

even earlier, perhaps 10:15 a.m., and be prepared to introduce their amendments.

The leadership has assured the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY) that he will have at least 2 hours on his amendment, and that amendment being the final amendment to be disposed of prior to final action on the bill, Senators, I repeat, are urged to be on hand early to call up their amendments if they have such.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, while Mr. BUCKLEY has the privilege of offering an amendment to the bill which is not germane, it is my present inclination to urge the Senator not to offer his amendment on the bill, even though the Senator from Louisiana would expect to vote for it if the Senator offered it. The Senator from Louisiana might even feel disposed to vote for a motion to table the amendment so that we could limit amendments on this bill to amendments that are germane.

I wonder if there would be any objection if we might limit the right to offer the amendment to the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY) because I can foresee the possibility that someone else might offer the Buckley amendment so as to take us into the area of nongermane amendments.

May I address my inquiry to the acting majority leader in that regard?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Yes. If I may respond—and I ask the Chair if I am correct—under the agreement, it is my understanding that no nongermane amendment to the Buckley amendment would be in order to the Buckley amendment, and no amendment not germane to the bill would be in order to the bill, except the Buckley amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator from West Virginia permit us to pause while the Parliamentarian studies the question?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Very well.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess awaiting the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and at 7:56 p.m. the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 8:19 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, as an addendum to my statement of the program, I wish to emphasize the fact that under the agreement entered earlier, immediately upon the close of routine morning business tomorrow the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1283, the energy R. & D. bill, at which time the pending question before the Senate will be on the adoption of the amendment by Mr. BUCKLEY. That amendment, of course, can be set aside by unanimous consent to permit other Senators to come in with amendments to the bill, provided such amendments are germane to the bill.

I would, therefore, reiterate to Senators, so that they will be adequately alerted, that if they have amendments they should be on the floor early, by 10:15 or 10:30 a.m., and be ready to call up their amendments, and if at all possible be willing to agree to a brief time limitation on their amendments because the leadership on both sides of the aisle has assured Mr. BUCKLEY that he would have at least 2 hours on his amendment.

Consequently, if there are other amendments to the bill, they should be called up prior to debate and action in relation to the Buckley amendment, but, I repeat, such other amendments can be called up only by unanimous consent.

This would mean that in order to allow Mr. BUCKLEY at least 2 hours on his amendment, as was promised by the joint leadership, the way ought to be cleared for his amendment by not later than 1 p.m. tomorrow so as to accommodate the disposition of that amendment by no later than 3 p.m. tomorrow.

Mr. President, I wish to make one addendum to my earlier statement. In answer to a question by Mr. LONG, I should state that a motion to table the amendment by Mr. BUCKLEY would be in order.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 8:23 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 7, 1973, at 10 p.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 6, 1973:

##### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

William B. Buffum, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Walter J. Stoessel, Jr., of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

David H. Popper, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Chile.

##### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Alan G. Kirk II, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, vice John R. Quarles, Jr., elevated.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATIONS TO GERALD R. FORD, OUR NEW VICE PRESIDENT

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today is a historic occasion for the House of Representatives and for the Nation.

For the first time, under the 25th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, we have just elected a Vice President, our able and genial colleague, GERALD R. FORD of Michigan, nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate and House.

This significant occasion in which we participated today is unique in the annals of the Congress. In selecting GERALD R. FORD as Vice President, we have chosen a Vice President who is neither to the far left nor to the far right: a moderate,

if you will, a team player, a product of the legislative process of the House of Representatives.

In other words, the solid vote in confirming GERALD R. FORD, the longtime minority leader of the House, as Vice President is a compliment and a tribute to him personally and a source of pride to the House of Representatives—he is one of us. He has had 25 years of distinguished service in the House.

Mr. Speaker, certainly I was pleased and delighted to vote for and support the nomination of our colleague JERRY FORD as Vice President of the United States.

As a matter of fact, when the President nominated GERALD FORD as Vice-President-designate, I was among the first to announce publicly my support for him to the people of my State of Tennessee.

We were elected to the Congress at about the same time. Prior to his election as minority leader, he was a member of the Committee on Appropriations where he served with distinction

and ability. He served on the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and built a record of solid support for a strong national defense.

We have seen his growth and progress—his development as a leader—through the years.

I believe that JERRY FORD will be a healer for our country. He understands the congressional process. He understands the necessity for maintaining our American system of checks and balances in our form of government. As Vice President JERRY FORD will have a special relationship both with the Congress and with the President.

It is my view that as a healer our new Vice President can be an instrument in binding the wounds in our body politic—and he can be a leader in restoring the confidence of the American people in Government.

It is my belief that GERALD FORD will speak with calmness and restraint and will be a voice for harmony and unity for the Nation.

We know our new Vice President as a man and a leader—a man of integrity and patriotism.

It has been a pleasure for me to vote for this distinguished legislative leader, colleague, and friend as he enters the executive branch. Many predict that he will yet achieve higher honors.

Again, my congratulations to our new Vice President, GERALD R. FORD. I wish him well as he continues to serve the Nation.

#### MIDEAST OIL EMBARGO

### HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the editorial which appeared in the Washington Post this morning, entitled "Trade, the Mideast and Détente."

On Monday of this week, I introduced Senate Resolution 210, calling for a cut-off of trade with the Soviet Union until the Arab oil embargo is ended. This resolution is now pending in the Senate Finance Committee. There are many reasons why the Senate should seriously consider, now, the actions contemplated by my resolution.

As the editorial states:

Events may have overtaken the debate on whether to link trade and emigration. We mean in particular the Mideast war; others might add the Soviet strategic arms buildup. By failing to do its part to lead Arabs to sit down and negotiate before the October war, by preparing Arabs for their attack, by ignoring its summit promises to consult with Washington about an impending explosion, by pouring in fresh arms once the battle began, by urging other Arabs to join the fight and then to withhold their oil, by reportedly introducing nuclear arms into Egypt, by threatening unilateral military intervention—by this whole pattern of policy, Moscow revived the most troubling questions about its readiness to accept the mutual restraint required for true détente.

In so doing, the Kremlin largely mooted the earlier hopeful American premise that trade would serve détente. At this point—one hopes things will change—a prudent person would have to conclude that trade would serve Soviet ambition. This goes especially for the kind of trade the Russians most want: long-term loans, at interest rates heavily subsidized by the American taxpayers, for oil and natural gas development. For the U.S. government to finance energy projects in the Soviet Union, while the Kremlin continues to importune Arabs to deny energy to the United States, is an irony which American policy can hardly countenance.

Mr. President, I submit that if the American people knew the Russians were seeking long-term credit, subsidized by the American taxpayer, to develop Russian oil and gas reserves, public pressure would result in my resolution being immediately adopted by this body without debate.

I am going to make sure the American

people do know about this, Mr. President, and I am going to put my resolution into form to be offered as an amendment to any appropriate bill considered by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the Post editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

#### TRADE, THE MIDEAST AND DÉTENTE

Mr. Nixon had no real choice but, finally, to ask the House to proceed to consider his trade bill. Further delay could have eroded support for those provisions essential to negotiations with the principal U.S. trading partners. But further delay would not have improved prospects for taking out of the bill the Soviet-related features to which the President had earlier objected. What looks likely now is passage of a bill that will 1) deny Mr. Nixon the unrestricted authority he had sought to offer Moscow "most-favored nation" (MFN) tariff status, i.e., to end tariff discrimination; and 2) take back the authority he now has to extend Export-Import Bank credits and guarantees to Russia. The House will probably link both of these dispensations to Soviet performance on Jewish emigration to Israel.

We think the House—and if not the House, then later the Senate—should ease the explicit link between trade and emigration. To tighten it, in legislation, is to take the considerable and perhaps unnecessary chance of pushing the Kremlin into a spiteful decision to cut back emigration, now running at 3,000-plus a month. It is wrong to assume the Russians are so eager for détente, or at least for trade, that they will put up with an unlimited degree of interference in their internal affairs to achieve it—and emigration policy surely is an internal affair. To interfere more deeply and explicitly, in a bill that to become law would bear the President's signature, when the Moscow authorities have permitted emigration at a rate and for a time greater than almost anyone had expected, is, we submit, too risky. It is not, after all, difficult to monitor Soviet emigration policy. The Congress is not about to lose either its concern or its leverage, should Soviet performance falter.

Events may have overtaken the debate on whether to link trade and emigration. We mean in particular the Mideast war; others might add the Soviet strategic arms buildup. By failing to do its part to lead Arabs to sit down and negotiate before the October war, by preparing Arabs for their attack, by ignoring its summit promises to consult with Washington about an impending explosion, by pouring in fresh arms once the battle began, by urging other Arabs to join the fight and then to withhold their oil, by reportedly introducing nuclear arms into Egypt, by threatening unilateral military intervention—by this whole pattern of policy, Moscow revived the most troubling questions about its readiness to accept the mutual restraint required for true détente.

In so doing, the Kremlin largely mooted the earlier hopeful American premise that trade would serve détente. At this point—one hopes things will change—a prudent person would have to conclude that trade would serve Soviet ambition. This goes especially for the kind of trade the Russians most want: long-term loans, at interest rates heavily subsidized by the American taxpayer, for oil and natural gas development. For the U.S. government to finance energy projects in the Soviet Union, while the Kremlin continues to importune Arabs to deny energy

to the United States, is an irony which American policy can hardly countenance.

The Congress should, then, pass a trade bill which does not tie trade so tightly to emigration as to endanger emigration. It should make clear to the President, who, one trusts, needs little educating on the point, that the United States cannot support trade of the sort and scale the Russians desire while such considerable ambiguities remain about the general thrust of Soviet foreign policy, in the Mideast if not in strategic arms as well.

#### THE HONORING OF CARDINAL JOSEPH Mindszenty

### HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues the translation of a speech given in Hungarian by Mr. Julius Belso, a former member of the Hungarian Parliament, at a testimonial dinner held in New Jersey on September 30, 1973 honoring Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty:

(This is a translation of the speech given in Hungarian by Mr. Julius Belso, a former member of the Hungarian Parliament, at the testimonial dinner honoring Cardinal Mindszenty on September 30, 1973.)

Right Reverend Monsignor Archbishop of Hungary, Your Eminence. About a half century ago your Eminence, as pastor of Zalaegerszeg, visited the muddy little towns in the County of Zala near Kerka, in order to establish a parish in my hometown of Kerkakutas.

As a 10 year old boy, this was a great experience for me because for the first time I served in the mass, while your Eminence said the following in your sermon, "A good shepherd always looks after his sheep wherever they may be".

A few years later, through the will of God, the then reigning Pope, who is Christ the King's earthly governor, bestowed upon you the greatest honor that the church can give, so that you can be a worthy successor to the rest of the brave Hungarian bishops and archbishops.

As Hungary's spiritual leader you still felt closest to your faithful, despite your many engagements. Your Eminence traveled throughout the country talking to hundreds of thousands of people. You were the first to warn the world of the threat of communist tyranny.

Your Eminence's brave resistance, immeasurable suffering, exemplary behavior gave new hope to Hungarian people, and the Hungarian name became known and respected all over the world.

After almost a quarter of a century of captivity, humiliation and suffering your Eminence has accepted exile, the greatest cross of a holy life, so that as the Primate of Hungary you can continue the work that was left behind in Zalaegerszeg, Veszprem and Esztergom.

It has been almost 2 years since your Eminence arrived at the Vatican.

Since then, your Eminence as a good shepherd, has visited Hungarians in all parts of Europe and Canada in order to serve the scattered Hungarian sheep in the entire world. Your Eminence has come to New Brunswick to bless the St. Ladislaus Church. Through this visit to America your Eminence



wanted to bring attention to the importance of our Hungarian churches.

The blessing of the church today will be an unforgettable event for all of us. Our hearts are filled with gratitude, happiness and love toward your Excellency. This day is not only a great day of celebration for the parishioners of the St. Ladislaus Church but for all the 200,000 Hungarians in the state of New Jersey.

At this joyful occasion I have been granted the honor of greeting your Eminence in Hungarian on behalf of the members of the St. Ladislaus parish.

Welcome, your Eminence, our Great Shepherd and Good Father, the Primate of Hungary, our Cardinal and the spiritual leader of the Hungarian people who live within and outside the borders of Hungary.

We are grateful for the opportunity to be able to express our gratitude to your Eminence for the courageous perseverance with which you have expressed to the entire world the view of the Hungarian people in the fight which went on and is still going on today between freedom and tyranny.

Our beautiful church which was rebuilt and blessed today is the spiritual citadel which was built by hardworking Hungarian immigrants 70 years ago. They are the ones who sent their American born children to attend Hungarian schools and churches so that they may acquaint themselves with the beautiful Hungarian language and heritage.

In this parish of ours, we the old and new Hungarian immigrants work together with our American born Hungarian brothers, under the leadership of our beloved Father Julian Fuzer to whom we express our gratitude and love for all his hard work.

Within our church there are no barriers among us. We are the children of one spiritual Mother. We are working together for the preservation of our heritage and Hungarian history.

We promise your Eminence, on this festive occasion, that not only will we be useful, hardworking and lawabiding citizens of this great country which accepted us with great love, but we will be an example for all the rest of the Hungarian parishes, churches and schools. With dignity we will hold, cherish and keep these institutions in good order so that we may give them over to the next generation.

We are grateful to your Eminence for coming to us here in this great and beautiful country. We are glad that your Eminence can see that we have freedom, that we live happily and treasure our Hungarian heritage, religion, language and each other.

We pray to the Lord that He may give your Eminence a long, happy and blessed life so that we may greet you again on your trip to America next year.

May the good Lord bless your Eminence. May God bless your apostolic good work.

#### SENATOR McCURE TAKES INDEPENDENT OIL POLICY

**HON. JESSE A. HELMS**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, our colleague, the distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. McCURE), has recently returned from a 2-week, five-nation fact-finding mission to the Arab world. In that mission, Senator McCURE met with government and business leaders to dis-

cuss the issues of war and peace, and a return to normal trade relations.

He went to discover the intentions and observations of the various sectors of the Arab world toward us, and to find how our policies might be changed to defuse what surely will be a long series of wars that can only lead to disaster for the United States.

His third reason for going was to report his findings to the American people. In a brief sentence Senator McCURE has summed it up:

Never have the chances for peace been so great, nor the consequences for losing the peace been so great.

I would commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial column in The Idaho Falls Post-Register, and ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the extensions of remarks.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Extensions of Remarks, as follows:

[From the Idaho Falls (Idaho) Post-Register, Nov. 28, 1973]

#### SENATOR McCURE TAKES INDEPENDENT OIL POLICY

(By Ben J. Plastino)

One of the most portentous and significant action taken by a public official is the one-man goodwill trip of Idaho's Republican U.S. Senator James A. McCURE.

While most members of Congress and the Nixon Administration are talking about short term emergency measures to solve the energy crisis, McCURE is striving to bring the cure.

Most co-called political experts are either ignoring or overlooking the far reaching benefits that McCURE could bring if he received support.

McCURE at present is visiting the oil rich Arabian countries in an effort to see what can be done to alleviate the Arabian oil export ban to the United States and other countries which have adopted a pro-Israel policy in the smoldering Middle East War.

McCURE knows he is following an action that certainly is against the majority in Congress, including most members of the Idaho delegation; the Nixon Administration, and perhaps, the American people.

But it might be that in time that McCURE may have followed the right course, just as U.S. Sen. Frank Church, D-Idaho, did six years ago in consistently opposing military intervention in the Vietnam War.

McCURE is following a path that he hopes will bring oil to America immediately by placating the Arabians. He pointed out a month ago that attempts by the Nixon Administration to minimize the real magnitude of Arab oil import on the U.S. economy as "very dangerous." He also asserted that the Arab oil loss is not five per cent as many are saying but actually 17 per cent. He already has been proven accurate in this statement.

He warned then that America was facing a more critical crisis than others believed. The recent drastic measures taken by Nixon on gasoline and heat cutbacks now substantiate his assertions.

While Church and U.S. Rep. Orval Hansen, R-Idaho, with alacrity followed the Nixon Administration's pro Israel policy, McCURE refused to be stampeded.

Hansen has always followed a hawk policy in the Vietnam War but Church's enthusiasm for military weapons and favoring an extension of credit to Israel is somewhat a mild surprise. It gives some credence to the charge by Church's announced Republican election opponent, Robert Smith, Nampa attorney,

that Church's anti-war stand is questionable.

McCURE has announced it is his hope that Arabian oil can be brought to this country immediately by adopting a neutral attitude in the Middle East War. He joined in a resolution to Congress to this effect, and in this was joined by U.S. Rep. Steve Symms, R-Idaho, whose views are somewhat similar to McCURE in this respect. This proposed resolution, however, hasn't got far in view of the adamant opposition of the Nixon Administration and most members of Congress.

While McCURE's almost one-man onslaught would almost immediately ease the oil shortage, all other measures are temporary relief or are years away. These include the cutbacks in gasoline and heating fuels, the Alaskan pipeline, increased Canadian oil imports, and development of offshore lands and other oil fields, geothermal and solar energy.

Since taking the Senate toga early this year, McCURE has assumed a new guise from his conservative and staunch party stance in the House. He has been highly critical of Nixon's Watergate handling except in backing him in the firing of Special Watergate Prosecutor Archibald Cox whom he thought was too partisan to be effective.

All of the Idaho congressional delegation has lamented that the executive was attempting to usurp legislative prerogative. McCURE joined Church in voting to override many of Nixon's vetoes. Hansen and Symms, despite their protestations, have not. While both Church and McCURE voted recently in successfully overriding Nixon's veto on curtailing his commitment of troops on foreign soil, Hansen and Symms sided with maintaining the presidential powers.

The Arabian state of Kuwait invited the friendly McCURE to visit the Arabian countries and hear their side of the story. This likely was more an assignment that should have gone to Church, an influential member of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

McCURE's first report only Tuesday stated the Arabians invoked an oil embargo because they said they were deeply hurt over what they thought were friendly nations, such as the U.S., now following a pro-Israel policy.

It might be added that neither the Nixon Administration nor the State Department were happy to see the free-swinging McCURE in Arab country.

This writer predicts in a few months, not years as in the Vietnam War, sentiment may swing against Israel and for the oil rich Arabians as Americans become colder and travel less.

#### U.S. LOOKS TO U.S.S.R. TO SOLVE OUR ENERGY CRISIS

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as Americans are made more and more conscious of the energy crunch, our leaders make more and more agreements with the Communist world as if the only solution to the energy shortage can be found in developing production behind the Iron Curtain.

Some Americans may even question whether or not a solution to the domestic energy problem is really being sought, since the emotional hysteria has served so well to usher in a new political era of Communist interdependence.

Related newscippings follow:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 6, 1973]  
U.S., U.S.S.R. EYE SIBERIA GAS  
(By Dan Morgan)

Soviet and American sources said yesterday that the two countries are proceeding with studies of joint Siberian natural gas projects despite their Middle East confrontation and the Nixon administration's new policy of energy independence.

U.S. officials said that the first three-sided talks including the Japanese may be held early in 1974, to decide on exploration of gas fields in the Soviet province of Yakutsk. These fields, which eventually would cost at least \$4-billion to develop and would require U.S. government underwriting, could produce gas for the West Coast of the United States.

At the height of the Middle East crisis in October, Deputy Soviet Minister of Foreign Trade Nikolai G. Osipov held two weeks of intensive talks with administration officials in Washington and with company executives in Houston.

The head of the Japanese gas consortium, Haroshi Anzai, president of the Bank of Tokyo, is due in Houston early in December to discuss the Yakutsk project with American businessmen, officials said.

The continued activity suggested an effort by all three of the countries involved in the Siberian studies—the United States, Russia, and Japan—to keep the possibility of cooperation alive during a period when strong arguments are being marshalled against U.S. participation.

President Nixon has called for the United States to become self-sufficient in energy by 1980. Also, he has described the Middle East crisis as the worst Soviet-American confrontation since the 1962 Cuban missile crisis. The crisis was a double blow to the hopes for American economic development of Siberia because it highlighted the risks of having important fuel resources located in other countries and also raised doubts about the durability of the administration's detente policy.

Forces opposed to detente with influence in Congress, such as the AFL-CIO, are against government guarantees and credits for the massive investments. Legislation would be needed to increase the present \$20-billion lending authority of the Export-Import Bank if the projects are to go forward.

After the Middle East war, some official U.S. sources said that the energy situation might force this country to reconsider investing billions in Siberia instead of at home.

Nevertheless, Soviet sources in Washington said this week that commercial contacts are continuing.

One U.S. official said that the Middle East aftermath was "one factor," but he added that "nobody is going to stop looking for energy."

The price of Siberian natural gas, they say, looks much more competitive than it did only a few months ago. Studies completed last summer indicated that Siberian natural gas landed at U.S. ports would cost \$1.25 to \$1.50 per thousand cubic feet. Domestic natural gas at the wellhead now costs 25 cents per thousand cubic feet, and about 60 cents in New York City. However, industry officials believe that these costs could double under a controlled price rise or deregulation of gas prices, bringing the price much closer to that of the Soviet gas.

Congressional sources who follow the energy scene closely say that the Siberian gas deal is therefore still a possibility.

Political factors may be more important than the economic ones in determining whether the government will support U.S. investment, officials believe. The Soviet Union would have control of the flow of gas.

However, officials note that the United States would have leverage lacking in the Arab countries because of the Soviet Union's need for advanced western technology and credits—a need that most experts agree will last for at least 10 more years.

The Chinese have protested against American or Japanese investments in Siberia. However, the Japanese, who already are almost 100 per cent dependent on foreign oil and gas supplies, are enthusiastic.

Officials say that joint Japanese-American investment in Siberia might be one way of carrying out Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger's promise to seek ways of helping allied countries hurt by the energy crisis.

It is still not known if the Yakutsk fields possess adequate reserves to warrant major investments. At the trilateral meeting to be held in 1974, a protocol will have to be drawn up concerning test exploration, officials said. Its total cost is estimated at \$150 million and would be shared by the U.S. and Japan. Until now, the Soviets have been reluctant to allow foreign geologists and experts to work on scene.

American experts say that the scale and complexity of the Yakutsk project is overwhelming. Temperatures drop as low as minus 80 degrees and permafrost is 1,500 feet deep.

Under present plans, U.S. companies would provide drilling equipment, liquefaction plants and tankers and the Japanese would provide financing and 48-inch pipe to transport the gas from Yakutsk to Khabarovsk on the Chinese border, and thence to the port of Nakhodka on the Sea of Japan.

Two American consortia have been negotiating with Japanese and Soviet representatives on participation in Yakutsk.

Large gas reserves already are known to exist in the Urengoy gas field in Northern Siberia. Nicknamed "North Star," it would be linked by a pipeline to the Barents Sea, from which tankers would take the fuel to the East Coast of the United States.

American companies have completed feasibility studies, but a major government commitment of credits and guarantees would be necessary before any investment could be made.

[From the Washington Star-News, Dec. 5, 1973]

#### ROMANIA MAY AID UNITED STATES WITH MORE OIL

President Nicolae Ceausescu of Romania is understood to have indicated that his country could be helpful in alleviating the current oil shortage in the United States.

The issue was brought up yesterday during discussions the Romanian leader had at the White House and the State Department, knowledgeable diplomatic sources reported.

Romania, one of the few oil-producing countries in Europe, currently is exporting some 17 million barrels of crude oil and oil products a year to the United States. The quantity could be doubled easily, "if the price is right," the Romanian leader is said to have explained.

Ceausescu and his wife arrived here yesterday. They had spent Monday night at Camp David.

In welcoming ceremonies at the White House, President Nixon promised "the same warm-hearted welcome" in this country for Ceausescu and his wife that President and Mrs. Nixon received on a 1969 visit to Romania.

Ceausescu spent 80 minutes talking with Nixon at the White House and lunched with Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger.

White House spokesmen described the Nixon-Ceausescu talks as dealing in generalities, but noted that today's sessions would be more specific in terms of bilateral issues.

Romania could be helpful in smoothing ap-

proaches between the United States and the Arabs because unlike most other Eastern European countries which strictly follow the Moscow line, Bucharest maintains an independent policy and has contacts with both Arab governments and Israel.

Nixon and Ceausescu formally signed three agreements yesterday.

One provides for the continuation of Pan American World Airways' operations to Bucharest and beyond Romania to the Near East. It also authorizes Tarem, the Romanian national airline, to open services to New York next year.

Another agreement permits Romanian fishing vessels to call at ports of Baltimore, New York and Philadelphia for repairs and rests for their crews.

The third is a tax convention, similar to other treaties with European countries, removing tax barriers to the flow of investment and to individuals.

A joint declaration setting forth new principles for expanded relations between the two countries was to be signed today.

Ceausescu, disclosing the forthcoming pledges in a dinner toast at the White House last night, said the declaration would be "a document of historical importance" for future relations between the United States and Romania.

In his toast, Nixon pledged that U.S. relations with world superpowers would be pursued in a way that would not infringe on the independence of smaller nations.

Ceausescu said more efforts would have to be made to insure a place for smaller nations in international affairs "based on equal rights and regardless of size."

Diplomatic sources said, meanwhile, that Ceausescu has decided to cut short his visit to several states at the end of his Washington schedule and return to Bucharest. The sources said that Ceausescu would leave for Romania tomorrow, eliminating plans to travel to North Carolina, Ohio, Texas, Louisiana, Florida and Connecticut. He had planned to leave from New York City Monday.

The State Department declined to comment on the report.

[From the Washington Star-News, Dec. 5, 1973]

#### THE TOASTS WERE ALL OPTIMISTIC (By Isabelle Shelton)

Some people thought the toasts at last night's White House dinner for Romanian President Ceausescu set a record length.

But Henry Kissinger said NO.

With no more than the usual twinkle in his eye, the Secretary of State insisted: "the record is held by the Emperor of Ethiopia, and the president of Mexico is second (that's the preceding president, not the current one)."

Whether or not their 39 minutes of toasts set any records, President Nixon and his Communist guest of honor vied with each other over who could say the warmest, most optimistic things about the relationships between their two countries.

"Something very profound and something very positive" has happened to the world in the last six years, changing it for the better, President Nixon said.

A "very costly war" is over, "a new relationship has been developed between the two most powerful nations, and also a new relationship between the United States and the world's most populous nation."

And, Nixon added, President Ceausescu "has made a major contribution to this profound change in the relationship between nations . . . he has shown wisdom and understanding, and has contributed enormously to the opening of dialogues that might otherwise have forever been closed."



He wanted to hail his visitor, Nixon said, because, "he stands for a principle that we Americans believe in so deeply, the right of every nation, large or small, in its independence, to its freedom."

The President pledged that as this country continued its summit diplomacy with other great powers, it would never "do so at the expense of 'proud, fine people like our friends in Romania.'"

Ceausescu said his talks with Nixon yesterday had gone splendidly, and that he would "like to see the relations between the two countries with such different social systems 'become an example of the way in which two countries can cooperate.'" Kissinger, teased by reporters about a newspaper story that he had always pestered White House Social Secretary Lucy Winchester to seat the most attractive women next to him at a White House dinner, said he couldn't do that any more at his new post as Secretary of State (in which protocol determines his seating companion). But he totally enjoyed the new arrangement last night, Kissinger added gallantly.

He was seated between Mrs. Ceausescu and the wife of Romanian Ambassador to Washington Bogdan.

"I told them about Dracula," he said. "I always tell Romanians about Dracula. Usually, they don't know the story. Mrs. Ceausescu did. But it doesn't make any difference. I just make it up."

While foreign policy was the focus of the evening, there were reminders of the Nixon administration's Watergate problems in the presence of three of the Watergate lawyers J. Fred Buzhardt, Leonard Garment and Samuel J. Powers.

Buzhardt, who was criticized a few days ago by White House Press Secretary Ronald L. Zeigler said: "No," he didn't regard his presence at the dinner as a kind of "farewell," or even a farewell to his handling of Watergate matters.

But he was glad to be getting back to other White House affairs as a "change of pace," he said.

Presidential assistant Bryce Harlow, who returned to the White House, when Watergate disclosure forced the resignations of some top staff members, talked with reporters about reports that he will leave soon. "I always said that I would leave in a little while," he said. "Who knows what a little while is."

President Nixon got his signals crossed in introducing the after-dinner entertainment, the opera Society of Washington singing excerpts from Rossini's "Barber of Seville."

The singing would be in English, the President told the audience in the East Room, because although the Romanians could "understand it better in Italian, since their languages are similar, none of us would be able to understand it."

When the voices came out loud and clear in Italian, the President quipped: "If that was English, my Italian is awfully rusty."

Since the opera was about a barber, the President noted, his own White House barber, Milton Pitts, had been invited in to hear the entertainment.

"He told me he's really a hair stylist, but I told him he didn't have much to work on with me."

There had been a mix-up about dress for the dinner, but nobody seemed to mind. While White House state dinners usually call for black tie for men and long dresses for women, this one was to be business suits for men and short dresses for women because the Communists said they preferred it.

But when Mrs. Ceausescu arrived yesterday morning, she asked what the usual custom is and was told it was long dress. She said she had brought two and would like to wear one. The word was passed on to Mrs.

Nixon, so both women wore floor-length dresses although their husbands were in business suits. There wasn't time to notify the guests, so the rest of the women came in short dresses.

#### DIXIE BUSINESS MAGAZINE

### HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Hubert F. Lee, editor of Dixie Business magazine and one of our State's more outstanding citizens, has reprinted two articles which should be of interest to the Members of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the extensions of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ACE NEWSMAN REPORTS ON CHINA (By Fay Smulevitz Joyce)

Don Carter told the members of the East DeKalb Rotary Club that when he visited Red China earlier this year, the Chinese Communists "weren't trying to sell us on their system."

But judging by his description of the crime-free, drug-free, stable society, he was sold anyway on what that system had done for an incredible 800 million people.

The executive editor of the Macon Telegraph and News addressed the Rotarians Tuesday after accepting the annual Distinguished Service Award from Dixie Business Magazine editor Hubert F. Lee. The award was based on Carter's reporting of the Chinese people in a special supplement to the Macon newspaper.

Stationed in China as the battles of World War II ended, Carter contrasted the modern China to the opium dens, concubines, filth and starvation that he remembered.

"I had taken notes when I was in China 26, 27 years before, and I took them out to compare," the Plains native began. "I remember China as a country of pleasant, happy people, but it was so smelly you could hardly stand it. One time we saw dead bodies just lying along the side of the road where people had died of cholera."

"The war lords were extremely corrupt, and kept all the wealth for themselves. People were starving to death. Eighty per cent of the population was illiterate; only those destined for a job in the government bureaucracy were sent to school."

"There was little or no electricity and the water was unsanitary. A civil war was going on between Chiang Kai-shek and Mao Tse-Tung. We weren't allowed to say anything, but we saw radical changes had to take place. Everywhere there was hunger, mass inflation, no security, complete disregard for human rights."

After the World War ended the civil war raged on until October 1, 1949, when Mao marched into Peking to take over and name the People's Republic of China. All foreigners were kicked out, except the Communist Russians. The bamboo curtain of secrecy cloaked the country where one-quarter of the world's population lives and was only lifted in February, when President Nixon was welcomed in.

Shortly afterward, China's officials invited the American Society of Newspaper Editors to pick 22 of its members to glimpse the awakened giant.

"I think they invited us in order to show

off the Chinese Communist system," Carter speculated.

What the newspapermen found, he said, was "a fanatically clean place. The Communists have been able to clean China up. All the streets and public places are spotless. Even the trees are whitewashed."

More impressively, the leaders "have been able to increase production to the point that everyone has enough to eat. Only cooking oil, cereal and cotton fibers are rationed, and there is no shortage of them."

With more food has come better health care—a great emphasis on sanitation to prevent disease, on immunization and on medicine.

These changes have contributed to a life expectancy rate double of that in pre-Communist days. In 1945, said Carter, a Chinese person was expected to survive no further than age 26; now the average person will likely live to be 52.

"It's not a government that we Americans want or like, but it does offer a secure life. The government is stable, and there is no fear that armies will rush in during the night and drag people away, as there used to be."

"The government has been able materially to improve the life of the Chinese, and the price has been a loss of freedom."

"China is not a police state; you don't see armed guards standing around. But there is no self-determination. Everyone must accept the government-assigned job, salary and education. There are no strikes, no freedom to disagree."

And there is no private property. "Beyond a few possessions, a Chinese is not allowed to own anything—no cars, no land, no houses. A bicycle is the most valued possession; a sewing machine is second and third is a transistor radio."

Alcoholism never has been a problem, he said, because Chinese know how to control their drinking.

Factories do not lock up their tools, he continued, because thievery would be futile. The thief's neighbors would see him with the tools and report him.

Carter said the Chinese he talked to knew of the American capitalistic system, but preferred theirs. The teachings of Mao have taken hold, and the people would rather own next to nothing and work for the advancement of the entire 800 million-member society than be rewarded for hard work and initiative by making more money than the next person.

"The idiom is conformity—everybody dresses alike, thinks alike and acts alike."

During his 23-day visit Carter won a four-hour interview with Premier Chou En-Lai, and praised him as a "brilliant man who could have been President of the United States or Prime Minister of Great Britain." He characterized the Chinese people as a while as "brilliant," with a "breadth and scope of knowledge that amazed me."

The former Atlanta Journal and National Observer editor played down the possibility of China's endangering the United States.

"The Chinese now hate the Russians a lot more than they hate the Americans," he offered. "There's 6,000 miles of border they share with Russian, and there have been some incidents. They feel those will erupt into major problems, and they'll want some friends then."

Rather than using force, the Red Chinese are trying to "sell" their way of life to the people of North Africa and the rest of Asia, he added.

Mao Tse-Tung has tried to create a new kind of moral man, Carter believes, and he has no fears of Chinese aggression as long as the 80-year-old philosopher remains head of the country.

"I'm afraid of what will happen after he dies," he admitted. "I'm afraid those younger leaders might not be so peaceful. Eight hun-

dred million obedient people like that, in the hands of a Hitler . . ."

#### PUBLISHING VENTURE STARTED WITH ORANGE CRATE, PORTABLE TYPEWRITER

A newspaper which was started with portable typewriter and an orange crate has grown into one of the publishing giants in the southeast.

It was in March of 1949 that Bud and Mary Crane, with \$600 and a lot of fortitude, put together the first edition.

It was named the Decatur News since it initially covered only the city of Decatur with saturation delivery of 5,000 papers.

And it was unique in that it was one of the first really legitimate free (the industry calls it controlled circulation) newspapers in the south.

The others had been mostly advertising circulars sometimes with a sprinkling of highly partisan news or "canned" filler materials sent to newspapers by firms promoting various products and ideas.

Bud Crane had been night foreman in the composition department of Atlanta Newspapers, Inc. As a sideline, the Cranes operated a small service station at Church Street and Sycamore St. in Decatur.

They found that there was no way to get their advertising message to all of their potential customers. Other merchants, they found, were in the same dilemma.

So the idea came.

Why not start a newspaper, deliver it to every home and business in Decatur and assure each merchant who advertised in it that he would be reaching every potential customer in his market area?

Let the advertiser pay for delivery. But it wasn't easy in the early days. Free newspapers in the south were scorned by big advertising agencies and many big advertisers.

Their poor reputation had been created by the "shoppers" which threw all journalistic principles to the wind and did very little to either cover local news or to be impartial in that coverage.

The Cranes literally produced their own newspaper alone in the early days, using high school and college students with no pay to assist. The first office was on West Ponce de Leon in Decatur. Later it was moved to a Church Street location.

But the demand for a competitive medium was great and many small businessmen, delivery boys and others helped out in many ways to keep the struggling publishing venture alive.

Gradually, the concept began to catch on. Advertising volume increased as readers began to rely more and more on the paper for news and information about their community and their neighbors.

From a one-room operation, the News expanded into an old bowling alley on the Square in Decatur and put it in its own press and typesetting equipment.

Circulation was expanded outside the City of Decatur as the free newspaper caught on and became accepted and shopping centers emerged in outlying areas. The paper was renamed the Decatur-DeKalb News and by 1959—10 years after it was started—was distributing 14,000 papers.

A weekly newspaper with that kind of circulation was unheard of in the southeast. Older, more established paid circulation publishers frowned on the "unpaid" upstarts.

The News publishers founded a sister paper, the South Side Sun, in 1966 to give similar saturation news and advertising coverage to the Tri-Cities and southside Atlanta area.

From the beginning the News had maintained a paid circulation list of subscribers who did not live in its free distribution area but who wanted to get the paper for its news value.

These included servicemen college students. Decaturites who had moved to other cities and others.

From this list, the News established a paid circulation version of the free, larger paper with a different front page and several additional inside pages changed to coverage of governmental, business and professional news and features.

The paid paper in mid-1973 was designated as the County's Legal Organ and the Business and Financial Review and legal advertising tabloid went into it for the paid subscribers.

In October, a fourth publication—the third free newspaper—will crank up in northside Atlanta. Based in Sandy Springs it will be known as the Northside Sun.

In combination, the four papers will circle the metro area saturating the suburban market, offering an advertising package reaching—one area—or a combination of the three, with more than 150,000 newspapers.

A modern new Goss urbanite offset press capable of printing a 48-page broad sheet newspaper at speeds up to 50,000 per hour, recently went into use at the headquarters of the publishing firm.

The firm also retains its former 24-page capacity, 30,000-per-hour Fairchild Color King offset press to help it meet the demands of its fast-growing printing business for other publishers.

Many of the area's and the nation's best known periodicals are printed in the News plant including an occasional foreign-language publication.

The News/Sun publications are distributed from especially built motorized vans and are placed in plastic bags—sealed on rainy days—to assure that a dry newspaper reaches the reader.

Employees total nearly a hundred, and the publishing firm no longer is confined to the rear of the bowling alley, having bought the whole building in the early 1960's with a front door on Atlanta Avenue and later building one of the south's most modern, and best equipped newspaper and publishing plants on DeKalb Industrial Way in North Decatur.

"You might say we are built on a lot of faith, hard work and good credit," says Publisher Bud Crane. Mary Crane says it was a case of filling a demand by the community and the merchants for a full-coverage newspaper.

Today, the publishing venture includes their son, Jerry, who started in the business at the bottom—"inserting" papers on publication day when they were run one section at a time and had to be assembled before delivery.

He is Executive Vice-President.

Their son-in-law Rick Sauers heads up the commercial printing division of the firm, which obviously isn't yet finished making its mark on the publishing industry.

#### THE LACKAWANNA FRONT PAGE'S OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, this Chamber has echoed and reechoed with condemnation and defense of the Office of the President as a result of the continuing Watergate investigation.

Daily, major newspapers, networks and other widely influential news media confront the people of the United States with accounts, charges, countercharges, and comment concerning these ongoing investigations and the activities of that office.

With this in mind, I want to share an

editorial view of the weekly newspaper, the Lackawanna Front Page, published in Erie County, N.Y., which was brought to my attention by that publication's very thoughtful and able publisher, Mr. William Delmont.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I add this constructive and provocative editorial, carried on page one in the November 15 edition of Mr. Delmont's publication, to my remarks:

#### WORKING ALL DAY FOR THE U.S.A.—AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

Not long ago we read about Julie Nixon Eisenhower's comment on the way her dad felt about the troubles he's got. She said, "Some mornings he doesn't even want to get out of bed."

This letter to Mr. Nixon is prompted by that remark, and is meant to reflect at least some Americans' understanding of their President's predicament, some appreciation of the thankless tasks he undertakes in our behalf, and some encouragement to him to continue doing the work before him until such time as, in the providence of God, we will look to another to lead us as a nation and a people.

We offer no excuses or apology for Mr. Nixon's administration. Let the chips fall where they may. Every American has already been made aware that arrogance, greed, dishonesty and incredible hypocrisy has infected the precincts of power in Washington in the last five years to the extent that citizens everywhere have become confused, disgusted and cynical. The resultant political alienation of the people is not only regrettable, but scary. For in the secular order, it is an axiom that democratic processes of government require positive faith and hope from the participating electorate. People must believe that government can serve them, and that by their earnest, honest, collective efforts, will serve them.

Unfortunately, in President Nixon's second term, this faith and hope is fading from the faces of the American people. And, in all candor, we must confess that Richard Milhous Nixon, willingly or not, is the primary architect of our disillusionment. The scandals of this administration are enormous and not easily forgotten.

Having said this, we would get on to the point of this letter.

Richard M. Nixon is a man and our President. As a man he's bleeding. As our President he's discouraged. No one should take joy in the sight of a man bleeding. And no citizen should assist those pitiless, vengeance-prone individuals in our society who wish to humiliate and bring low among men the President of the United States.

Undoubtedly Richard Nixon has failed to fulfill, in all of their implications, his oath and obligation to the Constitution of the United States. Let the law take its course.

But as God-fearing men and women let us forgive the human weakness of our brother, Richard. And as Americans, let us all unite in thanking him, despite his faults, for getting up every day and getting on with the work of the Presidency.

You and I have only one President. Shame on us if we allow friend or foe, alien or native, to show disrespect or dishonor to the man who occupies that august office. For better or worse, he's the leader of forces for man's freedom in this world.

There is a Constitution. There is personal conscience. There is an all-just, all-seeing God.

Richard Nixon must face the Constitution before the people, the Congress, and the Courts.

In the privacy of self he must face his conscience.

At the end of it all, like the most humble man or woman in the country, he must face his God.



But for us, now, there is only one course to take, and that is to say, "Take courage, Mr. President, and continue to do those things that, day by day, are required by your office, for, until ordained otherwise, the fate of the Republic is in your hands."

HOWARD MOORE ALBAUGH

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, Howard Moore Albaugh, a personal friend of mine, a Masonic brother, and a revered community leader, has passed away. Mr. Albaugh was not a well-known national figure—the kind of person you would see or read about regularly in the media. No; Mr. Albaugh was a local figure—a man whose stature was gained by doing things behind the scenes, by saying "yes" to community work, by recruiting youth for unselfish civic causes, by remembering the sick, by friendship, by morality, and by brotherly love toward the masonic order he so faithfully served. In tribute to Mr. Albaugh I now commend to you an editorial which recently ran in the *Frederick News-Post*:

HOWARD MOORE ALBAUGH

"May their souls through the mercy of God rest in peace."

These were the prophetic words pronounced just a few days ago by Howard Moore Albaugh in asking that a large gathering of his brethren and their ladies observe a moment of silence in memory of two departed members of his fraternity—Harry O. Schroeder and Elmer R. Bokesch.

Mr. Albaugh died unexpectedly Sunday at his home. He was 80 years old.

He had intoned the belief to his audience of friends that certainly these two men who had served their communities, their churches, and their Masonic organizations so faithfully throughout their lives were "certainly here in spirit among us" to celebrate the 100th anniversary of Lynch Lodge No. 163, AF&A Masons.

Even at his grand 80 years and seldom having missed a meeting of the several organizations in which he remained active to the end, Mr. Albaugh took the time (and he was not given to brevity) to make what must now be considered a final appeal for keeping the fires of membership and service alive in any organization—whether it be the church, the Masons, the Knights of Columbus, the Eagles, civic clubs or whatever.

His talk was entitled, "Put Another Log on the Fire," and it carried a universal message so important in this era of atomized families, declining membership in churches and organizations, and increasing reverence to things, more of material than of intrinsic value.

Briefly, Howard Albaugh defined six "logs" that must be put on the "fire" if the "eternal flame" of service to others is to be kept alive:

1. Attend the meetings of the institutions or organizations to which you belong. "Don't let it up to a faithful few to keep the home fires burning," he said.

2. "Don't say 'No.' Do your best. You'll feel good you helped."

3. If you are an officer, "be interested in your work. The responsibility that goes with it is more than just sitting in chairs."

4. "Youth. Get youth active. Some of us 70 to 80 don't know how long the Supreme Architect will allow us to be here. The future of any organization depends on youth."

(He especially urged his brethren to support two Masonic youth organizations. DeMolay, for boys—"I'm appealing to you to help them. They will soon be knocking at our door seeking admission." And Job's Daughters, for girls.)

5. "Visit your sick and distressed . . . there is nothing so good as to be visited by friends . . . and to be told, 'Keep your chin up, keep fighting.'" (Howard Albaugh knew whereof he spoke; he had just won a long battle, he said, "Thanks to you, my friends.")

6. Pay your dues. Don't be in arrears. And he quipped this item which brought warm laughs from those assembled, a moment of mirth that will linger as legend with his many brethren who carry dues cards signed by Howard Albaugh:

"Now if you were to die tomorrow and you were a couple years in arrears, how would you feel?"

Howard Albaugh was never in arrears, not in dues, not in attendance, not in saying "Yes," not in interest in his work, not in recruiting youth, not in remembering the sick and distressed, not in friendship, not in morality, not in brotherly love, nor in any of the cardinal virtues which enabled this man to walk so uprightly before God and man.

And as the youth he described, "knocking on our door seeking admission," may the distinct knocks of Howard Moore Albaugh be answered from within—where he will be reunited with his loving wife Effie and other loved ones; and sit again in that Supreme Lodge with all his friends and brethren that have gone before, to "that house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

VICE PRESIDENT GERALD R. FORD

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, on October 12, GERALD FORD was called to serve his country as its 40th Vice President. Today the House followed the Senate in giving his nomination resounding approval.

In this crucial time in the history of our great Nation—when a widespread crisis in confidence in the institutions of government exists—it is important that the Vice President have a long record of dedication, integrity, and dependability. Those of us who have served in the House with JERRY FORD know that he possesses these qualities.

It is also important that he brings to the office 25 years of service in the House with 9 as minority leader. For his knowledge of the Legislature is as vast as the respect in which his colleagues hold him. Hopefully, for the first time during this administration there will be an understanding presence high in the executive branch who knows and honors the ever-present need of working with Congress for the betterment of our Nation. Indeed, this cooperation is an essential ingredient in achieving solutions to the energy crisis and other pressing problems of our time.

JERRY FORD will be missed in the House. He has our hopes and prayers for the days ahead.

May the Nation benefit from his experience in our time of great need.

IS SELF-SUFFICIENCY REALLY  
WHAT WE WANT

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Anthony Lewis of the *New York Times* has a wise word of warning about self-sufficiency in the energy field.

If self-sufficiency means that we are going to be willing to adjust our profligate use of energy, then this will be a noble goal, he says. But, he warns, if self-sufficiency means an inward-looking effort to continue a wasteful style of life regardless of international consequences, then we may be opening the door to disaster.

I agree with the basis for his thinking—that the age of cheap energy is now past and cannot be recaptured by 1980 or any other near date.

Mr. Lewis offers the alternative of conservation as our best hope, and I agree with him here, too.

I would like to reprint Mr. Lewis' article from the December 3, 1973, *Times* in the *Record* at this time:

A FORTRESS AMERICA?

(By Anthony Lewis)

BOSTON.—A main theme in the rhetoric of the energy crisis is the need for American self-sufficiency. That is the goal of President Nixon's Project Independence—to insure, as he put it, that by 1980 "Americans will not have to rely on any source of energy beyond our own."

Self-reliance is generally an admirable trait. But in discussion of world resources and energy it can have disturbing overtones. It sounds a little too much like the economic nationalism of the nineteen-thirties, with its disastrous influence toward international tension and war.

If we think past the present concerns with scarce heating oil and closed gasoline stations; we recognize that the long-term energy problem poses a profound threat to our whole system of international relations, economic and political. It could break down the network of trade that has been one of the world's great postwar achievements and bring on atavistic attitudes of hoarding, plunder and economic warfare.

Stuart Hampshire, the Oxford philosopher, has put in a few words what it is we fear. The successive crises over wheat and oil, he said, suggest that "we are entering a period of intense, nervous competition for scarce resources among countries and alliances, a period in which every group of countries anticipates that the weak will be cut off from the diminishing resources necessary to survival. Each group therefore grabs: a Darwinian nightmare."

The Arabs' use of oil as a crude political weapon gives us a taste of the barbarous world we could find ourselves in. Some American intellectuals have now talked of withholding food and manufactured goods from Arab countries as a counterweapon—a sad indication of how quickly economic discourse may be brutalized.

In terms of America's energy goals, "self-sufficiency" can imply two very different things. It can mean an inward-looking, selfish program designed to continue an extraordinarily wasteful style of life, regardless of international consequences. Or it can mean an attempt to adjust America's profligate use of energy and other resources to the realistic necessities of international peace and order.

President Nixon has made it clear that he sees restraint and conservation in the use of energy as only temporary requirements for Americans. By 1980, he said, "we will once again have those plentiful supplies of inexpensive energy which helped to build the greatest industrial nation."

It is hard to find any qualified expert who thinks the United States can recapture the age of cheap energy, by 1980 or any other foreseeable date. But even setting the goal would have large consequences.

It would be a commitment to continue the energy-intensive direction of our society, doubling our consumption of energy every 15 or 20 years. It would be a signal to ordinary citizens to go on expecting a life of limitless energy—and to create demands based on that expectation.

To follow that path would mean immense capital investment in new energy sources. It would mean accepting severe environment damage and, in the short run, serious risks from proliferating nuclear fission generating plants.

But the more profound implications are for America's relations with the rest of the world. With 6 per cent of the world's population, we now use 30 per cent of its energy. To continue on that road in an age of declining resources and technological strain—to persist in the dream of two large cars in every garage when our friends fear paralysis of their societies—can only alienate us from the rest of mankind. Indeed, the vision must be of a Fortress America.

The idea of withdrawing into a fortress will always appeal to some. But it is not only wrong morally—because so much of the world, developed and underdeveloped, depends on economic relationships with the United States. It is also wrong as a matter of self-interest. We learned in the nineteen-thirties that no country can wall out the rest of the world's economic distress. And even the richest country may be endangered if distress sets loose violence.

There is one real alternative to the vision of limitless energy and luxury as our credo. That is the ethic of conservation; not saving by such marginal notions as turning down home thermostats but conservation through fundamental social choices, requiring changes in value.

The symbols of necessary change are at hand. To take just one, does it make sense for the United States to go on now with an enormous highway-building program?

Changing our attitudes toward energy use will be a long and complicated process, raising tough problems of how such decisions should be made in a capitalist democracy. But there is only one way to begin: by leadership. That means politicians who do not give us empty promises of plenty but teach us the necessity of living a more frugal and more rational life, as part of a world community sharing its resources. That is the only way to dispel the Darwinian nightmare.

A TRIBUTE TO HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1973

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of Congress this year, I have been particularly sensitive to the treatment I have received from my colleagues in the House of Representatives. I have found BILL KEATING to be one of the most cordial and inspirational young leaders of the House of Representatives. Although only in his second term, it is ob-

vious that he is admired and respected by all for his very quiet and positive manner. As a fellow member of the House Judiciary Committee, I have also found that he is a very capable lawyer.

Men like BILL KEATING will always move on and up. Therefore, I join with my other colleagues in wishing him well in his new position as editor of the Cincinnati Enquirer. Although, we need men like BILL KEATING here in the House of Representatives, we also need such men in the news media. We will miss him, but know that success will always be his.

NELSEN LAUDS SCOTT COUNTY EFFORTS IN ENERGY CONSERVATION

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, we are all well aware of how pervasive the energy crisis is. All units of Government and all individuals are being called upon to do their part to help save gas and heating oil, to cut down on the use of electrical power and to conserve our Nation's fuel resources. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the action taken by one of the counties in my district to comply with the President's directives. I want to commend the Scott County commissioners for the early and official action in this area, and I hope we see the same kind of cooperation throughout the country in the crucial days ahead. Mr. Speaker, I place the resolution immediately following my remarks in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A SCOTT COUNTY POLICY ON THE NATIONAL ENERGY CRISIS

Whereas, it has become apparent throughout the nation that the citizens of the United States will soon be faced with an energy crisis of critical significance; and

Whereas, said energy crisis has been recognized by federal and state leaders to the extent that President Nixon has requested of the Chairman of the Scott County Board of Commissioners by telegram, that measures be taken by the citizens of Scott County to conserve on energy in its various forms; and

Whereas, the Scott County Board of Commissioners has acknowledged through lengthy discussion, the need to develop a policy for county offices and guidelines for the citizens of Scott County with respect to the conservation of energy during the crisis period.

Now therefore be it resolved by the Board of Commissioners in and for the County of Scott, Minnesota, that the following steps shall be taken by all offices and employees of Scott County to preserve energy for the duration of said crisis, to-wit:

1. The use of electric lights and appliances shall be curtailed to a minimum consistent with safety requirements.

2. Thermostats shall be maintained at a maximum of 68° in all offices and facilities controlled by the county.

3. County owned vehicles as well as private vehicles used in the service of the county and for which mileage is paid its operator shall be restricted to the maximum speed of 50 miles per hour, except for county vehicles operating under emergent conditions.

4. Car pools of county employees commuting to and from work are encouraged.

Be it further resolved, that the County Civil Defense Director, Mr. Tim O'Laughlin, be and hereby is designated as the County Energy Coordinator for the duration of the crisis with the charge that he shall develop, coordinate and administer a County Energy Emergency Plan at the earliest practicable date, consistent with federal and state guidelines, for the review and approval of the County Board.

Be it further resolved that said County Energy Emergency Plan shall include but not be limited to regulations and guidelines governing the use of energy resources in Scott County during the crisis period.

CRIME CONTROL—NO. 10

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, one of the arguments so often used by the gun control lobbyists is an argument based upon a misunderstanding of the Constitution. One of my recent correspondents phrased the argument in this manner:

The Constitution clearly gives us the right to own guns only to establish "a well-regulated militia."

This is obviously a stock argument of the gun control lobby which will not hesitate to cite from "a document written for an agrarian society" if it in any way can be turned to the lobby's ends.

Before I analyze the argument, I would like to include here the complete text of the second amendment:

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

This amendment, which explicitly says "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed" has been used by the gun control lobby as an argument in favor of infringement of the right to keep and bear arms. How has the gun control lobby achieved this preposterous reversal, and more importantly, why have the infringers got away with an explicit reversal of the language and the sense of the amendment?

The answer is quite simple. The argument which achieves the reversal of the sense of the amendment runs as follows: the dependent clause "a well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State" contains the only reason why people should be allowed to keep and bear arms, and since a well regulated militia already exists in the National Guard, the right of the people to keep and bear arms may be infringed at will, since the purpose of that right has already been achieved.

I do not wish to discuss the nature of militias and of the National Guard, for that issue is not central to the argument. What is central is the argument that the establishment of a militia is the only reason the Constitution gives the people the right to keep and bear arms.



It is this argument which must be challenged.

Simply stated, the Constitution does not give rights to anyone, either the people or the States. If the gun control lobbyists would pay more attention to the language of the Constitution, they might notice that the second amendment does not give a right, but regards the right in question as already possessed by the people, and forbids infringement of that already existing right.

More important, however, is the nature of the Constitution itself. The States by the Constitution created a Central Government and delegated to it certain of their powers which are specifically enumerated in the Constitution, principally in article I. The Central Government, therefore, is not authorized to exercise any powers which the State governments did not delegate to it. Since the States at no place and time have given the Central Government the power to register, regulate, or confiscate arms owned by their citizens, the Central Government has no power to engage in such activities. The Central Government, in short, can do only what it is permitted to do by the Constitution. Neither it nor the Constitution is the source of the rights of the States and their citizens. The States are prior to the Central Government; the Central Government was created by the States for the benefit of the States and their citizens. It follows from these facts that neither the Constitution nor the Government it established can give rights or powers to anyone. This is true for two reasons: First, the Constitution and the Government it established are derivative, not origination; and second, the States by the Constitution did not delegate any power to control civilian firearms to the Central Government.

Thus the argument that the Constitution gives citizens the right to keep and bear arms under only one condition, to establish a militia, is the exact opposite of the truth. The Constitution empowers the Central Government to do certain things; all other activities are denied to the Central Government. The gun control lobbyists wish to argue that the Constitution empowers the States or individuals to do certain things—own guns in order to form a militia, in this case—and prohibits all other activities—own guns for self-defense or recreation, in this case. This, of course, is a gross misunderstanding of what the Constitution is, how it was created by the States, and how it is supposed to function.

But there is a more fundamental confusion here, which desperately needs correction. Neither the Constitution nor any government gives individuals rights to do anything. Rights are granted by God:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are . . . endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights . . ."

And are operable only under His law. The notion that rights are something granted by human institutions is a very dangerous notion, for if man, not God, is viewed as the giver of rights, then man, not God, must also be viewed as the taker of rights. The result is that "the government giveth, and the government taketh away."

## YOUNG REPUBLICAN NATIONAL FEDERATION OPPOSES LOAN TO RUSSIA

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, next week we in the House are being asked by the Nixon administration to act favorably on the Trade Reform Act of 1973. But under the provisions of this legislation the U.S. Export-Import Bank would be permitted to continue to subsidize the economy of Soviet Russia at the expense of the American taxpayer. The Ex-Im Bank plans to lend the Soviets \$180 million at 6 percent interest for a new fertilizer plant. Mr. Speaker, this is an outrage to the American public. Some Americans must now pay 10 percent interest if they must borrow money in order to educate their children. Others must pay interest rates almost as high in order to buy a home.

How, at the same time, can we lend taxpayers' money to the Communists—our sworn enemy—or any foreign country for that matter at such low rates? As an additional insult, we are taxing Americans to build a fertilizer plant in Russia, while our American farmers are unable to plant some crops because of vast shortages of fertilizer in our own country.

Now for the worst part; it is my understanding that the credits granted to the Soviet Union will also be used to acquire advanced computer technology which the Soviets can use to greatly advance their MIRV warhead capability up to a level comparable to that of the United States. Not only does this smack of utter stupidity, but the main argument used by the administration to "sell" the recent SALT agreement—an agreement which gave the Soviet Union a 50-percent advantage in numbers of launch vehicles—to Congress and the American people was that the United States was years ahead of the Russians in MIRV technology and that the Soviets would not obtain this capability in at least 5 years. Consequently, it seems incredible to me that anyone could consider such irresponsible action which would amount to forcing the American taxpayers to build the Soviet war machine.

Mr. Speaker, at their recent National Committee meeting in Chicago the Young Republican National Federation unanimously passed the following resolution on the Trade Reform Act:

Whereas, the Trade Reform Act of 1973 is now pending in Congress, and

Whereas, the U.S.-Soviet wheat deal of 1972 has cost the American people over \$1 billion in government credits, food shortages with higher prices, and inflation, and

Whereas, the Soviet Union has been re-selling wheat to other countries at 2 to 3 times the price they paid for American wheat, and

Whereas, U.S. Government credits to the Soviet Union through the Commodity Credit Corp. and Export-Import Bank at the proposed rate of 6 percent interest will cause these institutions to incur a deficit of 1.7 percent which must be paid by the American taxpayers while Americans would have to pay consider-

ably higher interest for comparable credit, and

Whereas, these Export-Import Bank credits would be used by the Soviet Union for the purchase of American technology such as advanced computers which would greatly assist them in developing a MIRV warhead capability comparable to that of the United States, and

Whereas, the Soviet Union has continued to increase its strategic nuclear force and develop a first strike capability; has continued its policy of repression; has refused to permit free emigration of its citizens; and has stated that it is using détente only as a means to achieve military and economic superiority, and

Whereas, under the Johnson Act of 1934, Most Favored Nation status to any country in arrears on payments of debts to the United States is specifically prohibited, therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Young Republican National Federation, while recognizing the necessity of American industry to seek out new markets abroad, due partially to over regulation at home, opposes the granting of any U.S. Government credits to the Soviet Union, Red China, or any other non-market country which denies its citizens the right to emigrate, and be it also

*Resolved*, That the Young Republican National Federation opposes giving "Most Favored Nation" status to the Soviet Union or Red China, and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President and all Republican Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to point out here that this resolution had the support of Y.R. leaders of all philosophical persuasion. It was sponsored by the Florida Federation and seconded by the New York Y.R.'s. Furthermore, I feel that it reflects the real opinions of all people at the grass roots in America, both Republican and Democrat.

Also, I am especially pleased that some of our political leaders recognize that American industry is over regulated at home and is therefore forced to seek markets abroad wherever they can find them. It is really ironic that our businesses find it easier to do business with Communist Russia than with capitalist America. There is simply too much government regulations and we are all the losers as a result.

I hope that my colleagues in the House will join me in supporting the Vanick amendment to the trade bill which prohibit taxpayer subsidized credits to the enemies of the liberty of our people.

## BUDGET REFORM

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was unavoidably detained in my office and was unable to record my vote on roll Nos. 630 and 631. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the amendment to implement the anti-impoundment provisions at the same time that the budget control sections become effective. Since I strongly favor the reorganization of the Congress to permit proper legislative branch con-

trol over the budget process, I would have voted in favor of the bill on final passage.

#### COMMISSION SPELLS OUT POLICY ON FEDERAL HIRING PRACTICES

**HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there has been a new and accelerated series of complaints and charges about abuses of the hiring procedures in the competitive Federal civil service.

The integrity of the Civil Service System is a subject of continuing oversight by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of which I am chairman. Our committee has been looking into these charges and complaints.

Since this recent series of cases surfaced and the committee began inquiries, it is interesting to note that the Civil Service Commission has prepared and issued to all departments and agencies a clarifying statement of its policy.

In a covering memorandum dated October 26, 1973, Bernard Rosen, executive director, explains:

The attached statement is self-explanatory. While it contains no new policy, we believe you may find it useful as you deal with civil service matters.

The memorandum was addressed to: executive officers, department and agencies; assistant secretaries for administration; assistant administrators for administration; executive directors, regulatory agencies.

Our committee is deeply concerned with the preservation of the integrity of the Federal career service. Because of the vital importance of this matter, I believe the Commission's October 24 statement warrants wide circulation among the Members, Federal employees, and the general public.

Mr. Speaker, I include the full text as part of my remarks:

#### STATEMENT BY U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

This statement explains how agencies can properly consider referrals of persons from various sources (including political sources).

#### SCHEDULE C AND NONCAREER EXECUTIVES

Appointments to key policy-determining jobs, or jobs having a close personal relationship to an agency head or his key officials, are excepted from the usual merit system requirements. These jobs (Schedule C and Noncareer Executives) are expected to be filled by the appointment of people who are clearly in close policy and political agreement with the appointing officials or have their personal confidence. Thus, political recommendations and advice on such appointments is normal practice and fully supportable. After all, it is these appointees who are responsible for public advocacy and defense of agency and administration policies and programs (or in close personal support of such people).

#### CAREER JOBS

More than 90% of all Federal jobs are required by law to be filled through open competition and solely on the basis of merit and fitness. In filling such jobs, the question of whether it is proper to consider persons

referred from a variety of sources is frequently raised.

Anyone who knows of a person seeking employment generally has a right to bring that person to the attention of the Civil Service Commission or an official of any Government department or agency.

"Anyone" means just that. Employment referrals by Congressmen, officials of political parties or the White House, State Governors, Mayors, representatives of trade associations, labor organizations, civil rights groups, ethnic and racial groups, and other groups and individuals, are completely proper and legitimate. The major limitation in law\* is that of 5 U.S.C. 3303 which states:

"An individual concerned in examining an applicant for or appointing him in the competitive service may not receive or consider a recommendation of the applicant by a Senator or Representative, except as to the character or residence of the applicant."

This limitation is not a ban on referrals. It is rather a restriction on the examining or appointing official as to how he may consider this referral. Any candidate referred through political sources must be fully considered, but only in the same manner, and subject to the same requirements, as those which are applied to all other candidates. This can only be done by placing the applications of people received through such referrals into the regular system for receipt and consideration of all other candidates. Only in this way can equal consideration be given to those other citizens (usually including many highly qualified people) who express interest in Government employment through the usual channel of application in civil service examinations or directly to an agency in whose program they are interested, without reliance on referral from a third party.

Thus, what is prohibited is not referrals, but the giving of special preferential or exclusive consideration to referrals from only one source. A merit appointment can be made only after the requirements of public notice, broad opportunity to apply, and common, realistic standards have been met. These must be met in fact and not just by lip service. There needs to be an active search for candidates from relevant sources; the final competition must occur among candidates recruited in such a manner; and the final selection must be made from among only the most highly qualified and solely on the basis of merit and fitness, as required by law.

In addition, pursuant to the Civil Service Act of 1883, Federal officials are bound by a Presidential order, initially promulgated by President Arthur in 1883, which without significant change in meaning is currently found in Rule 4.2 of Title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The current Order explicitly prohibits officials, in connection with competitive service employment, from making "any inquiry concerning \* \* \* political affiliation." The Rule then states that all disclosures concerning such matters shall be ignored, and that no discrimination shall be exercised, threatened, or promised because of political affiliation.

#### EXPERTS AND CONSULTANT APPOINTMENTS

There are special provisions of law relating to the appointment of experts and consultants (5 U.S.C. 3109). It is particularly important that these provisions and the Commission's implementing instructions are followed carefully. The major need is to be sure that experts and consultant appointments are genuinely that; not a subterfuge to fill an operating job. Thus, the appointee must be a bona fide expert actually needed for short duration or intermittent assignment.

\*There is another limitation (5 U.S.C. 3110) which deals with restrictions on recommendations for employment of relatives.

#### FOR FURTHER ADVICE

The Director of Personnel of each Federal department or agency is available to advise in more detail on the requirements of law and regulation regarding appointments in that agency. He is fully committed to the furthering of his agency's mission and expert in the proper way to do that within the meaning and spirit of merit principles and civil service law.

#### THE "ECONOMIC AGGRESSION" OF THE ARABS

**HON. CLARENCE D. LONG**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a perceptive column in the Washington Post by Hobart Rowen. Mr. Rowen accurately perceives the Arab oil embargo as economic warfare that, if successful, will encourage other countries to use the same tactics.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 6, 1973]

#### THE "ECONOMIC AGGRESSION" OF THE ARABS (By Hobart Rowen)

The extraordinary thing about the Arab oil boycott is the refusal of the Western World to recognize it for what it is—economic warfare—and to deal with it in those terms. Economic aggression is no less a hostile act than military aggression.

So far, the Arab strategy has worked beautifully. It has confused and divided the West, notably Japan, France, Great Britain and other nations that have gone on bended knee to get themselves on the Arabs' "preferred" list.

But as The Economist observes this week, "The Arabs are largely unimpressed with western Europe's policy on Israel and will be pushing for something stronger, like the cutting of trade ties and imposing actual embargoes."

If the Arab economic weapon succeeds in what purports to be its main objective—a retreat by Israel to the pre-1967 borders—what will be the next demand from the now powerful sheikhs? Their price, in political and economic terms, is sure to escalate.

And beyond that, a new incentive will have been given to other countries or groups of countries to use economic blackmail.

It's already beginning to happen. Gabon's President Omar Bongo, according to Newsweek, is hiking the price of uranium exports. Skyrocketing copper prices are the result of producing countries holding supplies off the market. South American cotton exporters have extracted double an agreed-upon price from the hard-pressed Japanese.

State Department Under Secretary William J. Casey reminds us that in 10 years, the United States will be primarily dependent on imports for nine of 13 basic raw materials, including three very important ones—bauxite, iron ore and tin.

In these circumstances, to let the Arabs' economic weaponry go unchallenged is nothing but a self-destruct process. Therefore, it was refreshing to hear William E. Simon, the new energy czar, say that the U.S. "will never again be subject to economic and political blackmail by any foreign power."

The important thing at the moment is to keep Arab strategy in perspective. The real motivation of the oil-producing nations of the Persian Gulf is less rooted in a holy war to wipe out the State of Israel than in an effort to maximize profits.

True enough the Arab-Israel war provides



a convenient backdrop for the economic boycott, and an attempt to shift world hostility to the Israelis. But the fact is that the cut-back in Mideast oil production and the boost in prices began before the war, and everything that one can learn from the brilliant Saudi oil minister, Sheikh Yamani, indicates that the squeeze play will continue even after there is an Arab-Israeli settlement.

Keep in mind that Arab oil, which costs only 10 to 15 cents a barrel to produce, is being shipped now at \$6 to \$8 a barrel. As economist Arnold X. Moskowitz points out, hiking the price that way "sets the stage for monopoly profits of unusual dimensions." Yamani is already talking of \$10 oil for the mid-1970's.

Clearly, Yamani and other Arab policymakers have concluded that the Western World, even if driven into a serious depression, would not risk military intervention. In a nuclear world, no one can tell where that would end. Besides, Yamani has said, the Saudis would immediately blow up their oil fields if there were to be military retaliation.

What, then, is the answer? In the longer-run, of course, the world must make itself independent of Arab oil by producing adequate energy from other sources. But that may take up to 10 years, and is not the solution to the immediate problem.

A counter-boycott, according to most experts, might prove mildly annoying to some Arab states, but would lack the economic punch to be really effective. That, therefore, offers no solution—although it is sheer madness for the American government to keep up its shipments of military equipment to Arab nations maintaining the oil boycott.

What the nations of the Western World must do, to maintain their self-respect and dignity, is to get together—as both George Ball and Paul Samuelson have suggested—to cope as one unit with the Arabs' blackmail.

The West must share its supplies, its know-how and its drive for new energy sources, rather than begging—in disarray and humiliation—for dribbles of Mideast oil.

Arab leaders have operated on the theory that if faced with the choice of sacrificing Israel and getting no oil, the Western World would swallow hard and dump the Jewish state. If the Western World doesn't want that course of action on its conscience, it can still re-group itself, and perhaps convince Arab policy makers that they may have overreached themselves.

#### NEED FOR OVERSIGHT REFORM

### HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, during the more than 35 days of hearings held by the Select Committee on Committees, one of the most consistent complaints from members and other witnesses was the lack of adequate oversight. I feel very strongly that any reform of the committee system must include provisions for adequate oversight activities by each committee of the House.

The record of inadequate oversight activities was made clear during the hearings. The remark of one member was typical: "I have never felt that any committee was doing an adequate job on oversight, and I felt very strongly our committee was not doing a good job on oversight through the years."

The select committee has worked long

and hard to develop a committee print, which it will release December 7. Recognizing the many issues involved, and the difficulty in a set of recommendations to reform the committee structure of the House, the select committee designed its committee print to be a working document in order to focus on the major issues and problems related to reorganization. The committee print is not a final document, and in many instances discusses alternative approaches.

One section of the draft report discusses oversight. I would like to urge my colleagues to examine the entire report, and to give special attention to the whole area of oversight. The draft report contains several approaches to oversight which could be used, and I invite my colleagues to study these approaches and to make their views known. Before the Select Committee on Committees begins public markup on the committee print, I would like to have the opportunity to discuss oversight with as many of my colleagues as possible.

I believe that we need a separate oversight subcommittee for each authorizing committee of the House. In my view, it is imperative that those who enact specialized legislation and are intimately familiar with the intent of Congress that has developed during the hearings, floor consideration, and conference procedure, be given the additional responsibility to review the implementation of the laws by the executive branch.

We can no longer afford to enact legislation which expends our country's hard earned funds without meeting the needs of our Nation. We need to end outdated programs and stop wasteful spending. As legislators, we must accept responsibility for the implementation of the laws we enact and conduct meaningful legislative review. Unless that responsibility is given to each committee, and the members who serve on those committees, we will not be adequately discharging our responsibility.

When the select committee begins to mark up its recommendations, I intend to press most vigorously for strong and effective oversight by each committee. I urge my colleagues to study the alternative approaches to oversight, and to indicate their views to me or other members of the Select Committee on Committees. I hope that my colleagues will join me in pressing for meaningful reform in this critical area of responsibility.

#### THE FORD NOMINATION

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today in a letter to the Washington Post, Joseph Rauh has outlined some cogent arguments for opposing the confirmation of GERALD FORD as Vice President.

Rauh cites Mr. Ford's anti-civil-rights record and his consistent opposition to domestic social programs as reason enough to reject the minority leader's nomination.

Rauh maintains:

No congressman has sided more consistently with the haves at the expense of the have-nots than Gerald Ford.

I am inserting the Rauh letter at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 6, 1973]

THE LIBERALS, CONGRESS AND GERALD FORD

The saddest thing about the confirmation of Rep. Gerald Ford is what it says about current American political standards and horizons. When such liberal stalwarts as The Washington Post editorial page and Chalmers Roberts can argue for the proposition that a man ought to be confirmed as Vice President of the United States because he is financially honest, one can only see the flags of progress and the high goals of our nation dragging in the dust. I would never have thought the day would come when old friends would be urging the confirmation of an obviously unqualified nominee for the vice presidency simply because it is unnecessary for him to say "I am not a crook."

Mr. Ford's record, as The Post and Mr. Roberts appear to concede, is abominable. As House Minority Leader he sought to gut the Voting Rights Act of 1965, take the fair housing provisions out of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, delete basic provisions from the extension of the Voting Rights Act in 1969 and cripple the Equal Opportunity Amendments of 1971. Indeed, Mr. Ford's legislative decisions are no less anti-civil-rights than the judicial decision of Judges Haynsworth and Carswell (especially when one compares his Northern surroundings with their Southern background) and one might wonder whether the Senate intends to adopt a resolution apologizing to both Messrs. Haynsworth and Carswell.

But civil rights is only the beginning. Mr. Ford's record shows that he has consistently opposed programs to help the disadvantaged, and this includes votes against food stamps, legal services and child care, minimum wages, education, Medicare, OEO, public housing, public works programs, the rat extermination program and rent subsidies. No congressman has sided more consistently with the haves at the expense of the have-nots than Gerald Ford.

Apparently recognizing the negative weight of Mr. Ford's record, The Post seeks support in the Senate Rules Committee hearings and investigation which it calls "notably" thorough and serious." Yes, if one means financial peccadilloes; no, if one means qualifications to be Vice President. Indeed, The Post itself states that Mr. Ford's effort to impeach Justice Douglas was marked by "reckless statements, innuendo and great carelessness with facts"; yet no member of the Senate Rules Committee ever asked Mr. Ford to explain a single one of those reckless statements or to indicate whether they had come from Attorney General John Mitchell as part of a conspiracy to get rid of Justice Douglas just as Mitchell had previously conspired against Justice Fortas.

Indeed, both Houses can be said to have failed in their duties under the 25th Amendment. That Amendment gives the President the right to nominate a new Vice President, but it gives Congress a responsibility of review and selection in connection with confirmation far different from its obligation in any other confirmation proceeding. The subject of confirmation (a potential President) and the confirmers (the full Congress rather than the Senate) are both unique in our history. And the President and Congress are acting together here not to nominate and confirm an executive or judicial appointee, but rather to choose, in lieu of the electorate, a man who must have the qualifications for President of the United States. This would be true in any event since the only significant attribute of the vice presidency is the pos-

sibility of succession to the presidency. But it becomes doubly true in the present circumstance where the calls for impeachment or resignation by the present incumbent grow daily.

Congress, as surrogate for the voters, is obligated to use the tests voters use—stature, competence, experience and philosophy. Financial cleanliness is not enough; a vote for Mr. Ford on that ground is a cop-out on the 25th Amendment.

The Tonkin Bay Resolution had everyone's support, too—that is, almost, everyone. But the heroes today are those who said "no" to the Resolution and refused to rubber stamp the White House. Maybe a new group of heroes who know how to say "no" are being made today.

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.,  
Former president of Americans for Democratic Action.

## INTEGRITY AND THE PRESIDENCY

### HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as the question of impeachment is considered by the Congress, and as we all seek to heed the recurring admonitions to avoid partisanship, the following editorial relating to this problem appeared in what is generally recognized as our Nation's most neutral newspaper, the Christian Science Monitor, on November 30, 1973:

#### INTEGRITY AND THE PRESIDENCY

When once asked for a statement on her politics, the founder of this newspaper, Mary Baker Eddy, replied: "I have none, in reality, other than to help support a righteous government; to love God supremely, and my neighbor as myself."

It is a calm and simple dictum, well worth heeding in these days when politics are beset by emotionalism and tawdry abuse.

Today, just as it has for 65 years, this newspaper stands firmly in support of righteous government in countries around the world. In the United States, it respects and supports the office of the presidency. Because of this, it demands that the office be honored by high standards of morality and integrity from any incumbent, of whatever political party, whatever religious faith, whatever racial background.

The United States was a nation founded on little more than soaring ideals. Over the years, it has developed diplomatic skills, its economy has become strong, its military might awesome. But its real strength lies in the extent to which it demonstrates moral power as a nation and freedom and justice for its citizens.

It is essential that these standards and ideals be honored at the highest levels of the country's leadership. Throughout the long months of Watergate anguish, we have urged President Nixon to greater candor, to more forthrightness with a puzzled populace. We were pleased when recently he launched Operation Candor. The promise to answer all questions fully was welcome though belated. But with the latest revelations and contradictions concerning the presidential tapes, it is clear that Mr. Nixon will have to try much harder if he is to restore his credibility.

With so much confusion abroad in the country, such apparent contradictions as the following need clarification:

"My consistent position from the beginning has been to get out the facts about Water-

gate, not to cover them up," Nixon, Aug. 15, 1973.

"It was on March 17 that I first learned of the break-in at the office of Dr. Fielding. . . . On April 25th Attorney General Kleindienst came to me and urged that the fact of the break-in should be disclosed to the court. . . ." Nixon, Aug. 15, 1973.

"This nation—Republicans, Democrats, Independents, all Americans—can have confidence in the fact that the Attorney General, Elliot Richardson, and the special prosecutor that he will appoint in this case will have the total cooperation of the executive branch of this government. They will get to the bottom of this thing." Nixon, May 9, 1973.

"Though I have not wished to intrude upon the independence of the special prosecutor, I have felt it necessary to direct him, as an employee of the executive branch, to make no further attempts by judicial process to obtain tapes, notes or memoranda of presidential conversations." Nixon, Oct. 19, 1973.

"You remember the famous case involving Thomas Jefferson where Chief Justice Marshall, then sitting as a trial judge, subpoenaed a letter which Jefferson had written which Marshall thought or felt was necessary evidence in the trial of Aaron Burr. Jefferson refused to do so, but it did not result in a suit. What happened was, of course, a compromise in which a summary of the contents of the letter which was relevant to the trial was produced by Jefferson. . . ." Nixon, Oct. 26, 1973.

"Understanding that it is thought important that a letter of Nov. 12, 1806, from General Wilkinson to myself, should be produced in evidence on the charges against Burr. . . . I send you a copy of it, omitting only certain passages. . . ." President Thomas Jefferson, September, 1807. (Italics added.)

"Before their existence became publicly known, I personally listened to a number of them (the tapes)." Nixon, July 28, 1973.

"As a matter fact, the only time I listened to the tapes, two certain tapes—I didn't listen to all of them, of course—was on June the fourth." Nixon, Sept. 5, 1973.

"The tapes, which have been under my sole personal control, will remain so. None has been transcribed or made public and none will be." Nixon, July 23, 1973.

"On Sept. 29, 1973, I began a review of the tape recordings subpoenaed by the special prosecutor for the grand jury and by the Senate select committee. . . . It was during this process that I first became aware of the possibility that two of the 10 conversations in question had not been recorded. I proceeded with a review of the eight recorded conversations. . . ." Nixon, Nov. 12, 1973.

On Nov. 12 the mysterious 18-minute gap was disclosed though Mr. Nixon's personal secretary Rose Mary Woods said he had known about it since Oct. 1 when she was transcribing the tape for him—something he had said would never be done. If Operation Candor is not to become a hollow joke, Mr. Nixon needs to speak and act in the spirit of what he said Aug. 15, "Whatever the facts might be, I wanted the White House to be the first to make them public."

## THE NEED FOR PUBLIC FINANCING OF ELECTIONS

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the few positive results from the Watergate campaign crimes has been the renewed

push in Congress for public financing of elections. The knowledge that former Vice President Spiro Agnew accepted illegal cash "gifts" while in office and the misuse of campaign funds by President Nixon's Re-Election Committee has made Congress and Americans realize that there is a need to curb the undue influence of special interests and the extortion of contributions by politicians.

Truly competitive elections cannot take place when one candidate can simply buy the election by outspending his opponent.

The entire political system of the United States has suffered from the drop in confidence in the Government which has resulted from Watergate. Americans are clearly upset over a political system that has allowed such unethical and criminal activities to take place. Recent opinion polls bear this out. The September 30 Gallup poll found 65 percent of those surveyed endorsing public financing of elections; only 24 percent opposed it.

I now insert an article by David Adamany from the October 1973 issue of the Progressive into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that explains the need for public financing of elections:

#### PUBLIC FINANCING: A CURE FOR THE CURSE OF SLUSH FUNDS

(By David Adamany)

If Gallup-type polls are the seismograph of American opinion, Watergate has registered at least one earthquake of major proportions on the political Richter scale. Nine years ago, Americans opposed public financing of Presidential campaigns by a lopsided seventy-one per cent to eleven per cent. Scarcely three months ago, the public mood had turned dramatically—fifty-three per cent favored tax support for both Presidential and Congressional campaigns, with only twenty-nine per cent in opposition.

The tremors of Watergate have also been felt on Capitol Hill. More than 120 members of the House are co-sponsors of the Clean Elections Act of 1973, introduced by Representatives John Anderson and Morris Udall, which provides tax money to match private contributions up to \$50. Proposals in the Senate are far more sweeping:

Senator Philip Hart's Congressional Election Financing Act of 1973 would provide public money for as much as eighty per cent of the cost of House and Senate races.

A measure advanced by Senators Adlai Stevenson and Charles Mathias would supply tax funds for one-third of the expenditures in Presidential, Senate, and House campaigns.

A public financing amendment proposed by Senator Edward Kennedy and Hugh Scott, attached to a comprehensive Senate bill revising the disclosure provisions, contribution ceilings, and spending limits of existing law, was turned back in August, but it had the support of almost forty per cent of the Senate.

Despite this flurry of activity, Washington insiders—including many supporters of public financing—believe prospects for such sweeping legislation are uncertain. Political strategy is a major obstacle. Republicans are usually better financed than Democrats, and they resist measures that will dissipate their advantage. Only ten of the Senate's forty-two Republicans were among the thirty-eight supporters of the Kennedy-Scott amendment. And President Nixon's well known willingness to veto public-financing legislation requires that any reform measure be attached to a veto-proof bill on an entirely different subject, a strategy which subjects campaign finance legislation to assignment



to an indiscriminate range of House committee.

A still more formidable barrier is the demonstrated ability of incumbents to raise more money than their challengers, especially in the House, where three-quarters of the districts are relatively safe for one major party or the other. Since only incumbents vote on legislation, measures which threaten their term by financing the opposition do not pass easily.

To many in Congress and in the country, public financing of politics is a strange, unfamiliar, and uncomfortable idea. Yet tax support for campaigns is not new. Long ago various governments assumed the cost of ballots, polling places, and election day clerks, all formerly paid for by parties and candidates. In several states tax money is used to register voters. The Senate this year passed a comprehensive post card voter registration bill. The indirect subsidy to politics: at least \$100 million.

Wisconsin and several other states provide free radio and television time for candidates on state educational networks. Oregon subsidizes a voter pamphlet, mailed to each elector at state expense; for a nominal fee, candidates and referendum advocates may purchase space in which to advertise and advance their causes. Thirteen other states have enacted some variation of the voter pamphlet at one time or another. When Congress required broadcast media to sell political advertising time at the lowest unit cost charged for comparable commercial messages, it enacted a media subsidy to campaigns.

We also subsidize campaigns through the tax system. At least nine states allow tax deductions or credits for modest campaign gifts. Under the Revenue Act of 1971, Federal income taxpayers can deduct from taxable income half of contributions up to \$50 or take a tax credit for half of contributions up to \$25. Again, the public at large pays part of the campaign bill.

Two other tax subsidies may be nearing an end, thanks to merciless exposure by the press during the 1972 campaign. One allowed big donors to avoid gift taxes on their contributions by breaking them into sums of \$3,000, the maximum nontaxable gift, and distributing them to many committees supporting the same candidate. A second subsidy sanctioned capital gains tax avoidance on stocks that had appreciated in value. The contributor reported the stock gift at the purchase price, and the political committee which sold it at the appreciated value was not required by the Internal Revenue Service to pay a capital gains tax.

An even less visible subsidy to politics, but one that is extremely costly to us as consumers and taxpayers, stems from the massive contributions of special interests who expect a return on their investment. The dairy co-ops, for example, amassed a \$3 million war chest in 1972. After making substantial contributions to the Nixon campaign and various members of Congress, they were rewarded by an Executive Order increasing milk price supports. Cost to us as consumers: at least \$100 million. The maritime unions, to cite another case, spent more than a half million dollars in the 1972 campaign, and managed to head off Congressional opposition to continued subsidies for a shrinking and ineffectual merchant marine. Cost to us as taxpayers: about \$500 million a year, and at least \$3 billion during the decade.

Jerry Landauer put it aptly in *The Wall Street Journal*: "Should we publicly finance our election campaigns? Don't kid yourself. We already do—through direct subsidies to incumbents, through tax subsidies for big contributors, through dodges and loopholes and regulations the average taxpayer hasn't the time to try to understand. The issue is whether we can do it honestly."

It is odd that a nation with so many indirect public subsidies to politics has so little

experience with direct public support for campaigns. Public financing is an accepted part of political arrangements in West Germany, Sweden, Finland, Norway, and other democracies. Our neighbors to the north and south have similar experiences. Public financing is found in the Province of Quebec and in the American Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

In 1966, at the urging of Senator Russell Long, Congress enacted the nation's first system of direct public financing of campaigns. Taxpayers were allowed to earmark one dollar of their taxes to subsidize Presidential campaigns. The next year, worried by flaws in the legislation, Congress indefinitely delayed operation of the tax check-off. But the idea of public financing of campaigns stayed alive as Long's Finance Committee held full hearings and reported favorably the Honest Elections Act of 1967, providing extensive public financing for Congressional as well as Presidential campaigns.

In 1971, the check-off idea was revived in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. Reformers succeeded in getting the tax check-off onto the tax forms, but a Presidential veto threat once again delayed full operation of the plan. In 1973, the Nixon Administration tried to undermine the check-off by putting it on a separate tax schedule, missed by most taxpayers and not even available to many. Fewer than three per cent of taxpayers allocated a dollar to the Presidential campaign fund, although forty-five per cent told pollsters they would do so. Democrats responded by attaching an amendment to the 1973 Debt Ceiling Act requiring the tax check-off to appear on forms 1040 and 1040A, which are used by almost all taxpayers.

The most urgent reason for public financing is the need to curb the undue influence of special interests and the extortion of contributions by politicians. Second, the public wants an end to the vast disparities in campaign spending between opposing candidates. All too often, the candidate with the most money wins by burying his opponent in an avalanche of paid campaigning. Third, opportunities ought to be preserved for citizens to help fund candidates and campaigns, but Americans want these opportunities equalized. The disproportion between multimillionaire W. Clement Stone's contributions of \$2 million to Mr. Nixon's 1972 campaign and Joe Grab-a-Sandwich's \$2 gift to the Democratic telethon is no longer tolerable, even in a society which admires its rich and successful members.

Fourth, most Americans would agree that we ought to have vigorously competitive elections. They are unlikely to understand that this requires more money for politics, not less. Despite well publicized high-spending races, most campaigns in America are won by default. The incumbent or the majority party candidate has so many resources, including a long lead in campaign money, that the opposition is simply unable to wage any campaign that lets voters know the choices before them. Political finance reform should not only regulate spending and contributions, it must also provide adequate funds to turn the theory of competitive elections into a reality.

These objectives require an array of legislative remedies, but public financing is the pivot. Ceilings on contributions to candidates and political committees might curb the influence of special interests and the increasing tendency toward extortion of campaign money. Aggregate limits on a contributor's total outlays for all political purposes are also necessary to head off the laundering of money through dummy committees. These contribution curbs might roughly equalize the extent to which citizens can participate in financing campaigns. The disparity between contributions by the well-off and the low-income citizen can be leveled down by modest contribution limits.

The time is long overdue to reduce the influence of big money in campaigns. W. Clement Stone exemplifies the need for reform; the public recoils from revelations that he and his wife have contributed almost \$7 million to Republican politics since 1968. Hundred thousand dollar contributions are no longer uncommon. And more than 400 contributors gave \$10,000 or more in the Humphrey-Nixon contest. When the avalanche of reports required by the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 is finally cleared, the number of \$10,000 contributors in 1972 will reach at least 1,200.

The ultra-rich can avoid reliance on big contributors. Vast personal wealth has made the Kennedys, Rockefellers, Shapps, Metzenbaums, Ottingers, Reids, and DuPonts the new grandees of American politics. It is arrogant for these millionaire candidates to tell us they are so rich they cannot be influenced by campaign contributions. That argument insults democratic ideals: It restores in a new form the means test for public office rejected in America a century and a half ago during the Jacksonian revolution. It is within legislative means, through contribution limits and public financing of campaigns, to make it unnecessary that a candidate be rich to be free.

Big money is often tainted money in American politics. In one Presidential year after another, two-thirds of the members of the Business Council, a third of the officials of the American Petroleum Institute, and at least a quarter of the officers and directors of Pentagon, Atomic Energy Commission, and NASA contractors give sums exceeding \$2 million to national political committees. We have created a political system where a national roster of realty, banking, construction, and other financial interests rushed large sums to the campaign of a prominent Democratic Senator, chairman of a committee affecting them, to assure his re-election and thereby to deny the chairmanship to the next ranking Democrat on the committee, a consumer-oriented maverick.

It is no less troubling that national labor committees spend more than \$7 million in campaigns. Many Democratic Senate and House candidates rely on union contributions for at least twenty per cent of campaign funds. The clout that goes with union money was well demonstrated when labor cut off \$150,000 in promised campaign contributions to a prominent liberal, union-endorsed Senate candidate who would not go along with labor's favorite for the Presidential nomination in 1968.

The man-bites-dog version of special-interest giving occurs when politicians shake down the interests. The Nixon campaign set \$100,000 quotas for a number of firms and calculated the anticipated contributions from individuals at one per cent of total wealth. Six large corporations have already publicly disclosed that they tried to meet their quotas illegally by using corporate funds for campaign contributions. About a dozen more—still publicly unidentified—have told special prosecutor Archibald Cox of similar illegal contributions. Most of these firms have contracts with the Government or are regulated by agencies whose members are named by the President. American Airlines, whose \$55,000 illegal contribution made national headlines, had a merger pending before the White House and the Civil Aeronautics Board. American Airlines Board Chairman George A. Spater shed light on a dark corner of our politics when he ruefully explained: "A large part of the money raised from the business community for political purposes is given in fear of what would happen if it were not given."

Less well known is the class bias of political financing. Only seven to twelve per cent of Americans contribute to any candidate or party in a Presidential year. More important, these few dramatically over-represent the

well-off and well-educated classes. More than thirty per cent of families earning \$25,000 or more contribute to politics, but only three per cent of those with incomes under \$4,000. While twenty-eight per cent of the college educated give money to politics, only five per cent of those whose education ended by the eighth grade do so. It is not just that the poor can hardly afford to contribute to politics—they also suffer from a sense of impotence in shaping public affairs. They know that the big contributors and special interests dominate campaign financing. They correctly assume that their small contribution will have no effect on the conduct of government.

American politics is locked into a tragic cycle: As long as politics is dominated by big money, the poor will not contribute; and as long as small contributions are not available in large numbers, politics will be dominated by big money. Contribution limits and public financing break this cycle. They cut off big contributions and special interest money, replacing them with untainted tax dollars. When candidates need not rely on tainted money, the general public in all economic classes is more likely to trust them and to help support campaigns with small gifts.

An even more compelling reason to adopt public financing addresses not the sources or sizes of campaign gifts, but whether enough money is spent in American politics. It will seem unorthodox, even perverse, to argue that we need to spend more money in politics when Presidential campaigning has reached the \$50 million mark and the news media are filling with reports of "high spending" in races for other offices.

The confusion arises because campaigns have two functions: the private purpose of advancing the personal ambitions of candidates; and the public purpose of assuring vigorous competitive elections in which candidates advance their qualifications, programs, and criticism of the opposition. There is no public interest whatever in financing the careers of politicians. But there is a vital public purpose in assuring sufficient money for competitive campaigns.

The framers of our Constitution declared long ago that counterposing the ambitions of the three branches of government was the best safeguard against tyranny. In a nation that has moved to popular choice of the President and Senate as well as the House, the competing ambitions of candidates in campaigns are a new and essential check upon authority. Vietnam and Watergate make tragically plain the dangers of bloated Presidential power, and the reassertion of Congressional checks is widely welcomed. But what good does it do to restore Congressional prerogatives if members of Congress themselves are not responsive to the voters because of the atrophy of opposition in elections?

This is a powerful but ignored argument for public financing: Most American elections pose no choice at all. Incumbents are returned to office ninety per cent of the time. Officeholding allows them to raise more money than their opponents. And they have the accumulating advantages of incumbency—name recognition, professional staff, the franking privilege, good will built through services to constituents, and favors. It is not surprising, then, that in sixty to eighty House contests each biennium, no opposition candidate bothers to file. In another 275 races, the incumbent is so well entrenched that the opposition is merely token. "Smart money" is not interested in supporting longshots. Even local partisans are inclined to make their contributions to other, more closely contested races, where they believe their money may affect the outcome.

The private money system for financing politics does not raise enough money to support vigorous campaigns for all offices. It

allocates money to incumbents, to sure winners, and to those in competitive races who cozy up to the major economic interests. Most elections are decided virtually by default. Without effective opposition, those who govern grow arrogant and unresponsive. There is an urgent need to revitalize American politics by forcing every officeholder to run for his political life in every election. If he knows that the opposition will be financed generously enough to challenge his conduct of office and his voting record, his attention to popular concerns will be heightened. Public financing of campaigns can supply enough money to spur strong opposition. With enough clean money to turn tepid races into real challenges, a larger number of smaller gifts should also become available. The vitality of elections as an instrument of popular control over officials can be restored by this mix of public financing and small private gifts.

Many who are persuaded by these general arguments for public financing still are perplexed by the Gordian knot of policy objections and technical problems that surround any specific program of tax support for campaigns. "Do you really want public funding for all campaigns?" they ask. At the outset, I believe, public financing should be enacted only for Presidential and Congressional races. They are the most costly, often the least vigorously competitive, and perhaps the most often influenced by special interest money. An enterprising state or two might try public financing of statewide partisan contests, and, perhaps, of legislative races. Some bold state will win the gratitude of the nation by publicly financing campaigns for judges and eliminating the indecent hold that lawyers have on the bench. If these experiments succeed and the need for public financing spreads, the system could easily be extended to the city, county, and other local offices that account for most of the 524,000 public posts that Americans fill by election.

What about the allocation of money? Most public financing plans define "major" parties as those that received more than twenty or twenty-five per cent of the vote in a prior election. Major party candidates can be made eligible for equal flat grants—perhaps of fifteen cents times the number of voters in a district, as proposed for Senate candidates in the Hart bill. But no proposal would deserve support if it did not also provide for new and minor parties, which often have reflected deep discontents welling up among Americans. Parties receiving less than twenty-five per cent of the vote could claim the same proportion of a major party grant as their vote was of the average major party polling. This would probably strengthen minor parties, which have traditionally lagged farther behind the major parties in money than in votes. Furthermore, minor parties should be safeguarded by allowing them to spend private funds up to the same expenditure limits permitted for major parties, so that no inequality would fall on them as a result of public funding.

The other side of the concern to safeguard minor parties is the need to protect the public from frivolous candidates or frivolous minor parties. Some cut-off is probably needed. The Supreme Court has upheld a Georgia distinction between political parties which have certain ballot privileges, and "political bodies," which do not. The dividing line was three percent of the vote. A similar qualifying threshold for public financing would be reasonable. Some newly organized parties might be left at a disadvantage if public financing were based solely on the last election's returns. Several Senators have suggested, therefore, that a party might be permitted to base its grant on the current year's balloting. If the polls showed a minor party drawing widespread popular support, it could borrow money during the campaign and pay it back by claiming a post-

election public grant based on its electoral showing.

The same issue of frivolous candidates has prompted some public financing advocates to abandon the idea of providing money in primaries. But if no public financing is available in nomination contests, we will simply have moved the evils of existing practices back one stage, from the general election to the primaries. And the primary is, after all, virtually the election in at least that two-thirds of House contests occurring in one-party districts.

Public financing can be provided without encouraging frivolous candidates. The most prominent Congressional solution sets a financial threshold. A House candidate who collects, for instance, \$1,000 in modest contributions of \$50 or less, could become eligible for public grants matching those and subsequent private contributions. Eligibility for matching grants in a Senate primary could be set at \$5,000. These qualifying thresholds would demonstrate at least that a primary candidate had a reasonable base of support from small contributors. A somewhat different formula, using flat grants rather than matching money, would set a series of financial thresholds, each of which would trigger a substantial payment to the candidate. A serious aspirant would presumably be able to woo enough small contributions to trip these public financing triggers.

To forestall manipulation of political financing arrangements, these formulas and thresholds should be written into the statutes. An appropriation could be provided to assure enough money in every election, so that no one party or faction could seek political advantage by trying to dry up public money when the opposition is dependent on it. If public grants were linked to the eligible electorate and to the Consumer Price Index, there would be little opportunity for intransigent opponents of public funding to render it meaningless by refusing to add more money as the number of voters increases and inflation escalates campaign costs. Prompt judicial review must be provided to forestall bureaucratic tampering with the administration of public financing of campaigns.

Opponents of public financing often insist that too much money is already spent on politics, and that it would be wasteful to throw good money after bad. Senator Hart has put this argument in a healthy perspective: "I know that many will regard this as a new raid on the Treasury by greedy office holders. But I think many people, upon reflection, will realize that this will be as wise an investment as a democracy can make. When a politician's success depends on a combination of dollars and votes, the nation is clearly less democratic than it would be if victory depended on votes alone. Congress annually disposes of a Federal budget in the hundreds of billions of dollars and takes actions with tremendous impact on a trillion-dollar economy, not to mention their impact on the incalculable values of our health, safety, and liberty. Surely in that context public campaign subsidies would be a growth stock for everyone."

A combination of traditional political finance reforms and generous public funding of campaigns can achieve the goals of clean, fair, vigorous elections. Contribution limits and disclosure of sources can curb big contributions, rich candidates, and tainted money. Expenditure limits help level down the excessive spending that now occurs in occasional campaigns. Public financing replaces big, tainted contributions with clean money that will reduce both special interest influence over politics and the extortion of givers by politicians. It also "levels up" the funds available for reinvigorated opposition and greater public choice in elections.

The conservative columnist, James J. Kilpatrick, has written that he favors public



financing, despite its drawbacks, because "on balance, drastic measures are needed if we are to remove the curse of money that now corrupts our political process. If we do not learn at least this lesson from Watergate, we are doomed to repeat that wretched course of instruction." Some of us will plead for public financing before another Watergate occurs, doubting whether public faith in our system of free elections can or indeed should survive another such shock.

#### THE NEW SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME PROGRAM

### HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following fine article by Vee Burke and her late husband, Vincent J. Burke, which appeared in the *Progressive* of December 1973, explains the new supplemental security income program.

The article follows:

#### THE MINIMUM INCOME REVOLUTION (By Vincent J. and Vee Burke)

(NOTE.—This January the nation's first Federal income guarantee goes into effect for the elderly, blind, and disabled.)

Only after the event are some revolutions detected.

That audacious dream of radicals, the right to a minimum income from the U.S. Treasury, will come true on January 1, 1974, for all but one group of those Americans who society feels should not be obliged to work. Excluded from our first Federal income guarantee, which was enacted on October 17, 1972, were the nation's children. Ironically, they were the very persons for whom Richard Nixon originally had proposed this historic birthright, the only President to do so (although he later abandoned the fight for a children's income guarantee).

Starting next year, the Federal Government will guarantee a minimum income (\$130 a month until July 1, 1974, when it will rise to \$140) to Americans at least sixty-five years old, and to the blind and the disabled of any age. Available to those whose resources are modest, the guarantee will be an absolute right, unlike Social Security old-age payments, which are conditioned upon earlier payment of payroll taxes.

The Federal Government will make the new guaranteed payments, called Supplemental Security Income (SSI), without asking whether recipients have worked, without making any claims against their estate (two-thirds of the elderly, including some of the poorest, own their own homes), and without even asking if their own children are well-to-do, and if so why they should not help their aged parents. The Supplemental Security Income program will be administered by the Social Security Administration. However, the money will come not from the Social Security Trust Fund, but from general funds of the U.S. Treasury.

For most aged poor recipients, the new Supplemental Security Income check will be a supplement to their Social Security payment. The extra monthly payment confined to the poor will alleviate some of the poverty among America's aged. It will assure those with no other income \$1,560 per year (\$1,680 after July 1), and each recipient will be able to add to his or her basic SSI payment \$240 from any source, plus a sizable proportion of earnings, without reduction in the SSI check.

The triumph of the guaranteed income for

the aged constitutes a revolution in the philosophy and financing of public charity in the United States. The income guarantee shifts from states to the Federal Government the responsibility for basic welfare decisions. Except for an emergency program that operated briefly in half a dozen states during the Depression of the 1930s, the Federal Government heretofore has given no relief money directly to the poor. Instead, beginning in the late 1930s, it has helped states finance state-operated programs of public assistance. Today, the Federal Government helps pay the costs of welfare for four categories of the needy: blind, aged, and disabled adults, and broken or unemployed families with dependent children. In general, the Federal Government pays at least half a state's welfare costs; in poor states it pays even more. But the states decide which groups to help, who among them is needy, and how much to pay them. In the field of welfare, at least, Federal dollars failed to bring Federal control. The result has been a chaotic and unfair patchwork of assorted benefit levels and eligibility rules.

Next January 1, Supplemental Security Income will remove from the state welfare rolls all these groups except families with children. Because SSI's eligibility rules are much more liberal, twice as many persons will go on its new rolls as will depart from state welfare rolls. In all, SSI checks will go to an estimated 6.2 million Americans—to 4.6 million aged (more than one of every five Americans over sixty-five), and to 1.6 million blind or disabled persons (SSI will cover disabled children, excluded by current law from state-Federal welfare disability payments).

When the United States adopted Social Security almost four decades ago, it began to collectivize the filial duty to "honor thy father and thy mother." Social Security is a mechanism for taking money from sons and daughters and giving it to their elderly parents and grandparents. In the early years of the program, payments into the Social Security Trust Fund greatly exceeded benefits paid out. But today there are twice as many aged parents, relative to the sons and daughters of working age (twenty to sixty-four years), as in the 1930s, and most of the aged are eligible for Social Security. Therefore, the recipients are getting back more than they paid into the fund. Indeed, the amount of money in the Social Security Trust Fund would not pay the bills for more than one year. All Social Security payroll taxes currently collected are currently spent on benefits for those on the rolls.

A look at treatment of the aged poor today and next year shows the dramatic impact of the new guarantee.

The place is a Social Security office in Charleston, South Carolina. Enter two persons: Tom Brown, retired farm hand, and Mary Smith, widow of a factory janitor. Each is sixty-five years old and carries a birth certificate to prove this. Mrs. Smith's husband paid Social Security payroll taxes for several years, and she is entitled to benefits. But Mr. Brown has no Social Security work "record," for he was employed only by small farmers. Neither Mrs. Smith nor Mr. Brown has a job; neither has any regular source of income. Each needs help.

The time: January 1973. The clerk tells Mr. Brown that he has come to the wrong place. "Social Security cannot help you," the clerk says. "You must go to the local welfare office." (At the welfare office Mr. Brown learns that the maximum help available to him is \$80 monthly, plus a \$22 bonus in food stamps.) The clerk tells Mrs. Smith that her husband's payroll taxes entitle her to \$108 a month in Social Security benefits. Her face falls. She had hoped for more. How will she manage?

The time: January, 1974. The clerk tells Mr. Brown that although he never paid Social Security taxes, he will begin receiving a

\$130 check from the Social Security Administration. It will be called Supplemental Security Income.

The clerk tells Mrs. Smith that she may be eligible for some payment in addition to her monthly \$108 Social Security benefit. "Let's talk about it," says the clerk. Although Mrs. Smith owns her own home and a 1971 automobile with a market value of \$2,200, and has \$1,500 in the bank, it is determined that she is eligible for a second check from the Social Security Administration to bring her monthly income up to \$150. The clerk does not ask Mrs. Smith whether she has children who could contribute money to her support (she has a physician son who earns \$45,000 a year). Mrs. Smith will receive two checks—a \$108 Social Security check (which officially will be called "retirement income" rather than old-age insurance after SSI begins), and a \$42 Supplemental Security Income check.

Mrs. Smith's guarantee is \$20 higher than Mr. Brown's because under the SSI law the first \$20 in Social Security benefits or other income is not "counted." Thus, Mrs. Smith's \$108 Social Security check is treated as an \$88 check, entitling her to a \$42 supplement.

#### TERMS OF THE GUARANTEE

Levels.—The SSI payment will equal the deficit between a recipient's income and his guarantee. Although there will be a uniform Federal floor of \$130 per person a month starting January 1, 1974, rising to \$140 on July 1 (\$195 per couple initially, \$210 at mid-year), guarantees will vary among states, reflecting state supplements to the minimum payment. The twenty-five states that now pay an old-age assistance check larger than \$130 to the penniless will be required—under penalty of loss of all Federal Medicaid funds—to supplement the SSI floor so as to preserve higher benefits for those already on the rolls (in December, 1973) at the start of SSI.

Moreover, these states will be rewarded if they also supplement the SSI floor for new recipients and if they agree to Federal administration of all supplements. For Federal administration, the states will give the Federal Government money for supplementary payments, reversing the traditional order; and their reward will be an almost irresistible promise that no matter how much a state's SSI population expands in the future, it never will have to pay for SSI supplements more dollars than its calendar 1972 welfare outlay for the aged, blind, and disabled.

For the minority of SSI beneficiaries—those with no other income—monthly guarantees will range from \$130 (in twenty-five states) to \$204 in Michigan and \$250 in Alaska (\$130 SSI floor plus state supplements). For recipients who also receive Social Security checks, minimum guarantees will be \$150 per person and \$215 per couple, reflecting the disregard of the first \$20 in any income.

Every recipient will be able to increase net income by earnings. Not "charged" against his SSI benefit will be the first \$65 earned per month plus half of the remainder. Also exempt will be \$60 worth of unearned income (including gifts), provided it is received infrequently and irregularly.

One immediate effect of SSI will be to succor the poorest of the aged poor, those like Mrs. Willie Miller, sixty-nine, of West Point, Mississippi, who subsists on \$75 a month in state welfare plus \$26 in free food stamps. Under SSI, Mrs. Miller's income will climb to \$130 a month, in cash, on January 1, 1974, and to \$140 on July 1.

It is estimated that Supplemental Security Income will increase the incomes of almost sixty per cent of present old-age relief recipients. In addition, it will qualify 2.8 million elderly persons, who have been ineligible under less liberal state welfare rules, for cash help.

Resources.—Under Supplemental Security Income a sixty-five-year-old will be entitled to a payment to boost his total income up to

a specified minimum if his resources do not exceed \$1,500 (not counting a house, car, household goods, or personal effects). The resource limit per couple is \$2,250. (The Social Security Administration plans to exclude from counted resources the first \$25,000 in market value of a house, \$2,700 in market value of one car [or in equity of a more valuable car], and the face value of a life insurance policy, if \$1,500 or less.)

In contrast, under the current system one state requires an aged person to use up his last dollar before receiving Public Assistance; another allows a cash reserve equal to one month's cost of living; six others limit cash reserves to \$300 or \$350. New Hampshire forbids the recipient to make withdrawals from his bank account without the signed permission of the welfare department, and many states require the needy person to assign his life insurance policy to the welfare department. One state forbids old-age relief to one whose house has a value more than \$750 above that of "modest homes in the community." The resource limits of some states virtually preclude ownership of an automobile.

**Estates.**—In yet another liberalization, the new Federal program will not seek posthumous recovery of SSI funds. To receive SSI, the recipient will not have to encumber his house. In contrast, twenty-nine states today require the old-age relief applicant to give the welfare department a lien against his house or a claim against his estate, practices that have deterred applications.

**Relatives' Responsibility.**—The new guaranteed income also will benefit thousands of middle-income families in the seventeen states that now require grown children, if they have the means, to help support needy aged parents, a burden that sometimes coincides with that of paying college tuition.

In the high-benefit state of California, for example, a family of four with earnings of \$20,000 annually can now be required to pay to the county welfare department, as partial reimbursement for Public Assistance given to one or more elderly and needy parents, as much as \$165 a month. (Neither the basic Federal SSI benefit nor the Federally-financed portion of any state supplemental payment will be subject to state liens or state rules about relatives' financial responsibility. States may apply such rules to the portion of the supplement paid with their own funds, but the Federal Government will not administer such rules nor vary the state supplemental payment to comply with them.)

Some revolutions are invisible because they occur in small steps that seem continuous at the time. Not so the guaranteed income revolution. Income by right was won for the aged, blind, and disabled not by gradual increments, but in a single section of an Act of Congress.

Yet when the historic legislation was enacted, it went unheralded by most politicians, unreported by most newspapers, unnoticed even by many members of Congress who voted for it. Tucked into fourteen pages of H.R. 1, the 165-page Social Security Amendments of 1972, the right to income in old age was as much under-advertised as Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty had been over-advertised. Politicians and the press dwelt on the bill's liberalizations of the Social Security system: a benefit increase for widows (on top of a twenty per cent general benefit boost enacted four months earlier), extension of Medicare to the disabled, and a more generous work bonus.

Ignorance and neglect probably aided passage of the nation's first guaranteed income. Politicians and the public focused their eyes on the other welfare section of H.R. 1, Title IV, the highly controversial Family Assistance Plan to guarantee a minimum income (\$200 a month per family of four) to

families with dependent children. This plan was killed by Congress after President Nixon deserted it.

Aside from a handful of persons who engineered it, and some governors who anticipated savings from its Federally-paid income floor for the aged, blind, and disabled, few knew the contents of Title III of H.R. 1. Most never read beyond the antiseptic title, "Assistance for the Aged, Blind, and Disabled," which was replaced in the closing months of the debate by the equally bland phrase, "Supplemental Security Income."

President Nixon's welfare reform plan of August, 1969, asked much from Congress for poor children and their parents, but little for aged, blind, or disabled adults. His Family Assistance Plan (FAP) proposed to give unqualified income guarantees to all children, regardless of their parents' behavior, and to mothers of pre-schoolers, plus bonuses for those heads of poor families—father or mother—who worked. FAP for the first time would have granted welfare supplements to intact families of fathers with full-time jobs, a sizable fraction of the nation's poverty-stricken families.

At the outset President Nixon proposed to leave welfare for the aged, blind, and disabled under state management, but, for the first time, to require the states to assure recipients a Federally-prescribed minimum income (Mr. Nixon's first draft bill set a floor of \$65 a month, but by the time it went to Congress the figure had grown to \$90). In the Congressional arena, this little plan was embraced, expanded liberally—with the blessing of the Nixon Administration—and made into the nation's first Federal income guarantee.

Both welfare titles of H.R. 1 (FAP and SSI) provided for the transformation of welfare into a direct Federal benefit, operated by the Federal Government on standard rules. Because of their more liberal eligibility standards, both SSI and FAP would have vastly enlarged the number of persons getting "welfare," and would have given maximum help to the poorest—the welfare and sub-welfare poor of the South. FAP's Federal payments would have cost an estimated \$6 billion annually at the outset, about one-third more than the initial cost of SSI payments.

But after twice passing the House, FAP floundered and died. It was fought by most conservatives, precisely because it would increase welfare appropriations and the number of recipients, and by organized welfare mothers of the North, who feared that FAP would benefit the working poor at their expense. Their pressures frightened most Senate liberals (who were from the North and West), though FAP was supported by some blacks in the South. Finally, the measure was deserted by its sponsor, Richard Nixon.

For several reasons, SSI survived. It dealt with persons unquestionably worthy of help. Since it was phrased in technical terms that understated its impact, it attracted little Congressional scrutiny. Finally, and most important, SSI solved a problem for key politicians—the defense of the Social Security wage-related "insurance" system against assaults by "welfare." Over the years provisions intended to give income support to the low-wage worker and to those who had worked only a short time at jobs covered by Social Security had gnawed away at the relationship between individual benefits received and payroll taxes paid.

The basic motivation for the radical income guarantee was conservative: the preservation of Social Security. Year after year politicians complained that Social Security was failing to pay the elderly a decent minimum. The minimum payment, made to those with minimal credits of payroll taxes, was raised in 1968 from \$44 to \$55; in 1969 to \$64; in 1971 to \$70.40; and in 1972 to

\$84.50. Since the minimum benefit, like all Social Security benefits, was paid without regard to need, it went to the rich as well as the poor. In fact, analysts found that whenever the minimum was raised, most of the extra money went to the nonpoor.

Obviously, to raise the Social Security minimum high enough to provide a decent income for the minority totally dependent on it would have given a gigantic windfall to those not in need at a huge cost to the workers in payroll taxes (which in 1972 cost employee and employer each 5.2 per cent of the first \$9,000 in wages and are scheduled to rise in future years). Nevertheless, some liberals pushed for a general boost, even a doubling, of all Social Security benefits in the name of the poor. Although this was economic nonsense, it was politically seductive.

A few other liberals saw an outright Federal income guarantee as the way to help the aged poor without further weakening the link between wages and Social Security benefits. They pointed out to the conservative leadership of the Ways and Means Committee that the guarantee would put an end to the perennial question, "But how can anyone live on \$55 a month? On \$64? On \$70.40?" The question no longer would make sense. No longer would anyone be asked to live on the Social Security minimum. Those needing more would receive a second check, a candid welfare supplement, and it would be financed not by payroll taxes but by the U.S. Treasury.

On October 17, 1972, America rejected a Federal income guarantee for its children while enacting one for its aged. The Ninety-second Congress left poor children to the mercy of states, many of which were slashing welfare payment levels, despite the rise in living costs, in an effort to spread funds over an increasing number of families.

Better treatment of the needy aged than of needy children is traditional in American public charity. For several reasons poor children and their mothers have suffered welfare discrimination. First, they lack political appeal and support. Not only do they have less voting strength than do the needy aged and their relatives, but the cause of their need—lack of an able-bodied father at home—often arouses condemnation rather than compassion. Second, economic forces operate against them. In many states family welfare payments have been depressed so as to spur welfare mothers into the domestic or farm labor market at low wages. And it has generally cost states more to guarantee a given payment to a needy child than to a needy adult. Because most of the needy aged receive Social Security checks, they have needed only a supplementary welfare check to reach an income goal, in contrast to penniless children. Moreover, until 1966 Federal law required states to finance a larger percentage of their payments to families on Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) than of their relief payments to the aged.

Passage of the income guarantee for the aged, blind, and disabled does not give promise of a universal cash income guarantee. The circumstances that enacted SSI are lacking for other poor groups: families with children, childless couples, singles. However, in the Federal food stamp program America already has an income guarantee open to all these needy groups (except those who live in the 800 counties that have refused to offer food stamps).

Supplemental Security Income, for the first time, makes the cash income of millions of Americans—the aged, the blind, the disabled—a legal obligation of the Federal Government. For a bewildering and unfair variety of state rules to decide who is "needy" enough to be helped, SSI substitutes objective and national standards of income and



resources. In philosophy, procedures, and financing, the new law represents a quiet revolution in American welfare.

**TRANSPORTATION PLAN OF  
DR. ROBERT W. ALRUTZ**

**HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, serious problems facing our Nation concerning the energy crisis and the environment must be met forthrightly if we are to resolve these difficulties. The energy crisis and environmental considerations are not necessarily contradictory. A reasoned, intelligent policy can consider all aspects of national importance and the long range goals in both areas should be compatible not contradictory.

Prof. Robert W. Alrutz of Denison University has worked on environmental and energy problems for many years. His concern predates the present crisis by many years. We have corresponded on many occasions and it has not been unusual for us to be in agreement on some issues and disagreement on others.

In the particular energy-environmental crisis and debate, no one is arrogant enough to think that they have all of the answers. There are many different points of view and yet there should be an openness to consider every reasonable alternative. I certainly do not have the answers and I have tried to keep an open mind.

Dr. Alrutz has presented a program to reduce energy waste and to encourage mass transit. As such, it should be considered with all of the other viable alternatives. Without endorsement or criticism, I call his views to the attention of the Members of this body and suggest that they read it and also use this forum to disseminate the widest possible variety of suggestions, alternatives and plans. Dr. Alrutz is both knowledgeable and sincere and his proposal should be given fair consideration. I insert his program at this point in the RECORD:

**A PROGRAM TO REDUCE ENERGY WASTE AND TO  
ENCOURAGE MASS TRANSPORT**

The Energy Crisis so dominating the American scene today is in truth not merely a shortage of fossil fuels. It is the final collapse of a whole series of systems built upon generations of wasteful use of nonrenewable resources. The American love affair with the private car, though only symptomatic of the problem, is the single most critical factor in this collapse. This implies that our problem is not to be solved by merely regulating gasoline consumption; we must also change our transportation patterns, putting the personal use of the automobile into the luxury category it personifies.

Transportation plans must not only restrict one form of movement, but must also encourage another. The American public will respond better to the "stick" of use limitations if the "carrot" of alternatives is encouraged. Unfortunately, we have neglected mass transit to the point that it needs a massive infusion of resources before it can become a viable alternative for most Americans.

What is needed is a Transportation Cur-

rency that is usable only for energy-conserving mass transit systems. It has been proposed to Washington that this be developed along with automotive limitations. The proposal suggests that a Transportation Tax be placed upon both gasoline for automotive use and diesel fuel for trucks to reflect the inefficiencies of such use.

The Transportation Tax on gasoline could be set at any amount, but should be high enough to put it into a luxury category as do the taxes on alcoholic beverages. Setting it, for the sake of argument, at 40¢ per gallon, represents a nearly 100% taxation. The question arises, how to apply these revenues to mass transit without creating a whole new bureaucracy of proposals, reviews, priorities, allocations, etc.?

Transportation Currency in the form of Tokens issued to the consumer at the time of purchase would make possible a natural system of allocation. Again, to adopt an arbitrary system, the Transportation Token could carry an evaluation, of say 20¢, representing a fraction of this tax. Such Tokens would be usable only as currency for some form of mass transit. Assuming the allocation of one Token, 20¢, for each gallon of gasoline purchased, the citizen would accumulate a currency that could be expended only by utilizing it in travel by means other than the automobile, naturally, the tendency would be to find alternative systems of travel for commuting, longer trips, vacations, etc.

The Mass Transit Systems and Authorities would be encouraged to accept these Tokens as fares. Once collected by the transit authority, the Token would then represent a tangible evidence of need for federal assistance or allocation. Those systems carrying the heaviest traffic and collecting the greater number of Tokens would represent systems which are most effective in reducing automobile usage.

Revenues collected by the Transportation Tax would be placed in a Transportation Trust Fund. Transportation Tokens would be redeemable by the mass transit systems at a rate somewhat in excess of their face value, for instance 25¢. This would represent to the mass transit system a 25% increase in revenue over services rendered. Such increases would allow for expansion of service, upgrading of equipment and perhaps, eventually, a reduction in the price of fares. When this takes place, the system then begins to have the sociological impact of reducing transportation costs for the poor. This latter value is one of the negatives against a straight tax on gasoline. This system of Token redemption would obviate the need for grants, allocations, or special programs of assistance.

Obviously, such a system would lack total equality. There would be some who would not have mass transit easily available. However, since the Transportation Token is a form of currency, it is negotiable. One could foresee the rapid development of a "currency exchange" whereby the holders of Tokens would be seeking to convert them to cash. However, the mass transit rider would have no incentive to buy such Tokens unless they constituted a savings. Hence, one can be certain that a market of sliding values, all less than the face value, would develop within various regions. But irrespective of this market, those who would continue to utilize private transportation would be paying the price differential of the 20¢ unreturned tax plus the loss on the face value of the Token. This loss in fact value would be an additional savings to those who regularly utilize mass transit.

The inequality of available mass transit would create problems in many areas. But it would also create a demand for new or expanded services. In many of our smaller towns the mass transit systems have been allowed to go out of existence. Obviously in such communities the citizens would find

themselves accumulating Tokens. Such "bankrolling" would unquestionably amass a demand for the reinstatement of local services. In the meantime, the residents would have only several recourses other than the "currency exchange". They could use the Tokens for intercity travel or, more likely, for vacation travel by such means as Amtrak.

Such a program is not without its problems. Our nation has so neglected mass transit that there are only three major manufacturers of buses while Amtrak is limping along with obsolete equipment. There would be a lag period between the onset of demand and the meeting of this demand by industry. But already Detroit is finding a decrease in demand for automobiles. As they shifted production at the onset of World War II, they should likewise be able to convert, in time naturally, to accommodate this new demand. Perhaps there would arise a new form of mass transit structured around the use of "minibuses" that are already in production. Though certainly more expensive to operate and less economical of fossil energy, such a system is better than private cars and would have the advantage of picking up some of the employment slump created by the decrease in fuel availability.

Distribution of the Transportation Tokens to the gasoline retailers would be simple and rather routine. The refinery would be the obvious point at which the Transportation Tax would be levied and to which the Tokens would be delivered in bulk. Then, at the time of delivery to the service station, the trucker would deliver a number of Tokens equivalent to the gasoline delivered.

Mass transit companies and authorities having received Tokens as fares could redeem them through their purchase of fuel, at their trade-in value, or through agencies designated by the Transportation Trust Fund. In addition to acting as a transferral agency of tax revenue to mass transit agencies, the Transportation Trust Fund would have revenues available for its own administration and for research. This latter function would make it possible to develop new systems of transit even more economical than those in existence. It could also have the power to issue loans in anticipation of revenues yet uncollected. In this manner it might be possible to upgrade existing transit systems or create new ones to help alleviate the crunch that is to come.

A program similar to that designed to move people could be instituted to change our way of moving freight. A comparable system of Freight Tokens or Credits could be instituted based upon the purchase of diesel fuel for trucks. Such Credits would be redeemable only as currency to move freight by rail or waterway. Were this program to be implemented, there would be a shifting of trucks to piggy-back or container transport. This would help alleviate the home fuel oil shortage.

Inherent within this program of Transportation Currency is a facility of manipulation to achieve desired ends. The Currency, whether Tokens or Credits, could be assigned values to correspond to the desired flow of traffic, and of funds. By decreasing their value private transport is encouraged, by increasing their value, it is discouraged. Also, this system should become self-balancing in time. As the purchase of gasoline decreases, less revenues flow into the Trust Fund and less currency is issued. Therefore, the Transportation Trust Fund should not become the uncontrolled monster that is the Highway Trust Fund. The latter is more comparable to a self-breeder reactor and has been an important factor in the creation of the present energy crisis.

This is not a new concept. The practicality of such a system is evidenced by that started by Sperry and Hutchins in their issues of the first S & H Green Stamps. Trading stamps are a form of currency, expendable in only

limited ways. They too have been used to change the purchasing habits of the American public. The only long-term solution to the energy crisis is a similar change in our life style.

#### NIXON FEARS PRESS SELF-CENSORSHIP (IN 1961)

#### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in light of President Nixon's recent attacks on the communications media, a May 9, 1961, Associated Press report published by the New York Herald Tribune makes fascinating reading.

Mr. Nixon criticized a speech to the Nation's newspaper publishers in which President Kennedy urged the publishers to exercise self-restraint when national security matters were being reported. Nixon concluded:

President Kennedy's remarks will inevitably encourage government officials to further withhold information to which the public is entitled.

If a plea for self-restraint can have such an effect, and it may, one wonders what inhibitory effects vicious Presidential attacks on the media may have. And when these Presidential attacks are compounded by attacks clearly inspired by the President, it becomes perfectly clear that President Nixon's concern for a free and untrammelled press has waned.

The 1961 article follows:

NIXON FEARS PRESS SELF-CENSORSHIP WOULD HELP GOVERNMENT HIDE FACTS

DETROIT, May 9.—Former Vice-President Nixon, stepping up his attacks on the Democratic administration, said today President Kennedy's call for self-censorship by the press will encourage government officials to conceal facts the public has a right to know.

Mr. Nixon, who kept silent during the first 100 days Mr. Kennedy was in office, is on a week-long tour in which he has become increasingly critical of the man who barely defeated him in November.

He chose the Detroit Press Club—"an appropriate forum," as he called it—to discuss a recent speech Mr. Kennedy made to the nation's publishers in which he urged self-restraint when national security is affected.

"The plea of security," Mr. Nixon said, "could well become a cloak for errors, misjudgments and other failings of government. . . . The whole concept of a return to secrecy in peacetime demonstrates a profound misunderstanding of the role of a free press as opposed to that of a controlled press."

#### "DRASTIC PROPOSALS"

Mr. Nixon had a word, "drastic," to describe Mr. Kennedy's proposals. And he contended the President talked in such generalities it was impossible to determine if there was any urgent increase in the need for secrecy—or if any governmental action had been harmed by open reporting.

"He appeared to blame the press for recent Cuban events," the former Vice-President said of Mr. Kennedy. "But would the results have been much different had the press failed to perform its traditional role?"

"If a bad reporting job was done, was it entirely the fault of the press? Can it not be said there was a deliberate attempt to mislead? And how can the press be expected to

get at the truth when anonymous Administration spokesmen keep contradicting each other?"

And although those around him have complained they think newsmen were unfair to the Republican candidate during the 1960 Presidential campaign, Mr. Nixon said of his fourteen years in Washington:

"It has been my own experience in government that newspaper men will co-operate fully when they are dealt with honestly.

"No reporter worth his salt would deliberately publish information hurtful to national security. The record of patriotic self-restraint is a good one."

And he reached this conclusion:

"President Kennedy's remarks will inevitably encourage government officials to further withhold information to which the public is entitled."

Tonight, at a combination entertainment and Republican fund-raising rally, to which 12,500 tickets were sold, Mr. Nixon again reviewed the Administration's beginning, and, in his estimation, found it wanting.

As he did in Chicago last week, Mr. Nixon suggested a summit meeting between Russia's Nikita S. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy, mostly because he thinks Mr. Khrushchev should see for himself that Mr. Kennedy can't be pushed around.

"It is imperative," Mr. Nixon said in his prepared text, "that any illusions Mr. Khrushchev may have gained as to America's determination and ability to defend the areas of freedom against Communist aggression be dispelled."

#### DAVE MARTIN AND THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE

#### HON. JOHN Y. MCCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. MCCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, predictions and rumors this entire year have been that no budget bill would be presented to Congress in 1973. Those predictions have recently been proven wrong, and I would like to commend the Members of the House Rules Committee and their staff for their remarkable efforts toward getting this legislation ready.

I especially want to commend my colleague from Nebraska, DAVE MARTIN, who as ranking member of the Rules Committee and vice chairman of the Select Committee on Committees, spent long, hard hours in working on and studying this compromise between the various bills that had been submitted. His time and efforts are deserving of our appreciation.

I hope all of us are aware of the extreme significance of this bill. It is, as others have stated, the most important piece of legislation Congress has seen in 25 years. It is the first meaningful step toward ending deficit financing; I will not list the ills of deficit financing here; all of us know what those ills are. Thus, we should be aware of the importance of the budgetary provisions in H.R. 7130.

Getting congressional control of the budget and expenditures can be accomplished by way of the budget process provided in this measure. Alterations will be necessary, I am sure; nevertheless this legislation is a strong attempt at ending deficit financing and establishing a comprehensive view of the Federal budget.

Again, I commend DAVE MARTIN and his colleagues on the Rules Committee, for coming to an equitable and workable compromise.

#### THE REALITIES OF NONVOTING

#### HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, legislation to create a national post card voter registration system has been under consideration as a possible solution to the low voter turnout in the United States as compared to some other Western democracies. A considerable amount of testimony given at the House Administration Committee hearings on the subject demonstrated overwhelmingly, first, that such a scheme would be virtually impossible to administer equitably or efficiently, second, that it would actually tend to disenfranchise some voters and, third, that it would open the door to a vast fraud potential at the polls.

As the article below from the fall 1973 Harvard Political Review shows, the psychological causes of nonparticipation far outweigh the legal or administrative causes. This article reviews some of the evidence for the impact of psychological causes of nonvoting and questions the wisdom of expecting any benefits from enactment of Federal legislation aimed at increasing voter participation.

The article follows:

#### THE REALITIES OF NONVOTING

(By V. Lance Tarrance, Jr.)

Exactly ten years ago this fall, the Commission on Registration and Voting Participation, which was appointed by President Kennedy, issued its findings and presented recommendations for solving a widely recognized socio-political malaise. A review of this six month Commission, chaired by Dick Scammon, then current Director of the U.S. Census, is now in order because of the shockingly low turnout of the recent 1972 elections and because of the speculation being cast on voter participation in the forthcoming congressional elections.

The Presidential Commission Report stated that "one-third of our adults do not vote in presidential elections (1960) and more than half do not vote in congressional elections (1962). The reasons for America's low voter participation are both psychological and legal." The Report, based upon the conventional wisdom of the day, assumed that "restrictive legal and administrative procedures in registration and voting (which) disenfranchise millions" could be alleviated by a series of steps contained in its twenty-one "standards" for social and political change. It also stated in a simplistic fashion that the psychological causes could be "attacked by education and educational programs."

However, nonvoting has become worse, and many of the Commission's panaceas which were supposed to alleviate the causes of nonparticipation have proven to be irrelevant. The inadequacy of the Report can partially be blamed on the Commission's charter which primarily recommended strong legal remedies and which was obviously intended for short-range political purposes. Unlike other Ker-



ner-type Commissions which were created in that same decade, this Commission had neither a large staff, nor a substantial budget. Furthermore the Commission chose to use published research information gathered in the 1940's and 1950's instead of developing its own social science research projects which would have provided more recent data.

During the ten years, after the Report was issued, the malaise has become worse:

Percentage turnout in Presidential elections:	
1960	63
1964	61
1968	60
1972	56
Dropoff	-7

[In millions]

Nonvoters:	
1972	50 million
1968	38 million
1964	33 million

These "nonvoters" statistics are actually understated since national surveys on voter participation contain a 7 to 10 percent over-reporting problem for researchers.

Did the Kennedy Commission fail to have an impact upon our political system? Hardly. The Report's "affirmative action plan" was taken quite seriously; indeed its legal prescriptions were extensively implemented. Let's view the results of some of the more important recommendations:

#### PROPOSED 1963 MANDATE AND FINAL RESULTS AFTER TEN YEARS

1. "Each state should set up a commission on Registration and Voting Participation, or . . . survey in detail its election law and practices."

The Campaign Finance Act of 1972 established an "Office of Federal Elections" in GAO to do this on a fifty-state basis.

4. "Local residency requirements should not exceed 30 days."

Implemented by the Supreme Court in *Blumstein v. Dunn*, 1972.

5. "New state residents should be allowed to vote for President."

This was accomplished in time for the 1968 elections by the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965.

6. "Voter Registration should extend as close to Election Day as possible, and should not end more than 3 or 4 weeks before Election Day."

The Federal Voting Rights Act of 1970 and the *Blumstein* case contributed to extending voter registration deadlines.

11. "Literacy tests should not be a requisite for voting."

Accomplished by the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965.

16. "Voting by persons 18 years of age should be considered by the states."

Implemented by the 26th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, 1971.

18. "The right to vote should be extended to those living on Federal Reservations."

The Supreme Court in 1967 accomplished that standard in the *Corman* case.

20. "The poll tax as a qualification for voting should be eliminated."

Accomplished by the 24th Amendment, 1964.

Thus, many if not most of the legal standards contained in the Kennedy Report of 1963 have been met over the last ten years by either judicial decree or legislative initiative. Yet, voter participation has continued to decline in this country. Although the prescriptive recommendations of the Kennedy Commission were important and needed to be enacted, in certain areas they did not have the intended effect and many nonregistered voters remain. The U.S. Census survey immediately after the 1968 elections showed that only 13 percent of those who reported themselves as not registered provided the reason as being "unable to register" (presumably

because of administrative discrimination of one kind or another). Another "legal" reason—"residency requirement not satisfied"—was given by only 11 percent of the non-registered respondents (that statistic has since been reduced to only 6 percent in the 1972 Census survey—no doubt a result of the *Blumstein* case). This research data demonstrates that the Commission's emphasis on "legal" solutions was misplaced since only a minimal number of non-registered citizens are not registered because of legal barriers.

Even though legal stimulants to increase voting participation are never quite exhausted, one is led to the conclusion that the 1963 Kennedy Commission findings on the psychological causes were more "major" than the Commission realized. The Report in retrospect overemphasized legal barriers and deemphasized the psychological ones. For example, no public opinion surveys which would have allowed attitudinal research in key psychological areas were included in the Commission Report. The conventional wisdom of the day was simply recycled through the Report.

Not until recently have the U.S. Census surveys begun to probe the reasons for non-voting and, more recently, non-registration. The Census' 50,000 Household Survey reported the following information after the 1972 elections:

#### Persons who were not registered in November 1972

Legal reasons:	
Unable to register	12
Not a citizen	10
Residence requirement not satisfied	6
Total	28

Psychological reasons:	
Not interested	43
Dislikes politics	8
Other reasons (nonlegal)	15
Don't remember	6
Total	72

Thus, about three out of every four non-registered potential voters apparently are completely indifferent to the political process. Clearly it seems that the more substantial root causes of low voter participation are "invisible ones" which are producing the deepest and most persistent decline in national voting since the early days of this century (e.g., participation in the 1920's was only around 40 percent).

The large number of persons in 1972 who made the effort to register but who still did not vote on election day presents a problem that requires review. This phenomenon was described nicely by the New York Times in a post-election article entitled "Voter Explains Why She Wasn't" which included a Times-Yankelovic national survey. The survey was designed to probe nonvoting among registered voters. On the question, "Which candidate, Richard Nixon or George McGovern, do you find the more attractive?" the following response was given:

Neither	37
Nixon	33
McGovern	23
Unsure	7

The high percentage of those who answered "neither" or "unsure" offers one possible explanation for this phenomenon of non-participation among registered voters.

Census surveys later confirmed a psychological basis for non-voting by reporting that nearly 13 million registered voters in 1972 did not bother to vote on election day. That number, incidentally, is as large as the total number of registered voters in 1972 in the combined states of Texas, Massachusetts, Florida, and New Jersey, or to put it another way, a total of seventy-four electoral college votes. To compare the 1972 statistics to the 1968 election is somewhat frightening—in

that year only about 7½ million registered voters failed to show on election day or about one-half of the incidence of 1972. The 1972 registered nonvoter was also almost 30 percent of the total non-voting electorate which is a significant increase from the 20 percent proportion in 1968.

Obviously, much more research would be undertaken into the indifference and alienation of these most recent "vanishing voters." They are more likely to provide insights into this phenomenon than those already lost in the not registered nonvoting class. A comparison of these two types of nonvoters in 1972 demonstrates presumptive evidence that they have different motivational drives which account for their nonparticipation:

#### Reasons for nonparticipation

Registered nonvoter:	
Not interested	15
Dislikes politics	12
Unable to go	35
Nonregistered nonvoter:	
Not interested	43
Dislikes politics	8
Unable to go	12

This difference emphasizes the importance of analyzing each group separately when studying the motivations of nonvoting.

Even though the 1963 Kennedy Commission Report cited briefly some of the psychological causes for low turnout in American elections, it actually devoted only about ten pages to "remedies for voluntary nonvoting" while spending about fifty pages on "involuntary nonvoting." The Report also oversimplified the voluntary remedies by stating that "the most obvious method of combating apathy is a register-and-vote campaign" and "the teaching of citizenship in our elementary and secondary schools needs a major overhaul." However this mode of attack on voter turnout has proved to be far from the pat formula the Report seemed to imply. Furthermore, Penn Kimball has ably demonstrated in his recent 1972 book, *The Disconnected*, that independent citizen group registration drives are ineffective and not the long-range solution.

The final remedy in the Report for the psychological causes was the familiar plea for increased two-party competition. ("A great ally of education in the fight against apathy is politics itself—the two-party system.") The Commission members, however, were not able to see the futility in such a "call." One sign of decreased two-party competition is a decrease in the extent of political party allegiance. Over the past ten years, a diminution in political party allegiance has occurred. David Broder's conclusions in his book, *The Party's Over*, and DeVries and Tarrance's research in *The Ticket Splitter* have presented evidence of less party cohesion and more party-government fragmentation in the 1970's. Thus, the "last hope" of the Kennedy Commission leaves us with an insoluble situation if voted interest is to be predicated on the traditional model of the party system.

If the conventional wisdom espoused in the Kennedy Commission Report did not yield in retrospect the "quick turn-around results" that the Kennedy Commission was looking for, what then could be the causes of the long-term decline in voting participation? Even if we concede that party identification has eroded considerably over the last decade, could it not also be that potential voters today are simply less likely to vote if they believe their votes "just do not make any difference"? Recent studies out of the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center have measured political efficacy and found it at an all time low and this alienation has become in their view a real and alarming problem. Again, according to this social-psychological school of thought, a major shift in attitudes is taking place, and, for reasons not fully understood, more and more Americans are intentionally disregarding elections which seem less and less important to them.

Further evidence of this "new view" was illustrated when the Secretary of State Richard Stone in Florida conducted a survey of 15,000 poll workers and local election judges in order to shed light on the very low turnout in that state's first presidential primary in 1972. The survey data showed that a new "what's the use" attitude prevailed as the chief explanation and these workers and judges felt registered nonvoters simply did not think that the election really mattered very much. Perhaps political scientists should reexamine Anthony Downs' theory postulated in the late 1950's, that if the "long-range participation value" of voting (utility) is something like .000000003, the citizen will not spend his scarce resources (time) to purchase that commodity on the open market. Similarly, it would be worthwhile to reexamine the research of Angus Campbell, who in "The Passive Citizen" (1962) reported that in addition to perceiving an election to be important, the citizen must also perceive the government as responsive to his efforts if he is to be highly motivated to participate.

In summary, our review of the Kennedy Commission Report on voting participation in 1963 does not leave one with much optimism except to say that after ten years the causes of volitional nonvoting are still not fully understood and not enough research money has been expended in that pursuit. Secondly, there is a strong case that all the original emphasis on restrictive legal and administrative procedures represented only the tip of the iceberg and that the psychological causes of nonvoting were, even in 1963, much more serious than the Commission was able to perceive. No amount of federal administrative intervention is going to alleviate the deeper psychological causes for non-registration. Also, no amount of superficial educational programs by civic groups are going to have much impact if the political party system as we know it today is under rapid decomposition and resulting in divided party government in nearly every state.

New answers from new research are the only solution. Instead of the "one-third who do not vote in Presidential elections" that so concerned the 1963 Kennedy Commission, we have ten years later, "one-half who did not vote in the 1972 Presidential election." Instead of the "one-half who did not vote in congressional elections" ten years ago, we most likely will approach "nearly two-thirds" who will not vote in the 1974 congressional elections.

#### ANOTHER THOUGHT ABOUT SPIRO AGNEW'S RESIGNATION

### HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, even though Elliot Richardson considers himself to be the epitome of justice, it seems to me that there was something sinister and very fishy about a deal made in which the Vice President of the United States had charges of high crime waived in exchange for his resignation from the office to which he was duly elected by a majority of the voters in a national election.

Adam Clayton Powell, an admitted thief, got a much better deal than that from the U.S. House of Representatives.

### THE ENERGY CRISIS IN PERSPECTIVE

### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the response to the current difficulties we are facing with regard to energy has been all too typical of our response to so many other problems.

What is called for is increased Government coercion, the creation of huge and expensive new bureaucracies, and the provision of virtually total and unchecked power to the executive branch of Government.

The concept of gas rationing, advocated by so many who insist upon telling us that it is inevitable is a typical example of this kind of thinking.

Gas rationing would be unfair to everyone. With more than 100 million cars on the road. It would require a huge bureaucracy to implement. More significant, perhaps, is the fact that it would stimulate increased, rather than decreased, use of the available gasoline supply.

Prof. Milton Friedman points out that if the price of petroleum products was permitted to rise on the free market, all of us would have a vested interest in using as little as possible, and the oil companies would have a vested interest in exploring for new sources. Rationing, quite to the contrary, would make it economically unattractive to seek new sources and would give each of us an interest in obtaining as much gasoline as possible. It would, in simple terms, be not only coercive and unfair, but also counterproductive.

Dr. W. Philip Gramm, professor of economics at Texas A. & M. University and a consultant to Canada's Ministry of Natural Resources, declares that—

The first step in solving the energy shortage is to allow the free market system to work. All price ceilings and government controls should be eliminated. Such action would greatly stimulate the supply of energy sources and eliminate shortages. Prices would rise but the expansion of output would hold prices to the minimum which current conditions dictate.

Writing in the Wall Street Journal, Professor Gramm notes that—

... the free market will insure that energy will be allocated to the highest priority users. Price increases are not pleasant, but they are better than low prices and no energy. If these higher prices work hardships on the less fortunate among us, special provisions which would be preferable to the distortions and waste of rationing, could be provided for this small minority.

I wish to share with my colleagues the important article, "The Energy Crisis in Perspective," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of November 30, 1973, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 30, 1973]

#### THE ENERGY CRISIS IN PERSPECTIVE

(By W. Philip Gramm)

Much of the prevailing rhetoric on the "energy crisis" expresses this kind of logic:

Since there is just so much oil, coal, natural gas and other energy sources, sooner or later we are going to run out. We must, therefore, begin to ration these resources not only to meet the current crisis but to conserve energy in our time and move the day of reckoning further into the future. Americans have been "energy pigs," according to Stewart Udall, and have been operating on the misguided assumption that there is no limit to the quantity of energy. Since we are at the end of the era of cheap fuel and dealing with a problem without precedent, strong and previously unacceptable policies are called for: government regulation of the production and distribution of energy.

Ignored is the fact that mankind has frequently experienced instances of increasing scarcity, and by ingenuity and free action has solved all of them. In fact, we are currently experiencing the second major energy crisis in American history.

From the colonization period until the Civil War the major source of artificial lighting in the U.S. and Europe was whale and sperm oil. Since there were no good substitutes for these oils as a source of light, the world's supply of artificial light depended almost exclusively on the whaling industry. People did not need computers to project that the supply of whales could not keep pace with the rapid expansion in demand.

Sperm oil rose from 43 cents per gallon in 1823 to \$2.55 a gallon in 1866. Whale oil rose from a low of 23 cents in 1832 to \$1.45 a gallon in 1865. As price rose, gas distilled from coal became an economically feasible substitute causing whale oil demand to fall off sharply in Europe.

In 1859 sperm oil was over \$1.36 a gallon. But that same year, an event which in nine years would end the whale oil crisis forever occurred: petroleum was discovered in Pennsylvania. In the meantime, the demand of the Civil War boomed whale oil prices. Not only was there increased demand, the war disrupted production. Conscription of whaling vessels as freight ships and the capture or destruction of ships by Southern privateers caused a decline of more than 50% in the number of U.S. ships in whaling and a 60% decline in tonnage. By 1866, sperm oil had reached a high of \$2.55 a gallon.

The high prices for whale and sperm oil between 1849 and 1867 provided a growing profit incentive to develop an efficient refining process for crude petroleum and induced the investment required for the production of kerosene. Beginning in 1867, kerosene broke the sperm and whale oil market and prices tumbled. By 1896, sperm oil was cheaper than it had been in any recorded period—40 cents a gallon—but whale oil lamps were no more than relics for succeeding generations.

#### TWO VITAL FUNCTIONS

Aside from providing an incentive for the development of petroleum products rising whale and sperm oil prices performed two other vital functions. Rising prices caused consumers to act out of their own self interest to economize the use of oil. Rising prices gave an inducement for producers to increase output of whale and sperm oil through increases in investment, improvements in technology, and increased labor input. The rise in prices from 1820-1847 induced a rise in the tonnage of whaling vessels of almost 600% and produced numerous technological improvements in the whaling industry. It appears that rising prices caused output to increase perhaps by 1,000% or more. Had government possessed the power and volition to ration whale and sperm oil to hold its price down or to levy a tax on oil to reap the gains from the price rise, the shortage would have been catastrophic, and the advent of kerosene and other petroleum products might have been delayed for decades.



The whale oil crisis is a case study of how the free-market system solves a scarcity problem. The end product of this process of discovery and innovation is the Petroleum Age in which we live. We owe the benefits and comforts of the present era to free enterprise and the scarcity of whales.

The history of our first "energy crisis" demonstrates that there is no reason to believe that we face long-term doom. If technology were suddenly frozen, some of the dire projections being made now might be realized in several hundred years or less, depending on which "expert of the week" one believes. But technology is *not* frozen. It is instead progressing at a rate unprecedented in history. The Petroleum Age will pass as did the Stone Age (and the Whale Oil Era). The real danger is that we may foolishly restrict the exploitation of current energy sources and allow them to become valueless. Only if we eliminate the market incentives for innovation and investment will we face a real, long-term "energy crisis."

Though there is no long-term "energy crisis" there is a short-term problem. Economic science teaches that shortages cannot exist in free markets. In free markets prices rise in order to eliminate shortages. "Crisis" as opposed to simple scarcity, results from market disruptions; and the *only* sector of society which possesses the power to disrupt a large market is the government. Government price ceilings on natural gas at the well-head have been one of the most disruptive public policies. By setting the price of natural gas artificially low, the government has stifled the incentive of producers to increase supplies, while the artificially low price has stimulated demand. Furthermore, since profits are low at these artificially low ceiling prices, investment and exploration have fallen off sharply.

Price controls have also had a detrimental impact on the supply of petroleum products and the construction of refinery capacity, essential to increasing domestic energy supplies. Due to the pressure to keep prices below what the free market would specify, shortages of petroleum products have occurred at both the retail and wholesale levels. Had prices been allowed to rise, the quantity supplied would have expanded to meet the quantity demanded; and each consumer would have had direct incentive to economize on usage. We are only now beginning to realize the distorting impact on the production of inputs essential for fuel production (drilling equipment, tubular steel, etc.) which four phases of price controls have produced.

Environmental legislation and court action also have had a significant impact on the supply and demand for energy. Injunctions against atomic and conventional power plants have prevented the supply of electricity from keeping up with the demand. The injunction against the Alaskan pipeline has impeded the growth of oil supplies. Pollution control devices on automobiles have increased fuel consumption and, thereby, increased the demand for gasoline. Mass conversion from high sulphur to low sulphur fuels in order to comply with EPA regulations to abate pollution has caused a change in the composition of energy demand from plentiful, cheap sources of energy to scarcer more expensive ones.

The energy crisis has made it clear that pollution abatement has a definite cost to society. Only by understanding the costs involved in various forms of pollution abatement can we choose how much environmental protection is optimal.

The bureaucratic method of looking at the supply and demand for energy products differs substantially from the market-directed approach. The bureaucrat presumes first of all that the supply of the product is absolutely fixed. Price does not matter. A price

rise, he argues, will not put more oil in the pipelines—at least not before the next election. People "need a certain amount" of the product, and they will always buy the same quantity regardless of price unless they are too poor to afford it at all.

These views are, of course, economic nonsense. In weighing the various courses of action which might be followed in minimizing the cost of dealing with the current energy problem it is useful to make a ballpark estimate of the price level that the free market would yield in the shortage period.

#### ESTIMATING OUTPUT AND DEMAND

Estimates of how much the demand for energy sources would decline in a period less than a year, if prices rose by 1%, range from roughly 0.2% to 1.2%. Estimates of how much the quantity supplied would rise in the same period, if prices rose by 1%, vary from roughly 0.6% to 2%. A reasonably conservative estimate is that a price of 1% will provoke a decline in the quantity demanded of 0.5% and a rise in the quantity supplied of 1%.

The practical importance of these estimates is that a 10% shortage in the supply of fuel at current prices would yield a free market rise in price of less than 7%. If we are more pessimistic about the shortage and assume that demand exceeds supply by 20% at the current price, we might expect a price rise of less than 14%.

The above estimates, though conservative, do not take account of the disruption produced by the crisis atmosphere that surrounds this issue. Since the magnitude of the crisis has been blown out of all reasonable proportions and people fear shortages and rationing, hoarding by both the supplier and demanders is a genuine possibility. In the very short run (up to three months) we might expect prices to rise above the long-term market price. After roughly one to three months we should expect the crisis mania to pass and a general dishoarding to occur so that prices would fall to a level below the above estimates. These estimates are of course based on the assumption of unhampered market adjustments. Government attempts to interfere with this market process would tend to shift the estimates upwards.

The first step in solving the energy shortage is to allow the free market system to work. All price ceilings and government controls should be eliminated. Such action would greatly stimulate the supply of energy sources and eliminate shortages. Prices would rise but the expansion of output would hold prices to the minimum which current conditions dictate. Furthermore, the free market will insure that energy will be allocated to the highest priority users. Price increases are not pleasant, but they are better than low prices and no energy. If these higher prices work hardships on the less fortunate among us, special provisions which would be preferable to the distortions and waste of rationing, could be provided for this small minority.

There is an additional advantage of allowing domestic prices to rise. As prices rise in the U.S., the cost to the Arabs of maintaining the restriction on sales to the U.S. will get higher. If we simply allow the market to work, the agreement to restrict sales to the U.S. will break and with it Arab unity will break. The Arabs are playing a dangerous game. If we allow prices to rise we can expect the development of new domestic sources such as oil shale and domestically produced substitutes for petroleum.

#### COSTS AND CLEAN AIR

Another step in solving the energy problem is to inform society of the cost of environmental and ecological programs and allow the people to choose. If people want the end products of such programs they will have to pay the cost in higher energy prices. With-

out adequate information, society will not be able to decide which programs are worth the cost and which are not. If people prefer cleaner air to lower fuel cost they can choose to convert from coal to oil. If they choose lower fuel cost they can burn cheaper and dirtier fuels. Such a system seems preferable to allowing a bureaucrat to decide for them.

To increase supplies we should open the continental shelf for drilling but make firms liable for oil spills and other forms of ecological disturbances. Most oil spills are not from drillings but from tankers. By employing the Naval oil reserves, the continental shelf and areas which will become economically feasible at higher prices, output could be greatly expanded.

We should institute peak-load pricing for electricity in shortage areas. Brownouts and blackouts occur because in peak use periods overloads occur. By charging more for power in peak use periods, nonessential use would occur in nonpeak load periods when power is cheaper. Under the current system there is no incentive to spread out power use. Peak load pricing could minimize overloads in the current system and allow time for supply sources to catch up to peak load demand.

In a free market, when the price of a good starts to rise, three simultaneous forces are produced. First, people start to use the good more judiciously, second, producers and consumers who use the product begin to search for cheaper substitutes, and third, producers of the product attempt to expand output by using and developing technology to meet the demand. It is this process which has always forestalled doom. We will run out of energy only if we prevent the free market from working. Herein lies the real danger of the "energy crisis."

#### THE BUDGET AND IMPOUNDMENT CONTROL ACT

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
OF CONNECTICUT

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, for the last 25 or 30 years, the Congress has been handicapped by an inadequate, inefficient, and antiquated budgetmaking apparatus while the executive has cornered the vital area of fiscal management.

By approving H.R. 7130, the Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1973, the House has taken a major step toward returning the traditional balance between the powers of the legislative and executive branches of Government.

Without question, the Congress cannot perform its most basic task of making decisions about the raising and spending of Federal tax dollars unless its capacity for dealing with the budget is greatly enhanced. Determining spending priorities within the isolated context of separate appropriations bills precludes a comprehensive review of the entire budget and a balanced determination of spending priorities.

This situation will be altered by H.R. 7130. The bill establishes a new Budget Committee to study various requests and establish ceilings for expenditures in the various categories of the Federal budget. It also provides a timetable for considering the new budget, establishes a Legislative Budget Office to supply the Con-

gress with independent information on programs and priorities, and requires the Congress to keep expenditures within the ceiling originally adopted.

In a related area, the impoundment of appropriated funds and the discontinuation of lawfully enacted programs by the executive seriously erode the system of checks and balances contained in the Constitution. To help restore this balance, earlier in the session I cosponsored legislation to control impoundment and supported H.R. 8480, the Impoundment Control Act. Title II of H.R. 7130 establishes the procedure by which Congress can overrule the impoundment of lawfully enacted funds by the executive.

The Budget and Impoundment Control Act, while not perfect, represents the first major step taken by the Congress in years toward reforming its inefficient control over fiscal matters. Just as the war powers resolution restored the constitutional balance in foreign affairs, the final passage of H.R. 7130 will restore the balance in domestic matters by revitalizing the fiscal responsibility of the Congress.

#### THE QUALITY OF MEDICINE BEING ENDANGERED BY FEDERAL REGULATIONS

#### HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the quality of medical care in the United States is important to each of us. It is a matter of health and life.

During recent years, this profession, like so many others, has been beset with new Federal regulatory and reporting requirements, some of which reduce significantly the doctors' abilities to serve adequately their patients. One of these requirements was imposed as an obscure provision of last year's Social Security Act amendments. It is the requirement of establishing "Professional Standards Review Organizations"—PSRO's—assigned the tasks of second-guessing doctor's decisions on the treatment of patients under medicare, medicaid, and maternal and child health programs.

One of the rights inherent to a free society is the right of a patient to have his or her medical problems attended to in the fullest of privacy. This confidential relationship is as privileged as one between a priest and penitent or an attorney and client. Many legal authorities believe the PSRO's violate this constitutional principle.

The PSRO's were added to last year's act as an amendment on the Senate floor. It was not fully debated. It was not even the subject of public hearings in the House. It is law today because it was buried in such an otherwise complex law that it never received full attention.

I am introducing legislation, together with other Members, to repeal the PSRO requirements. I believe this to be in the best medical and legal interests of the patient community. At the very least, its

introduction ought to engender the debate and public hearings necessary to air fully the pros and cons of this issue. Hopefully, those hearings will bring out, sufficiently, why the PSROs are not consistent with the long established American traditions surrounding doctors and their patients.

This morning's Wall Street Journal carried an excellent editorial on the PSRO's and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

#### NO TIME FOR PATIENTS?

We would never argue that any group should be exempt from accountability to the larger society, but we can understand why many doctors at an American Medical Association convention in Anaheim this week are up in arms over a new federal law purportedly designed to monitor the way doctors deal with federally insured patients.

The law, described elsewhere on this page today by Dr. Winston, requires the establishment of "Professional Standards Review Organizations" all around the country starting Jan. 1. These PSROs, which will be comprised mainly of doctors, will have the task of second-guessing decisions made by other doctors in treating patients under Medicare, Medicaid and maternal and child health problems.

Their findings will be used by a HEW bureaucracy to establish certain "norms" that doctors would be expected to follow in treating federally insured patients. Such questions as whether some doctors overprescribe or require unnecessary hospitalization will enter into the review and norm-setting process.

While we favor a businesslike administration of federal social programs, the PSRO legislation raises some questions which didn't get adequately asked or answered by Congress. It was attached, by Senator Bennett (R., Utah), as a rider onto last fall's big and controversial Social Security bill and somehow rode through with almost no public attention. The House did not even hold public hearings on the PSROs.

And yet the law empowers the government, through PSROs, to examine medical records in doctors' offices, not only of federally insured patients but private patients as well. The Association of American Physicians and Surgeons thinks this is an unconstitutional invasion of a private relationship.

Further, it can be doubted that Congress gave sufficient thought to the cost of all this monitoring and norm-setting. There is no clear picture of how many PSROs there will be but a minimum of 150, and probably considerably more, is likely. The man-hours of doctors who serve on them will be that many fewer man-hours devoted to practicing medicine, not to mention the man-hours that will have to be devoted in doctors' offices to meeting demands for information or justifying decisions.

It might be noted that some 50 million patients and 10 million hospital missions are potentially subject to monitoring and that the proposed norms cover some 350 procedures. It makes you wonder if doctors will have any time left to treat patients.

Finally, the law seems to ignore that a great deal of peer review already goes on in medicine, by state and local medical societies and hospital boards that review decisions to operate and the like. While peer review has been criticized as ineffective a lot of the criticism remains unproved. In Louisiana last December, it was the state medical society that blew the whistle on a HEW-financed private birth control scheme that now is under criminal investigation, which suggests that the public interest may fare at least as well under private peer review as through the good offices of HEW.

Many doctors claim that the PSRO sleeper actually was designed to open the medical

profession up for full federal insurance, or, as the AMA once would have termed it, "socialized medicine." Interestingly, the AMA had a hand in the original conception of PSROs, apparently with some notion of displaying flexibility—thus avoiding the kind of pitched battle it lost over Medicare—and at the same time keeping PSROs in the hands of physicians. But a good many physicians are making it clear that they think that was a bad tactic.

It would seem that they have a point. Medicare and Medicaid were a product of the mid-1960s and there is no denying the public support that then existed. But this is 1973 and Americans have seen quite a lot they don't like about federal social programs. There is no certainty they are yet ready for national health insurance and they certainly aren't ready for sneaky approaches to that end through innocent-looking riders to complex bills in Congress. As to monitoring Medicare and Medicaid, HEW might do well, or so the Louisiana case would suggest, to get better control of its existing auditing system.

Rep. Rarick (D., La.) has introduced a bill to repeal PSROs. It may well be that the public has a bigger stake in repeal than it realizes. At any rate, the issue deserves a better hearing than it got when PSROs were so nimbly written into law last year.

#### TESTIMONY ON POW'S AND MIA'S

#### HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I submitted testimony to the House Foreign Affairs Committee in support of legislation to require a full accounting of our men who are missing in action in Southeast Asia. Though the United States has withdrawn from Vietnam and our POW's have come home, we should not forget the tragic lessons learned during that conflict, nor should we forget that 1,200 men have not been accounted for as yet. We must not back down from our demand for a full and complete accounting of our MIA's and we must not forget that this problem is a daily tragedy for the parents, wives, and children of these men.

Following is the text of my testimony before the committee:

#### TESTIMONY OF HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 271, I have joined with more than 100 other Members to express my deep concern at the continuing and unresolved problem of our men who are missing in action in Southeast Asia. This is not the first, nor the last, effort I shall make on behalf of our POW's and MIA's. It is imperative for the families of these men and for the integrity and honor of our fighting forces that this problem not be allowed to slide into oblivion.

The question of a proper accounting of our MIA's is part of the larger tragedy which took place for all mankind during the conflict in Southeast Asia. The Communist forces, and most specifically the Government of North Vietnam, repeatedly, consistently, and blatantly refused to abide by the prisoner treatment protocols of the Geneva Convention. The United Nations, the fundamental world body charged with the protection of human rights, stood by helpless, the victim of an avalanche of anti-United States rhetoric. The other signatories of the



Geneva Convention paid only lip service to their responsibilities, and the forum of world opinion chose only to concentrate on alleged mistreatment of prisoners in South Vietnam.

During my service in the House I have continually sought and supported means to make the Communists abide by the regulations for treatment of POWs set forth in the Geneva Convention, and I have stressed the critical importance of a full accounting of Americans missing in action in Southeast Asia.

In April of this year I was moved by the horror stories of our returning prisoners of war to request of the President that the United States take the initiative in convening a new international convention for the purpose of reviewing agreements relating to treatment of prisoners of war and to provide effective methods to guarantee the enforcement of agreements relative to prisoners of war. I am happy to report that the President responded with positive news: an international meeting on precisely this issue has been scheduled by the Swiss Government (the depository for the 1949 Geneva Convention) for February 18 to April 11, 1974 in Geneva.

Also in April, I formally requested House Armed Services Committee Chairman Edward Hébert to have the Committee conduct a thorough investigation of the treatment of Americans held prisoner by the Communists. I expressed the sincere hope that we all share, that Americans will never again become involved in any military conflict, but also put forward my feeling that an Armed Services Committee investigation could contribute to the assurance that our men would be more adequately protected in any such future eventuality. Moreover, an investigation such as I recommended could reveal the presence of any prisoners of war who had not been previously identified and could provide additional information on those still unaccounted for.

In the wake of our national joy at having our POWs home at last, the problems of their mistreatment and of the more than 1,200 MIAs seemed to be slipping into the background. But I, along with many other Members, was determined not to let this happen. Therefore, on July 31 I joined with more than a hundred other Members of the House to introduce H. Con. Res. 271, expressing the sense of Congress with respect to those men still missing in action in Southeast Asia. This resolution clearly prohibits any further Congressional consideration of aid, trade, diplomatic recognition or any other form of communication, travel, or accommodation with North Vietnam or the Viet Cong until such time as the January 27, 1973 agreements relating to our military and civilian personnel in the missing in action category are complied with.

Furthermore, on September 25th I sponsored H.J. Res. 741, calling for a full Congressional investigation into the status of our servicemen still listed as missing in action as a result of the Vietnam conflict. This resolution not only calls for an independent Congressional inquiry but also the withholding of any aid to the North Vietnamese government or any government supported by insurgent communist forces in Southeast Asia until there is a full accounting of MIAs. On the same date, I again renewed my request to Chairman Hébert for investigation by the Armed Services Committee into the whereabouts of the more than 1,200 American MIAs. I noted in my letter that such an investigation would help to end, once and for all, the uncertainty for those families of men still missing as well as to obtain the release of any prisoners who may still be held in Southeast Asia. I am therefore especially pleased to see this Subcommittee break the logjam of Congressional inaction and begin hearings on this im-

portant sense of the Congress resolution. As the world's most powerful nation and as a people who have suffered deeply from the Vietnamese conflict, it is incumbent upon us to act responsibly to prevent any further such abuses of prisoners' rights as we saw in Southeast Asia.

That this is not just a problem peculiar to our involvement in Vietnam has been brought home to us strongly by certain events which took place during the recent Middle East conflict. I am referring, for example, to a formal complaint filed by the Government of Israel with the International Red Cross in Geneva concerning crimes of murder and mutilation committed against Israeli prisoners of war by Syrian military forces on the Golan Heights. In retaking certain areas of the Golan Heights, Israel Defense Force troops claim to have discovered proof that 28 Israeli soldiers had been murdered in cold blood after their capture by Syrian troops.

If the United States and other free nations concerned with human rights do not take firm and unequivocal stands against such barbarities and bring to bear every ounce of moral, political, and economic power that we possess against the offenders, we are serving notice to aggressors large and small that they can violate the Geneva Convention with impunity and that some of the most fundamental rules of civilization no longer apply.

I cannot urge my distinguished colleagues on this subcommittee strongly enough to take immediate and constructive action on behalf of our missing in action. The Congress must not abdicate its responsibility to our POWs, to the families of the MIAs, and to the men of our armed forces who may face similar trials in future conflicts. If we sweep this problem under the rug by leaving it to the sluggish efforts of governmental agencies, future generations of mankind may suffer the results.

#### PARTY DESIGNATION IN LOCAL ELECTIONS IN WASHINGTON, D.C., FAVORED

#### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia home rule conference report to be voted on in the House next Wednesday, December 12 provides party designation on the ballots on which the new Mayor and City Council will be elected in the fall of 1974.

That feature was in the committee bill, H.R. 9682 when it was voted out of committee last July by a vote of 20 to 4.

Testimony at the hearings on the bill from February 8 to July 15 was overwhelmingly for party designation. Let me quote from the hearing record.

BOARD OF TRADE FAVORS PARTISAN BALLOT

Mr. Walter F. McArdle, president of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade voiced the support of business in these words:

These legislators (city council) should be elected by partisan ballot.

We support the election of the chief executive of the District of Columbia on a partisan, city-wide ballot.

GOP IN FAVOR

The District of Columbia Republican

Party testified in favor of party designation in these words:

We believe the Mayor should be elected in partisan elections. There is no question but the present political parties in the District of Columbia can provide the machinery by which a candidate aspiring to office can best bring his or her views to the electorate.

The League of Women Voters also spoke in favor of party designation as follows:

We support a legislative body broadly representative of the community, elected in partisan elections, some by ward and some at large. The chief executive should also be elected in a partisan election.

ONLY THREE OF FIVE AT LARGE COUNCILMEN MAY BE FROM SAME PARTY

The conference report includes a feature to help keep a minority party's voice on the council. Only three of the five members at large on the City Council may be from the same party.

HATCH ACT PREVENTS CITY MACHINE

An additional benefit of partisan elections is that city employees will not be able to be coerced to collect money and campaign for city officials in order to keep their jobs or get promotions. The Hatch Act gives them that protection, but would not under nonpartisan elections.

All in all, I feel that partisan elections will work well in Washington, D.C.

#### A CHRISTMAS WITHOUT CHRIST?

#### HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was with a good deal of dismay that I read that the annual Christmas Pageant for Peace on the Ellipse will not include a depiction of the Nativity this year. Zealous separatists have convinced the Federal Court of Appeals that to include Christ in Christmas is an "excessive government entanglement with religion," and that such a display would be offensive to non-Christians.

Frankly, I find the scene's exclusion from the pageant extremely offensive, and obviously so do many East Texans who have written to me in the past weeks expressing their strong disapproval of the action.

I would like to take this opportunity to reprint here a few of the letters I have received from my constituents, as well as the letter which I am sending to Rogers Morton, Secretary of the Department of the Interior, which has ordered the removal of the Nativity scene from the pageant.

NEW CANEY, TEX.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CHARLES WILSON: When I discovered that the Nativity Scene will be removed from the Christmas Pageant for Peace in Washington, I must say I was amazed. Can this be true? Will you let this happen? Will you sit idly by and make no effort to prevent it? The very idea! It is the most absurd of all the absurdities in Washington in this year of absurdities and outrages. What is Christmas about if not the birth of Christ? How can there be a Peace Pageant without the Prince of Peace?

No doubt, you can tell I am very disturbed and concerned over this development; and I urge you as my elected representative to do everything in your power to prevent the removal of the nativity scene from the Pageant. Please let me know what action you plan to take on this matter and notify me if there is anything that I, as an individual, can do to help you in preventing this disaster.

Most sincerely,  
Mrs. CHARLOTTE WRIGHT.

PORTER, TEX.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILSON: The article I have attached was handed to me in church Sunday (it tells about the removal of the Nativity Scene). Needless to say, I was shocked. Can this happen in our nation? If it does I shall lose the faith I have kept through the recent Washington scandals and the impending energy crisis. I have kept faith that we as a nation shall come through, but if we leave Christ out of a celebration built around him, there isn't much hope. How can you have a birthday celebration and leave out the birthday person?

Why not just abolish Christmas? It is bad enough that prayer was abolished from schools and such. It is my belief that a nation without Christ cannot long stand. I urge you as my elected official to prevent the removal of the Nativity Scene from the celebration of the birth of the Prince of Peace. It will be indeed a dark Christmas if this is allowed.

Sincerely,  
Mr. and Mrs. JEROME ASHY.

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON,  
Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you to express, in the strongest possible terms, my displeasure with the removal of the Nativity scene from this year's Christmas Pageant for Peace. I urge you to appeal the decision of the Federal Court of Appeals swiftly, in order to include the display this month.

My constituents in the Second District of Texas have seized upon this action as a final Federal blow to their faith. They are asking me why, in the midst of all the crises we face, we here in Washington should remove from Christmas the very symbol of that holiday, the symbol of peace and brotherhood.

I hope to hear soon that you have initiated action to restore the Nativity scene to the Pageant on the Ellipse.

Sincerely,  
CHARLES WILSON,  
Member of Congress.

TRIBUTE TO HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that I pay tribute today to Thomas M. Pelly, our former distinguished colleague from the State of Washington.

Tom served in the Congress during 20 of the most exciting and eventful years in our history and he helped maintain, in the Congress, a balanced view of where the United States was and where she should be going.

Although I was not privileged to serve on any committees with him, I nevertheless heard frequently of his outstanding contributions to legislation to preserve

the independence of the American merchant marine and to achieve American predominance in the exploration of space.

Those of us who knew him especially remember his forthrightness and integrity in this era when the morality of all politicians is being questioned. Tom Pelly was certainly one of the most honest and dedicated public servants I have ever known.

His wise counsel has been missed by all of us in the 93d Congress who had the pleasure of working with him in the past and we all sincerely mourn his passing.

The Pelly family can be comforted by the knowledge that he served his country well.

ENVIRONMENTAL ZEALOTS WANT  
TO STOP THE WORLD

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the leading newspaper in the Los Angeles area, the Los Angeles Times, carried a very interesting editorial in its December 4, 1973, edition.

The editorial deals with the San Onofre nuclear power generating station, located near the San Clemente residence of the President, which has been providing inexpensive, clean, and reliable electricity to our area for several years now.

Few people realize that our State and local governments will not permit even a relatively clean gas-fired generating plant to be built in our area, even if the gas were available, and it is not.

Because of this, the owners of the San Onofre—Southern California Edison Co. and San Diego Gas & Electric Co.—were forced to plan new nuclear powered facilities at San Onofre in order to fulfill their public obligation to supply electricity to the area. This was more than 4 years ago.

A continuous struggle has been carried on by San Onofre's owners during that more than 4-year period. A mountain of paper was prepared and submitted to local, State, and Federal Government agencies. Literally dozens of proceedings, consuming time, energy, and management and engineering talent, were required to obtain the necessary permits and licenses to satisfy zoning regulations, State utilities commission regulations, various safety regulations, Federal Power Commission regulations, and Atomic Energy Commission regulations. Every agency approved the project, even the Environmental Protection Agency.

The owners had one last hurdle to clear—the California Coastline Commission—which was created long after the San Onofre expansion was planned. Incredibly, the staff of the commission recommended against the project because a small area of bluffs must be leveled and because the marine plankton near the plant might be adversely affected.

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of thing

with which this Congress must come to grips, and soon, if we are to assure an adequate supply of energy in the future. We cannot continue to permit the placing of layer after layer of administrative stumbling blocks in the path of those who have the only capability of providing energy.

The Los Angeles Times recognizes this problem in its editorial of December 4, 1973. This is an excellent statement of the problem, and I want to insert it in the RECORD at this point. I commend the Times for its position.

I was shocked when I learned last night that the California Coastal Commission refused to approve the San Onofre expansion. This simply means less electricity and probable brownouts in our area in the future.

SAN ONOFRE: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE

The state coastline commission will make one of the crucial decisions of its brief life when it votes tomorrow on the controversial proposal to add two more nuclear units to the San Onofre power station. We believe it is important to the state, and indeed important to the continued effectiveness of the commission, that it overrule the recommendation of its staff and approves the expansion.

It is not an easy decision for the commission to make. But we think the commission has to make it. The principal concern everyone has about San Onofre or any other nuclear power plant is safety. The state attorney general, though, advised the commission that safety considerations belong to the federal government alone, as intended by Congress. The Atomic Energy Commission's licensing board, after thorough hearings on the safety question, ruled that the additions to plant can proceed. We discuss the safety question in the following editorial.

The coastline commission staff based its recommendation to deny the expansion on environmental and ecological grounds alone. The staff pointed out that the expansion will destroy some sandstone cliffs and caves, and said the intake and outflow of water used to cool the nuclear reactors "could" create a marine desert in the nearby ocean. The staff recommended moving the new units, at least to the landward side of Interstate 5, and installing a different kind of gas reactor and changing the cooling system to protect marine life.

The staff said it emphatically was not trying to force a "no growth policy," and was working on the assumption that it was possible to have both energy and a pleasing environment, but we believe the staff was taking too narrow a view of both energy and environment when it recommended against expansion.

Even with a reduced rate of growth in the demand for electricity, the demand for electricity continues to grow. Even with new kinds of antipollution devices, conventional oil and gas power plants pollute the air. Once you convince yourself of the relative safety of nuclear plants—and remember the commission cannot consider safety—you have to conclude that nuclear power is the cleanest kind of power generated. If San Onofre is not allowed to grow, the conventional plants will have to grow.

We believe the commission staff has given too much weight to the cliffs and caves, and to the possible but disputed hazard to marine life, and not enough weight to the demonstrated need for power, and for clean power.

It is not as if a power plant were being proposed for this site for the first time. There already is a power plant at San Onofre. In other matters the commission has wisely taken the established use of a piece of the coast into account when deciding whether to grant permits to build. These caves and cliffs are interesting, but they are not unique. Their disappearance would not so



greatly matter. The beach is scarcely used by the public; it is not like putting a new power plant at Malibu, say, or Venice.

The potential damage to the plankton is problematical, in any case, and it is possible to change the water intake system should that prove necessary.

The commission staff argues that since the new units would not be operating anyway until the end of the decade, a delay now would not matter much. But a change of site could easily take two or three years, because of the hearing process and the congressional action required. It seems to us that two or three years is too long for the marginal improvement to be had—if there would be any improvement at all.

Those Californians who, like us, strongly supported the coastline initiative, hoped that the coastline commission could bring the management of the coast into a rational process that would weigh one good against another and come up with a reasonable solution. As we were saying Sunday, we like the way the commission has been going about its work to date. It has been sensitive to the needs of the state.

So we hope the commission continues to show this sensitivity in its vote tomorrow. The commission has approved new construction in harbors, and modifications to a conventional power plant on Terminal Island. It seems to us that the San Onofre expansion is analogous to those actions, not to an attempt to radically invade a stretch of wholly untouched coastline. If Californians should come to think the coastline commission is taking too narrow a view of the needs of the state, the commission would lose much of the support it has won for itself by its intelligent decisions. That broad support is essential for the long-range coastal plan the commission will give the 1976 Legislature.

When the San Diego regional coastline commission, whose decision is being considered by the state commission tomorrow, approved the San Onofre expansion, it attached conditions designed to protect the ocean life, if necessary, and to minimize access to the beach and obstruction of the ocean view from the highway. These are reasonable conditions, which the state coastline commission could well adopt, while approving a nuclear power plant expansion that is clearly in the public interest.

#### THANKSGIVING PARTY

**HON. LESTER L. WOLFF**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 20th year that Mr. Walt Kaner has organized the annual children's Thanksgiving party. When you think of the number of children who have enjoyed this party over the years and the amount of time and work contributed by Walt Kaner, this 20th party represents a truly remarkable achievement. I might add that Mr. Kaner also finds time to write one of the country's most distinguished entertainment columns.

This year's party was held at Antun's Restaurant in Queens Village. The VIP guests were some 750 handicapped and needy children from 25 orphanages, welfare agencies, and hospitals in the New York City area. The guests were treated to toys, comic books, balloons and refreshments and saw a 2-hour show replete with clowns, magicians and cow-

boys. And, of course, Santa Claus appeared with gifts for these youngsters, many of whom are on crutches or in wheelchairs. The party was a bright spot for these children, some of whom have very few bright moments.

If he had only given this year's party for these unfortunate children, I believe Walt Kaner deserves recognition. However, for his 20 years of devoted efforts to bring some happiness to these children, he deserves acclaim of the highest order. He has worked hard to give these children something they will be thankful for; and this, rather than a stomach ache, is in the true spirit of the Thanksgiving holidays.

#### NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD OPPOSES FORD NOMINATION

**HON. BELLA S. ABZUG**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, on November 19 James Larson, president of the National Lawyers Guild, testified before the House Judiciary Committee opposing the nomination of GERALD FORD as Vice President. For the benefit of my colleagues I insert his testimony in the RECORD.

#### STATEMENT OF JAMES LARSON

##### INTRODUCTION

I would like to thank the committee for extending this opportunity to the National Lawyers Guild. We are strongly opposed to the confirmation of Gerald Ford as the next Vice President of the United States.

As I stated in my letter of November 13 to the chairperson of this committee, we are legally certain that the election of 1972 was void. Therefore Richard Nixon has no authority to act pursuant to the 25th amendment. Only the people of this country can choose his successor. This committee has no jurisdiction to act in this matter, except to make clear that the nomination of Gerald Ford should not even be considered by the Congress.

The Lawyers Guild will file a lawsuit within the next four weeks on behalf of thousands of individual voters to declare the re-election of the President invalid. We ask you to join with us in that suit. We believe this action to be consistent with previous petitions of Congresspersons to stop the bombing of Cambodia and to void the termination of Archibald Cox.

##### BACKGROUND OF THE GUILD

Before proceeding to the merits of our case, I would like to describe the National Lawyers Guild briefly. At present our membership consists of approximately 4,000 attorneys, law students, legal workers and jail-house lawyers. The organization was established in 1937 during the Great Depression. At that time the Guild provided legal support for legislation intended to correct the economic injustices which caused the recession.

Since its inception the Guild has been guided by the belief that poor and working people, especially blacks and other national minorities, have consistently been denied access to decent jobs, health care, education, adequate housing and meaningful participation in the political system of this country.

In our support for the rights of working people to form unions, to strike against their employers and to bargain collectively, we and

the people we represented confronted powerful government and private economic interests. We and they continue to do so.

We were also involved in the civil rights struggles of the early 1960's, when other lawyers were reluctant to support the legitimate demands of blacks for equality, and the government dragged its feet. We continue to struggle against racism in its many forms. We represent many of the inmates who were indicted after the Attica prison uprising. We defend Native Americans who were charged at Wounded Knee. We are assisting the United Farmworkers Union.

We have also been active in the movement against the War in Southeast Asia. We have counseled draft resisters, supported GI's and defended civilians singled out by the government for prosecution and harassment. We continue to speak out against the unwarranted and unlawful interference by the government in the internal affairs of other countries, such as Chile and Greece.

Throughout our history we in the Guild have also been the object of attack, both at the hands of government and private interests which hinder the development of poor and working people. We refuse to be intimidated. We will continue our representation of political activists who are subpoenaed by grand juries and harassed because of their beliefs and associations. We will defend students and immigrants from abroad who are fighting here against repressive conditions in their own countries. We will support tenants' struggles against slumlords and welfare recipients who struggle for a better standard of living.

#### THE PEOPLE'S LAWSUIT TO SET ASIDE THE 1972 ELECTION

In the course of our recent activities we have talked with thousands of people who were effectively disenfranchised and defrauded in the re-election of President Nixon. We support their efforts to overcome the influence of large corporations and monied interests which prevent them from controlling their own lives. We condemn the massive effort by this administration to stifle all opposition to its policies. We wish to clarify the unholy alliance between the President and big business which continues to ensure ever greater profits at the expense of working and poor people. We charge that the specific illegal acts by the committee to re-elect the President are directly related to the economic crisis which we face. We know that the confirmation of Gerald Ford will merely perpetuate these evils.

It is now well established that agents of this administration conducted a wide-ranging effort to subvert the free flow of information to the American population during the course of the election campaign. The committee for reelection employed spies to infiltrate the organizations which supported various opposition candidates. The committee authorized the bugging of the Democratic Party Headquarters. Agents of the committee slandered and defamed opponents of the administration. The administration authorized the misuse of government agencies, such as the Internal Revenue Service, to intimidate its so-called enemies. Fund-raisers for the committee extorted illegal campaign contributions from some large corporations. The administration forced the Justice Department to drop anti-trust litigation against ITT in exchange for a \$400,000 contribution. Other big businesses were bribed by the committee to support Nixon with promises of subsequent payoffs.

All of these facts were known to be illegal. Whether or not Nixon himself knew in advance what the committee and its agents were doing is beside the point. The fact is that he is the beneficiary of the conspiracy. No one would seriously claim that any person whose election was secured by payoffs to voters, by falsification of election returns or by padding the rolls of registered voters, should remain in office. In fact other elec-

tions have been set aside for these and similar reasons.

In addition, the administration and the committee attempted to create false issues and distort the campaign by provoking violence at the Republican convention, to tie in with Nixon's law-and-order platform. To this end the government employed paid agents to infiltrate the organization of Vietnam Veterans Against the War, which opposed continued American military intervention in Southeast Asia. When the government provocateurs failed to influence the activities of this important anti-war group, the administration secured false indictments against the organization and pressed the case to trial to further discredit it and derail its influence on the general electorate. Ultimately a jury of the people acquitted all the defendants after less than thirty minutes of deliberation.

As evidence of the widespread conspiracy to secure the re-election of Nixon by illegal means came to light, the administration and the committee attempted to cover up their unlawful activities by concealing the true facts from the American people. Witnesses were bribed. Perjury was encouraged. Executive clemency was promised. Evidence was "misplaced" or destroyed. The activities of the special prosecutor appointed to investigate the Watergate break-in were deliberately hindered by various officials in the administration.

Other unlawful activities have recently come to light. The administration attempted to prevent black and other third world organizations from voicing their legitimate demands and criticizing the President by threatening to cut off federal aid to their programs, if they opposed his re-election. Others were paid substantial sums of tax dollars to support the re-election effort, and give the appearance of minority support for Nixon.

While promising to end the War in Vietnam, the President initiated a conspiracy to prevent people from learning the extent of American military involvement in Southeast Asia and perpetuated the war effort. I refer to the secret bombing of Cambodia, the massive Christmas bombing of Vietnam shortly after the election and the current deployment of 20,000 "civilian" advisors to prop up the tottering and corrupt Thieu regime.

By far the most insidious campaign which the administration waged was the appeal to large corporations for heavy financial contributions in exchange for economic favors and easing restrictions on prices and profits while wages were held down. Richard Nixon accepted \$2 million in campaign contributions from the dairy industry. Subsequently the President ordered restrictions placed on imports of dairy products. The United States Department of Agriculture reversed its decision not to raise federal milk price supports in exchange for a \$422,500 contribution through various dummy fund-raising committees. The direct effect of these acts was to raise prices for consumers of milk and other dairy products. The people did not vote for Nixon to further raise the cost of living.

Nixon accepted contributions totalling \$1 million from pharmaceutical companies and the health care industry. Recently the President paid them back handsomely by permitting a 9 per cent increase in hospital costs which will result in \$5 billion profits. At the same time he has refused to allow the 7.5 per cent increase won by New York hospital workers in direct arm's length bargaining with their employers. Again American workers were victimized by a secret deal between Nixon and big business.

The President has also illegally interfered with the struggles of the United Farm-

workers Union against agribusiness interests. The grower paid substantial amounts of money to the Teamsters Union to employ goons to break the strike of farm workers in California. The Department of Justice declined to prosecute the Teamsters or the growers for these unlawful acts in return for their support of Nixon's re-election campaign.

After the election the U.S. Department of Labor arranged for a meeting between Teamster president Fitzsimmons and agribusiness leaders in which the Teamsters were encouraged to enter into "sweetheart" contracts with the growers upon the expiration of UFW contracts. This relationship between the Teamsters' union leadership and the growers has been condemned by the California Supreme Court. These secret agreements further evidence the disregard of the Nixon administration for the judicial process.

In general the American people were tricked through a series of secret and illegal agreements between the administration and corporate interests to vote for the man who promised them that inflation would end. Nixon's slavish obedience to the interests of big business has led to record profits, substantial exports of staple items and resultant shortages as well as higher prices. The generally deteriorating position of American business in the international economy has been transferred to the backs of workers and poor people as prices rise, plants speed up and workers are laid off. Never before has any candidate for president secured his election by such a blatant appeal to racism, militarism and corporate capitalism, to the direct detriment of the general working population.

The People's Lawsuit will document many additional abuses. It is clear that the election was bought and paid for by certain large corporations and wealthy individuals. The American people will suffer cutbacks in many areas of social legislation essential to the maintenance of a decent standard of living. Nixon's recent veto of the minimum wage bill passed by Congress is another example of his contempt for the people and the other institutions of government. We note that Ray Croc, the owner of the McDonald's chain, contributed \$250,000 to the Nixon campaign. His employees would have been covered by the new law.

We are confident that our legal position is correct, that the election was fraudulent, and that the results are void. We are just as confident that the lawsuit is the only feasible way for the American people to express their opposition to President Nixon and his deliberate manipulation of their concerns. We feel that their participation in selecting a new president is essential.

#### FORD HAS NOT DISSOCIATED HIMSELF FROM THESE ILLEGAL ACTS

Up to this point Representative Ford has indicated that in general he supports the policies of Richard Nixon. Review of his voting record indicates that he has voted the President's position in 81 per cent of the issues considered. Ford is a self-acknowledged conservative. He has no record of having proposed or effected legislation dealing with any of the major questions confronting the nation. He comes from a "safe" district in Michigan, where he has never faced any serious opposition. His ability to deal objectively with the current energy crisis in light of the heavy influence of the automobile industry in his home state further disqualifies him.

It is inconceivable that Gerald Ford after all his years of unquestioning loyalty to President Nixon and the Republican Party will now exhibit the kind of independence,

initiative and creativity which are required by the times. His record on all major outstanding issues—the war in Southeast Asia, the domestic economy, racism and social legislation—is atrocious. It is highly likely that he will continue to follow orders. We have already observed the fate of those who dare to challenge the absolute authority of the "commander-in-chief."

Ford has only reluctantly and indirectly criticized the President for his handling of the Watergate scandal. He confuses the principles applicable to criminal trials with the political question of Nixon's continuation as president of the United States. The presumption of innocence, the inadmissibility of hearsay evidence and the requirement of proof beyond a reasonable doubt are totally inapplicable here. No civilized country in the world would permit its highest leader to remain in office, given the general lack of popular confidence in his administration, his admittedly negligent supervision of aides and assistants, and the corruption which has already been exposed among his confidants and advisors.

#### NIXON'S RECORD OF APPOINTMENTS

Our conclusion that Nixon is without authority to appoint a new vice president is further bolstered by his past record of deliberately choosing cabinet officers, judges and administrative assistants who will blindly follow his orders and disregard the legitimate needs of the people, our system of civil liberties and authoritative orders and rulings of other departments of government.

At the outset this committee must face the spectre of Spiro T. Agnew, the President's original running mate, who now stands convicted of income tax evasion arising out of a long series of petty bribes and influence peddling in his relations with Maryland contractors.

The committee should also recall Nixon's first attempts to influence the direction of the United States Supreme Court by appointing Messrs. Carswell and Haynesworth, both of whom were seriously discredited and disgraced both in terms of legal incompetence and small-time corruption.

Other Nixon appointees currently stand charged with or convicted of various crimes, such as perjury, bribery and political sabotage. It is inconceivable that given Mr. Nixon's record thus far that he should now be permitted to choose a new vice president and his own potential successor.

John Mitchell, the President's close friend, ex-law partner, former Attorney General and campaign manager, is about to stand trial in New York for perjury. His political career has been destroyed as a result of his alleged involvement in the Watergate conspiracy and the subsequent coverup attempt.

Mitchell's successor, Richard Kleindienst, was forced to resign under fire for his participation in the coverup also. He now stands accused of perjury in connection with his testimony regarding the failure of the government to pursue its antitrust case against ITT, a former client of the Mitchell law firm.

Patrick Gray, another Nixon appointee, and temporary director of the FBI, also became embroiled in the Watergate controversy by his admitted destruction of certain incriminating evidence. John Ehrlichman, the President's closest advisor, is under indictment in Los Angeles for his alleged role in the burglary of the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist. His testimony before the Senate Watergate Committee was riddled with contradictions and convenient losses of memory. It was further characterized by the utmost contempt for civil liberties. H. R. Haldeman, the president's third in command, also faces indictment.

The list goes on to include Maurice Stans, the ex-secretary of Commerce, who is ac-



cused of soliciting illegal campaign contributions from Robert Vesco, who is also under indictment, and others totalling \$80 million. Herbert Kalmbach, the President's own lawyer and John Dean, former counsel to the President, also face charges. Egil Krogh, Robert Mardian, Charles Colson, Donald Segretti, Jeb Stuart Magruder and Gordon Strachan are further examples of the kind of men Nixon has surrounded himself with and foisted off on an unsuspecting public. The credentials of each of these men have been advanced in much the same way as Nixon recommends Gerald Ford.

This is not to accuse Mr. Ford of specific improprieties. The purpose of this recitation is to support our claim that Richard Nixon is not fit to pick the second highest officer of the land.

Let's make no mistake here. It is widely rumored that President Nixon's own days are numbered. Many members of Congress and others in high places are openly saying that once Ford is confirmed that Nixon will be forced to resign. In light of this reality it is even more ridiculous for this committee to permit the man to replace himself and further prevent the people of the United States from exercising their own choice in the matter. There is no doubt that if Mr. Ford were the candidate of the Republican Party in a general election, he would be soundly defeated. Recent local elections around the country show that the entire party has suffered as a result of Nixon's crimes.

This committee, which must also consider whether or not the President should be impeached, is caught in a dilemma of parliamentary procedure and a clear conflict of interest. An opportunistic move to recommend confirmation of Ford as a prelude to impeachment proceedings again defrauds the right of the American people to choose its leaders.

We do not propose any specific remedy for this situation. We have serious doubts with respect to the resolve of Congress or the Courts to apply any innovative thinking to the problem. The legislative and judicial branches of the federal government have been consistently slow to act and unwilling to turn Nixon out of office. We support the good will of this committee insofar as it will now move to impeach the President, force his resignation, or otherwise invalidate the election of 1972 and prevent the confirmation of Ford. We urge you to set aside whatever concerns you may have for your own political careers and break out of the lethargy and clinging hope for the President's survival which follows each of his current ploys to sweep aside the wrongs he has committed. Any failure on your part to act decisively can only serve to deepen the mistrust of the American people for its elected leaders and representatives.

We strongly feel that the People's Lawsuit offers you as well as the poor and working people of this country an opportunity to act. We challenge you to involve the people in your activities. We are speaking of the people who are currently on welfare, who can't find jobs or those who are unemployed for the first time because of cutbacks in the domestic economy and illegally impounded federal funds. We are talking about workers whose real wages are declining as prices and profits steadily rise. We refer to the parents and wives of men who were killed or wounded in Vietnam. We mean people whose level of cynicism about corruption in government has steadily risen during the last five years, people whose tolerance of favoritism, inside deals and manipulation of their lives has been pushed to the breaking point.

## CONCLUSION

There are those who would justify the quick confirmation of Ford because failure to do so will diminish Nixon's ability to solve the domestic economic crisis and weaken his hand in dealing with other nations. These people, including the President himself, insist that we must get Watergate behind us and proceed with the business at hand.

I would like to remind the committee that the crisis is already present, and the confirmation of Ford will not affect it. Nixon's policies would only affect those same large business interests, the multi-national corporations, in whose exclusive interest the current administration has been operating already. We are talking about democratic rule in America.

In the field of foreign affairs the Soviet Union has already expressed a lack of confidence in Nixon's ability to govern. Confirmation of Gerald Ford will not help that situation. The bulk of United States foreign policy consists of unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of other countries, particularly in Latin America and Southeast Asia. Gerald Ford supports this policy. It is time that we reverse this trend. Current foreign policy is not in the interest of working people here. The people who oppose Nixon know this.

The fact that a substantial number of people reacted with disbelief to Nixon's saber-rattling worldwide alert in response to the Middle East situation and accused him of creating an international incident to divert attention from his own crisis of leadership is sobering indeed. Appointment of Ford will not alleviate this distrust.

We should examine the positive aspects of the people's renewed interest in national politics. Setting aside the election and turning Nixon out of office will ultimately restore some of the people's faith in their ability to control their own lives and the decisions which affect them. A new basis for popular unity is created whereby the serious problems which we confront can be attacked in new and hopefully more successful ways.

Throughout our history the American people have always had to fight for their rights beginning with the struggle against colonialism. We have fought against slavery and child labor. We have won these battles and the right to organize labor unions. We are continuing the struggle for equal rights for all national minorities and women and for an end to the American involvement in Vietnam. Repeatedly the very forces which Nixon represents at this point in history have opposed the expansion of the rights of the common and working people all over the world.

You members of the committee must see your responsibility in this light. If you vote for the confirmation of Ford, you will avoid the challenge which the people have issued. You will side with corporate profits and against the people.

Current opinion polls indicate that upwards of 80 per cent of the American people have lost faith in the ability of Richard Nixon to govern this country. The people know that the interests of ITT, of the large dairy combines, of Standard Oil, General Motors and numerous other corporations are not the same as theirs.

Big business insists that what is good for it is good for the people. This is obviously not the case. Unless you open your eyes and ears to this reality, you too will continue to suffer the people's loss of faith. The American people will be forced to organize themselves, independent of your representation and leadership, and the National Lawyers Guild will be there to support them in their efforts to establish a government which is

concerned with their needs and serves their interests.

## HARD FACTS ON THE OIL SHORTAGE

## HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, in all of the conflicting reports and confusion that surrounds the public discussion of the energy crisis, the public and the Congress are desperately in need of guidance as to some of the basic facts. Some of the best factgathering has been performed by two reporters of Knight Newspapers, Mr. Donald L. Barlett and Mr. James B. Steele. In their latest special report, printed in the Akron Beacon Journal for Sunday, December 2, they point out that neither the Congress nor the Nixon administration has yet come to grips with two underlying problems that brought on the present shortage. These problems are:

First. A serious lack of refinery capacity. Only one major refinery has been built in the United States since the late 1960's and plans for construction of additional refineries have been shelved or postponed.

Second. A leveling off in production of crude oil in the United States and a decline in exploration activities, despite the existence of huge oilfields.

Another disturbing fact developed by these reporters is that all of the statistics relied upon by the Government—and many of the essential statistics are not even available—are derived from the oil industry itself. There is no Government agency that verifies data furnished by the oil industry, or collects information independently.

Another disturbing set of facts presented by these reporters is that while families are being asked to cut back fuel oil consumption by 15 percent and commercial users by 25 percent, a proposed gasoline allocation program calls for only a 10 percent reduction.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I seriously question whether placing the control of the new energy program under an oil industry-oriented investment banker, assisted by a bureaucracy composed of executives recruited from the industry, is going to solve the energy crisis in a way that gives priority to the interests of the consumer.

It seems to me that it is time the Congress demanded some answers to these questions.

The Akron Beacon Journal article follows:

UNITED STATES IGNORING REAL CAUSE OF OIL SHORTAGE

(By Donald L. Barlett and James B. Steele)

Despite an outpouring of proposed legislation and presidential proclamations on the energy crisis, neither Congress nor the Nixon administration has come to grips with the two underlying problems which brought on the present oil shortage.

They are:

A serious lack of refinery capacity. With demand for petroleum products running about 17 million barrels a day, refineries in the United States can process fewer than 13 million barrels.

A leveling off in production of crude oil in the United States and a decline in exploration activities. This despite the existence of huge oilfields to be tapped, largely in offshore areas, Alaska and the Arctic.

Only one major refinery has been built in the United States since the late 1960s and plans for construction of additional refineries—announced just several months ago by several companies—have been shelved or construction dates pushed back.

Yet while the largest oil companies are suspending expansion projects in the United States because of alleged uncertainties in the world market, a New York independent is forging ahead with a three-quarter billion dollar refinery-building program in Canada.

The man is John M. Shaheen, onetime publicity director for the Illinois Republican Party who heads Shaheen Natural Resources Co.

Seven weeks ago, a new Shaheen refinery was dedicated in Newfoundland. Two weeks ago, Shaheen signed contracts for construction of a second refinery in Nova Scotia, and site clearance has begun for a third refinery in Newfoundland.

The three refineries have a planned total capacity of 600,000 barrels a day. When the second and third are completed, Shaheen will have built more refineries in Canada than all major American oil companies combined have built in the United States in five years.

Interestingly, during his negotiations with Canadian politicians in the 1960s—negotiations which ultimately led to the refinery construction projects—Shaheen was represented by a Wall Street lawyer he described as a personal friend and "the greatest strategic lawyer I have ever known."

The lawyer was Richard M. Nixon.

While the Federal government has failed to tackle the issue of lagging refinery construction in this country, an investigation has turned up some curious patterns in the Nixon administration's approach to dealing with the energy crunch.

A mandatory fuel allocation program, to take effect Dec. 27, will come down hardest on those who use a small percentage of petroleum products consumed daily—families who heat their homes with oil.

Statistics maintained by the Bureau of Mines show that during four of the first eight months of this year—the latest period for which figures are available—the nation's oil companies produced a smaller percentage of distillate fuel oil (which include home heating oil) than during the same months in the preceding four years.

Statistics published by the American Petroleum Institute, the oil industry trade organization, show that a pattern of reduced refinery production continued well into the Fall despite signs of an impending shortage.

While families must cut back fuel oil consumption by 15 pct. and commercial users by 25 pct., a proposed gasoline allocation program calls for only a 10 pct. reduction below 1972 demand.

There is some reason to be suspicious of the oil shortage statistics floating out of Washington. That is not to suggest there is no shortage, but there is some question as to whether the administration has overstated the shortage.

There is but one certainty: Each and every figure is derived from the American oil industry.

And therein rests another disturbing aspect of the current crisis. There is no government agency that verifies data furnished by

the oil industry, or collects information independently.

The significance of the government's failure to collect oil industry data was spelled out in a series of articles by the Philadelphia Inquirer, "Oil—The Created Crisis."

The series appeared in the Beacon Journal two weeks ago.

Based on a nationwide investigation and the assembling of a wide range of statistical material from a variety of sources, the Inquirer established that the energy shortage was brought on by long-term policy decisions made by the oil companies and blunders by the Nixon administration.

In a report last month, a Congressional committee published essentially the same findings documented by the Inquirer.

These findings contradict claims by both the oil industry and the Nixon administration that an energy-guzzling American public is to blame for the shortage.

The Inquirer survey also found that the percentage growth in energy consumption in Europe and Asia has far outstripped that in the United States over the last two decades.

To meet that demand, the five major American oil companies began concentrating operations overseas, drilling and producing oil abroad, constructing refineries around the world.

As a result, the United States is just another market—and not necessarily the largest—for Exxon Corp., Mobil Oil, Texaco, Gulf and Standard of California.

Last year, for every barrel (42 gallons) of oil those sold in the United States, they sold nearly two barrels in other countries.

While there was abundant evidence last Summer that there would be fuel oil problems this Winter, refineries produced record volumes of gasoline at the expense of fuel oil.

Last June, on the eve of what was billed as the great fuel shortage of 1973, gasoline represented 48.4 pct. of the total products being turned out by refineries. This compared to 45.8 pct. a year earlier.

[In thousands of barrels a day]

Jet fuel.....	6.4%	1,045
Fuel oil for generating electricity.....	7.3%	1,189
Heating oil for homes.....	7.6%	1,248
Fuel oil for other industrial and business use.....	8.2%	1,340
Heating oil for other business and commercial use.....	10.3%	1,689
All other uses (including liquid propane, petrochemicals, asphalt, lubricant).....	21.2%	3,467
Automobile gasoline.....	39.0%	6,376
	100.0%	16,354

SOURCE.—U.S. Bureau of Mines.

The above table provides a breakdown of petroleum product sales in the United States last year. For example, demand for automobile gasoline amounted to 6,376,000 barrels a day—or 39 pct. of the total daily oil demand of 16,354,000 barrels. Home heating oil (No. 2 oil) on the other hand, accounted for just 7.6 pct. of demand, or 1,248,000 barrels a day.

The record production prompted the Wall Street Journal to observe that:

"Refiners are demonstrating that, barring breakdowns or an interruption in the flow of crude, they can handle the demand."

"Because they can sell every drop they make, few refiners are likely to be in any hurry to begin reducing production."

And that is what happened. With gasoline selling at a more profitable level, refiners continued turning out gasoline rather than heating oils.

While all of this gasoline was being produced last Summer, Federal officials were

sitting by, hoping for warm weather this Winter and insisting that a mandatory fuel allocation program was unnecessary.

In September, former Colorado Governor John A. Love, the White House energy chief, noted that "The situation for this Winter is very tight, although it is difficult to forecast because of the variables."

During the same month, President Nixon discounted any talk of an energy crisis. Said the President: "We have heard a lot about a crisis. I do not use that term because we do not face a crisis in that sense of the word."

"I would simply say that in the short term we face a problem with regard to energy, heating for example, this Winter, just as we thought we faced a problem of gasoline this Summer, and the possibility of brownouts."

Meanwhile, Love was assuring New England politicians that there would be adequate supplies of fuel oil for the coming Winter, as long as the weather didn't turn especially cold.

In August, Love suggested that it might be a good idea if refiners increased their output of heating oils—a proposal largely ignored—and in the weeks that followed he continued to insist that a mandatory allocation program was not needed, a position the administration adopted early in the year. Said Love:

"(The administration is) extremely wary of the ramifications and potential risks of a mandatory petroleum allocation system and (did) not believe that the current supply situation or other industry problems warrant use of such a system as a remedy at this time."

The administration was still clinging to this position in October, when Stephen A. Wakefield, an assistant Department of the Interior secretary, predicted there would be heating oil shortages with some resultant hardships.

Explaining what he considered a hardship to be, Wakefield said:

"I am talking about men without jobs, homes without heat, children without schools. That is what I mean by hardship."

More weeks went by until finally last Sunday President Nixon reversed positions and announced his mandatory allocation program, a Washington term for rationing.

To show that the industry is beginning to catch up on the refinery construction lag, the Office of Oil and Gas of the Interior Department has compiled an impressive chart showing the location of proposed refineries and the dates they will be completed.

It lists 18 new refineries with a capacity of 2,440,000 barrels a day, as well as refinery expansion programs.

There is a footnote which cautions that 10 of the 18 (capacity 1,330,000 barrels) are "projects which are uncertain or in very early stages of planning."

How did the Office of Oil and Gas come by these statistics?

"This is information we picked up from various sources," said an Interior Department official, "from trade journals (of the oil industry) and from some of the companies themselves."

How is construction going with some of the eight refineries slated to be in operation between 1974 and 1977, like the Shell Oil refinery (150,000 barrels) at Paulsboro, N.J., and the Pennzoil's refinery (150,000 barrels) at Pascagoula, Miss.?

Says a Shell public relations official of the date Shell's refinery will be completed (the Interior Department says 1977):

"I wish I could tell you. We're still trying to get permits. There's no definite time for completion." He said that it will take about four years to build the refinery so even a 1978 or 1979 completion date is "optimistic."

"We have no permits," he added, "and the



environmental impact statement hasn't even come through yet."

Says a Pennzoil official of his company's refinery the Interior Department says will be completed in 1976 at Pascagoula:

"About a year (ago) we had obtained option on land as a possible site. But we have looked at land in Louisiana as well as land in Mississippi and frankly have not made up our minds as what the best location would be."

And that's the way it goes with government statistics on the oil industry. But the situation is not new.

A congressional investigating committee once urged that a government agency should be empowered to collect data "so that any time the exact condition of the industry can be ascertained." That was back in 1923.

It was followed by a recommendation last June 4 by Sen. Henry Jackson (D-Wash.), who told his colleagues that Congress needed to have "objective facts" on the oil industry.

"I hope we will have something introduced shortly, probably giving this authority to collect data to the General Accounting Office, to marshal all the facts and the information so that we can get it on the basis of sound data, objective facts," said Jackson.

Now, with many essential statistics lacking, the Federal government, or more particularly the Office of Petroleum Allocation (OPA), is getting ready to administer a fuel oil allocation program.

Last week the OPA staff was just getting settled into its new office in the Winder Building in Washington, the former headquarters of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

It was from this building in the Fall of 1972 that OEP conducted a survey of the nation's energy needs and announced there would be no fuel oil problems and that the oil industry was capable of meeting demand.

#### "DEATH BY HANDGUN: THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL"—NO. 53

### HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, In my series in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I have given many examples of the ease with which harm can be done with handguns. Every day for several months, there has been another grisly story of "Murder by Handgun." Handguns are not, however, dangerous simply because of dangerous men; they can kill in the most innocent of situations, as shown by this article from the December 5 Washington Star-News.

For every day that goes by without adequate handgun control laws, for every murder and every accidental death, we in Congress must take the responsibility. This is a continuing tragedy that can only be solved by congressional action, and is only allowed by the lack of that action. I urge my colleagues to pass the laws necessary to prevent these tragedies in the future.

The following is the text of the article.

#### FATAL SHOT

A 16-year-old Rockville youth was fatally wounded yesterday when the .22-caliber pistol an older brother was loading and unloading at a Germantown construction site discharged and he was struck, police reported. Toll: Kim Roy Dolan of 615 Edmonston Drive, Rockville, was killed by the shot shortly after 1 p.m. He and his brother, Joseph, police

said, had been target shooting. Police said the dead youth's father, John, and an uncle were present when the accident occurred.

#### STRAUSS DEVISES A BETTER WAY

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Eagle of Bryan, Tex., on Wednesday, November 28, 1973, carried an article on Robert S. Strauss, the Democratic national chairman. The editorial points out that Mr. Strauss is making efforts to improve our party and that he is having success. More important than this is the last sentence in the Eagle editorial, "A change certainly should be made, and by both parties."

I recommend the editorial to you, Members of this Congress and the general public.

The editorial follows:

#### STRAUSS DEVISES A BETTER WAY

Robert S. Strauss, Democratic national chairman, has managed to glue the parts of his party back together again. Whether the patch will hold, only time will tell. But Strauss has achieved a compromise between reformers and old-liners on rules for delegate selection, one which keeps intact the best features of 1972's rules, without the divisive quotas.

Now Strauss is turning his attention to other matter—the way in which the party selects its vice presidential candidates. Goodness knows the Democrats were made painfully aware of deficiencies in the present system by the Eagleton affair. So the time for a change couldn't be better.

What Strauss proposes to do is to allow more time, at least, for the selection of the No. 2 man on the ticket. He suggests three ways to do this: A screening committee to review potential candidates in advance of the convention, shuffling of convention events to provide more time between the nomination of a presidential candidate and his running-mate, or handing the task over to the national committee after the convention has adjourned.

While any of these would be an improvement on the present hurry-up system, all have their deficiencies. For instance, how many good vice presidential prospects who also entertain hopes for the top spot would go through the screening process? And would the addition of a convention day really provide the time necessary to do a better job? As for the third choice, should the national committee be given the power to select a man who might become the nation's president?

Of the three, however, the last has most to recommend it. The reason is time; perhaps a 30-day delay or at least two weeks could be arranged. That would provide ample opportunity to search out skeletons in prospective nominee's background and as a practical matter, the selection would be no more "undemocratic" than the present full-convention method. Presidential candidates get their choice of a running mate; there may be some opposition (as in the case of Agnew in 1968) but it simply cannot be effective. So what does it matter in practical terms whether the presidential nominee's choice is ratified by a convention or by the national committee?

At any rate, the Democratic party panel considering the question is to deliver a report by the end of the year. A change certainly should be made, and by both parties.

#### COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS ENDORSES FORMATION OF STRONG FEDERAL CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, many of us who are interested in the welfare of the American consumer have long supported the creation of a Federal Consumer Protection Agency which would represent the interests of the consumer before all Federal departments and agencies. For too long the consumer has been without an effective voice when government decisions affecting him are made.

The Council of State Governments agrees, for at its recent meeting in Washington, D.C., its Eastern Regional Conference Committee on Consumer Protection endorsed the passage of legislation to create a strong Federal Consumer Protection Agency.

In a cover letter accompanying a copy of the resolution, it was stated that "the establishment of a viable, effective Federal agency to represent consumers is regarded by our committee membership as one of the most urgent priorities facing the Congress."

While Congress has been preoccupied lately with the energy crisis and other concerns, it does not follow that legislation to form a Consumer Protection Agency should be delayed. On the contrary, such an agency is needed now more urgently than ever to represent the consumer in the vital decisions that will be made to solve the energy crisis and related problems.

I enter into the RECORD the resolution of the Council of State Governments endorsing formation of a Consumer Protection Agency:

#### RESOLUTION OF THE EASTERN REGIONAL COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PROTECTION OF THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY

As the elected and appointed officials of various state governments most directly concerned with the protection of the American consumer, we make the following Findings and Declarations:

Whereas decisions made by federal agencies and courts have enormous impact on the health, safety and economic well-being of consumers, and

Whereas American consumers would benefit from increased representation and protection at all levels of government, and

Whereas it is an essential function of government to protect the buying public from marketplace abuses and to represent their interests whenever vital consumer decisions are made, and

Whereas improved consumer protection and representation at the federal level may have a direct and substantial bearing on the quality of consumer protection at the state and local levels of government, now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Eastern Regional Committee on Consumer Protection of the Council of State Governments does hereby urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation at the earliest possible moment to establish an independent Consumer Protection Agency with power to represent con-

sumers; to seek judicial review of federal decisions that are not in the consumer interest; to investigate marketplace abuses; to gather and disseminate consumer information to the public; and to make its expertise and services available to state and local governments when requested to do so by appropriate state and local officials, in conjunction with the established consumer protection agency, bureau or division of the State.

It is also resolved that a duly certified copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the House and Senate Government Operations Committees and the House and Senate leadership of both political parties.

## BUDGET CONTROL

### HON. IKE F. ANDREWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 1973

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it was most encouraging on Tuesday and Wednesday to be present on the House floor and see colleague after colleague rise in support of the Budget and Impoundment Control Act, H.R. 7130.

This bill is, as so many of them said, a constructive and much-needed step.

It shows that those of us in Congress recognize our responsibilities as well as our rights.

It provides the mechanism for Congress to regain its authority over our Nation's fiscal process and to take responsible steps to bring into focus the relationship of taxing and spending measures.

It evidences a considerable amount of careful study and hard work on the part of many Members, and I especially congratulate my distinguished colleagues, RICHARD BOLLING, AL ULLMAN, and JAMIE L. WHITTEN, for the leadership they provided.

At this point, I would like to insert into

the RECORD a portion of the news story, "Hill Passes Budget Reform," from today's Washington Post.

#### HILL PASSES BUDGET REFORM

(By Mary Russell)

The House yesterday passed, by a vote of 386 to 23, a bill that would significantly reform the process of handling the multi-billion dollar budget and provide for congressional review of presidential impoundments of funds.

Leaders on both sides of the aisle hailed the bill as a long overdue means for Congress to regain the purse power it has given up to the executive branch over the years.

Rep. John Anderson (R-Ill.) said, "I think that, along with the war powers resolution which we enacted earlier this year, this will prove to be one of the most monumental reassertions of congressional prerogatives in this century."

Rep. Richard Bolling (D-Mo.), chief architect of the bill, said it "gives Congress the capability to decide budget totals and priorities." Bolling and the Rules Committee took over responsibility for the bill after an earlier proposal by a special House-Senate committee ran into stiff opposition as being too rigid, and foreclosing opportunities for changing budget totals.

The Senate is expected to act on its version early next year.

The bill would require Congress to set an overall spending ceiling with sub-ceiling targets in program categories.

It would revise the timetable for the authorization and appropriations process, setting an April 1 date for Congress to complete action on authorizations and an Aug. 1 date for appropriations bills to be cleared.

A first concurrent resolution setting the overall spending ceiling and sub-ceiling targets would have to be passed by May 1. Proponents of the bill hope the resolution would engender a debate on national priorities and force Congress to make major policy choices on spending.

The start of the fiscal year would be changed from July 1 to Oct. 1. Congress would adopt a final concurrent budget resolution by Sept. 15 reaffirming the original ceilings, revising them upward, or directing the Appropriations Committee to make cuts in appropriations to bring them in line with

the ceilings. If the ceilings were increased, the Ways and Means Committee could be asked to report out a tax increase or other revenue raiser. Congress could not adjourn without passing the final budget resolution.

New budget committees would be created in House and Senate. The House Budget Committee would consist of 23 members, five from Appropriations, five from Ways and Means, 11 from other committees and one each appointed by the majority and minority leaders.

The power of the Appropriations Committee would also be strengthened by giving it control of all new back-door spending, such as contract authority, loan authority and mandatory spending. Present back-door spending measures, such as revenue sharing, would come under its control starting in October, 1978.

Under the impoundment section of the bill, the President would have to notify Congress 10 days after each impoundment has been made. If either chamber passed within 60 days a resolution disapproving the impoundment it would have to stop.

I was pleased to join the overwhelming majority of my colleagues in voting for this bill and look forward to its early enactment and implementation.

At the same time, I would like to express the hope that the House-Senate conferees will improve this legislation by adding the two Bennett amendments, one calling for evaluation and pilot testing of programs and the other for limiting the period of authorization of new budget authority to 3 fiscal years.

And, now that we have voted on this bill, I urge that we turn our attention to other pressing matters—the need to retire the national debt, the need to reorder priorities and control Federal spending, the need to balance our budget so that income always exceeds outgo, the need to bring interest rates back to normal, among others.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's economy is in disarray, and I urge that the Congress provide the leadership our country expects of us to enact the legislation necessary to restore the order we need.