew up determined never to take a bath. Sick of a world in which automobiles and air-conditioning were equated with happiness, they turned their backs on the simplest material necessities. Sick of competition for glossy baubles, they opted out of the workaday world.

A distinction has to be made between the disdain for materialism and the necessity of a work ethic. An individual can be indifferent to material rewards as such, but still have a positive attitude toward work. Work in the best sense is an expression of a person's intellectual powers or artistic sensibility or physical strength or personality. There is satisfaction in making use of each of these human capacities.

If one's work does not provide any kind of distinctive outlet, it may still provide the psychic rewards of being a member of a group with its own élan and cohesiveness. Since no society has yet been invented in which the overwhelming majority can survive without working, and since everything we have learned about human beings suggests that they are happier when they are performing some useful function, parents have an obligation to their children to

instill in them a positive attitude toward work. Such an attitude involves acceptance of a relationship between effort and reward, a willingness to share, an ability to follow and accept discipline as well as to lead and give direction, and a capacity to postpone immediate gratification for the sake of later accomplishment. No child should be stifled or severely coerced, but too much emphasis has probably been placed on self-expression, with the result that many children grow up never realizing that there are times when they can be happy only if they subordinate themselves.

Probably the whole point of rearing a child can be summed up in one word: "individuality." That is, helping him to be who he is with all his strengths and nuances of personality and distinctiveness of background. Naturally, the stronger the parents, the more coherent the values of the family, the easier it will be for the child to evolve his individuality.

It is equally important that parents put forward a positive attitude toward their own racial and ethnic heritage. There are some untenable and self-defeating impulses in the Black Power movement, but for Negro children there is surely an enormous psychic gain in being taught that "black is beautiful." Black is beautiful—and so are white, red, brown and yellow.

But the dark side of ethnic self-esteem is prejudice. My observations convince me that youngsters are naturally suspicious and sometimes hostile to the unfamiliar face or the different skin. Racial tolerance, like courtesy or not slugging one's little brother, has to be taught.

Almost anything that a family does together—whether it is eating in a restaurant or camping or going on a vacation or going to church, or hiking or bicycling or working on the family boat—is worthwhile, because it promotes a family spirit. Children may resent at times that they cannot do what every other child on the block is doing, but, far outbalancing that resentment, they gain the security of family membership.

The civilizing of a child begins with the recognition of restraints. If a child is to learn to be an adult, he has to begin by respecting the adults he knows best—his parents and grandparents. By learning to obey his father and mother, a child has the freedom within the sure boundaries they set for him to discover his own identity. By learning to respect other people's rights, a child gains the self-confidence to claim his own.

#### KAISER ENCOURAGES CAR POOLING TO CONSERVE ENERGY

**HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, Kaiser Steel in Fontana, Calif., is making an effort to conserve gasoline and reduce pollution that deserves some attention. Mr. Jim Franzen, an industrial engineer at the Fontana plant, has organized a computerized program under which every one of the approximately 9,000 employees at the plant will be given the names of other Kaiser employees living in his or her immediate area. Individual employees need take no action whatsoever to be included in this program; every individual's name and address will be fed into the computer unless the employee specifically requests that his or her name be held out by simply

writing his or her name and employee identification number on a form which has been distributed to all employees and returning the form to a foreman or supervisor, or to Mr. Franzen.

Participation in the car pooling program, even after the names and addresses have been given out, is strictly voluntary. Those wishing to take part will contact one another, using their lists to determine likely prospects in their areas. No one is obliged to participate by having their name listed. The computer work is being supplied by Kaiser Steel as a free service—at no charge to anyone.

Mr. Speaker, the advantages of car pooling are widely known; I need not elaborate on them. But I would like to emphasize the magnitude of the benefits of such a large car pooling program. Mr. Franzen has calculated that if just 5 percent of the employees at Kaiser's Fontana plant participate, it will take more than 400 cars off the road. This will not only reduce the gasoline shortage, but also the clean air shortage, and it will save wear and tear on 400 cars at the same time.

The program will take effect in March, Mr. Speaker, and I eagerly look forward to the first results. If other large companies will follow Kaiser's lead it will be of tremendous assistance to us as we attempt to overcome the short-term problems we are currently encountering.

#### WOMEN IN BUSINESS

**HON. PETER A. PEYSER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been interested in the significant contributions women have made in operating businesses and assuming leadership roles in determining corporate policy. Mrs. Sally L. Cohen, a resident of Yonkers, exemplifies the talent and dynamism that women have long exhibited in the business world. The Journal of Business in New York State, published by the N.Y. State Department of Commerce, recently contained the following tribute to Mrs. Cohen who has done an outstanding job of operating and expanding the Excelsior Transparent Bag Corp. of Yonkers, N.Y.

The article follows:

DIVERSIFIED SMALL INDUSTRY IN THE FABULOUS WESTCHESTER AREA

Things have not always been easy for Mrs. Cohen. She inherited the business when her first husband died, and it took many long hours of hard work to continue her responsibility of raising four children as well as making a success of the enterprise. As a result of her experience she believes "a mother who works has learned to schedule her time so that she actually spends more time with her family, and to better advantage, than the average non-working mother who is caught up in meaningless social activity."

Her success in combining two careers is attested to by the fact that all four of her children, now grown and educated, are a part of the business with an enthusiasm matching her own.

As one of the largest independent operations in the flexible packaging industry,

Excelsior has wide capabilities in its machines, which can economically produce runs from thousands to millions. Many of its customers, which range from small specialty producers to mass merchandisers, learned of Excelsior by word of mouth advertising, and Mrs. Cohen believes that customer recommendation of her company's services has been a potent factor in its growth.

The Cohens are extremely civic-minded, sponsoring two local Little League ball teams, for example. They work closely with the community's Board of Cooperative Educational Services school to develop courses which will equip young people for jobs. Mrs. Cohen is also a member of the Yonkers Mayor's Council on Consumer Affairs.

And, just to assure continuity of this resourceful family business, there are six grandchildren waiting in the wings.

EXCELSIOR TRANSPARENT BAG CO., INC.,  
YONKERS

From a two man cellophane converting plant in 1945 to a full service, highly technical flexible packaging operation with 100 employees today—that is the record Excelsior Transparent Bag has racked up under the leadership of Sally L. Cohen.

And further expansion is in the wind—today the company utilizes a 42,000 square foot building which is bursting at the seams; shortly it will occupy an existing 120,000 square foot building on six waterfront acres in Yonkers.

The company offers broad service to industries requiring creative packaging, utilizing films, foils, papers and a host of combinations and laminates. Oriented primarily to the food industry, Excelsior is prepared to clarify the market for the product, work out a full marketing approach, design and produce the package and means for displaying it.

CONGRATULATIONS TO NEW HAMPSHIRE  
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY  
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I rose on the House floor to commend the Mississippi Army National Guard for the excellent job they had done in recruiting and the efforts they had put forth to maintain their authorized strength levels. My good friend and colleague the gentleman from New Hampshire, Congressman CLEVELAND, has brought to my attention the commendable record that has been achieved by the Army National Guard in the Granite State of New Hampshire. Under the leadership of Maj. Gen. F. B. McSwiney and the officers and men under his command, the New Hampshire Army National Guard completed a highly successful recruiting program during the month of January that resulted in their achieving 106 percent of its programmed strength. I commend the New Hampshire Army National Guard and hope other States will be following the example set by them and my own State of Mississippi. For the information of my colleagues, I include a copy of the letter Major General McSwiney sent to Representative CLEVELAND regarding his

organization's successful recruiting program:

THE ADJUTANT GENERAL,  
THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,  
Concord, N.H., February 8, 1974.

Hon. JAMES C. CLEVELAND,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CLEVELAND: You may be interested in knowing that the strength of the New Hampshire Army National Guard is now 2436, or 106% of its programmed strength. This figure represents 164 officers, 37 warrant officers and 2235 enlisted men. We are now second only to Puerto Rico in actual vs. programmed strength.

During the month of January, an all-out recruiting drive succeeded beyond all expectations. The enthusiastic attitudes and vigorous recruiting efforts were apparent at every level from Colonel to Private, which would seem to indicate excellent prospects for an all volunteer force.

Being aware of your keen interest in the posture of the Reserve Forces, I am pleased to forward this information.

Sincerely,

F. B. McSWINEY,  
Major General, AGC, NHNG, The Adjutant General.

TWO BILLS TO HONOR AND  
COMFORT SOLZHENITSYN

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two bills to extend the recognition and the hospitality of the United States to the expelled Russian novelist Alexander Solzhenitsyn. I am inserting the text of these two bills to be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The first measure would confer honorary U.S. citizenship on Mr. Solzhenitsyn. It follows earlier precedents of the Congress in awarding this status to the Marquis de Lafayette and to Winston Churchill, with one important exception. The Churchill bill for example vested authority in the President to confer honorary citizenship, through what, in effect, was a formal diplomatic gesture extending the hand of amity to the British people as a whole through their celebrated leader. That would obviously be inappropriate in this case, so my bill simply declares "that Alexander Solzhenitsyn shall be an honorary citizen of the United States." It is an act of recognition of a freedom-loving individual, pure and simple, with no diplomatic entanglements whatever.

The second measure would allow Solzhenitsyn and his family, once reunited, to enter and reside in the United States—if and only if they choose to do so. It is a humanitarian offer of refuge, bespeaking our sympathy and admiration for this embattled but uncowed man of letters. He will, of course, decide where he wishes to settle, be it in Scandinavia or Switzerland or possibly these United States. No act on our part should seek to politicize his process of choice, and the bill I am introducing avoids any

pressures in that respect. It would take effect only if Solzhenitsyn freely expresses his wishes to have it do so, by writing to the Secretary of State. Should that occur, my bill would remove all impediments to his acquiring a visa, whether because of his statelessness or because of other procedural delays and requirements normally encountered under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. Speaker, these are not abstract gestures on my part. In consultation with the Iowa Writers' Workshop, I have personally invited Mr. Solzhenitsyn to accept their offer of a quiet and congenial haven in which to continue his writing as a free and honorable man. A copy of my cable to him is inserted for printing in the RECORD. I do not know when he will reach a decision about this invitation, or what that decision may be when he does make it—but I hope and trust that he will recognize the unity that joins his fearless spirit with that of our own freedom-loving people in Iowa and the Nation.

The two bills and cable follow:

H.R. 13027

A bill to permit Alexander Solzhenitsyn and his family to become permanent residents of the United States if Mr. Solzhenitsyn wants to immigrate to the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act or any other provision of Federal law, upon written request by Alexander Solzhenitsyn to the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Solzhenitsyn, his wife, and his unmarried children shall each be issued a visa and shall each be admitted to the United States for permanent residence at his request.

H.R. 13026

A bill to confer honorary United States citizenship upon Alexander Solzhenitsyn

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Alexander Solzhenitsyn shall be an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

AMERICAN EMBASSY BONN.

Representative John Culver, member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, requests following message be conveyed through Heinrich Boell or other literary channels to Solzhenitsyn:

"I very much hope that, when your family has been reunited, and you have had a chance to relax and reflect, you will give serious consideration to accepting the invitation forwarded through your attorney in Switzerland to at least visit and perhaps join the faculty of the Writers Workshop at the University of Iowa. It would give you peace and calm in which to continue your writing of which the world is so proud.

"The countryside in Iowa is very like that of Northern Europe, and many of our people are of Scandinavian and Slavic origin. Anton Dvorak settled in Iowa and composed his new world symphony here.

"You need not be a citizen to enter or reside in the United States, although I am introducing legislation to grant you U.S. citizenship if you should wish it.

"I am sure I speak for all Iowans in saying we would welcome and respect having you, a son of Russia and citizen of the world, as our neighbor and friend."



## EXPANDING THE RIGHT TO VOTE

## HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as the November elections approach, it is urgent that election reform legislation still tied up in committee be acted upon. The absence of a workable mail registration system is a major factor in the embarrassingly low registration and voting turnout in American elections.

The use of complex and inconvenient voting procedures has effectively disenfranchised millions of potential voters. The hardship of registering to vote in person at a city hall or county courthouse falls primarily on the poor, the worker who cannot leave his job in the middle of the day, the sick, the handicapped, and the aged. Mail registration would make the cherished power of the vote more of a right and less of a privilege.

While House inaction continues there have been several favorable steps being made in my own State of New York toward electoral reform.

Paul O'Dwyer, the distinguished president of the New York City Council, has forcefully endorsed a mail registration plan.

The New York Post, in an editorial in support of mail registration said:

There would doubtless be some administrative complexity in a mail registration program. Accurate reporting and record-keeping would be basic, both to insure full participation and to prevent fraud. But use of the mails for important transactions is hardly a novelty any more. Voters routinely make bank deposits, borrow money, obtain credit, pay bills, purchase merchandise and carry on a variety of other business via the post office.

Salvatore Scalfani, president of the New York City Board of Elections, recently testified before a joint hearing of the New York State Legislature's Select Committee on the Election Law and a citizens advisory group which is drafting recommendations on election law reform. Mr. Scalfani also called for allowing citizens to register to vote by mail.

Even the New York State Senate, long a roadblock to electoral reform, unanimously voted to authorize absentee voting in primary elections, a matter decided long ago by virtually every other State in the country.

The concept of a democratic government is a farce unless the Government does all in its power to make full participation in elections and other decision-making processes a reality. When only 55 percent of those eligible to vote actually go to the polling place during a Presidential election—the case in 1972—there is a serious and frightening danger that all power will be abdicated to the wealthy, the powerful, and the power hungry.

The National Voter Registration Rights Act of 1973 which I introduced in the House of Representatives would help reverse this trend toward nonparticipation. As I said a year ago,

CXX—261—Part 3

This rapidly developing phenomena of political non-participation is threatening to destroy our democratic society as we know it, even faster than pollution or inflation.

Legislation bottled up in the House Rules Committee would help remedy this critical situation. I testified there in favor of the Voter Registration Act, but it is still languishing in committee.

To those of us from communities traditionally wielding little power in governmental policymaking, election reform and expanding the right to vote means an opportunity for a fair share of our own Government. At a press conference in New York City last year, I was joined by David Dinkins, then president of the Board of Elections, William Larkin, then a member of the Board of Elections, Prof. Penn Kimball of Columbia University, an authority on the election process, and former Attorney General Ramsey Clark. The common concern at that press conference was the disenfranchisement of American citizens by antiquated voter registration laws.

If the 1974 elections are to be a true opportunity for the American people to express their views on the leaders and policies available, we must open up the election process.

SELF-DEFENSE OF FREE MEN,  
ANCIENT RIGHT—PART II

## HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD another excellent editorial appearing in the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader of Thursday, January 3, 1974, by Mr. Gordon N. Johnson, chief of police of Minneapolis, Minn., which speaks clearly for itself.

In this Mr. Johnson discusses the threats now rampant in the land to the ancient right of free men to own and use firearms for legitimate hunting, sport, and defense purposes.

Chief of Police Johnson is entitled to discuss these matters and to be critical of the statistical games played by those who seek to strip law-abiding citizens of this ancient and honored right:

WHEN OPPONENTS SAY SOMETHING IS WRONG WITH FIREARMS OWNERSHIP, THEY FORGET—40 MILLION IN UNITED STATES HAVE A 350-YEAR-OLD RIGHT

(By Gordon N. Johnson)

The statistics game is a common ploy. I could play it too, citing Minnesota's low crime rate and attributing it to relatively non-repressive laws! However, any half-witted excuse for a social scientist knows that a scientific study must involve isolation of variables.

The general problem is that the varied causes of crime are still not well known, to say nothing of being taken into consideration. Firearms or firearms laws are not among the 11 major variables of crime as listed at the front of the FBI's latest Uniform Crime Reports. There are even more variables involved when countries are compared.

Another ploy is the opinion poll.

The trick is to word the question to elicit the desired response. Polls commonly lack validation. A poll which asks if the citizen favors federal regulation of firearms may get a positive response, but never does a poll seek to learn public knowledge of present laws.

I'll venture to guess that a poll done on the percentage of handguns thought to be used in crime would show wide variance from known statistics. Should a campaign against handguns succeed, polls may show that most of the citizenry favors confiscation. So what? Shall civil rights be denied by a majority decisions? Bills of rights were devised to recognize rights and protect them from tyranny of the majority.

When opponents tell us there is something wrong with firearms ownership itself, they reveal more about themselves than about the issue raised. Americans had and used firearms for three centuries before Hollywood began making up myths about ownership, a common law right recognized in most state constitutions and in the federal Bill of Rights. Firearms ownership does not indicate a basic predilection to violence.

Handguns are today being subject to special vilification. A few basics about handguns and their use should be noted. Before playing devil's advocate, however, I'll add the caveats that I have never urged any citizen to possess or carry a handgun or any other firearm and I firmly believe that anyone who owns a firearm should know exactly how and when to use it legally, safely, accurately and prudently.

Handguns differ from other firearms not by function but by mobility. They do not have purpose, unless one believes in animism. Very often a handgun is the only practical firearm for self defense. A long gun is awkward to store and cannot be cleared for action as quickly as a handgun. Those who keep handguns for self-defense tend to view them not as threatening instruments but as precautionary devices akin to fire extinguishers; there if needed, but hopefully not; objects of psychological assurance if nothing else. The handgun is an equalizer against the criminal and the right to use it is often the right to life itself. Contrary to apparent popular belief, however, most cases in which handguns are used in self-defense do not involve killing or bodily injury.

Often the sight of a handgun is all the "action" needed to nip in the bud an attempted assault or criminal violation.

Opponents of handgun ownership assume that the defender is always the loser in an encounter. Although there has never been a scholarly, broad range study done on handguns actively used in self defense, it does not appear valid. But even should it be, who has the right to say that a citizen may not defend himself?

Police forces were never designed to provide general personal security; that reliance has of necessity rested with the people. Who provides protection in the ninety seconds before the squad car arrives? It would be an ultimate madness of the bleeding heart liberal to disarm the public to the peace of mind of the criminal.

Regardless of the need for handguns, a move to confiscate them outright or through increased repression seems to be picking up ground. Some of the same people who said in 1968 they only wanted to register the guns, now openly admit they seek confiscation.

Confiscation has been endorsed by national commissions, by the Americans for Democratic Action, the Committee for Economic Development, and the Young Women's Christian Association, among others.

The totalitarian approach has prevented the passage of good legislation, an example being regulation of the so-called "Saturday

Night Specials." Quality control standards for handguns are desirable. When the confiscators came along, they tried to eliminate as many handguns as possible.

One ploy was class legislation, getting rid of "cheap" handguns, depriving the poor. Another ploy was to allow only handguns suitable for sporting purposes, not for self defense. Let's face it, a short barreled handgun is often ideal for self defense and it does not have to be a cannon. Caliber varies with need. Women, who may be subject to more non-lethal attacks than lethal, may choose a diminutive handgun of small caliber. It may not kill an attacker, but he knows he'll be miserable for a long time, if only in thinking about his good fortune in being still among the living.

As things stand now, I'm afraid the legitimate issue of quality control has gone down with the ship.

The main concern for me is that the police will end up taking the rap for this misguided totalitarian zeal. I'm worried that if we're forced to act like the Gestapo we'll get an appropriate reception.

I'd rather fight crime than try to take the firearms from 40,000,000 Americans who believe they have a 350-year old right to have them.

When the proponents of repressive legislation fail, they invariably ignore the faults of the legislation and project blame upon the "gun lobby," particularly the National Rifle Association. They badly misapprehend their opponents.

An active five per cent of gun owners (not including myself) belong to the N.R.A., but the majority also opposes repressive legislation, and on essentially a civil rights basis. It should be evident that the basic freedoms of speech, press, religion, and the right to have and use arms are probably the most fiercely defended civil and constitutional rights.

Many a politician has been mauled in the process of learning that the "gun lobby" is primarily a broadly based citizens' rights group rather than an industry lobby. Repressive legislation has the counter-productive effect of arousing citizens who want to be left alone. When we look at the proponents of repressive legislation we are faced with the strange spectacle of explicitly named civil rights organizations trying to stamp out another civil rights movement and denying its right to exist on the precarious constitutional argument that part of the Bill of Rights is outdated or should be.

Instead of their usual role in defending abusers of civil rights, here they try to deny rights to those who have not abused them. Consistency, it seems, is a trait most admired in others.

In the interest of empathy, consider some of the "gun control" arguments facetiously applied to press controls: The time is past when editors could fire off their opinions in any direction without hurting anyone. In a crowded society we must all agree to responsible press controls. Freedom of the press in the Bill of Rights is not an individual freedom, but corporate, meaning the government and its printing office.

This epidemic of printed lies and character assassinations cries for government action. How long will Congress be cowed by the self-seeking press lobby? It is time to pass the Personal Safety Press Control Act of 1973. The act will involve minor inconveniences, but no responsible editor can argue against submitting his stories in advance for a minimal check on accuracy, libel, and the like.

The provision for registering printing presses is necessary to prevent the printing of lies. Admittedly, there are those who feel that the only purpose of a printing press is character assassination, but be assured that no one in government presently has any plans to confiscate printing presses, except when misused.

Should there be a change in policy, it is unthinkable that anyone in public office

would use a press registration list for confiscation. Discretionary power exercised by governmental issuing authorities also would not be misused to confiscate printing presses, but merely to verify and insure the good character of editors and determine their need to publish given stories. After all, if you can't trust your elected public officials, who can you trust?

Think about it.

#### WHY AMERICAN MILLIONAIRES ARE THE WORLD'S WORST FARMERS—OR, HOW THE TAX CODE CONTINUES TO ENCOURAGE TAX LOSS FARMING

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the 1969 Tax Reform Act closed the tax loopholes which permitted tax loss farming by wealthy individuals—right? Wrong.

Many of us in the Congress may have thought that we were closing a tax loophole in 1969, but the Treasury Department's "Individual Statistics of Income" for 1970 show that the loophole lives on—that American millionaires are still the world's worst farmers—but keep getting richer through the magic of the tax code.

In 1969, the last year that the old law relating to farming tax losses was in effect, 27 American millionaires made \$1,770,000 from farm operations—but 136 millionaires managed to lose—generally for tax purposes—\$9,037,000 on farm operations. In other words, these millionaires, whom most of us would think must be pretty good managers and businessmen—lost an average of \$66,448 each in farm operations.

In 1970, under the new law, only 19 millionaires made \$435,000 from farming. Ninety-four "lost," generally for tax purposes, \$12,046,000 for an average "loss" of \$128,149 each.

In short, the amendments may have discouraged a few individuals from trying the tax farm loss gimmick, but those wealthy individuals who continued nearly doubled their tax advantage. Truly, the American millionaire has a green thumb; it does not help him grow things—but it brings in the green.

The statistics will show, Mr. Speaker, that we failed to close the tax-loss farming loophole in 1969—and additional and more thorough reform is needed.

The example of tax-loss farming is just one more argument for tax reform this year.

In 1939 the Congress decided, according to the House report on the Tax Reform Act, that for those with farm income:

The combination of a current deduction against ordinary income for various farm expenditures which are capital in nature and the capital gains treatment granted on the sale of the asset to which the expenditures relate produce a significant tax advantage and tax saving for the taxpayer whose ordinary income is taxed in a high bracket.

These special provisions grew up, largely, as an effort to save the farmer the labor and extra effort of the book-keeping chores associated with inven-

tories and the accrual method of accounting. These rules were understandable years ago, when the farmer may not have had the opportunity for as much formal education as his city cousins. These special rules, however, have been used by those whose real purpose in life is not farming—but reducing their tax burden. The special rules designed to help the American farmer are now used by Wall Street investors who seldom see any larger open space than Central Park.

The importance of the special rules can be seen from an example which was included in the Senate report on the Tax Reform Act. In this example, a taxpayer sells \$1,000 worth of a product which cost him \$800 to produce. The \$1,000 in farm income can be treated as capital gains, while the \$800 is deducted against ordinary income. In other words, the sale is taxed at capital gains rates, about 25 percent, while the cost is deductible at the taxpayer's marginal tax rate—up to 50 percent and even more.

If the taxpayer in this example is in the 50-percent bracket, his tax saving is \$400 on the deduction of the costs. If the product he sold is taxed at the 25-percent capital gains rate, his tax is \$250. This means a net reduction in taxes of \$150—despite the fact that actually, economically, a \$200 gain was realized.

As the Senate report further noted:

In contrast, were the entire \$800 to be treated as the cost basis for the \$1,000 asset, even though the \$200 gain still was taxed at capital gains rates, instead of receiving a tax reduction of . . . \$150 . . . the taxpayer would have an additional tax cost of \$50.

Thus the total tax gain of using the special rules is actually \$200 in the above example.

Quoting again from the House report:

These rules have allowed some high-income taxpayers who carry on limited farming activities as a sideline to obtain a tax loss (but not an economic loss) which is deducted from their high-bracket, nonfarm income.

This has also been a tax loophole which particularly benefited the wealthy. Again, as the House report noted:

Data prepared by the Treasury Department indicates that in the farming business, as distinguished from other types of business, it appears the trend toward losses increases as the taxpayer's adjusted gross income increases.

As a result of these concerns, the Congress attempted to correct the situation in the 1969 Tax Reform Act. In short, the new law provided that a person who had nonfarm income of \$50,000 or more and who had \$25,000 in farm losses, would have to treat capital gains arising on the sale or disposition of farm property as ordinary income rather than as capital gains income.

Unfortunately, the amendment did not work. The statistics of income for 1970 show that the number of very wealthy individuals engaged in tax farm losses has declined slightly—but their tax savings continue to rise.

Following are the tax loss farming figures for 1964 through 1966 excerpted from the 1969 House report. In addition, I am listing the figures for 1967, 1968, 1969, and 1970 for those with more than \$100,000 adjusted gross income:



TABLE 1.—NET FARM LOSS, NUMBER OF RETURNS AND AVERAGE NET FARM LOSS, BY AGI CLASS, TAXABLE RETURNS, 1964, 1965, AND 1966

AGI classes (thousands)	1964			1965			1966		
	Number of returns	Net loss (thousands)	Average loss	Number of returns	Net loss (thousands)	Average loss	Number of returns	Net loss (thousands)	Average loss
0 to \$5	222,910	\$236,049	\$1,059	197,762	\$203,526	\$1,029	171,410	\$167,024	\$974
\$5 to \$10	314,346	340,867	1,084	319,741	334,943	1,048	324,312	349,196	1,077
\$10 to \$15	70,351	112,499	1,599	79,564	123,177	1,548	104,509	142,655	1,365
\$15 to \$20	17,969	48,817	2,717	23,843	60,292	2,529	31,667	35,370	2,380
\$20 to \$50	29,394	152,693	5,195	30,380	133,187	4,384	36,861	154,263	4,185
\$50 to \$100	6,865	63,526	9,254	7,424	76,852	10,352	8,883	76,402	8,620
\$100 to \$500 <sup>1</sup>	2,546	53,608	21,056	2,874	54,872	19,093	13,241	160,789	118,756
\$500 to \$1,000	145	5,295	\$6,517	170	6,625	38,971	193	7,566	39,202
\$1,000 and over	76	4,500	\$9,211	103	7,630	74,078	88	3,555	40,398

<sup>1</sup> Greater detail available for 1966.

1967:	Net profit (number of returns)		Net loss (number of returns)		Average net loss/return	1969:	Net profit (number of returns)		Net loss (number of returns)		Average net loss/return
	Amount	Amount	Amount	Amount			Amount	Amount	Amount	Amount	
\$100,000 to \$200,000	1,052	\$21,569,000	3,009	\$47,800,000	\$15,886	\$100,000 to \$200,000	1,530	\$27,838,000	4,116	\$62,634,000	\$15,217
\$200,000 to \$500,000	225	3,473,000	1,044	29,874,000	28,615	\$200,000 to \$500,000	331	6,623,000	1,212	37,349,000	30,816
\$500,000 to \$1,000,000	35	950,000	243	11,503,000	47,337	\$500,000 to \$1,000,000	35	1,212,000	271	11,129,000	41,066
\$1,000,000 plus	12	73,000	108	8,007,000	74,139	\$1,000,000 plus	27	770,000	136	9,037,000	66,448
1968:						1970:					
\$100,000 to \$200,000	1,309	25,299,000	3,653	59,013,000	16,155	\$100,000 to \$200,000	1,767	32,462,000	3,846	68,560,000	17,826
\$200,000 to \$500,000	321	6,699,000	1,242	37,038,000	29,821	\$200,000 to \$500,000	389	6,899,000	1,166	36,771,000	31,536
\$500,000 to \$1,000,000	55	2,258,000	277	11,161,000	40,292	\$500,000 to \$1,000,000	55	1,979,000	210	9,060,000	43,142
\$1,000,000 plus	29	1,046,000	134	9,525,000	71,082	\$1,000,000 plus	19	435,000	94	12,046,000	128,149

## CONCLUSION

In the murky maze of the tax code, "going broke" for the tax-loss farmer really means making hay. These abuses, which are still unrestrained, create huge tax inequities and serve to distort agricultural markets and drive up the cost of the land. These unfair tax rules create an unfair competition for the real farmer.

The tax laws which encourage the false, unreal, deceptive habit of tax farming must be repealed. We must make new efforts in this year's tax deliberations to repeal these special tax rules.

## ARCHAIC BAN ON GOLD OWNERSHIP SHACKLES AMERICANS

## HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as the price of gold continues to soar—\$147 an ounce, and silver at \$5.50 an ounce, indications suggest that many aroused citizens are fleeing from inflation-riddled paper money.

Yet, as many Americans seek protection of their wealth from excessive taxes and Government control, foreign investments in the United States exceeded \$3 billion last year.

The Federal Reserve Banking System, seeking to excuse its failures in preserving the stability of the U.S. dollar, is grasping for more control over checking deposits and all banking institutions. Its world counterpart, the IMF continues to announce low-interest loans to Italy, Great Britain, Japan and France. Ostensibly, this financing is said to be needed because of increased prices of Middle Eastern oil. Yet it is also noted that this new wave of borrowing from the IMF had been brought about because of the failure of nationalized industries to meet production demands, thus causing serious financial distress in those Socialized industries.

The U.S. Federal Reserve Bank, intent on control and growth at the expense of the American citizen, now announces that it is increasing its short-term swap agreements with Italy by \$1 billion.

Americans still face problems in trying to shore up their financial losses by private ownership of gold. Last year, the Par Value Modification Act authorized the President, when he determined that it would not have an adverse effect on our international monetary position, to lift the present barriers on private ownership of gold.

Apparently, the President has not heard from enough inflation-weary Americans concerning their right to own gold to encourage him to use his discretionary powers to free Americans from the shackles of the archaic ban on gold ownership.

I include the related newsclippings: [From the Washington Post, Feb. 21, 1974] NEED FOR FED CONTROL OF RESERVES DISPUTED (By James L. Rowe Jr.)

A study released yesterday by the Conference of State Bank Supervisors contends that the Federal Reserve Board would not improve its conduct of monetary policy if it controlled the amount of reserves all banks must keep on their checking deposits.

Last month, the Fed asked Congress for authority to set uniform reserve requirements for all banks, whether or not those banks are members of the Federal Reserve system.

It said the volume of checking accounts under its control was shrinking and, consequently, its ability to set monetary policy is being eroded.

Ross M. Robertson, professor of business economics at Indiana University and coauthor of the study, said that the reserve requirement is not an important tool of economic policy.

"In comparison with the open market operations, it pales in comparison," Robertson told newsmen. The Fed increases the money supply by buying government securities on the "open market," thereby increasing bank reserves. Similarly, when it sells these securities, it absorbs funds which banks otherwise might lend.

Robertson said open market operations

affect banks whether they are members of the Fed system or not.

Almarin Phillips, professor of economics and law at the University of Pennsylvania and co-author with Robertson, said the reserve requirements are too inflexible to be used as a tool of short-term monetary policy.

The Fed contends that as its controls over checking accounts shrink, any action it takes against the remaining bank deposits must be more stringent, which encourages more banks to leave the system. Fed member banks earn no money on their reserves, while many state member banks can put their state-set reserves into earning assets.

He said that the Fed has seldom used the reserve requirement in the nearly 40 years it has had it in its arsenal.

Both professors contended that the Federal Reserve has presented no evidence to support its stand that its ability to set monetary policy is eroded because the portion of checking accounts subject to its reserve requirements is declining.

While 17.2 per cent of checking deposits were not subject to Fed controls in 1960, 25.4 per cent were not in 1973, according to the central bank's own figures.

Phillips suggested that the Fed's desire to subject all banks to its reserve requirements comes about not because of any effect on monetary policy but because a number of banks are leaving the Fed system, non-bank institutions such as savings and loan associations might soon have accounts resembling checking accounts and the Fed is showing a bureaucratic tendency to want to grow.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 18, 1974]

## ITALY BORROWING \$1.2 BILLION FROM IMF

(By Ronald Koen)

In the first instance of an expected wave of large-scale international borrowing to pay for the increased cost of oil imports, Italy announced over the weekend that it is seeking a \$1.2 billion credit from the International Monetary Fund.

In Washington, the IMF confirmed that its director general, H. Johannes Witteveen, had agreed to recommend approval of the standby credit. Such approval is considered a formality. It would be one of the largest credits ever granted by the fund.

A number of other advanced Western industrial countries are expected to get in line behind Italy to seek money to pay the oil import bills they have been incurring since

the petroleum-exporting states more than quadrupled their prices this autumn.

There is informed speculation that strike-bound Britain will follow Italy in seeking major international monetary help.

Japan is also said to be a likely candidate for international help. The Japanese started the year with the world's most massive accumulation of reserves—nearly \$20 billion. The Japanese are totally dependent on foreign oil imports to fuel their industry, and their monetary reserves have been whittled away at a steady pace to pay for them.

Japan is rumored to be getting ready to seek a major commercial loan on the Eurodollar market—the pool of U.S. dollars that circulates in Europe.

France recently borrowed \$1.5 billion commercially to pay for its oil, and the Italians also have been borrowing commercially.

Witteveen recently told his organization's Committee of 20, a group concerned with international monetary reform, that the IMF should set up a special major new fund to help countries pay for their energy imports during a transitional period while the world adjusts to the present tightness in petroleum supplies.

The idea is that the oil-producing countries would lend at least part of their burgeoning surplus to the IMF to help out their clients in the industrialized West.

The United States has expressed opposition as a "stopgap" which does not deal with the basic problem of the phenomenal price of oil.

Iran announced a week ago that it is willing to lend "a considerable amount" of its surplus income this year to the IMF "at current commercial rates" to help the advanced countries. The IMF normally lends at nominal interest rates, far lower than commercial ones.

Witteveen is scheduled to be in Tehran Wednesday to discuss the matter with the shah. The Iranians said they would also be willing to open credits for the World Bank to help the underdeveloped countries, presumably at lower interest rates. World Bank chief Robert S. McNamara is scheduled to meet with the shah a day after Witteveen.

The underdeveloped countries have been harder hit proportionally than the industrialized countries by the quadrupled oil prices. But, officials of the oil-producing states point out, organizing international help for them should be easier than for the industrialized countries, since the underdeveloped world consumes only 6 per cent of all the oil that is exported.

The Italian announcement on Saturday night explicitly linked the IMF credit to Italy's problems "in light of the energy crisis." The Italians have been saying for several months that they are the most vulnerable in Europe because of their almost total dependence on imported energy sources.

Even Britain is in a better position because, if not for its miners' strike, it can depend on its large coal supplies for much of its energy needs.

Italy had been running serious international deficits even without the added burden of the energy crisis. Italy's whopping deficit last year was largely masked by heavy commercial borrowing in Europe by the Italian nationalized industries.

The first major monetary crisis of 1973, resulting in the devaluation of the U.S. dollar in February, was touched off in the first instance by a flight from the Italian lira into Switzerland and West Germany.

The U.S. Federal Reserve Bank recently announced that it was increasing its short-term swap arrangements with Italy by \$1 billion.

[From the Washington Star-News, Feb. 19, 1974]

#### FOREIGN INVESTMENT SURGED IN 1973

Last year's sharp upsurge of direct foreign industrial investment in the United States—

ranging upwards of \$3 billion—shows strong indication of continuing despite the recent strengthening of the dollar that now makes such investment more costly.

This is one of the main conclusions to be drawn from an analysis by David Bauer, international economist with the Conference Board, concerning the increased investment interest by foreign companies in the United States.

Bauer's study, covering reported direct investment by foreign companies in the United States for the nine-month period of March through November of last year, appears in the current issue of the Conference Board publication, Record.

There were 129 investments in the period, on which capital investment information was reported for only 67. The reported total for these was \$1.9 billion, but Bauer estimated that total direct foreign investment during the nine-month period could be conservatively estimated at \$3 billion.

The bulk of this direct foreign investment in the United States—one of the highest totals of recent times—came from Japan, Canada, West Germany and Britain. Bauer's article is considered to be the first time that information on direct foreign investment has been reported in detail.

The Conference Board is a non-profit research organization.

Of the 129 separate investments, Japan led with 45, followed by Canada with 22, West Germany with 19 and Britain with 12. More than two-thirds of the total involved construction of entirely new facilities. Most of these represented a first-time bid by foreign companies to gain a production in the U.S. market.

Only 18 percent of the new investments by foreign companies involved the take-over or acquisition of existing American companies.

Two devaluations of the dollar, combined with upward revaluations of the Japanese yen, West German mark and other major currencies, unquestionably helped spear the direct industrial investment in the United States. Foreign companies could buy relatively more real estate and other assets with currencies that were worth more dollars in 1973.

However, the multinational trend of business, the need of many companies for closer access to markets as well as increasing world shipping costs, have also been factors in influencing foreign investment in the United States.

Among some of the major ventures were a \$175 million plant in South Carolina by the Michelin Tire Co. of France, and a \$100 million plant in Virginia by the Swedish automobile company Volvo.

#### DO NOT ADD INSULT TO INJURY

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we undertake to resolve, for better or worse, the legislation currently pending on the energy conference report, I insert a very timely editorial carried on Radio Station 78, WBBM, Chicago, and call to the attention the emphasis of the potential of the free market system to best solve the energy crisis.

The editorial follows:

#### DO NOT ADD INSULT TO INJURY

Stamps and money. That's what the U.S. Bureau of Engraving and Printing prints! At least that's what it usually prints. At the moment, the Bureau is concentrating on producing gasoline rationing coupons. Not, mind you, because Energy Chief Simon has

yet put us on a gasoline diet—but because the Bureau wants to be prepared just in case he does.

We take this as a bad omen. If the government is printing these things—chances are we'll be using them. And as we've said before, that's not a good idea. Look, for example, at what happened to the beef supply when the Cost of Living Council zeroed in with regulations.

Producers stopped cutting, meatpackers stopped shipping, customers bought in a panic—and when the freeze was finally lifted, the meat counter and the cash register went berserk. Only after a time, did the free market cure the worst of the evils wrought by price control.

Now we know that the present gasoline shortage is creating hardships. But the real mess comes from the rationing plan now imposed on gasoline wholesalers and dealers. Why add another layer of mess? Why compound the disorganization by issuing gasoline rationing coupons?

The only effective way we're going to deal with the crisis is to free the price on oil and oil products. We realize that removal of price controls on gas would initially drive up the price. But experience has shown us that a free market system is the only method we can use to cut demand and at the same time, stimulate production and encourage new exploration of energy supplies. In other words, it's the most efficient system we have for allocating our dwindling resources.

#### RAPID SOLUTIONS TO SHORTAGES IN HEATING FUEL

**HON. LESTER L. WOLFF**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 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. The unprecedented rise in fuel oil prices and the two-tier price system represent a grave emergency problem for the independent fuel oil distributor and the consumer. The purpose of the hearing was to provide a forum for the exchange of grievances and ideas and to ascertain what immediate steps Government can take to rectify an already chaotic situation.

With me at the hearing were Representatives CAREY of New York, BINGHAM, MURPHY of New York, ABZUG, ROSENTHAL, and BIAGGI. Congressmen HELSTOSKI, ADDABBO, and DELANEY were also represented at the session. We received testimony from government officials, scholars, representatives of all parts of the fuel oil industry, and members of the public.

Because the ideas of the people most involved with energy problems are critical to the developing of a national energy policy, I would like to share with my colleagues the informative testimony given at the New York hearing. First, I would like to insert into the RECORD a statement by Dr. Lawrence Rocks and Dr. Richard Runyon, both of whom have been familiar with energy problems for a long time. In the next few days, I will insert the rest of the testimony into the RECORD. Dr. Rocks and Dr. Runyon teach at C. W. Post College and wrote an excel-



lent book on the energy crisis. Their statement follows:

**ABSTRACT: RAPID SOLUTIONS TO SHORTAGES IN HEATING FUEL**

Congress' role in solving the fuel oil shortage should be that of a catalyst to speed up those natural economic forces that are spontaneously at work in our economy. Clearly, we can't burn oil we don't have, so the only question remaining is whether we will use our oil in inefficient devices or efficient devices. As oil becomes more expensive, there will be a movement to replace inefficient oil burners with more efficient ones, and to practice conservation in space heating systems. This natural process must be accelerated with properly placed tax incentives and national educational programs that concern energy conservation in buildings. We believe that the fuel oil shortage situation can be turned around, but not by the strategies outlined in either the President's energy proposals or in the rival proposal initiated by Senator Henry Jackson. Both of these strategies overlook the basic facts concerning energy procurement and deployment possibilities.

Buildings consume about 40 percent of the nation's total energy budget and about 20 to 50 percent of this is wasted by inefficient climate control systems and electrical systems. There is no other target area in the energy budget where so much energy is used and so much wasted with the exception of transportation systems. A resolution of the energy crisis requires that we solve our short-term problems while we lay the groundwork for the larger solutions. The short run goal should be to establish fuel efficient practices in existing climate control systems through government encouraged educational programs. A concurrent program should be a tax incentive schedule to encourage the rapid construction and purchase of fuel efficient climate control systems. These policies, coming into effect immediately, would tide us over for several years until supplies of fuel oil could be increased from domestic sources and from synthetic fuels derived from coal. The synthetic fuels won't be available until the 1980's in meaningful amounts, but energy conservation can be effected immediately.

1) Large savings in fuel oil can be effected by altering the "respiration" of a building in space heating systems. The respiration rate at which air is drawn in, heated, circulated and vented. This rate is about three volume changes per hour which is at least twice as much as is needed. The air flow should be timed to the work load, the people load, and schedule of occupancy of the building. This technique alone can save about 20 to 30 percent of a building's heat needs. No new equipment is needed; it is an operational matter that can be phased in immediately. There are many areas of operational practices where large energy savings can be effected. Altogether, about 20 to 40 percent of a building's fuel needs can be eliminated by changes in maintenance procedures alone. Since 20 percent of our oil budget is accounted for by space heating, we have a potential immediate saving, in buildings alone, of 4 to 8 percent of our total oil budget (240-480 million barrels of oil annually). A national effort to further research, and education, in the area of climate control systems is urgently needed. The costs of such a program would be several million dollars, but the savings would be a thousand times greater. Moreover about 70 percent of natural gas goes into space heating. Since natural gas is on an interruptible basis for many segments of the economy, number 2 heating oil must be substituted for gas when the latter is not available. Thus, the gas shortage contributes significantly to our heating oil shortage. Conservation measures described above could reduce natural gas consumption in space heating by 20 percent, ef-

fecting an overall savings of about 14 percent of our natural gas budget. This is equivalent to about 500 million barrels of oil annually. Thus, by moving swiftly and dramatically into energy conservation in the space heating sector, we could achieve, without capital investment, the equivalent savings of at least 740 million barrels of oil per year. This is more than we presently import from the Middle East.

2) The heart of our nation's energy conservation program should be tax incentives for the building and purchasing of fuel efficient systems, especially in the areas of climate control and transportation. The capital investment to raise the efficiency of an oil burner, for example, is just about equal to one year's worth of fuel cost savings.

Energy conservation has come to mean, for many, a reduced standard of living. Fuel reduction and conservation, though, are two different things. Unless we change the inefficient climate control systems and transportation systems, we shall find that the amount of synthetic fuels, or natural fuels, required in the next several decades is preposterously high.

3) Looking down the road some two to four decades, we see the ultimate need to electrify space heating and transportation, at least to a substantial degree. About three-quarters of our gas and one-fifth of our oil now is used for space heating. In the future, we shall face the choice of deploying expensive and scarce natural gas and oil for space heating or deploying synthetic fuels from coal for this purpose. The first is expensive and unlikely to succeed; the second is energy wasteful. A more logical approach would be to convert coal to producer gas and then through the combined cycle power plant generate electricity. Electricity should be used for space heating, but not through resistance heaters, but rather through the heat pump. The heat pump concept can be used in climate control systems to yield accurately controlled climate, and highly efficient energy transfer.

It is remarkable that neither the President's energy program, nor that of Senator Jackson, recognizes the ultimate need to electrify, at least in part, climate control and transportation, although both energy programs speak of uranium, coal, and other sources of energy which are most readily expressed as electricity. Furthermore, solar power for space heating can be economically feasible only if buildings are on an energy conservation mode to start with. As long as our homes and buildings are like sieves which leak heat in the winter and capture it in the summer, the collector surfaces required by solar heating devices would remain uneconomically large. In addition, solar heat is best deployed via the electrical heat pump. Hence, the electrification of heating integrates with general conservation practices, with solar input and, with the ultimate need to tap eternal sources of energy which are themselves harnessed as electricity.

4) For the short run we need energy conservation with education and tax incentives accelerating processes that are inevitable. For the long run we need the electrification of the economy. For the mid-term run we need synthetic fuels from coal. We believe that our present synthetic fuel program is too slow in coming and misses some technological points. The most feasible way to use coal is to produce electricity; next to manufacture "producer gas". The producer gas can be used to generate electricity and to make methyl fuel. Methyl fuel is underrated in our present scheme of synthetic fuels. Methyl alcohol can be added to gasoline—it will raise the octane rating and permit lead to be taken out. Methyl alcohol can be added to heating oil—it will permit the oil burner to operate more efficiently due to the lessening of soot formation. Most startling, the technology to produce methyl alcohol from coal is well understood; this is not the case

for synthesizing methane gas or gasoline from coal.

We have briefly listed here our suggestions for a national energy policy. We believe that this is inseparable from solving the fuel oil problem. Both energy proposals before Congress, one from the President and one initiated by Senator Jackson, miss the essence of the energy crisis: the phase-in time of energy sources, and their economics, is what counts, not a theoretical speculation about the amount of energy in a source. We feel that the short run problems are not clearly understood, and the mid-term problems are erroneously targeted for solution by systems that are really long term and electrical in nature.

Attached are two articles which will soon appear in our weekly column in the Hearst newspapers. The first article illustrates the dramatic savings that are possible in the area of space heating. These savings were made rapidly, employing existing knowledge, and requiring no capital expenditures. The thrust of the second article is that the energy crisis will force us to alter our ways of thinking about energy. In this article, an "absurd" idea is presented. It is then modified to show how the shortages of gasoline can be "turned around" in a five year period.

**POST COLLEGE ENGINEERS SAVE 30 PERCENT OF ENERGY**

Energy conservation is destined to be a topic of ever-growing importance. Even when Arab oil starts to flow again, and even after we get oil from Alaska, we shall find that our total energy resources are insufficient to meet our expectation for the latter half of this decade. To bring our expectations in line with our inadequate energy production capabilities will require a widely-practiced ethic of energy conservation. Where can we conserve and how can we do it? Let us analyze an on-going experiment at C. W. Post College of Long Island University in Greenvale, Long Island. The work is under the direction of John P. Agnew and Mal Ryan of the Buildings and Grounds Department.

The situation at the college is this: Post College uses approximately \$185,000 per year for heating and \$325,000 per year for electricity. The heating is done primarily by oil. A central power plant provides air heating and air cooling to approximately two-thirds of the entire campus. A few buildings were selected for energy conservation practices and here is what happened.

Daytime temperatures were lowered from 72 degrees to 68, and at night to about 60 degrees. This resulted in about a 10 percent fuel reduction. Next, the flow of air was retarded throughout the selected buildings. This resulted in a saving of an additional 30 percent.

It is a strange situation, but the air turnover in most buildings is unnecessarily high. By historical precedent and by engineering rule-of-thumb, the air replacement in most buildings is about three volume changes per hour. This is over ten times what is needed for oxygen replacement. In fact, if buildings had odor removal systems, the air freshness would appear acceptable at very low turnover rates. As cold air is drawn in, it must be heated. Here is the heart of the energy waste. A building needs a "respiration" rate that is timed to its occupants and their work schedule. Hence, by restricting the air flow and timing it to the people-load, Post College saved some 40 percent of its oil bill in the targeted buildings. The principle of climate control that is illustrated here is known in the trade as the "mass transit of air" for a building.

Post's Library uses air conditioning and heating throughout the entire year. It strikes some people as odd to hear that a building uses air conditioning in the winter and heat in the summer. This is precisely true. Most modern office buildings require air conditioning in the central power plant to withdraw excess heat derived from lights, people,

office equipment and the absorption of sunlight by the peripheral rooms. In the summer, hot air is drawn in and chilled to about 55 degrees to get the excess moisture out. Then it is reheated to about 72 degrees. Without the chill-reheat step, the air conditioned air would be too humid. Unfortunately, the over-chill and re-heat cycles are not coupled in most buildings. Climate control technology developed over decades when energy was plentiful; there never was a need to consider these factors before.

What Agnew and Ryan did in the library was to turn off the air cooling system, and regulate the heat to below 68 degrees so that lights and people would not create excessive heat. Further, they lowered the lighting levels from 110 foot candles to about 65. The recommended lighting levels from the New York State University run about 40 to 50. In other words, the library was over-lit. Most buildings are over-lit. In fact, for every two excessive watts of lighting, a building needs one excessive watt of cooling. The practice of lowering light levels saved about 30 percent of the electric requirements in the experimental buildings.

Notice that these changes required no capital outlays. The savings were effected by changing engineering practices alone. Agnew and Ryan feel that if Post installed integrated chill-reheat equipment and heat recovery units in the power plant's stack exhaust, then they could save upwards of 50 to 70 percent of the fuel budget. Energy conservation for buildings is certainly technologically feasible and meaningful for our national energy budget.

Now for the bad news. Post College didn't save money. Even though we saved fuel, the fuel bills went up. Back in 1972 Post paid 13 cents per gallon for number 2 heating oil; now it's 22.5 cents. Back in 1972 Post paid 55 cents per 1,000 cubic feet of gas, now it's 76 cents. The cost per kilowatt hour of electricity went up 15 percent, reflecting a "base rate" increase and a fuel adjustment factor for the higher costs of oil that fires the power plant of Post's utility.

In short, Post saved fuel but not dollars. Without energy conservation, climate control costs will go out of sight. As a very general rule-of-thumb, it costs about one dollar per square foot per year to climate control the average large building. Fuel costs are going up. In terms of costs, you've got to conserve like crazy in order to stand still.

#### A WAY OUT—CALCULATED DESTRUCTION OF THE AUTO

By following a perfectly absurd idea to its logical conclusion, one may occasionally be led into a profound revelation. We did this recently, with startling results.

It all started when we puzzled over President Nixon's time schedule to achieve energy independence. By all that's reasonable and holy, there is no way to achieve Project Independence by the year 1980. We know it; the energy experts know it; and surely the President knows it. So, why did President Nixon set an impossible goal?

We all know that it is far better to set reasonable goals. To do otherwise is to invite frustration, disappointment, and despair. But is this always the case? Sometimes setting impossible goals forces us to depart from traditional ways of thinking, with all their built-in traps that say "no," and cause the mind to take wild but productive flights into uncharted regions.

This is precisely what we tried. We asked ourselves, "If a magic genie floated out of our gasoline tank and granted us one wish to reduce energy demand, what would we ask for?" The answer was clear, "Demolish this night all gas-guzzling cars on the road and replace them tomorrow with automobiles that obtain twice the miles per gallon of present cars." Truly an absurd thought!

But then the arithmetic of the situation took possession of our minds. The automobile

presently uses about 30 percent of all petroleum. By magically doubling the efficiency of all cars on the road, we would save 15 percent of our annual oil consumption. This savings would amount to about 1 billion barrels of oil per year. More than we import from the Middle East. Better than finding a Prudhoe Bay and obtaining its oil perpetually!

Suddenly the idea did not seem so preposterous. The American public is already moving toward the goal of energy efficient automobiles. About 50 percent of new car purchases are for the compact and subcompact models. At the present rate, however, it might be fifteen or twenty years before these cars will dominate the automobile population. This is much too slow a rate to head off the onrushing energy crisis.

But what about accelerating a process that is already taking place? Imagine that Congress were to enact legislation to encourage the removal of energy-wasteful cars from the road. At first, the target could be standard or larger sized cars five years or older. Such cars are typically out-of-tune, have faulty valves, and contribute more than their share to air pollution. Congress could guarantee low-cost loans or provide tax incentives to owners wishing to exchange these cars for energy-efficient automobiles. The old cars would be destroyed and recycled. Congress could provide a statutory deduction of, say, \$1,000 for automobile owners who make this choice. For those whose income is too low to benefit from this provision, low cost loans could be made available.

It will be argued that such a plan, if fully implemented, would seriously undermine the tax income of the federal government. To illustrate, if all one hundred million cars were to turn over in five years, and everyone took advantage of the statutory tax provision the loss of tax dollars would appear to be about twenty billion dollars annually. Countered against this argument is the fact that corporate profits in the automobile industry would go up, as would corporate taxes. Further, unless we solve the energy crisis, unemployment is sure to rise abruptly. Unemployed individuals do not pay taxes. Indeed they are a tax drain, since they receive unemployment benefits followed by welfare payments. Taken in conjunction with the dollar drain resulting from continued imports of Middle East oil, we suspect that the federal income would not be adversely affected. Certainly, the proposal warrants further study since it would solve the short-term energy crisis.

On the other hand, the benefits of such an action by Congress would be enormous. Within five years, virtually all cars on the road would be energy efficient. We would not need to import oil from the Middle East. The air would be cleaner. The lagging automobile industry would receive a shot in the arm. Gasoline rationing would be unnecessary. Recreational activities would be revived. As a final bonus, we would save energy in the manufacture of cars, since small cars require less energy to produce.

Perhaps the President's desire to achieve energy independence by 1980 is not as ludicrous as it first appeared.

#### THE ENERGY CRISIS AND ENVIRONMENTAL DEGRADATION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the energy crisis, as gasoline station lines have lengthened and building temperatures have gone down, there has been the demand that Congress reverse progress made in protecting the environment. Many have called for relaxa-

tion of air pollution emissions standards and for accelerated construction of atomic powerplants.

Relaxation of environmental protection measures is a shortrun expedient that will create even greater problems and may ultimately threaten the survival of humanity.

Dr. C. M. Woodwell, senior scientist in the Department of Biology, Brookhaven National Laboratory, writes succinctly of the problems created by reckless attempts to resolve the energy shortage. His letter, published in the February 1, 1974 issue of *Science*, notes that the most essential energy resource is solar energy captured by plants through photosynthesis. Yet humankind often misuses energy sources such as forests and oceanic fisheries.

Oceanic fishing provides our primary access to the energy produced by ocean plants, yet we are threatening the yields by dumping into the seas, sewage, industrial chemicals, reactor cooling water and radioactive wastes. We have indiscriminately drilled offshore oil wells and are over-harvesting the oceans. Decreased yields from these fisheries are extremely costly. We are losing a renewable resource and harming the entire biota.

As Dr. Woodwell notes, if we are really interested in protecting humankind we must preserve the biota. This means protecting the air and water; Congress will not be doing this by relaxing environmental protection regulations.

Dr. Woodwell's letter to the editor of *Science* magazine follows:

#### BIOTIC ENERGY FLOWS

Important aspects of the energy shortage are being ignored in both science and government. We tend to forget that most of the energy used by man is solar energy that has been fixed recently through photosynthesis. This energy provides food, fuel, fibers, and services that are essential for a habitable environment. Although the total amount of energy available as net primary production through this route has been estimated as 20 times the amount of energy in current use from fossil fuels, nuclear power, and hydro-power, these flows of energy from the sun are being reduced.<sup>1</sup> When the complex political, social, and economic systems of industrialized nations falter, as they appear to be doing at the moment, we turn immediately to biotic resources that are close to us. We substitute fish for beef, wood for fuel. Mounting world food shortages are contributing to the pressures on these resources. Shortages of both oil and food will get worse: worldwide demand is soaring, and supplies are limited. Reckless efforts to "solve" an energy problem that is unsolvable in the current context of growth threaten to speed destruction of renewable resources. Acid rains are a good example. Relaxation of air pollution standards for sulfur will result in continuation of the trend of rising acidity in rain in the Northeast. There is little doubt that a decade or more of precipitation with a pH of between 3.0 and 4.2 will reduce the net production of forests and agriculture. A 10 percent loss of net production in the New England states would be the equivalent of the power output of 15 1000-megawatt reactors. Would the people of New England

<sup>1</sup> R. H. Whittaker and G. E. Likens, in *Carbon and the Biosphere*, G. M. Woodwell and E. V. Pecan, Eds. (U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Oak Ridge, Tenn. 1973) pp. 281-300; G. M. Woodwell, *Science* 168, 429 (1970); *Sci. Am.* 223, 64 (Sept. 1970); *BioScience*, in press.



agree to supply such a subsidy to the rest of the country if they had a choice?

There is no simple technical or social solution to the shortage of energy. Growth in energy consumption in the pattern of past years is over for the present. In addition, biotic flows of energy are now being lost, often irreversibly; the biota is being mined. Environmental problems are not simply those of adjusting techniques of energy production to reduce intrusions on the environment; they also include the preservation of the flows of energy—including food, materials, and services—through the biota to man. The shortage of fossil fuels presents a challenge to technologists to find more efficient ways of exploiting biotic energy flows on a renewable basis. The problem warrants, but does not have, major consideration in the President's energy program. Facilities comparable to those of a major national laboratory should be devoted to the problems generated by the worldwide spread of biotic impoverishment that is caused in large degree by current rates of exploitation of nonrenewable energy sources.

G. M. WOODWELL.

### THE OIL SHALE DUMPING AND DAMAGES ACT

#### HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation—H.R. 12923—to prohibit the dumping of spent oil shale upon Federal lands other than those lands specifically leased by the Department of the Interior for oil shale development under the prototype leasing program. The bill provides that triple damages can be recovered from the lessee if such dumping occurs.

The Federal lands being leased by the Department of the Interior for the prototype oil shale program belong to all people of this Nation, but the lands of three States, Colorado, Wyoming and Utah, are those which will be specifically affected by this program. The entire country, of course, will benefit from this experimental program if it produces the technology through which we can obtain the oil found in the oil shale deposits at reasonable costs. However, it must be recognized that it is the people of the three States involved who will pay the direct environmental and social costs.

Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the need to develop new energy sources. The "energy crisis" has, in a few short months, increased everyone's awareness that our sources are limited, and that we must—and can—do better. The Federal Government must play a major role in helping develop these new sources. We are committed to this idea, as we demonstrated recently by the passage of the Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act. The Department of the Interior's prototype oil shale program is also a recognition that the Federal Government must play a major role in pursuing new energy sources, but the technology for processing oil shale is in its infancy, with many problems yet to be solved. It is the intent of the Department of the Interior's program to allow the industry itself to find solutions.

One of the most important problems that has to be addressed by the oil shale

industry is how to dispose of the spent shale. Oil shale, when processed, expands in volume. Obviously, not all of what remains can simply be put back where it came from. There has yet to be developed an environmentally sound answer to what to do with the excess spent shale.

It was therefore very distressing to learn that the Department of Interior has announced that the joint leaseholders of the first 5,100-acre tract in Colorado—Standard Oil of Indiana and Gulf Oil Corp.—have reported they will need 5,800 more acres of public lands outside the leased area to complete their operations. They will, I understand, apply for special permits to use this additional land for reservoirs and to dump debris.

This seems to me to contradict the original intent of Interior's program, which was to determine whether the production of crude oil from oil shale is feasible, both in economic and environmental terms. Permitting the leaseholders additional land on which to dump the spent shale seems to me to ignore one of the central problems the program was designed to meet: how best to dispose of the spent shale. Surely the answer is not to simply dump it elsewhere.

My colleague, Mr. VANIK, of Ohio, recently asked the Comptroller General for his opinion of the basic authority which the Department of Interior claims for this extra allotment of land. Indeed, the Comptroller's answer as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 4, 1974—page 2051—raises questions as to whether the Department has such authority. Yet the plan is continuing and this land is being set aside.

The bill I have introduced is designed to meet this problem head on by declaring it illegal to dump spent shale on land other than that leased under the original prototype leasing program. Any person doing so will lose his lease. It provides further for triple damages from the lessee in the event such dumping occurs. The excess of damages recovered over those used to repair the land will be applied to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

I am hopeful this legislation will prevent the Department of Interior from using the back door in this situation, without first submitting to the full and open scrutiny of congressional hearings. The question here is a basic one: How much authority does the Department of Interior have with respect to the disposal of Federal lands? As noted above, the Comptroller General questioned whether the Department has the right under current law to grant the use of more acreage than was originally leased. In fact, even the Department of Interior seems to have the same question, for it has a proposal, H.R. 5442, which would add the necessary authority.

H.R. 5442 is now before the Mines and Mining Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Hearings on this bill, I understand, are in the works. It is here, in the congressional forum, that the larger question of how much land should be used for the oil shale program must be resolved, and I hope that the legislation I have introduced will force a full examination of that question. If the Department of Interior feels that present technology warrants an additional 5,800 acres, it must make this case before proceeding to lease the additional

land. The public must participate in this decision. The lands under discussion are federal lands, belonging to all the people; the question of its proper use must in all fairness be a question that is resolved in an open and public discussion.

Mr. Speaker, we are all acutely aware of the need for new energy sources. My home state of Colorado was one of the first to feel the effects of the energy shortage, and the people there share with the rest of the country the desire to pursue every promise of new energy supply. But the people of Colorado are also very aware that the environment is a very precious resource itself. Nature, once despoiled, can rarely be returned to its natural beauty and harmony.

The prototype oil shale leasing program as originally designed seems to meet these dual concerns. It holds forth the promise that both the Nation as a whole and the States which host these programs may ultimately benefit from the program. The legislation I have introduced is designed to prevent a breach of that promise.

### FEDERAL SALARIES

#### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, WGN Continental Broadcasting Co. in Chicago, carried a very interesting editorial in its broadcast of February 12, which I will insert at the conclusion of my remarks. It is a very practical analysis of the pending Federal salary increase recommended by the President.

Hopefully, by the end of this week some action will be taken by the House and Senate subcommittees to expedite consideration of this matter.

Therefore it is to be especially noted that salary increase applies to some upper echelon, bureaucrats, Federal judges, and executive branch officials and Members of Congress.

The editorial follows:

[WGN Editorial No. 74-041, Feb. 12, 1974]

### FEDERAL SALARIES

Members of Congress felt awkward from time to time, when they voted on bills to increase federal salaries, particularly their own salaries. But, since Congressmen have bills to pay, like the rest of us, they know about inflation, like the rest of us. And, from time to time, like the rest of us, they have wanted a salary increase.

The question was, how to get a raise in pay without the embarrassment of going on record to vote for one. That they solved a little while back. They put the burden on the President, and in such a way as to make it almost impossible for him to propose salary increases for other federal employees without including raises for Senators and Representatives.

It works this way: The President submits his salary recommendations for the top level of federal employees, about ten thousand people, from Supreme Court Justices and Cabinet members, to high-ranking political employees and career officers. In this case, the recommendation is seven and one half per cent. Pay scales for a large number of civilian employees are geared to what their superiors earn. To keep the federal payroll from becoming a political football . . . and to save Congressmen from having to vote on pay hikes . . . the proposals take effect in 30 days . . . unless Congress acts to disapprove them. Congress has another option . . . reducing the requested increases.

Members of the House and Senate are paid

\$42,500 a year. Much can be said for paying our public officials salaries comparable to what they could earn in private business . . . what they should earn in carrying out heavy responsibilities. And, the point can be made that these top 10,000 have received no increase since 1969.

The 5.5 per cent pay hike guideline hasn't had much effect on curbing inflation, and President Nixon is letting it expire in about ten weeks. However, Congress, by voting itself and the rest of the federal establishment a smaller increase, might set an example of restraint for the rest of the country.

#### ENERGY CRISIS

### HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the painful dilemmas caused by the energy crisis have come as a genuine shock to a nation that has done little, until very recently, to discourage high consumption and waste. The search for scapegoats is intensifying with the environmental movement as well as industry likely candidates for punitive action. However, I am confident that in the long run national energy plans will evolve to provide us with a political and economic environment that will encourage energy conservation and development of new resources.

Difficult times lie ahead and perhaps the most demanding single step will be for all of us to realize energy shortages are going to be with us for a long time. That means we must continue to make sacrifices and work together to adapt to a new way of living in which we are no longer oblivious to waste. Citizen involvement is an old concept, but I would like to point out to my colleagues that it is paying real dividends in my district where energy-conscious individuals have initiated some very beneficial programs.

For example, citizens in the Ypsilanti-Belleville-Saline area have launched an "action-oriented, problem-solving local organization to battle the effects of the energy crisis." Sponsored by the Press in Ypsilanti, an award-winning daily newspaper, and the Ypsilanti Jaycees, the program called Operation E-CON has spurred intensive community interest in energy conservation and positive government steps to help cope with fuel shortages.

As an indication of the public interest in Operation E-CON, some 70 local residents turned out for the first public meeting last December. Committees were set up to draw on the expertise of a broad cross-section of citizens. Potential solutions were discussed and special problems examined. The residential committee headed by a hospital administrator concluded that homeowners needed help in understanding how best to conserve energy. Steps were undertaken to convey the ways homeowners could cut down on their energy bills while conserving fuel. The chamber of commerce got to work on ways businesses could save energy and a legislative committee researched laws and contacted State and local representatives. Somewhat later, elected officials were invited under the sponsorship of Operation E-CON to a public

meeting to report on government efforts and to hear problems voiced by constituents.

Every legislators' mail on energy-related problems has increased dramatically and mine is no exception. Second District residents have encountered such a wide range of difficulties that I had a special hotline telephone installed in my Ann Arbor office with the number 761-FUEL to handle the cases. I am hopeful this will speed up action on individual cases and help cut the red tape that has resulted from the bureaucracy surrounding the Federal Energy Office. Regrettably, we have too often not received the expeditious action these problems deserve.

While Operation E-CON committees were busy working on problem-solving, the Press began a column titled "Bright Ideas" which provided daily consumer hints on how area residents could conserve energy. The newspaper also offered free classified advertising space to persons interested in forming a carpool. Stickers were printed and given wide distribution which declared "We Support Operation E-CON Energy Conservation."

No one can fully assess the results of such a community oriented effort to conserve energy, but certainly the impact must be substantial. While some warn emotionally of riots in the streets because of fuel shortages, the people of my district are meeting the problems head on with a rational approach I believe can serve as a model for many communities. To help my colleagues in understanding how Operation E-CON works, I insert three articles dated December 4, 1973, February 1, 1974, and February 9, 1974 from the Press at this point in the Record:

#### ENERGY MEETING PLANNED

The Ypsilanti Area Jaycees and The Press today jointly announced plans for an "action-oriented, problem-solving local organization to battle the effects of the energy crisis in the Golden Triangle."

The cooperative effort between The Press and the Jaycees will kick off Wednesday, Dec. 12, with a meeting of all governmental leaders, service club officials, labor and business leaders. The meeting is set for 7:30 p.m. at Cleary College Auditorium.

At that meeting, people in attendance will divide into five areas of concern and map out a strategy for coping with the energy problems we're going to be facing in the upcoming months.

The five areas will include autos, commercial, residences, safety and legislative. Persons are to choose the areas in which they have particular interest of expertise.

Gary Allen, chairman of the project for the Jaycees, stressed that neither the Jaycees nor The Press plan on being solely responsible for problem-solving efforts.

"We just want to start the ball rolling and if people are really concerned they'll actively figure out solutions to the various aspects of this problem," Allen said. "Once the five committees are formed they'll be on their own working toward an area-wide solution to the problem."

"We visualize the auto committee advising motorists how to cut down on gas usage and we picture the commercial committee helping businessmen keep energy consumption at a minimum without affecting jobs or production. The residence committee will hopefully do the same for homeowners and the safety committee will make sure that any of these energy-saving measures don't lead to intolerable safety conditions in the area. The legislative group will hopefully work with

local governmental agencies to see if effective energy saving legislation can be enacted locally," Allen said.

Wayne Powell, publisher-editor of The Press said, "We think if leaders from throughout the community can sit down together, we can make a more sincere effort to cope with this crisis." He added, "Things done on a piecemeal basis are never as successful as coordinated efforts and hopefully next Wednesday's meeting will allow the community to get together to find some real workable ways to soften the effects of this crisis."

Allen pointed out the purpose of the meeting will not be to discuss whether there is an energy crisis.

"We're taking for granted this thing exists and that it's going to hurt for a long time. With that as a basis we'll want to get right down to work," Allen said.

Powell said the energy-savings meeting will only be one aspect of the newspaper's attempts to make people aware of the energy crisis.

"We've already significantly cut our energy use at the newspaper plant and we are also planning several promotional campaigns to make people aware of the necessity to tighten our energy belts," he said.

Powell also announced plans to offer free classified advertisements to anyone who wants to join a car pool.

"We think it would be a serious mistake to underestimate the potential effects of this crisis and we want to do everything we can to help the community and the country weather the problems a lack of energy is bound to bring."

#### LEGISLATORS TO SPEAK AT PUBLIC E-CON MEET

Operation E-CON is going public, and local legislators are going along.

Operation E-CON Chairman Rene Hauser announced plans today for an energy brainstorming session between the public and local legislators. The session is set for 7:30 p.m. Friday, Feb. 8.

Hauser said U.S. Rep. Marvin Esch, R-Mich., state Sen. Gilbert Bursley, R-Ann Arbor, state Rep. Gary Owen, D-Ypsilanti, Ypsilanti Mayor George Goodman and Ypsilanti Township Supervisor William Gagnon will participate in the forum.

"We plan to allow each of the five lawmakers to explain what their specific government is doing to cope with the energy crisis and then the five will submit to questions and suggestions from the public," Hauser said.

Hauser, who is an assistant vice-president for business and finance at Eastern Michigan University, said the Operation E-CON session will be the first opportunity Golden Triangle residents have had to face their lawmakers with the practical problems of the energy crisis.

"When The Press and the Ypsilanti area Jaycees first originated Operation E-Con, they hoped to provide forums in which the public could become more aware of the problems of the energy crisis and learn to live better with those problems," Hauser said. "We feel this public opportunity to probe possible legislative solutions to the problem will provide valuable input not only to the Golden Triangle residents who attend the session but to the lawmakers as well."

Hauser indicated that if the legislative session is greeted well by the public, similar forums will be held in the four other Operation E-CON sub-areas, automotive, safety, residential and commercial.

The Ypsilanti Jaycees and The Press started Operation E-CON in early December. Since then a daily Press feature called Bright Ideas has been designed by the E-CON Residential Committee and The Press, and the commercial sub-committee has begun efforts to educate businesses how to cope properly with the energy-related problems.

Press Editor-Publisher Wayne Powell and



Jaycees President Herbert McIntosh have expressed pleasure that Operation E-CON is making such progress.

"We're really hoping the public gets involved with this legislative forum because the chairmen of Operation E-CON, particularly Rene Hauser, are doing a great job in helping people to cope with this most serious problem," Powell said.

#### OFFICIALS EXPLAIN ENERGY MOVES

Some 50 persons turned out to hear local elected officials explain how they're dealing with the energy crisis at a legislative forum sponsored by Operation E-CON at Cleary College Auditorium.

U.S. Rep. Marvin Esch, R-Ann Arbor, State Sen. Gilbert Bursley, R. Ann Arbor, State Rep. Gary Owen, D-Ypsilanti, Ypsilanti Mayor George Goodman and Ypsilanti Township Supervisor William Gagnon and County Comr. Kathleen Fotjik, D-Ann Arbor, all discussed various aspects of the energy crisis.

All the officials admitted the realities of the energy crisis, but some, most notably Ms. Fotjik, questioned the suddenness of the crisis.

Esch explained part of the reason for the "surprise" has been the "inadequate information gathering system we've had for years on energy related materials." Esch said steps are now being taken to improve that information gathering process.

Esch and Goodman pointed out that the lifestyles of the Americans are going to have to change if they are going to cope with the crisis and sufficiently conserve energy.

The group of legislators admitted one of their biggest challenges is to relate local problems to the national scene. Esch said he will increase his efforts to handle the problems which Goodman or Gagnon may meet on the local level.

Owen and Bursley contended the state legislature has successfully avoided partisanship on energy issues and cited the almost unanimous vote in the state house on the Daylight Saving Time Issue Friday.

Charles "Tony" Duerr legislative sub-committee chairman of Operation E-CON co-chaired the meeting with Operation E-CON Chairman Rene Hauser.

Operation E-CON was originated by The Press and the Ypsilanti Area Jaycees.

#### DISTURBING TRENDS IN SALT II

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, negotiations are continuing on strategic arms limitations with the Soviet Union—SALT II. It is generally conceded that the SALT I agreement resulted in a decidedly disadvantageous position for the United States. Unfortunately, there is a growing belief that this damage to American national security may be compounded in future agreements that may be reached from SALT II or while the President is in Moscow in June.

One recent appointment to the State Department's Planning and Coordination Staff—the State Department's think tank operation that under Dr. Kissinger has become increasingly influential—has concerned advocates of a strong national defense. This is the appointment of Jerome Kahan, a former staff member of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Kahan has written that the United States should "eschew offensive weapons programs, such as warhead accuracy and yield improvement" which

would enhance the ability of America's launching counterforce strikes against Soviet ICBMs.

While the record of Soviet military expansion is clear, there are several disarmament theorists who still think that the United States must continually reassure the Soviet Union that we have no aggressive intentions. For some reason these same theorists seem to ignore the reality that it should be the Soviet Union giving some evidence of a lack of aggressive intentions and not vice versa.

At this point I include in the RECORD two articles entitled "Kissinger's New Disarmament Expert" from the February 16, 1974 issue of Human Events and "The Pentagon's Nitze: An Uncertain Trumpet" from the February 23, 1974 issue of Human Events:

#### KISSINGER'S NEW DISARMAMENT EXPERT

Supporters of a strong national defense posture were moderately pleased with the unveiling of the Nixon Administration's \$85.8-billion military budget, more than \$6 billion over the sums to be spent in fiscal 1974. Pressing the argument for the budget hike before the Senate Armed Services Committee last week, tough-minded Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger stressed he offered "no apologies" for its size. In real terms, he added, it means "no more than holding our own," for the greater part of the increase is consumed by pay and price hikes.

The Nixon-Schlesinger budget, however, is welcomed by hawkish lawmakers for some of the new initiatives and increases in certain critical categories. For instance, the budget provides funds for improving missile accuracy, the acceleration of an advanced nuclear submarine (the Trident), the speed-up in construction of the B-1 bomber and the more rapid development of strategic cruise missiles that can be fired from either submarines or aircraft. Moreover, it revitalizes our Navy in two ways: by continuing to build necessary nuclear and conventional aircraft carriers and by constructing smaller and more efficient "mini-carriers."

So pleased was Sen. Jim Buckley (C.-R.-N.Y.), a defense hawk, with the Nixon budget that he was preparing to deliver a speech this week claiming that President Nixon had "presented a defense budget that is a very welcome sight to those of us in the Senate who feared that the euphoria surrounding the alleged detente between the United States and the Soviet Union might well have caused our leadership to dangerously cut back in areas of defense spending."

While the military budget reflects a certain hard realism, however, there is still mounting concern that the new initiatives and weaponry outlined by Schlesinger last week are nothing but "bargaining chips," all to be sacrificed in the second round of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks at Geneva.

From a variety of reliable sources within defense and diplomatic circles, it is repeatedly heard that the United States, with Henry Kissinger as the master, behind-the-scenes negotiator, is prepared to conclude an offensive treaty with the Soviet Union that will leave this country forever inferior to the USSR in strategic nuclear weaponry. Sen. Henry Jackson (D-Wash.), for instance, who raised a furor about the outcome of SALT I, is said to be especially concerned with the course Kissinger is taking in directing American disarmament policy.

Kissinger is not only a "soft-liner" himself, argue knowledgeable Pentagon officials, but he is bringing into the State Department a number of dovish theoreticians. What particularly alarms some department observers is the increasing influence Kissinger is bestowing upon the Planning and Coordination Staff. The staff's director, Winston Lord, a long-time Kissinger intimate, is considered a devout dove.

As *Newsweek* recently described him, Lord is Kissinger's "valued aide, intellectual comrade-in-arms and personal friend. He has been a Kissinger brain-truster for nearly five years: as special assistant, he accompanied his boss six times to China, four times to the Soviet Union, and some 25 times to the Paris peace talks with the North Vietnamese. If anyone in the State Department can be called 'Kissinger's Kissinger,' it is Winston Lord."

When Kissinger appointed the 36-year-old Lord to run the department's think-tank operation, Kissinger told Lord that the planning staff would play a "principal role" in shaping policy options for the secretary of state.

In his effort to shape Kissinger's options on nuclear matters, Lord has brought on board the PCS Jerome Kahan, a former staffer with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency who for the past five years has been writing on strategic nuclear doctrine for the liberal Brookings Institution. Kahan's own writings plus what he says to friends and acquaintances clearly mark him as an outright dove. Indeed, Kahan's move from Brookings to the PCS has brought open hand-wringing from Pentagon officials, who are now certain that Kissinger, bolstered by such disarmament theoreticians as Kahan, is determined to undermine the military at SALT II.

While Kahan might not subscribe to the description, his own writings project an extreme fear that the United States might take some action to protect itself that would provoke the Soviets into mounting a fresh, nuclear arms race. Kahan seems especially worried, for instance, that American policymakers might deploy too many defensive weapons, thus irritating top Soviet strategists. Moreover, Kahan appears to have few worries regarding Soviet provocations, including Russia's massive buildup of offensive weapons, even since SALT I.

The types of options on defense that Kahan might develop for Kissinger were outlined at a conference on foreign policy on Oct. 23, 1972, sponsored by Pepperdine University. Kahan submitted a discussion paper for the conference in which the central emphasis focused on the need to restrain the impulse of U.S. officials to counter the Soviet military threat.

The U.S., advised Kahan, should reject efforts to modify the SALT agreements to permit a nationwide system of anti-ballistic missiles. In addition, America should "eschew offensive weapons programs, such as warhead accuracy and yield improvements," which would provide its land or sea-based missiles with the capacity to launch counter-force strikes against Soviet ICBMs. (The fact that the Soviets have the capacity to strike our ICBMs doesn't appear to worry Kahan too much.)

"In fact," Kahan went on, "consistent with the proposition that all nuclear defenses are potentially destabilizing, the U.S. should also avoid initiating massive anti-submarine warfare deployment efforts . . . and should reduce rather than increase its air-defense network."

While the absence of U.S. ABMs should alleviate any Kremlin fear that the U.S. might embark on a first-strike strategy, said Kahan, the "combination of American missile counterforce, ASW and air-defense efforts would create a serious threat to the USSR's deterrent within the next decade."

"On a broader level," Kahan maintained, "U.S. leaders should recognize that programs which they consider to be stabilizing, such as new submarines or bombers, might well trigger Soviet reactions based on Moscow's political attitudes or psychological outlooks. Even if certain U.S. weapons, such as Trident or the B-1, might not pose a direct threat to the USSR's retaliatory capability, premature deployment of any major strategic systems could stimulate a Soviet reaction for political 'force-matching' reasons, particularly if the

Kremlin came to believe that the U.S. was moving toward some form of superiority."

Scattered through Kahan's writings are a myriad of don'ts for U.S. policy-makers in the next phase of SALT. Kahan even goes so far as to suggest that U.S. leaders shouldn't take "high confidence" measures to protect our weaponry! "Premature force decisions taken to hedge against future Soviet threats of low probability should be avoided, and in many instances reliance on high confidence measures to ensure survivability and penetrability might have to be foregone in favor of measures which are less reliable but also less provocative." "Unilateral restraints," Kahan argued, could bring great benefits.

For the future, urged Kahan, officials "should play down our nuclear strength, avoid attributing undue significance to variations in the U.S.-Soviet force balance, and refrain from overstating the dangers of the Soviet threat or the problems of nuclear parity."

In short, what Kissinger's new disarmament adviser believes is that America, in order to reach a productive outcome at SALT II, must restrain its protective impulses, engage in unilateral disarmament, refrain from provoking the Soviets with "high confidence" defensive measures and virtually ignore what even *Time* magazine now sees as the growing and ominous nuclear threat from the Soviet Union. And what profoundly disturbs the hard-liners in Congress and the Pentagon is that they believe that these days Kissinger and Kahan think very much alike.

#### THE PENTAGON'S NITZE: AN UNCERTAIN TRUMPET

No sooner did it become known that Henry Kissinger had hired Jerome Kahan, a unilateral disarmament advocate, to enter the top councils of the State Department (see *HUMAN EVENTS*, February 16, page 3) than word leaked out that yet another controversial disarmament expert had been slated for a key Pentagon post. That expert: Paul Nitze, an old Democratic hand who played a major role in shaping the disarmament policies of former JFK-LBJ Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

Nitze is expected to be named to the job of Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, the same job he held in the Kennedy years and from which he and his successors exerted a powerful impact on the Pentagon's defense and foreign policy planning.

While the *New York Times'* Leslie Gelb quoted a former Nitze colleague as saying that he's "the most knowledgeable hawk in town," others more closely acquainted with his positions take strong exception to the "hard-liner" portrait. In the phrase of one observer, Nitze, at best, is "an uncertain trumpet." Far from strengthening the hawkish viewpoint in the Defense Department, for instance, there are some knowledgeable defense experts who believe that Nitze might seriously undermine the Pentagon's position on a variety of issues, including its "semi-hard" attitude toward the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks.

Though even his critics will acknowledge has hawkish moments, Nitze's rhetoric and actions in the past are not consistent with the views of a "hard-liner." Nitze's views on disarmament, in fact, have proved fairly consistent—and dovish—since 1958.

In November of that year, for instance, Nitze presided over Section 2 of the Fifth World Order Study Conference of the National Council of Churches which met in Cleveland, Ohio.

The panel claimed that "aggressive tactics of the Communist powers are caused, in part, by fear of their own security . . . and the history of Western imperialism must be taken into account if we are to understand contemporary Communist attitudes." It also claimed that "American nuclear stockpiles and widely scattered military bases, some of them near the borders of the Soviet Union, arouse

apprehension" among the Communist rulers. The clear implication of that argument, of course, was that America should relieve Soviet fears by abandoning our overseas missile bases.

Furthermore, the panel urged the United States to encourage Chiang Kai-shek to abandon the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu, to suspend nuclear tests unilaterally, and to use force only if it were "sanctioned by, and under control of, the United Nations."

Before the Senate Armed Services Committee in 1963, after he had been nominated as secretary of the Navy, Nitze said he had vigorously differed with many of the panel's points, though exactly which points were not always clear. His performance was not altogether convincing for the simple reason that his own thinking clearly bore a striking resemblance to some of the most controversial aspects of the panel report.

As Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs under Kennedy, he had, in fact, endorsed an American defense strategy that would not "provoke" the Soviet Union, he had favored withdrawal of U.S. missiles from Turkey, Italy and England, and he had openly supported the nuclear test-ban pact which the Joint Chiefs of Staff concluded was a "net disadvantage" to the U.S. military. Moreover, when Sen. Richard Russell (D-Ga.), then chairman of the Armed Services Committee, asked Nitze if he had believed in 1958 "that we should pressure the Chinese Nationalists to evacuate Quemoy and Matsu," Nitze replied, "My recollection is in 1958 I did think so." Nitze also opposed the 1955 Senate-House resolution empowering the President to commit American forces to protect those offshore islands from a Red Chinese attack.

One of the most provocative resolutions emanating from the World Order Study Conference panel was the proposition that America should use force only if it were "sanctioned by, and under the control of, the United Nations." Nitze said he opposed this part of the panel recommendations but his denial was less than persuasive in view of the startling speech he delivered to military and civilian personnel in Asilomar, Calif., on April 28, 1960—nearly two years after the World Order Study Conference in Cleveland and a few months prior to Kennedy's election.

The Nitze speech consisted of a series of finely reasoned assumptions, but the key element was that America should no longer strive for nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union or what Nitze defined as a "Class A" capability. Instead, said Nitze, the United States should aim for a "secure second-strike capability" with the capacity to retaliate if the Soviets strike the first blow.

Indeed, Nitze's 4,000-word address contained the seeds of the unilateral disarmament policy pursued so diligently and disastrously by the Kennedy Administration, a policy that called for—and resulted in—the deliberate abandonment of U.S. nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union.

At Asilomar, Nitze went even further than most dovish nuclear experts by explicitly proposing a plan that would make the United Nations the ultimate arbiter of when the Western world could employ its strategic nuclear arsenal. Said Nitze:

"The actions I propose are the following: (1) That we concentrate on building a variety of secure, purely retaliatory systems. . . (2) that, when we have such a mix of relatively secure systems, we scrap the fixed-based vulnerable systems that have their principal utility as components of a Class A [superior] capability; (3) that we multilateralize the command of our retaliatory systems by making SAC [the Strategic Air Command] a NATO command, and (4) that we inform the United Nations that NATO will turn over ultimate power of decision on the use of these systems to the General Assembly of the United Nations subject to the following conditions:

"(a) That we and our allies will assume continuing responsibility for manning, maintaining and improving these systems.

"(b) That U.N. inspectors would be invited to inspect and satisfy themselves that these are the only nuclear systems we are maintaining.

"(c) That a U.N. order to use them will be honored only in the event some nation has initiated the use of nuclear weapons other than on or over its own territory in self-defense against military aggression. . . ."

In other words, Nitze proposed turning over America's and NATO's strategic retaliatory forces to the Afro-Asian-dominated General Assembly of the United Nations. The Nitze-imposed conditions, moreover, would have been rendered the U.N. impotent, for the world organization itself would not have been permitted to allow the use of weapons consigned to its control if the Soviets had launched a massive, conventional assault.

Facing the Senate Armed Services Committee three years later, Nitze initially tried to downplay his proposal, but under considerable prodding he acknowledged it had been seriously put forth. Furthermore, only a few weeks prior to his appearance before the committee, Nitze, according to a *HUMAN EVENTS* source, had stoutly defended his Asilomar address before the liberal Democratic Study Group in the House. When Sen. Harry Byrd (D-Va.) asked Nitze about his remarks before the DSG, Nitze said that his "recollection" was that "I said that I very recently reread this Asilomar speech, and there were elements in it which I thought stood up after having reread it."

Sen. Robert Byrd (D-W. Va.), now the Democratic whip in the Senate, remarked to Nitze at the time: "I don't want to impugn your sincerity . . . [but] it seems to me that in my reading of this speech I get an impression that you threw out an idea which you thought might really be practicable and feasible. You attempted to destroy the anticipated objections to it. . . . I don't think a careful reading of the statement really would convince me and persuade me that it was indeed just a mere proposal which you did not believe in. . . ."

Under Byrd's continuing barrage, Nitze owned up: "I sincerely wanted this to be analyzed by these people who were there, I thought it was worthy of discussion."

In later years, Nitze has also been noted for his soft policies. From 1967 to 1969, Nitze was No. 2 man in the Defense Department. In the Nixon Administration, he has been an important member of the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks, and publicly defended SALT I, although he has been critical of the outcome in private conversations. In addition to his disarmament views, he also opposed the Vietnam War and argued against the belief that Hanoi could be bombed into submission.

So much for Nitze "the hawk." Nitze may now, in fact, believe in a "harder line" than he has voiced on the record, as many observers seem to think. And judged by the disarmament theorists who think the U.S. strategic arsenal should be reduced to a couple of H-bombs (a spare, in case one goes flat), Nitze is probably considered a Dr. Strangelove. But if past is prologue, as the saying goes, the selection of Paul Nitze is hardly likely to firm up the attitudes of Defense Secretary Schlesinger or send a single shiver down the spines of Kremlin strategists.

#### THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE

#### HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the television policy of the



National Football League last fall, some disparaging remarks were made in this Chamber about professional football in general, and about the NFL in particular.

I would first like to share with my colleagues some of the little-known facts about those activities of the NFL which often go unnoticed but which reflect an integral part of league policy.

The National Football League has volunteered NFL films and TV air time, for the promotion of federally sponsored programs, since 1971, valued at \$250,000. NFL players and their families have also donated their time for radio and television commercials and personal appearances to promote these agency efforts. In the past 3 years the NFL has extended over a half million dollars of time, people and footage for governmental projects in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Energy Commission, and the Department of Justice, as well as for projects dealing with sickle cell anemia, high blood pressure, Goodwill Industries, Careers, United Way, and cancer research. The National Football League and the players of the NFL have willingly and actively supported these civic service programs because they realize that their special expertise and appeal to a large cross section of our population places them in a unique position to easily influence their audiences, and in possessing that influence, that they have a responsibility to our society to encourage the development of and the participation in programs that better the society.

I am extremely proud of my years in pro football and of my affiliation with the game—its players, owners, and fans. And, as a Member of the House, I am grateful for the concern and commitment of the league to the betterment of our country and our people.

Second, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues some current statistics on league attendance which reflects what may be the results of the Congress recent alteration of NFL TV policy.

On Thursday, December 13, 1973, the Washington Post carried an article entitled "NFL No-Shows Jump 60 Percent From '72." In essence, the article pointed out that in the 13-week season of 1972, prior to the enactment of legislation to lift television blackouts in cities where NFL games were played, the "no-show" spectator count was 524,871. For that same period in 1973, after the legislation became effective, the early estimated "no-show" amount was 826,182. More recent figures reported by the league show that for the 1973 regular 14-week season there were 109 televised games and 1,017,333 "no-shows." The post-season "no-shows" totaled 41,902.

It would seem, in the interest of objectivity, Congress should monitor closely the effects of lifting the TV blackout. Admittedly, all the evidence is not in. Yet, as the Post points out:

The real test is expected to come next season when season-ticket holders, who comprise the bulk of NFL attendance, make their decisions about renewing tickets.

To call attention to these facts is not to "cry wolf" or engage in a "doomsday"

prediction about the destruction of pro football. However, the Members who voted to alter the TV policy of pro football should be open to empirical evidence that indicates trends in pro football's financial future. Rather than closing our minds, or criticizing the league for showing its side of the story, and even telling pro football to outlaw the zone defense, let's be openminded enough to watch these statistics and trends and be willing to adopt remedial legislation if the facts so warrant.

#### PICKING UP THE PIECES IN CHILE, AN UNTOLD STORY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 1973, after 3 years under Marxist rule, the people of Chile dramatically rejected Communist President Salvador Allende Gossens and his Marxist regime. The anti-Communist military had surrounded the Presidential Palace. Unwilling to answer to his Communist masters for his failure, Allende committed suicide with a gun given him by Fidel Castro, whom he had sought to replace as the most celebrated Communist in the Americas. Allende left behind him an economy so destroyed by communism that it may take years to recover.

The immediate reaction of outrage expressed by Communists and radicals in our country and throughout the world was to be expected. Their "showcase of democratic socialism in the Western Hemisphere," as Allende's Communist regime was called had failed. In its failure, the Allende government had learned what other Communists have long known—that a free people will not willingly trade liberty for communism.

By midsummer, most observers realized that Allende had led Chile to the brink of civil war or total collapse. Economic chaos paralyzed the country. Inflation had reached a staggering 350 percent by the end of July—the highest in the world. Consumer prices were more than doubling every 4 months, and what consumer products were available were earmarked as a first priority for party members. The people were forced to endure massive waiting lines to purchase their government rations of food and clothing, or to turn to the black market. Paper currency was so devalued by inflation that rather than reporting to work for a daily wage, workers often found it more beneficial to stand in line for a government handout, which many then sold on the black market. The black market, by now the free market left in Chile, became the only industry in the land that showed a profit.

Allende's policies of agrarian reform, which turned farmers into employees of the state, resulted in a drop of almost 20 percent in agricultural production. Uncertainty over expropriation of their crops and land discouraged farmers from planting. Agricultural production sank to

the level of 1936, when there had been half as many people to feed. Almost half of the country's export earnings had to be used to import food. And the balance-of-payments deficit and foreign debt soared—doubling in only 3 years. When the new government took control from the Communists it found that the Treasury contained only enough money to finance for a single day the purchase of food needed from abroad.

Repeated and prolonged strikes by copper miners had caused the country's major industry to clank to a halt. The demands of miners for higher wages to combat soaring inflation were coupled with protests against the inept administration of the mines by Allende's political commissars. Political appointees swelled the ranks of workers. They spent more time organizing and attending party meetings than in mining ore, and the industries operated only at fantastic losses. The efficient mining operations that Allende had without compensation "Chileanized" from U.S.-based companies became political playthings for the Marxists.

Hundreds of industries were nationalized. To force the bankruptcy of remaining private enterprises, Allende froze prices on goods manufactured by private concerns and at the same time granted large wage raises while inflating the prices of government-controlled raw materials. As this escalated, whole industries fell into the hands of Allende's Marxist henchmen and the economy disintegrated.

Furious, the people reacted. Strikes by truckers, shopkeepers, white-collar workers, taxi drivers, and hospital technicians rocked Chile in the months before the government was toppled. All semblance of social and economic order had been destroyed in Chile.

Meanwhile, even as he paid lip service to his goal of establishing a Communist state in Chile through democratic means, Salvador Allende armed an international brigade of workers, students, and foreign Communist revolutionaries, who had been quietly infiltrated into the country. He now realized that his only hope of retaining power was through an armed Communist takeover. In a letter of July 29, 1973, discovered among other Presidential documents after the coup, Cuban dictator Fidel Castro urged Allende to rally his forces and strike:

... Don't for a single instant forget the formidable power of the Chilean labour class, and the energetic backing that it has afforded you at all difficult times. It can, at a call from you should the revolution be endangered, paralyze those who favor a coup d'état, retain the adherence of vacillators, impose its conditions, and decide once and forever ... the fate of Chile. The enemy should know that it has been summoned and is ready to come into action. Its strength and combativeness may tilt the scale in your favor, even though other circumstances may be unfavorable.

But, in spite of their intensive guerrilla training and the large caches of arms and ammunition stored for them in the Presidential Palace and other government buildings, Allende's paramilitary commandos offered little organized resistance to the military on the morning of the coup. It was a preemptive move—well timed and well organized. In the

President's luxurious home in Santiago, the armed forces discovered an arsenal sufficient to supply over 2,000 men.

There were Russian-made rockets, 30- and 50-caliber heavy machineguns, AK-47's, recoilless antitank weapons, and bazookas—with enough ammunition to permit sustained gunfire for over 24 hours. A bomb factory and a guerrilla school were discovered at the home of Allende's private secretary. Caches of explosives, grenades, assault guns, and Molotov cocktails were found in factories and industrial plants operated by Allende's Communist appointees.

Documents found in the office of the Minister of the Interior, Daniel Vergara, a Community Party leader, indicates that if the military coup had not taken place when it did the Communists would have launched their formal takeover. Plans had already been made, and scheduled, to assassinate top military leaders on September 17. Even former Chilean President Eduardo Frei, who is hardly known as a rightwing extremist, looked upon the junta as the only escape from a Communist takeover:

The country had no other way out towards salvation but a government by the Junta. Allende had come to establish Communism by violence, not through democratic means. And when deceived democrats realized the magnitude of this treason, it was too late; masses of guerrilleros had been armed, and a program of extermination of military, civil and political heads was about to be put into action.

Chile was spared the massive butchery that followed Communist revolutions in Cuba, China, and Russia. The military apparently acted only after the threat of a Communist takeover by force seemed imminent. For 46 years the military in Chile had avoided involvement in civilian politics. But, as the Communists have proved again and again, there are far worse ways to live. And within a week the junta, composed of representatives of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and National Police, had established its credibility as a government and began to move the country back toward liberty.

For one thing, it assumed full responsibility for the foreign debts of the previous administration. The United States is still waiting for payment of debts owed by Russia in 1917 and Cuba in 1959. This was a significant step toward reestablishing international credit and respectability.

In the subsequent rush of the U.S. press to deplore military rule by the new government, inaccuracies, misrepresentations, and deliberate lies were headlined across our country. Widespread coverage was given a Newsweek story, filed by correspondent John Barnes, claiming an "official morgue body-count" showed that during the first 2 weeks following the overthrow of Comrade Allende the Santiago morgue processed 2,796 bodies. It implied that executions had taken place on the same scale in other Chilean cities. The report created a sensation and shocked most Americans. It was even read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as representing the brutality of the new anti-Communist government. The Newsweek report gained wide circulation on college campuses and was used by Marxist groups to raise money for anti-Chile propaganda.

Grave doubts about what had really happened in Chile were created in the minds of millions of uninformed Americans.

Little attention was paid to reports issued a few weeks later by reporters making independent investigations of the story. These investigations established that the allegations of Newsweek reporter Barnes were so wildly exaggerated as to constitute deliberate misrepresentation. The body-count figure of 2,769 was correct, of course. But what Barnes had neglected to tell the readers of Newsweek was that the figure represented every corpse admitted to the Santiago morgue for the entire year from January 1 through September. The Chilean Embassy in Washington reports that the actual death toll was less than 600, including 42 military and police.

After the first burst of sensationalist headlines, the U.S. press has largely chosen to ignore Chile. The new government's uphill struggle to restore an economy shattered by Allende and his Communists has been almost totally neglected. Yet the economy of Chile has begun to show signs of recovering from its 3 years under Marxism.

Copper production, which accounts for about 80 percent of Chile's income, has already shown a substantial increase. The copper mines are expected to produce a record 800,000 tons during 1974. And the government has begun to conduct negotiations "aimed at providing just compensation" for nationalized U.S. interests.

Farms illegally taken by the Allende regime are being returned to their owners. Agricultural production is expected to rise markedly despite the delayed planting season.

Public confidence in the escudo—Chile's national currency—is returning. Long-hoarded U.S. dollars are again being exchanged for escudos at the official rate. In fact, some \$19.5 million in small bills were sent abroad a commercial airliner to Miami in late December as the first installment toward repayment of Chile's financial obligations to the United States. In a little-publicized agreement with the U.S. State Department, Chile's new leaders have agreed to repay \$64 million during the next 6 years beginning in January 1975, with interest of 6 percent per annum. Reports indicate that it took the tellers almost a week to count the millions of U.S. bills, many of which had been exchanged for escudos after having been hoarded by Chileans throughout the Allende regime.

The social and political chaos Chile suffered under the Marxists is to be replaced by a new Constitution currently being drafted. It is expected to be submitted to a public plebiscite for approval within the next few months. But the liberal press in the United States, still mourning the fall of Communist Salvador Allende, has failed to report that the drafting committee does not include a single representative of the armed forces. Chile's military leaders apparently desire to return to their traditional role, separate from civilian politics, as soon as the emergency can be ended.

Early indications are that the new Constitution will reaffirm and strengthen basic freedoms and civil liberties denied under the Allende regime. One of the cor-

nerstones of constitutional freedom being included is the right to own private property. Every effort is being made to assure that no fanatical minority of Communists will ever again be able to gain a stranglehold on the country. The Chilean Embassy reports:

The final goal of the (Fundamental) Charter is to interpret the feelings of the majority of the country and to create machinery for preventing the nation from ever again being ruled by a minority which refuses to respect the popular will of the majority.

Anti-Communist Chile's Ambassador to the United States is Walter H. Heitmann, a soft-spoken retired air force general. Soon after his arrival in Washington, Ambassador Heitmann appeared on my weekly television program "You've a Right To Know" to discuss the situation in his country. This was his first appearance on U.S. television, and General Heitmann emphasized that his government's leaders hope "that they can show the world with actions and final results that they did the right thing." As we talked, Ambassador Heitmann discussed the recent events in his country with a determination and optimism that characterize conversations I have had with other members of the new anti-Communist government. I believe you will be interested in the details of that interview which follow:

#### INTERVIEW

Ambassador HEITMANN. It would take three years to explain the facts, because in three years the previous Government destroyed our country. Unless you have knowledge of the former conditions, you will not be able to understand the reasons why the military, breaking a long tradition in our country, intervened; and why the majority of Chileans are supporting the new government. It would be necessary for the American people to see how our women formed long lines just to get some food, and remained standing for hours well into the night. They were forced, with this system, to leave their children alone, risking their health and lives in order to get food. The food was distributed only to those who were members of the Marxist political parties. Citizens who did not belong to those parties could not even get the basic necessities to support life, but were forced to buy them in the "black market."

Congressman RARICK. Party—that's the Communist Party?

Ambassador HEITMANN. That's the Communist Party, yes. That is the way they operated in order to have the complete control over the Chilean people. Basically, the military was asked by the people to intervene to put an end to this situation. For three years, the population had been nourished with lies, with promises that were never accomplished. They grew sick and tired of demagoguery. The unions went on strike, especially the truckers' unions. And the university students too. Even the housewives went into the streets demanding the resignation of Allende.

The country was paralyzed, production was almost non-existent, everything was a matter of politics. The police force was called out to repress the people's protest, and police officers quickly became sick of misuse of authority. Finally, however, the leaders of the military could no longer remain deaf to the demands of the people for the resignation of Allende. They asked him to leave the country, and offered him safe passage to the nation of his preference, even Russia, with full assurance that he might take with him whomever he wished. When he did not accept this offer, the Armed Forces moved to overthrow him by force.

Congressman RARICK. Mr. Ambassador, you were in Chile at the time of the coup. What



do you believe would have happened if the military had not intervened?

Ambassador HEITMANN. I retired one year ago from the Armed Forces, so I was able to watch developments both as a military man and as a civilian. If the Army had not stepped in, the government would have started its own revolution. It had organized popular militias, it had weapons, organization, guerrilla-training camps with people coming in from Cuba, Korea, and other countries. Chile was invaded by foreigners who were ready to lead the coup that the Allende Government was preparing for the seventeenth of September, one day before our National Day. They had a detailed plan for that day, which was found in the safe of the Minister of the Interior. It was known as "Plan Z." Anybody can look at these documents in the "White Book" recently published by the new Government. My Embassy is making every effort to circulate this book in the United States.

Congressman RARICK. Do you feel that President Allende was the leader of this coup against his own Government, or was he being manipulated by outside forces?

Ambassador HEITMANN. Mr. Allende was in some way losing control of the political forces that supported him, especially of the Socialist Party, which was the most ardent advocate of violence. But Allende was a Socialist himself, and the disagreement with his party was only a matter of timing. There is no doubt he knew about this plot because some of the documents were found in his house, where he kept an arsenal: guns made in Russia, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia. There are some pictures of his practicing with machine-guns in the gardens of one of his several houses.

Congressman RARICK. But there were people from outside your country who had been moved in?

Ambassador HEITMANN. Yes, we detected about thirteen thousand foreigners, most of them Cubans and Brazilians, some from Uruguay, Korea, and other countries. They were actively training Chileans too. In the factories they were organizing workers in paramilitary armies and providing them with arms.

Congressman RARICK. In other words, the Socialists and Communists were using the labor movement and the poor people to arrange a guerrilla movement against their own country?

Ambassador HEITMANN. Yes, that's exactly what happened.

Congressman RARICK. But Mr. Ambassador, if Allende's guerrilla movement was so strong, why was there so little opposition to the preemptive coup by the military?

Ambassador HEITMANN. Why did they find little resistance? It is obvious: Because most people were against Allende. The Marxist regime became very unpopular during the last year. People were promised many good things, and they were misled for a time. But as soon as treason-to-promises was confirmed, they protested against the former Government. It was then that the Marxists had to look for more foreigners to help support Allende. Our citizens are lovers of peace and freedom, and only the knowledge that they had been cheated made them react violently against the cheater.

What happened in Chile was not a coup d'état. It was the only way to solve the problems of the nation. The problems had been created by the former Government through the illegal rulings applied during the last three years. Our moral, social, and economic status was destroyed. Such activity was formally denounced by the Supreme Court, the Comptroller's Office, and the Congress. However, Allende did not listen, and continued to violate both the Constitution and the law.

The military intervention was a consequence of the demands expressed by the majority of Chileans. At great risk, the newspapers, radio, and television published the facts that proved the failure of the so-called

"democratic communism," and the people understood. The shortages of food, medicines, and raw materials became a national tragedy. Women went out in the streets crying because their cooking pots were empty. Workers, technicians, employees, countrymen, professionals, and students went on strike and the country was paralyzed. All over the country people began collecting signatures to ask Allende to resign. At last, doctors of medicine and truckers declared that they would remain on strike until the President had left the Moneda. It was then that the Armed Forces and the Police Corps intervened.

Congressman RARICK. We are hearing talk about suppression of the minorities and of free speech in your country. Does this exist?

Ambassador HEITMANN. At this moment all political activities are suspended. The people accept this, and are offering to continue such a suspension until the country achieves a certain degree of recovery. Some news sources have publicized inadequate information, as well as falsified reports, related to the Chilean Government. Perhaps part of this misinformation is a result of the fact that the legal procedures under which the Military Courts operate require the strictest secrecy regarding those being detained. In compliance with the military code of justice that has operated in Chile for more than twenty-five years, the military authorities cannot divulge any information about those being held for questioning. For this reason, it is not unusual to hear that "so-and-so has disappeared," allowing the imagination to supply the remaining details, while the truth of the matter is that the person in question is only being interrogated by the courts. In addition, it is possible that some people providing false information are politically interested in distorting the actual situation in Chile.

Congressman RARICK. In the meantime, what has your country done with all of those Communists from other countries who were infiltrated in Chile?

Ambassador HEITMANN. We are giving them safe-conduct to leave the country. I don't know if the countries that are receiving them are aware of the problems they are going to have as a result. Some are even offering them high positions in universities and public activities. It certainly provides a good opportunity for Communism to spread its ideology to different countries.

Congressman RARICK. Mr. Ambassador I am sure you are aware that the U.S. Government has been discussing the possibility that these Communists and Marxists from Chile might be classified as "refugees" and offered sanctuary here in the United States. I'm sure your country is not going to object if some other country takes them off your hands, are you?

Ambassador HEITMANN. No, we want to get rid of them by all means, but we are not going to kill them. We just want them out of the country. And if they find a country that wants to take care of them, that's the problem of that country.

Congressman RARICK. The flow of private capital from the United States to Chile was cut off following the seizure of several U.S.-based copper companies. Within the past few weeks, however, private U.S. bank loans amounting to about \$150 million have been made available to Chile. Do you see this as an economic vote of confidence for the new Government?

Ambassador HEITMANN. There was no guarantee of national or foreign investment in Chile over the last few years because the Allende regime did not act in accordance with the Constitution and the law. Big and small factories were illegally seized, some were even taken over by guerrilla forces. At this moment, I think we are recovering the traditional confidence investors once had, because Chileans are once again working to increase and improve the quality of produc-

tion. As for negotiations with copper companies, we expect them to end in a mutual agreement that will benefit both parties. Nevertheless, we need all kinds of foreign help now. Technical, scientific, and economic aid is necessary because, as you know, the deficit in the balance of payments is \$700 million this year, despite the fact that before Allende came to power we enjoyed a \$400 million surplus.

Congressman RARICK. What is the new Government doing to restore economic and social stability in Chile?

Ambassador HEITMANN. The destruction of our economy by the Marxist was so complete that reconstruction will be even more difficult than that required of a nation reduced to rubble by a war. Emergency measures have been implemented with plans for short, medium, and long term reconstruction. As an immediate measure, efforts were concentrated on the provision of foodstuffs, to avoid the famine precipitated by the decline of agricultural production and the dismantling of the food-processing industry. This was followed by the initiation of short-term plans to reorganize labor in all sectors. The Chilean democratic organization is being restructured to encourage increased production in mining, agriculture, and industry.

Congressman RARICK. What lies ahead for Chile?

Ambassador HEITMANN. Regarding our future hopes, I can assure you that the coming years will be years of sacrifice and effort on the part of the people of Chile. If it is not possible to procure the immediate technical and economic support that Chile needs, the recovery will nevertheless continue. Without international understanding and cooperation, our recuperation will of course be slower. But Chile has no doubts about having taken the road back to freedom, and we hope that some day soon the other free nations of the world will understand and appreciate this.

NOTE.—This article originally appeared in the March 1974 issue of American Opinion.

## RESPONSE OF INDIANA CHURCHES TO THE ENERGY CRISIS

### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the text of a statement by the Indiana Council of Churches of December 27, 1973, setting forth the response of churches in the State of Indiana to shortages of energy.

The text of the resolution follows:

#### RESPONSE OF INDIANA CHURCHES TO THE ENERGY CRISIS

The churches of Indiana represented in the Indiana Council of Churches recognize their individual and corporate responsibility in the current energy crisis. They will undertake to counsel with their people in regard to conservation of fuel, adjust their programming to the same end and contribute positively to meeting the energy problem in communities, the state and nation.

The churches consider it essential at the national level:

(1) That the actual nature and extent of the shortage be determined by the Government itself independent of reports from the oil companies.

(2) That representatives of the public including the churches be involved in examination of the problem and in planning to meet it.

(3) That whatever plan or plans may be devised shall be made equitable so that some

do not profit greatly while others sustain heavy economic cost.

(4) That it be recognized that attempting to restrict the use of fuel by raising the cost through large price increases or greatly expanded tax would bear unfairly upon working people who must use their cars to get to work and can least afford higher transportation costs. Many such employees are in areas where no public transportation exists.

(5) That national leadership be given to strengthening and expanding local public transportation systems and to the development of such systems where not now in existence.

(6) That the current energy situation not be used to turn back the clock on school integration.

(7) That immediate attention be given to the problem of unemployment and redistribution of employment as a result of the energy situation.

(8) That Hoosiers recognize the crisis as national and that concern for Indiana's welfare not blind the state's government or people to the fact that this is one nation and that limitations on fuel must be accepted proportionately by all regardless of where in the country they live.

For themselves the churches declare their intention to:

(1) Combine necessary meetings to reduce travel.

(2) Reduce or eliminate meetings where possible by means of telephone conference calls, mail communication and other procedures.

(3) Foster car pooling on the part of individuals and families.

(4) Encourage members and constituents of the churches to conserve fuel in their homes and businesses.

(5) Close parts of churches hard to heat and use more easily heated portions of buildings.

(6) Explore joint use of facilities by more than one congregation.

(7) Survey the neighborhoods of the churches to find persons encountering difficulty in getting fuel oil and aiding them in securing it and providing shelter if required.

(8) Seek recognition of the special problem of churches which have bus ministries as an important or even major phase of their total program and articulate the particular problems confronted by pastors in parish connected travel and in reaching their fields.

This statement shall be communicated to William E. Simon, the federal energy administrator, members of Congress from Indiana, Governor Bowen, Robert Morris, Indiana's energy coordinator, Speaker Kermit Burrous of the Indiana House of Representatives and Chairman Pro Tem Philip Gutman of the State Senate.

Dr. F. BENJAMIN DAVIS,  
President.  
Dr. GROVER L. HARTMAN,  
Executive Secretary.

#### A YOUNG PERSON'S THOUGHTS ON THE RESPONSIBILITY OF CITIZENSHIP

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN  
OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues are aware of the annual Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary in which secondary school students in every State compete for scholarship awards by preparing a broadcast script addressing their remarks to a chosen theme.

May I share with you the winning

speech of Cumberland, R.I., high school senior, Lynne Coulombe. Miss Coulombe's well expressed thoughts reflect the concerns shared by many young citizens, yet present an affirmation of faith in our democratic form of government.

Her speech is titled "My Responsibility as a Citizen."

Describing my responsibility as a citizen is surely not as simple a task as it may appear. This responsibility is not one single, clearly discernible entity which can be isolated and analyzed. Rather, my responsibility lies in several intertwining duties which transcend the bounds of being merely responsibilities to act when the need for defense is evident. Responsibilities of thought and deliberation are perhaps more important because they are the catalysts which set duties of act into motion.

I, as a citizen, must recognize my country for her inherent values. Her heritage, particularly her founding and the incubation of what we have accepted as our Constitution and the varied qualities of her multi-ethnic citizenry are some of the more obvious traits worthy of mention and respect. She is a land of charity, to her own inhabitants as well as to many of the world's people. She has remained a bastion of freedom as it is printed, spoken and heard, and she allows it to thrive. Without further attempts to itemize the various freedoms that are offered, suffice it to say that they are, indeed, there, and they permeate the culture. Yet, most of all, she is strong and powerful country with the fortitude to endure. Our domestic political system has proven itself to be as valid for the industrial society that is present now, as well as for the agricultural society under which it was adopted. Even the effects of the tides of controversy such as we are experiencing presently, the fundamental constitutional system has held firm with minimal adversity. Her power has repeatedly been demonstrated. Never declared less than a victor in war, there is little likelihood of military or strategic failure and defeat in the future. Here is where by responsibility as a citizen becomes much more difficult, and where its manifestations are oft-times misunderstood. When my country misuses the strength that she possesses, either domestically or internationally, my responsibility as a citizen is to act; for not to is surely one of the basest forms of neglect. There are several distinctions within the defined realm of dissent, and one must realize that quiet, yet effective, dissent is easily as viable as what we have come to accept as synonymous with the word itself. For example, notifying one's representatives and senators in Washington of his disagreement on matters of principle, procedure or policy is probably the most common form of what could be termed "passive dissent."

Historically, it has been those who dissented who have achieved progressive results. Our independence was procured through dissidents who were eventually succeeded by the civil rights demonstrators, who at southern lunch counters, fought successfully for their integration. It is the individual who does not react to indignities, or even outrages, who does the greatest disservice to his country.

Still, through the internal pressure exerted upon the structure of our country she has endured, proving that since she is a government of the people, inherently she can withstand the actions of those people who care about the future and direction of the country.

Therefore my responsibility as a citizen is twofold: I must appreciate the attributes and values present in my country, and at the same time, I must strive to correct her deficiencies where they occur.

In conclusion, perhaps this sentiment was

best expressed by Carl Schurz, when he stated

"Our country, right or wrong;  
When right, to be kept right;  
When wrong to be put right!"

#### FORMER CONSTITUENTS AND MEMBERS OF RICHARD NIXON'S CHURCH CALL FOR IMPEACHMENT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in today's mail I received a copy of a resolution passed by the Peace and Social Order Committee of the Claremont Friends Meeting, the text of which I would like to insert in the Record. This resolution is of particular interest since Claremont is in the heart of what was once California's 12th Congressional District, represented by the Honorable Jerry Voorhis until he was defeated in one of history's most notorious smear campaign's by Richard Nixon in 1946. Congressman Voorhis still resides in Claremont and remains extremely active in local politics in the area.

Another factor increasing the interest of this resolution is the fact that Mr. Nixon himself was raised as a member of the community of Friends, widely known as the Quaker Church, even though his actions throughout his political career have gone against the principles of that religion quite consistently.

The text of the resolution follows:

FEBRUARY 3, 1974.

The Peace and Social Order Committee of the Claremont Friends Meeting urges Richard Nixon to drop his adversary role toward all who question his actions and that he freely come forward with all the necessary documents involved in the charges of illegal actions and abuses of power by his administration. We believe he should be willing, if need be, to submit to questioning by appropriate authorities of the other branches of government concerning these charges. At this time of crisis, we believe he should search his soul, for his own sake and for the morale of the country, and show his regard for and his trust in the American people by openly confiding in them about his relationship to the matters which so trouble them.

In any case, we believe that the House of Representatives should continue the investigation of the acts of Richard M. Nixon.

We believe the following are some grounds for Impeachment:

(1) The President has usurped the war-making powers of Congress; he deliberately concealed the bombing of Cambodia from Congress and the people and caused government records to be falsified. He has also announced that we would do so again under similar circumstances;

(2) The President established a secret police that operated outside the restraints of law and engaged in criminal acts of burglary, wiretapping, espionage and perjury;

(3) The President has flouted the Constitution and some of the laws of the land. For example, he impounded \$40 billion that Congress voted for humanitarian needs; he offered a high federal post to the judge at the time presiding in the Ellsberg trial, and he and his aides have obstructed investigation of the Watergate break-in.

JAMES W. GOULD,  
Chairman.