

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, April 20, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., pastor emeritus of St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton Manor, Md., and an honorary professor of the University of Santo Domingo, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, Author of life and of love, let the light of Thy countenance shine brightly upon the Speaker of this House and upon all the Members of the U.S. Congress.

Grant a special blessing, we beseech Thee, upon the President of the United States of America and upon all those who counsel him.

May coworkers in the Western Hemisphere, the chief executives, lawmakers, and judges of the American Republics and Canada be also inspired, enlightened, and strengthened by divine grace.

Vouchsafe, dear Saviour, that a renewal of brotherly love and generous cooperation may produce better homes, schools, food, and raiment for the farmers, miners, factory workers, owners, managers, and other personnel in industry, enabling them to improve standards of conduct and living everywhere.

As we share in this 28th commemoration of Pan American Day in the Congress, we implore Almighty God to refresh our souls and to rekindle our enthusiasm for the cause of inter-American friendship in an era of change and progress.

We pray humbly and fervently for these favors, spiritual and material, in the name of the Christ of the Andes. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

### PAN AMERICAN DAY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 338, this day has been designated as Pan American Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN).

### COMMEMORATING THE PAN AMERICAN DAY

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 387) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 387

Whereas April 14, 1971, marked the eighty-first anniversary of the Union of American Republics, now known as the Organization of American States;

Whereas the continued hemispheric soli-

arity is essential to the cause of progress and freedom for all citizens of this hemisphere; and

Whereas in unity there is real promise of accelerated progress in social and political reform and economic growth in the countries of our home hemisphere: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That in honor of the founding of the Pan American Union, the House of Representatives of the United States of America extends greetings to the other Republics of the Western Hemisphere and to all citizens of those Republics, with the fervent hope that new thresholds of good will, stability, and prosperity are being crossed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut for 1 hour.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise in support of this important resolution, and I regret that I have this opportunity because of the indisposition of our dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL), who is presently in the hospital in Florida because of complications resulting from the arm that he broke some time ago. The latest information I have is that he is doing reasonably well and goes home today. I know that I express the sentiments of all of us when I say that I hope that he will be back with us very shortly. Certainly all of us are indebted to him for the leadership which he has given to the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the extensive hearings which he has held and those which he projects on the clarification of our policy in Latin America.

Mr. Speaker, before making my own statement, I should also like to say a word of welcome to the distinguished cleric who acted as Chaplain this morning, Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, the "Padre de los Americas" who for 28 years—ever since the initiation of Pan-American Day—has offered the opening prayer on this occasion. This is typical of the devotion Father Thorning has shown to the cause of inter-American solidarity. It is through the continuous work of people such as Father Thorning that we hope to improve this cooperation and solidarity and make meaningful the work of the organization whose founding we celebrate today.

Mr. Speaker, today we mark the 81st anniversary of the founding of the Union of American Republics, which now, of course, is known as the Organization of American States. In effect, what we celebrate today is our confidence in the collective action of the governments of the Western Hemisphere to solve problems of mutual concern and to foster peaceful cooperation. There is no greater symbol of this collective purpose than the Organization of American States, one of the world's oldest and most suc-

cessful international organizations. Eighty-one years ago this organization was founded in Washington, and the fact that it continues to function effectively today attests, I think, to the importance of the basic concept behind it, that is the achievement of orderly and meaningful change, as our Chaplain said today, through political, economic, and social cooperation.

This celebration means that we reaffirm our goal of solidarity with our brethren south of the Rio Grande. We reaffirm our dedication to the objective of cooperation with the nations of Latin America in achieving our common purpose, which is the improving of economies, the raising of standards, and the bettering of the quality of life for the people of all the countries in the hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a visit to Latin America, where I had the privilege of attending the meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union at Caracas in Venezuela. I certainly would not be candid if I did not say that the relations of the United States with other countries of the hemisphere are in a difficult phase at the present time. We find differences in determining what our trade policy should be. We find differences about the degree of our economic penetration of these countries. We find conflicts between our culture and the cultures of other countries of Latin America. We find differences about the scope of the social system, and even what the proper system should be for achieving economic progress.

I must say that I find a certain air of unreality on both sides in appraising our problems. On our side I believe there is a lack of awareness of the legitimate national ambitions of these countries and a lack of understanding of the intensity of their desire for independence and for the unfettered pursuit of their national goals in an individualistic way. I find too a failure on the part of our own representatives in this area adequately to interpret to the Latin Americans our policies and the trend of our thought on problems that exist between us, and an inclination to tell these people what they want to know rather than what actually may be the current state of opinion in the Congress and in the country.

On the other side, I think that there is an excessive expectation of what the United States can or should do. There is a tendency on their part to consider their individual problem as being all important without realizing that the United States must view the desires and needs of other countries in the frame of our global commitments and the limitations of our own capacities, great though they may be.

The fact is that the times call for a well-considered and active policy on the part of the United States in this area, and a public statement on the part of the administration. The momentum of

the good neighbor policy and the Alliance for Progress has slowed, and we cannot rest content with the achievements or the rhetoric of the past. We must review all our policies—trade, defense, assistance—to make them responsive to today's needs and desires.

While proud of a more enlightened attitude of U.S. business, we must continue to stress our interest in the hemisphere, our understanding of the diversity of these countries, the variety of their cultures, traditions, and social systems.

There are certain things that we can do, I believe. We can make a concerted effort to improve communications and understanding between us. We have given lip service to this goal, but we have given inadequate performance.

We have had cultural exchange programs and shared visits with Iron Curtain countries. Should we not make a comparable effort in time and money with those Latin American countries which are so important to us?

We can improve our Voice of America programs to interpret adequately our cultural, social, and economic achievements and goals, which have so often been grievously misrepresented to them.

I remember gratefully the touching conversation last week of a Venezuelan cab driver who told me how much he admired the United States, our democratic system, and our pursuit of equality for all. There is a great reservoir of good will among the people of these nations and we should foster it diligently and not permit it to be dissipated.

Finally, our Government, and particularly our communications media, should accord to Latin American problems and developments the priority of coverage which they deserve. The Latin Americans complain with justification that East Pakistan or South Africa or Rumania receives more notice in our newspapers or on our television than Venezuela, Columbia, or Argentina.

It is fashionable now to talk of the need to define our priorities. And I suggest that it is essential that we reorder our schedule of priorities with relation to Latin America, to interpret ourselves to them, to make clear our objectives and policies, and to emphasize to them that their progress and difficulties and their orderly development are matters of primary concern to the United States.

These objectives have been the goals of the Organization of American States. Under men like Secretary Galo Plaza, the Organization, together with the Inter-American Development Bank, has striven to make them a reality. But we cannot be satisfied with the accomplishments of the past. Today's movement is too fast and too broad in scope.

Above all, the people of the United States must be educated as to the new needs and new opportunities and their implications for all of us.

Today's anniversary provides an occasion to recognize these critical considerations and furnishes an opportunity as a nation to direct our energies toward furthering these purposes with the knowl-

edge that bitterness and decay and insecurity may be our lot if we fail to act.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate Pan-American Day. This is a day set aside to mark the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union, one of the world's oldest and greatest international organizations. It is a day for paying tribute to the political and cultural ties joining the peoples of the United States, Latin America, and the Caribbean; a day of rededication to the principles of the Organization of American States and the Charter of Punta del Este; and a day for reflecting on the relationships between our two great continents.

The founding of the Pan American Union 81 years ago first gave formal structure to the steadily growing fabric of relationships which have bound the Americas since the days when we shared a common struggle against colonial rule. From the modest beginnings of 1890 have come a host of organizations, public and private, joining the peoples and governments of the Americas through the inter-American system in a common effort to better the lives of millions from Alaska to Cape Horn.

What is the inter-American system today? It is, of course, the Pan American Union, the Organization of American States, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Inter-American Defense Board. It is a common heritage and a dream of a better future based on a common set of principles, but most of all it is people. It is people, in and out of government, whose labor and devotion give life to the inter-American system and substance to all our dreams for a better hemisphere.

So, on this occasion, I wish to extend our best wishes to those tens of thousands of men and women who really are the inter-American system, and especially to the Honorable Don Galo Plaza, the distinguished and very able Secretary General of the Organization of American States.

Mr. Speaker, on Pan-American Day it is especially appropriate that we reflect briefly on the nature of our relationship with Latin America: where we are, where we have been, and where we are trying to go.

Latin America is in a period of great transition. So also are our relationships with the other nations of our hemisphere. Daily our papers tell us of new turmoil in one part or another of Latin America: a change of government, a political kidnaping, or pathetically, a story of a starving mob invading a city. And almost daily, we hear of a new crisis or a new turn in U.S. relations with one or more of our neighbors to the South.

What does all this mean? What does it portend for the United States—and our hemisphere?

The answer is not at all clear. It will depend a great deal on what we do, and especially on what the Latin Americans themselves do, in the next few years to steer into constructive channels the changes that are sweeping both Americas, North and South.

What is clear is that the static Latin America of rural land-owning elites supporting and being supported by Church and State is no more. It has been replaced by a new social, political, and economic environment where the best of 20th century art and industry coexists side by side with unbearable poverty and human misery.

Despite vast resources, Latin America today remains largely undeveloped and backward. Only an estimated 40 percent of her population shares in any meaningful way in the economic and social life of the area. The average per capita income of the remaining 60 percent is a meager \$110 per year.

The problems of Latin America have been compounded by a rush to the cities which seemingly is without parallel in the rest of the world. Fully 50 percent of Latin Americans now live in urban centers—many of them in the rings of slums which surround the old central districts of the major cities of the South American continent. This is twice the percentage of people living in urban areas for the developing nations as a whole. And, by the end of the century, it is estimated that 80 percent of the people of Latin America will live in urban areas.

We in the U.S. Congress should be familiar with what this means for we have struggled for years now with the effects of a much slower process of urbanization in considering welfare reform, tax sharing, and the host of problems confronting our cities.

The rapid process of urbanization has contributed to another of Latin America's most urgent problems—the extraordinarily high level of unemployment. That level has now reached about 11 percent. In addition, however, underemployment affects some 40 percent of the remaining labor force. Combined, these figures are comparable to an unemployment rate of 27 percent. When unemployment in the United States passed the 10 percent mark, we had the Great Depression.

Ten years ago, in response to the call of President John F. Kennedy, the nations of our hemisphere joined in a massive effort to remedy those conditions, and to bring the promise of a better life within the reach of the masses of Latin America. To date, the Alliance for Progress has not achieved that goal. It has, of course, provided tremendous impetus to the processes of change taking place in the hemisphere. It has changed the attitudes of individual leaders and of governments. It has created many new institutions: cooperatives, savings and loan associations, development banks, and other instruments of development. It has helped to provide thousands of Latin Americans with training and experience in many fields of human endeavor. And, by accomplishing those things, it has laid down the base for future progress.

The achievements of the Alliance for Progress fall short, however, of the goals of social, political, and economic transformations envisioned in the Charter of Punta del Este. The dramatic changes

outlined in that document continue to belong to the future. In some respects, therefore, the Alliance has not fulfilled the expectations of its founders.

That is regrettable. And yet, if we are to be realistic, could it have been otherwise? In 10 years, could the Alliance have revolutionized the social, political, and economic structures of countries whose cultures have been formed over a period of centuries? Could it have changed the attitudes of millions of peoples, provided them with new motivations, equipped them with new levels of education and training?

I, for one, feel that all of those changes could not have been accomplished in 10 years. I do not wonder, therefore, that many of the Alliance's goals have not been attained. And, I am encouraged by the progress made during the past decade.

For Latin America has begun to stir. Indians, peasant farmers, laborers, students, soldiers, and priests are challenging the old policies and institutions. Those challenges disturb many, but I find them encouraging. They are the outward signs of the tremendous forces let loose by the Alliance—forces which are providing new dynamism to Latin America of the 1970's.

The question that confronts us now is—"Where do we go in the 1970's?"

During the past 2 years, the United States and Latin America have been cooperating in developing new approaches to the task of advancing the goals of the Alliance for Progress. In the process, some helpful departures from old policies have been implemented. In many instances, however, decisions or major issues have been deferred.

The time for those decisions is at hand if peaceful revolution in Latin America is going to have any chance at all.

We cannot afford further delays in reaffirming our determination to make our hemisphere a place in which every man and woman can realize the fullest range of his or her potential.

The U.S. commitment to that goal is in question today. And as a result, many of those who have devoted their best years to the cause of progress and justice in our hemisphere are now plagued by doubts and uncertainties about the future.

The United States can remedy this situation by according the problems of our hemisphere the priority which they commanded during the past decade and which they deserve.

To this end, we can no longer postpone making delivery on promises tendered in the last 2 years.

We can no longer allow months to slip by while the new modalities of our cooperation with Latin America remain undefined; while the enactment of generalized trade preferences awaits some propitious moment; and while the time-frame and extent of our national commitment to the "partnership for progress" continue to hinge both upon political developments at home and upon the closing of a tragic chapter of history in a distant land.

As the old saying goes, the United States must either fish or cut bait.

Moreover, we must acknowledge with Abraham Lincoln that—

The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present.

And begin to shape a new strategy for our hemisphere in the 1970's.

What should the outline of this new strategy be?

First of all it cannot follow the old patterns of aid, with the United States providing not just resources for development but the plans themselves. A new strategy must follow a new course. Just as new priorities for development in Latin America must come from the Latin Americans so too must the techniques and methods for achieving them.

The United States, in looking to the decade of the 1970's, must recognize that our interdependence with the hemisphere requires not paternalistic concern but active cooperation—cooperation aimed at making this hemisphere a more satisfying and rewarding place for all of us to live.

The development of our resources is an investment in the future. It is a process which can benefit both the United States and Latin America. It must be done through a cooperative effort lest we threaten the very future we so ardently seek.

Second, the attainment of a healthy and benign environment must underlie all our efforts at development. We must strive to solve the problems which threaten future generations. We must redeem our rivers; rescue our oceans from pollution; cleanse our air; and control the use of chemicals which endanger all our lives. Only cooperative efforts which engage all the countries of the hemisphere can successfully meet these problems.

Such cooperative efforts are also necessary to solve other problems of our hemisphere: such problems as the conflict over tuna fishing off the coast of Ecuador and Peru. Our primary concern here should be the maintenance of peace and the preservation of the living resources of the ocean for the benefit of the entire hemisphere. Similarly, we should address ourselves to the problems of migrations which cause wars such as the one between El Salvador and Honduras. In general, we should try to extend throughout the hemisphere the kind of cooperation that we have enjoyed with Mexico in the matter of coping with illegal international traffic in narcotics.

These problems and issues require our attention in the 1970's. It is these problems and these issues which can only be met through a new commitment to a decade of improved cooperation in our hemisphere.

In closing, I want to add a few words about an escalating series of incidents which constitute a threat to the continued success of the inter-American system: incidents which reflect our propensity to engage in dangerous rhetoric; to shout before we think.

Everyone shouting and no one listening

can destroy a nation as surely as it can a family. Similarly, it can make enemies of once friendly nations.

It is easy to understand the anger that wells up on occasion both north and south of the Rio Grande. This Nation has been far from blameless in its past relations with Latin America. We have been overbearing on more than one occasion. We have meddled in matters we should have stayed out of—and ignored others which cried for our attention. And we have helped to create resentments which persist to this very day.

Reckless criticism, from whatever quarter, can only destroy the good will necessary if we are to cooperate in our trade, aid and investment policies for the mutual benefit of the hemisphere.

Both North and South, we must forgo the rhetoric of years gone by which polarize all economic and social rationales into the equally unacceptable terms of statism and economic determinism. We must recognize that the patterns of development and social reorganization which are likely to succeed in Latin America will arise out of the unique culture and history of the Latin American nations themselves and not be imported from either North America or the East.

Both North and South we will have to discard our preconceptions, one or the other. Both continents are exploring new ground. Both are passing through a revolutionary phase in which concern with economic development is being replaced by concern for human development. In my judgment, this broader and more basic concept, human development, focuses directly on the broad principles of civilization and democracy which have bound our continents together from the time of our revolutions. It should give us even more hope for the future of the inter-American system.

On this Pan American Day, it is difficult to be certain what the future holds in store for the hemisphere, but we can be certain that we still have the opportunity to realize the goals to which we pledged ourselves 81 years ago, and to those to which we dedicated ourselves 10 years ago. We should, we must, seize that opportunity.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONAGAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. First, let me join the gentleman in commending the distinguished cleric, Father Thorning, not only for his prayer this morning but for his continuing interest in the problems and affairs of the countries of Latin America.

Then let me commend the gentleman from Connecticut on the very fine statement he has made here this morning.

I agree with the gentleman that we are inclined, both in our public and private lives, to ignore the many and great nations to the south of us. We are inclined to generalize and think about them as one, whereas in truth and in fact, they are many nations with many cultures and many problems.

There are matters, though, upon which we can generalize. To begin with, Latin

America is growing faster than any part of the world and in doing so it compounds its problems more than any other part of the world with the exception of Asia. At the same time, Latin America has undergone a great migration to the cities so that suddenly most of Latin America has become an urbanized society whose people do not possess the skills and talents necessary to live in an urban society.

We can also point to the fact that, again with the exception of Asia, Latin America has the lowest per capita income of any place in the world, probably more illiteracy, more need for housing, more need for education, and more need for gainful employment of any place in the world.

At the same time, the opportunity for our country to assist our friends in Latin America is very great indeed. It is not an opportunity for platitudes, or for pleasant speeches, but an opportunity really to assist in the development of this great section of the world. It has been demonstrated time and time again, where a Latin American country prospers, that prosperity is immediately translated into trade with the United States. The best example that comes to my mind is the country of Venezuela, which is probably the most prosperous of all Latin American countries, with the possible exception of Mexico. We have a favorable balance of trade with Venezuela. We also carry on an enormous amount of trade with Mexico, which is growing rapidly and is becoming a prosperous nation.

So it is to our interest not only from the point of view of social unrest and political instability and from the point of view of establishing free democratic nations with free democratic institutions in Latin America, but also from the point of view of carrying out trade and commerce that we help to develop the countries of Latin America.

We have made a lot of progress. Some American companies have shown a great deal of ingenuity and have brought into their management and into their work force the people who live in the countries of Latin America.

For instance, I have been in a store, a Sears, Roebuck store, in Brazil where all of the employees, with the possible exception of one or two, are Brazilians. This is the type of people-to-people operation that I think commends itself to our American industry and American ingenuity.

It is appropriate that we today commemorate the anniversary of the Organization of American States. It has been a viable organization. I was very proud of President Kennedy when he inaugurated the Alliance for Progress. I hope that we will move forward in that direction. I am glad to see the regional groupings that have now occurred in Central and South America as nations seek to bring together their trade and resources rather than have competing steel mills and competing automobile plants and so forth.

So, as I see it, the gentleman from Connecticut is so right: Latin America

offers hope not only for the people of Latin America but for the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for his fine effort here in offering this resolution commemorating the 81st anniversary of the OAS and the Pan American Union.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for his very helpful and illuminating comments.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONAGAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleague from Connecticut in marking the 81st anniversary of Pan American Day.

The American people and their neighbors to the south are closely bound together, not only by geography but by a feeling of genuine affection. We are deeply concerned with the welfare of our Latin American neighbors—and not purely from the standpoint of self-interest. We are in a word, partners.

For too long the image of the United States has been that of the giant of the Western Hemisphere. I would change that. I would much prefer that we be seen in our true role in this hemisphere—the role of partner sharing good fortune and bad with our neighbors in Latin America.

We are, I think, carefully pursuing that role now, the role of partner. No longer do we dominate our Latin American friends. We offer them ideas and assistance, but we want them to steer their own destinies. Together we have one major goal—to keep the Western Hemisphere free from outside domination. Within the hemisphere, we will grow together and help each other to grow.

We have adopted a new approach toward Latin America, one which stresses shared responsibility and respect for the national identity and dignity of our Latin American friends.

We are offering help and we are encouraging self-help. But running through all our efforts is the theme of partnership and an eschewing of domination. We have taken steps to improve development assistance, increase the transfer of technology and to expand trade.

The goal of trade expansion is most important. We must help our Latin American friends increase their exports. This is the way to help them reduce their dependence and enhance their self-respect.

In 1970, we achieved agreement among the developed nations to go forward with comparable systems of generalized preferences which all developed countries would apply to all developing nations. This would significantly reduce discrimination faced by Latin American countries as well as give them preferential treatment in our market. The administration has also made available direct technical assistance for export development and for the promotion of tourism.

The present administration is dedicated to improving the quality of life in Latin America, as in our own Nation.

We have only just begun, but we have made an excellent beginning.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONAGAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIRNIE), former president of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and a member of the Council of that Union who has just returned also from the meeting in Caracas where the gentleman did excellent work in sustaining the position of the United States at that conference.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I share the regret which has been expressed by the gentleman in the well as to the illness of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) which has prevented him from taking part in this observance today. However, I do think it is appropriate that he is succeeded by the gentleman in the well in presenting in behalf of all his comments on Pan American Day.

During our recent recess as the gentleman has said there was a meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union in Caracas, Venezuela. The gentleman from Connecticut was one of the members of the Council which met diligently to attempt to translate into resolutions and deep understanding some of the principles which underlie our efforts in the field of good neighbor relationships with the Pan American nations.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that personal relationships such as can be developed through conversations on such occasions have a more lasting effect than we sometimes realize. In the remarks of the gentleman in the well he has stressed the difficulties with which we are faced. He has also indicated the attitude which must be maintained if we are to overcome those difficulties.

He has stressed the need for frankness and integrity so that there is a mutual understanding of the viewpoints of our respective nations. In order to create a friendly understanding we do not have to abdicate those things in which we believe, but rather to adjust and harness them together in a mutual program which can be enthusiastically supported.

It was my observation, and I hope the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) will agree with me, that such an attitude was respected, and that there was created a desire to make such accommodations as would maintain proper national interests, and yet develop the mutual support which is going to be so important if these programs are to continue.

It is also worthy of mention to the House that we had a chance to observe how a partnership with our great country can be of benefit to developing nations. We saw projects which were being started from absolute scratch being guided by studies conducted by business in regard to the needs of people and of planned communities; our help was not solely in regard to those material facilities such as power and sewage and roads, and what we might call the basic public utilities, but also the way in which

we develop culture, the training and educating of people in ways which introduced them into a productive society.

I was proud to know that people from this Nation were contributing so prominently in guiding these projects to fruition.

I would also like to pay personal tribute to the gentleman in the well (Mr. MONAGAN) for evidencing throughout the entire conference that sincere desire to be friendly and responsive to our purposes and he devoted his complete time to that effort. In my opinion the outcome was highly rewarding.

I would also like to join with the gentleman in the well in expressing appreciation of the attendance here today of the Reverend Father Joseph T. Thorning. His faithful adherence to the observance of this day has become a tradition of which we are affectionately proud. I know that we trust that the spirit which gave rise to Pan American Day will continue to be understood not only by this body, not only by this Nation, but by the entire Western Hemisphere, because of its contribution to the peace and the security of this hemisphere and also the world.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIRNIE), for his kind remarks, and I fully agree with his appraisal of the need for frankness and integrity between the United States and the countries of Latin America, and in this field the contributions made by the gentleman from New York have been most helpful.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to participate in Pan American Day and the celebration of the 81st anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union.

As the ties between the nations of this hemisphere have deepened over recent years—particularly through the communication made possible by the Pan American Union, the Organization of American States, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Inter-American Defense Board—much progress has been made in our relations with our neighbors to the south and with our efforts to assist them in the development of their economic potential.

Yet, in spite of our mutual efforts, endemic unemployment and rapidly accelerating urbanization remain major problems in Latin America and all too many of her people are still living in abject poverty, without hope for their own future and that of their children.

This situation calls for the most intensified efforts on our part to activate and give true meaning to the principles of the Organization of American States and the Charter of Punta del Este. We need to focus our efforts on ways to implement our pledges to work with the peoples of the Americas toward progress and peaceful improvement of their lives. We have seen all too many instances of disputes and even armed hostilities between nations which should regard themselves as sister states, indicating that we have much to do to perfect the forums in which such disagreements can be discussed and aired. Particularly of concern

are problems of boundaries, our mutual concern over the quality of the environment, the movement of narcotics across borders, and the whole gamut of social problems which we ourselves are encountering here in the United States in our increasingly technological, urbanized society.

The potential is there for consultation and peaceful resolution of all problems facing the nations of the Americas. We need only redouble our efforts to bring our peoples together in the natural union of those who share so much of common heritage and history. It is my hope that our participation here today will mark the recommitment of this Nation to enhancing the quality of life for all of our fellow citizens of this hemisphere.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker, in recognition of contributions to the cause of inter-American scholarship, Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., was one of the first educators to be elected an honorary member of the Academy of American Franciscan History. He was also chosen as an advisory editor of the academy's official quarterly, "The Americas." For many years, Dr. Thorning's articles and book reviews were featured in this publication. A number of these pieces touched upon the prominent role of California in the development of culture derived from Spain and Portugal throughout many areas of North America.

I include a news report published in the National Register on February 21, 1971, in the RECORD at this point:

"PADRE OF AMERICAS" TO GIVE INVOCATION

WASHINGTON.—For the 28th consecutive year, the Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, called by Senator Mike Mansfield "the Padre of the Americas" because of his services to the Hispano-Iberian world, has been chosen to offer the invocation in the House of Representatives on Pan American Day, April 20.

Father Thorning has been decorated by the governments of Spain and Portugal and almost all the Latin American countries.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, one of my friends gave the prayer today, marking the 28th official congressional celebration of Pan American Day. The friend is Father Joseph F. Thorning, pastor emeritus of St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton Manor, Frederick, Md., one of the associate editors of World Affairs, a publication whose principal objective is the understanding and peaceful solution of international problems. Dr. Thorning has lectured widely in the universities of North and South America and is the U.S. honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil. On numerous occasions he has also served as an honorary chaplain of the Inter-American Defense Board.

One of Dr. Thorning's most popular books is "Miranda: World Citizen," published by the University of Florida Press. It is the scientific biography of Don Francisco de Miranda, the precursor of Latin American freedom and independence. This study has a foreword written by Don Galo Plaza, then President of Ecuador, and now the Secretary General of the Organization of American States. The preface of "Miranda: World Citizen" was written by Sumner Welles, at that time Under Secretary of State.

Reviewing the aforementioned biography in the Sunday New York Times Book Review, Dr. German Arciniegas summarized his opinion of the volume in the following words:

Father Joseph F. Thorning has told this fascinating story of one of the first 'citizens of the world' in a compact and scholarly book.

About the same time, Dr. Charles G. Fenwick, himself a scholar of international reputation, wrote as follows in the Commonweal:

It is rare to find a biography in which scholarly research and dramatic presentation are so happily combined.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, Father Joseph F. Thorning, an associate editor of World Affairs, who has given the Pan American Day invocation for 28 consecutive years, was born in Milwaukee, Wis., and began his education there in St. Rose of Lima School and Marquette University.

As part of his service to the cause of inter-American understanding, he acted as director of inter-American seminars in the University of San Marcos, Lima, Peru; the National University of Mexico; and the University of Havana, Cuba. Many young people, active in international organizations today, got their start in these seminars. They continue to be responsible workers for justice, security, and international peace.

It is also noteworthy, I believe, that Dr. Thorning was one of the first leaders in the economical movement in the United States and in other parts of the globe and a pioneer in the cause of interracial harmony and fairness.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it may interest my distinguished colleagues to know that Father Joseph F. Thorning, the priest-scholar who gave the prayer on Pan American Day, is not only a leader in the cause of inter-American understanding, but also a lifelong admirer of the peoples of the Iberian Peninsula, whose culture is prominent in many regions of the United States today.

For that reason, I include a book review written by Dr. Thorning, entitled "Invitation to Portugal," in the RECORD. The volume reviewed was composed by Mary Jean Kempner with an excellent introduction by Alan Pryce-Jones, a celebrated man of letters, who once served as editor of the Times Literary Supplement, London.

The review follows:

[From the Fordham University Quarterly, Thought, Autumn 1970]

INVITATION TO PORTUGAL

(By Mary Jean Kempner, with an Introduction by Alan Pryce-Jones. Photographs by Russell Lynes. New York: Atheneum, 1969. pp. XVIII, 314. \$10.00.)

Portugal has been described as "a garden on a balcony overlooking the Atlantic Ocean." Landscapes and seascapes vie with each other in beauty and variety. Sunlight warms the cold stones of monuments which gleam, gems of architecture as many of them are, on mountaintops and in valleys where Cistercian monks cultivated the famous Alcobaca peaches and farther north, planted vineyards that continue to produce fine port and the full-bodied wines of Dão. The people who work this land, predominantly farmers and fishermen, are deeply conscious of their

forebears. The Portuguese know how much every continent owes to Lusitanian explorers and discoverers. Mary Jean Kempner, author of *Invitation to Portugal*, having visited every important area of the country in the last four years of her life, shares her impressions, her knowledge and her enthusiasm, balanced by sharp criticism where merited, with her readers. The latter should be legion, because relatively few of the tourists who throng to Lisbon and Fátima every year take the time to push on to Coimbra and the hill-towns of the north or to taste the delights of the southern, seaside resorts of the Algarve: Albufeira, Praia da Rocha and Portimão. As Alan Pryce-Jones, onetime editor of *The Times Literary Supplement* (London), points out, it is Mrs. Kempner's special skill to provide "one aspect of Portugal after another—historical, picturesque, visual, architectural, social—and build them into a kind of polyptych—a form of art at which the Portuguese themselves excel."

As a sample of the author's talent for swift, vivid characterization may be given her description of Evora, a onetime Roman settlement less than 100 miles southeast of Lisbon, located in the rich plains of the Alentejo. Famous for mules, cork plantations, cereal grains, olives, pigs, and antiquities, this cathedral town of some 40,000 inhabitants claims a temple, "dedicated to Diana," not far from seven public swimming pools, one of them "large enough for Olympic competition." Not only are there beautiful, multicolored mosaic pavements, predating Julius Caesar, but also "a portion of a Visigothic wall, a hint of Moorish domination, and examples of Romanesque, Gothic, Renaissance and Baroque art." Moreover, in the onetime Jesuit College of the Holy Spirit, one can still admire decorative tiles (*azulejos*), lining staircases, the refectory and chapel walls. Indeed, Evora once served as headquarters for the sophisticated Order of Aviz and a center of learning for *avant-garde* intellectuals, rich art patrons, powerful kings, prelates, and "dread Inquisitors." As early as the fourteenth century, monarchs sent their heirs to study here "when it seemed appropriate to remove the tender princelings from overprotective maternal influences." Today, spotlessly clean, narrow streets wind between "high whitewashed garden walls overhung with flowers." It is a typically modest-sized, Portuguese market town, as you view its charms through the eyes of Mary Jean Kempner.

Although this book is not precisely a model of exact research and scholarship, the treasures of fact and legend it presents are the result of consultation with the most reliable authorities. Outstanding in this category are Dr. Reynaldo dos Santos, president of the Lisbon Fine Arts Academy, and Dr. Robert E. Smith of the University of Pennsylvania. The latter's new book, *The Art of Portugal*, is often cited, not without wisdom and grace.

The photographs by Russell Lynes, including the jacket feature, add luster and meaning to every chapter of *Invitation to Portugal*. Similar praise must be accorded to the typography, paper and binding. "There will be more Portugal books to come," predicts Alan Pryce-Jones, "but none more useful nor more evocative." Most readers are apt to agree, completely, with this evaluation.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure on the occasion of the 81st anniversary of Pan American Day to pay tribute to our deep and abiding friendship with the nations of Central and South America and the Caribbean, and to extend a warm greeting to our hemisphere partners.

Pan American Day is a special occasion on which we honor the political, legal, economic, and cultural ties which

unite the 23 sovereign nations of the Western Hemisphere. It is a time of rededication of all our nations to the goals embodied in the Charter of the Organization of American States and that of Punta del Este: that through mutual cooperation, the American nations shall offer each man a land of liberty and a favorable environment for the realization of his just aspirations, and shall, through living together in peace, understanding, and respect, provide for the betterment of all, in independence, in equality, and under law.

Having been a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee since 1960, and having served in the capacity of U.S. Representative to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference for the past decade since its inception, the observance of Pan American Day is especially meaningful for me. Having had a firsthand acquaintance with the history and culture of this one special friend, I feel a real warmth for all of the peoples of this exciting region, whose nations are not only our closest neighbors, but also our best friends in the world community.

For the nations which make up the Pan American system, the decade of the 1970's promises to be the most exciting and challenging of any in our history. This decade offers the greatest potential for ever closer ties and stronger friendships between us and our southern partners as we strive to move forward with our shared dreams and goals.

In the past several years, problems hitherto neglected or unrecognized, whose dimensions transcend national boundaries, have emerged that must engage the attention of all of us in the Western Hemisphere. We in the United States have recognized the fundamental need for a change in the basic relationships upon which our friendship with Latin America is based, and have devoted much time to searching for new formulas to improve hemispheric cooperation, especially in the critical areas of economic and social development.

In his 1971 foreign policy message, President Nixon turned his attention to the great changes brewing throughout the American hemisphere and stated that the United States can have no greater goal than to help provide the means for these vitally needed changes to be accomplished throughout the region, in peace and with concern for the proud traditions and the dignity of each hemisphere nation. Indeed, it is my firm belief that mutual respect, understanding, and tolerance form the cornerstone upon which lasting friendships and meaningful relationships among nations are built.

Let me today on this Pan American anniversary say to all the Latin American peoples that the strongest desire of the people of the United States is to move forward with you—in peace, in justice, and in friendship.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, in the south Texas area I represent, every day is Pan American Day. Happily situated on the border between the United States and Mexico with the Rio Grande at our front patios as we look southward, the

culture of our people has been oriented toward Latin America for hundreds of years.

Ours is a two-language area. Our traditions are rooted firmly in Pan American soil. An outstanding State-supported institution of higher learning, Pan American University, is located in Edinburg, a southernmost city of the United States. The Pan American Round Table, an eminent organization of women, concerns itself with cementing the foundation of solidarity in the Western Hemisphere.

Hailing from the literal gateway to Pan America, I am proud and happy to join in the official observance of Pan American Day and to invite my colleagues to come to south Texas and see for themselves the results of Pan America in action, where day-after-day expressions of solidarity are exchanged by two nations and two people.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague, the Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN of Connecticut, in supporting the Pan American Day resolution.

The resolution very properly calls for unity, hemispheric solidarity, and the good will which is essential to our relations with the other Republics of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last week to participate in the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Caracas, Venezuela. This meeting gave our delegates the chance to become familiar with the progress of Venezuela and to note that country's sound relations with the United States.

I believe it is reasonable to expect a certain amount of stress and strain within the Western Hemisphere since, as in any long and close relationship, each tends to take the other for granted. The Latin Americans take the economic strength of the United States for granted just as we take their good will and friendship for granted.

In Venezuela, all the ingredients in our relations with Pan American members were visible. There is a tremendous American business investment which contributes directly to the economic growth in that country and to the constantly improving standards of living of its citizens.

There is also some resentment at the sheer magnitude and the overwhelming impact of the American investment. Yet Venezuela is a progressive country and leaders recognize their continued future growth, in large part, will come as a result of business partnership with the United States.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we observe Pan American Day as effective means of reemphasizing the historic ties, mutually valuable economic relations, and recognize the need for the continued cooperation that we share with our friends to the south. We will certainly have our momentary diplomatic complications, but the mutuality of interests and the continued progressive association, I am positive, will overcome short-term differences.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to speak on this Pan American

Day commemorating the 81st anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union.

In the past 10 years, some progress has been made in solving the many problems in our hemisphere, but we are still faced with many very formidable obstacles. High on the list of these obstacles in Latin America are unemployment, poverty, and massive urbanization of the population. This urbanization may reach 80 percent of the total population of Latin America by the year 2000, yet at the same time this area contains vast frontiers of unsettled lands and untapped natural resources. In the past, we have made many attempts to overcome the economic and social problems within our hemisphere, through the Organization of American States, the Inter-American Development Bank and the Inter-American Defense Board, and various other programs. While these programs have not solved all of the problems, they certainly have had many beneficial effects and they represent a first step in establishing a much needed framework for international cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, it seems we are today faced with a test of international cooperation in nearly every corner of the world. We have a civil war in Pakistan, a volatile cease-fire in the Middle East which may explode into war overnight, war in Southeast Asia, and recurring repression in Eastern Europe. If we have learned anything from these events, let us use this knowledge in our dealings with our neighbors in the Americas to prevent the recurrence of events such as the seizure of American fishing vessels.

I salute the progress which has already been made, but I issue a challenge. Let this decade be remembered as one of international cooperation and friendship within our hemisphere.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise today to pay tribute to the oldest international political organization in the world.

On April 14, 1890, the First International Conference of American States established the International Union of American Republics. Today, this union is known as the Organization of American States.

This organization—now in its 81st year—was the first concrete step in the formation of an inter-American system of cooperation and solidarity. We are attempting to work out a common understanding of our shared hopes, desires, and goals. To accomplish this end, the Alliance for Progress was established in 1961 as a pledge of U.S. commitment to Latin American economic and social progress.

The Alliance for Progress—a vast, cooperative effort to satisfy the needs of all people for homes, work, land, health, and education—ushered in a new era in inter-American relations. This has been an era in which economic, political, and social development formed the basis for a unique hemisphere unity. Although the Alliance has been beset by difficulty, we can point to substantial gains in Latin American development which could never have been achieved without the Alliance.

This Pan American Day—1971—is a time for us to recommit ourselves to the principles and goals of the Organization of American States and the Alliance for Progress. We must revitalize our policy and emphasize those constructive elements which foster close and healthy Latin American—United States relations.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee has vividly set forth the challenge which faces the Western Hemisphere. We must heed his words of caution and avoid a paternalistic approach in terms of aiding our Latin American neighbors.

Without question, the citizens of Latin America must have significant influence in formulating development of their own priorities. Only through equality in development strategies and techniques of program implementation will the relationship between involved nations be mutually strengthening.

I agree with my colleagues that we must expand our efforts beyond economic development alone into the realm of human development. We must cooperate with citizens of our neighboring nations through a people-to-people approach. Operating within a humanistic framework will result in more meaningful growth and development.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to join with my colleagues today on the occasion of the 81st anniversary of the Union of American Republics, now known as the Organization of American States. It is a date which not only marks the founding of the inter-American system, but also has traditionally symbolized the community of interests of the peoples and nations of the Western Hemisphere and the commitment of this country to unity and cooperation among the American states. It is for this very reason that I take the floor today, as the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, not only to salute that tradition but to urge a reevaluation of it as well.

We are now trying to think anew about Latin America, and we must let Latin Americans know we are doing so, and that we are anxious to listen to them in order to improve the framework for inter-American cooperation.

We must downplay the "special relationship," with its echoes of hemispheric domination. We must also understand, and convey that understanding to Latin America, that there is a far more substantial reason for us to be close than a vague historical concept—and that what is credible and desirable is a relationship that makes mutual political and diplomatic sense.

Anything less will not long endure, and certainly will not lead to a continued, meaningful inter-American system.

We are entering a period of stock-taking of the United States policy toward Latin America in an atmosphere which, I am convinced, can provide considerable headway for readjusting our own attitudes toward Latin America and for developing policies which are suited to the needs and the realities of this decade.

The new concept of hemispheric relations enunciated by the President in October 1969 and exemplified by our policy toward the new government in Chile, portends greater opportunities for a more healthy course of events than we have previously witnessed. And it is in welcome and much-needed contrast to the over-raised expectations, the unfulfilled promises, and the real or imagined U.S. predominance in Latin American affairs that has characterized United States-Latin American relations in the past.

We are, hopefully, beginning to be aware that the traditional definitions of forms of government may be less important than how a society works, how people live together; that although we clearly regard the development of a democratic, independent, well-educated and prosperous Latin America to be important to our own interests as well as to those of our neighbors, we also recognize the immense diversity not only between our neighbors and ourselves but also among the nations of Latin America, and realize that the facts of Latin American political life indicate that democratic development in some nations will not come quickly or easily; and that our relations with those nations should depend, as the President has stated:

Not on their internal structures or social systems, but on actions which affect us and the inter-American system.

I continue to believe, as I said in 1969, that the best course:

Lies in increasing our efforts to assist Latin America while employing techniques more effective and sophisticated, more sensitive and acceptable to Latin America.

And I have been encouraged by the progress made in the past 2 years toward making development a more truly cooperative and more effective venture. The United States and Latin America have been working together to determine new steps to improve development assistance, expand trade, and increase the transfer of technology. There have been changes in the administration of U.S. foreign aid, and the Latins have been giving us, at our invitation, their views of what they believe our policy should be. Recent revisions in the OAS Charter have improved inter-American mechanisms for noneconomic problems.

I am particularly pleased that the Board of the Inter-American Social Development Institute, a congressional initiative to intensify the implementation of title IX of the Foreign Assistance Act, has been appointed and staff is now being assigned. I look forward to its being operative in the very near future, for it offers an opportunity for helping the people of Latin America in the development process in a way that is far more responsive to their particular problems and needs than any government-to-government program could be.

But much remains to be done. Congress has yet to consider the President's proposals, hopefully forthcoming in the very near future, to facilitate exports from Latin America and other developing countries to the U.S. market. As yet outstanding are the recommendations for foreign aid reform which will en-

able us, among other things, to turn a larger share of our resources over to multilateral inter-American agencies, to separate developmental assistance from short-term political considerations, and to provide it in a form that accords more closely with the preferences of the recipient countries. We must move forward with dispatch on these and other major policy decisions.

Throughout our stocktaking, however, one thing must be remembered, and let there be no mistake about it: there is a tremendous difference between non-intervention and nonparticipation. Indeed, the distinction between maintaining a low profile and becoming invisible is a critical one; we cannot let the former sink into the latter.

To those who would say that the Alliance for Progress is "dead," and opt, in its apparent failure, for reducing our commitment to Latin America, I can but respond that its "death" is a question of terminology, not of substance. For although I agree that the Alliance was oversold and overly optimistic in its expectations, the Alliance partners have achieved important social and economic successes in addition to the significant success represented by agreement on goals. Latin America feels those expectations more intensely than ever before, and most important, these goals remain valid for the future. The Alliance can lead us in the right direction if we learn by its failures; if we listen instead of lecture; if we really think of Latin American concerns as they are perceived by the peoples of Latin America rather than imposing our own concepts and our own schemes; and if we seek to involve the people in the development process.

As I said in August 1969, in a speech delivered in this Chamber:

The future of the 200 million people of the United States is linked with that of the 250 million people of Latin America by geography, history, and the realities of global politics.

Geopolitically, the security of Latin America is indispensable to our own; by our very existence and economic involvement in Latin America, we have a stake in the manner by which our neighbors evolve; we have much to learn from Latin American culture; and there is a genuine desire on the part of the people of the United States, because of the affinity born of our common bonds, to aid our neighbors in Latin America in their own drive for self-sufficiency and equal standing in the world community. "We have expressed this commitment publicly," I stated then:

Such as in the Charter of Punta del Este and the 1966 Hemispheric Presidents meeting, and privately through the thousands of individuals involved in groups such as the Partners of the Alliance, and we cannot and must not shrink from responsibilities we have already openly, willingly, and enthusiastically accepted.

There is clearly a very real basis for a meaningful inter-American relationship. And since we know and they know that the concept of development will go forward, that basis is broadening to include issues such as problems of technology and environment.

CXVII—691—Part 9

We are into a critical point in our relations with Latin America, with a chance to develop a mature and meaningful relationship. With a firm commitment and with understanding and sensitivity on our part, it can be just that.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague from Florida, the Honorable DANTE FASCELL, in paying tribute to the abiding friendship of the peoples of the Americas on Pan American Day.

This 81st anniversary of this occasion is one that evokes for me warm and deep personal memories. I have often traveled in Latin America and I count many distinguished men and women of the countries to the south among my lasting personal friendships.

My wife and I have devoted many happy hours in the company of the great men and great ladies of the other Americas. We have been their guests and have been privileged to be their hosts when they have visited the United States.

The Americas, for me, are a friendly community, a neighborhood in which the peoples of two dozen countries share many things in common and rejoice in the variety that each country contributes to this great hemisphere.

It is, therefore, with a sense of personal loss, that I note the absence of the jewel of the Caribbean, the island of Cuba, from this hemispheric circle of friends and neighbors. It is also a sense of great loss which I share with many of my constituents who until a few years ago were among the leading and most productive citizens of Cuba.

The ruthless possession of that lovely island by the Communist regime of Fidel Castro is one of the great misfortunes which has fallen upon an American people. It is a tragedy for the people of Cuba and for the free hemispheric system which has given this segment of the earth the continuing appellation of the "New World."

If the American system means anything it means freedom. And the very idea of individual freedom is being crushed beneath the heels of the Castro dictatorship in Cuba today.

I do not think the American people can ever be reconciled to the destruction of freedom in Cuba or can ever be expected to accept the continued existence of this aggressive Communist dictatorship on our very doorstep.

There is a wave of fear blowing among the friends of a free Cuba as a result of the apparent trend toward reconciliation with Communist China. The fear is that, if it can happen there, it can happen in the Caribbean. But I am convinced that the people of the United States will not abandon Cuba to its Communist rulers.

I have therefore introduced today a concurrent resolution which would make clear the sense of the Congress "that the President should not extend diplomatic recognition to the Government of Cuba so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime."

I think this is the way the people of this country feel about the question of diplomatic recognition of the Castro regime and I believe the Congress should

reflect this sentiment in simple, unequivocal terms.

Mr. Speaker, I am nevertheless confident that the basic strength of the American system is such that the aggressive designs of the Castro regime will be thwarted, and such that in the end it will bring down this regime which is the antithesis of all that Pan American Day has meant for more than 4 score years.

I would prefer to note on this occasion some of the great things about our Pan America heritage. One of these is the extraordinary career of Francisco de Miranda, which has been described so well in the book by Joseph F. Thorning, "Miranda: World Citizen," and which has just been reprinted by the University of Florida Press.

This biography, when it was first published, was named by the New York Times as one of "the outstanding books of the year." It tells the story of Miranda from his birth in Venezuela through his travels in Russia, France, England, and North America, to his ultimate return to South America. Everywhere he went his curiosity and intelligence brought him into contact with the political and intellectual leaders of the great countries of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. In Russia he was a favorite of Catherine the Great; in France he was a general in the Revolutionary Army; in England he was a confidant of Pitt; in the United States he was a friend of Washington and Adams; and in South America he was the tutor of the great Simon Bolivar and general of the revolutionary forces which made Venezuela the first South American republic.

I am delighted that this splendid work is back in print and that the University of Florida is responsible for making it available again to all who appreciate the greatness which all of the Americas have contributed to the glory of our hemisphere.

I was also pleased to learn on the occasion of this Pan American Day that an aspiration of the distinguished Governor of Puerto Rico, the Honorable Luis Ferre, which I brought to the attention of our colleagues on Pan American Day last year, has become a living contribution to increased inter-American understanding.

Governor Ferre said at that time:

One step which I am taking immediately to increase inter-American understanding is the creation in Puerto Rico of a North-South Center to bring technical and scientific personnel, managerial personnel, educators and others from both North and South America to Puerto Rico for technical and scientific training and contacts. We feel we have the ideal bi-lingual, bi-cultural setting for such a Center. Puerto Rico, I am convinced, can serve as a bridge to bring our Latin American and North American brethren together before it is too late.

That projected North-South Center is now in existence and is beginning to serve the function which Governor Ferre had in mind. It will, I hope, soon receive the kind of support—now approximately \$5 million a year—which the Congress has provided for the East-West Center in Hawaii.

Even now, however, this new center in

Puerto Rico highlights the difference between the "bridge" between the Americas which has inspired Governor Ferre and the barrier to good relations and understanding which Castro has erected on the neighboring island of Cuba.

It is my sincerest hope that all of the Caribbean will soon become a bridge of friendship and good feeling among the people of this hemisphere.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, last week the general assembly of the Organization of American States met on the occasion of the 81st anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union. In those 81 years our relations with our sister republics to the south have undergone many changes.

Secretary of State William Rogers, speaking last week to the OAS Assembly in Costa Rica outlined the principles which will guide our new relationship with Latin America. His speech was a clear expression of the spirit of openness and equality that we desire as well as of the tremendous task of development that lies ahead.

The four principles which will guide our policy are:

First. The problems that affect the hemisphere are the concern of all its states;

Second. Initiatives in the hemisphere are the concern of all its states;

Third. The interest of developed nations outside the hemisphere in supportive cooperation with Latin America is to be welcomed; and

Fourth. The growing interest and participation of Latin American countries in global affairs gives the Organization of American States added importance.

These principles make it clear that we want no hegemony, and they also make it clear that we do not wish to withdraw from our commitment to the urgent task of economic development. They are an indication of the changes in our method of channeling aid to our Latin neighbors. Formerly most American aid was given directly, often creating an uneasy and unequal relationship between recipient and donor. To take some of the emotionalism out and put our foreign aid on a more businesslike basis, we have endeavored to divert larger shares of our assistance into multilateral channels.

While I favor continued bilateral aid, I think there are many instances where aid is more effectively distributed through international bodies. Institutions like the World Bank or the Inter-American Development Bank can base their decisions more strictly on considerations of economic viability than political attractiveness. The Congress will soon consider a request from the administration to increase our share in the lending commitment of the Inter-American Development Bank to \$1.8 billion. I urge my colleagues to consider this not as a partisan issue but as a chance to say to our Latin American neighbors that we continue to care.

Many countries in Latin America are experiencing serious social, economic, and political upheavals. As the richest nation in this hemisphere we must help

them to weather these recurrent crises until they reach a plateau of economic viability.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

#### WE MUST INCREASE THE SUMMER NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

(Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week, when the Congress was in recess, the President announced that he would ask for \$64.3 million in a supplemental appropriation in order to employ additional disadvantaged youths next summer. According to the President's plan, \$51.5 million of this amount would be used to provide 100,000 additional jobs, for a total of 514,000, in the summer Neighborhood Youth Corps. The remainder will be used for a recreation support program and for a transportation program.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud this action taken by the President. My only regret is that he did not ask for enough. In my letter to the President of April 2, which was cosigned by 60 of my colleagues, I respectfully urged an increase of the number of summer NYC positions to a minimum of 630,000 nationally. We need at least that. It is my hope that the Congress, in its wisdom, will take the President's request even further and provide the additional funds necessary to bring this desperately needed program up to a more meaningful level.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, my good friend and colleague for his very fine statement with regard to the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The gentleman has been outspoken for a long time on the need for expanding this program of employing disadvantaged youths during the summer and increasing the number of summer NYC positions.

Just about a month ago, DAN ROSTENKOWSKI spoke here about the need for additional Federal assistance to federally supported summer youth programs, and his strong opposition to cutbacks in those programs. The President has given in somewhat to the pressures of interested Congressmen, led by Congressman ROSTENKOWSKI and by the mayors of our Nation's cities. He announced while we

were in recess that he would seek \$64.3 million in a supplemental appropriation to provide for 100,000 additional jobs in the summer Neighborhood Youth Corps.

But Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI is correct in pointing out that this is still not enough and that in order to be truly meaningful, more than 100,000 additional jobs should be found for disadvantaged youth this summer.

I support my colleague in his efforts, and I again commend him for the fine work he has done in behalf of this program and for the youth of this Nation.

#### HIGH INTEREST RATES

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, what has happened to the administration's oft-stated pledge to bring the American people lower interest rates?

We have experienced several brief flurries of interest rate reductions, but now the trend has stopped and the consumer appears to have received only the most minimal relief from the record-high interest rates.

More importantly, the administration now appears willing to accept the current high level of interest rates as a new definition of "reasonable" interest rates. They seem willing to stop the trend toward lower interest rates.

We need lower interest rates—and plentiful credit—if we are to put people back to work and if local communities and school districts are to be able to market bonds to pay for a huge backlog of worthy projects. The Federal Government—and the American taxpayer—also need lower interest rates, and I am deeply concerned by the sudden increase in the interest rates paid by the Treasury Department on short-term borrowings. These rates were down as low as 3.3 percent, but last week they rose above 4 percent. They declined slightly in yesterday's offerings, but they are still considerably above the rates prevailing in February and March.

Mr. Speaker, we must not allow the trend toward lower interest rates to be slowed—or stopped—before the consumer—the key person in the economy—gets relief. We are not going to have economic recovery if we stop the push for low interest rates, and the administration must seize the initiative and do whatever is necessary to bring about broader relief for the American people. We cannot accept the trickle-down theory of interest rate reductions only for the "prime" corporate citizens.

#### THE GROWTH IN THE NATION'S ECONOMY

(Mr. CONABLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat surprised to hear the distinguished majority leader's comments

about interest rates. I wonder why he is shifting his economic attack at this point?

The first quarter gross national product figures show the largest growth in absolute dollar terms of any quarter in the Nation's history. Even after allowing for inflation, the rate of growth was 6.5 percent in real terms. In the light of these figures, it seems remarkable to me that those who have a vested political interest in the failure of the Nixon administration continue to use fear tactics to try to restrain the consumer's returning confidence. The issue is no longer whether there will be improving economic opportunities for our people during 1971 and 1972, but how much.

There has been a lot of back-seat driving during the difficult year through which the economy has just passed. Now that housing starts are rising every month, now that the working economists in Wall Street are registering almost daily their increasing confidence, now that productivity improvement fore-shadows rising employment and reducing unit labor costs, and now that the big ticket items in the retail trade, including cars, are beginning to move, I hope some of those backseat drivers and doom sayers will have the intellectual honesty to stay "Thank you," to the President for the coolness and foresight with which he has been following the difficult economic course circumstances have forced on him.

#### HIGH INTEREST RATES

(Mr. MYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago the distinguished majority leader tried to place the blame for high interest rates on the Nixon administration. The record will indicate that the distinguished majority leader has ignored the fact of how interest rates got so high. The fact is that under 8 years of Democrat leadership in this country—two Democrat Presidents, the House of Representatives, and the U.S. Senate under control of the Democrat Party—those interest rates continually climbed to the high rate that the gentleman referred to.

The facts will indicate that just about 60 days ago U.S. Treasury bills hit an 8-year low. It seems to have escaped the memory of the distinguished majority leader that this happened. This is the indicator that interest rates are falling. For the first time in 10 years interest rates have started to fall, and they are heading lower. It seems to me that instead of condemning the change, or whatever it was he was doing, trying to point the finger at someone else who is trying to do something about interest rates is not the way to help the true consumer.

#### VIETNAM VETERANS MARCH

(Mrs. ABZUG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute, to revise and extend her remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 days we have been visited by some very brave young men. These brave young men are veterans, veterans of our war in Vietnam, an illegal and immoral war which the President of this country continues without the consent of the American people and without the consent of this body. These young men came to remind us that it is time we withdrew all of our troops from Indochina. They are the consciences here in the House, because it is truly up to us in the Congress of the United States to see that we act to withdraw all of our troops from Indochina by the end of this year and to withhold all appropriations for the continuation of that war, which not only maims and kills our own young men, but is systematically tearing apart millions of innocent Indochinese abroad.

In addition, it is creating a tremendous dislocation in our own society, so that we are unable to meet the needs of our people in the areas of health, housing, and education.

And so I rise to commend the Vietnam veterans who are so tirelessly working to bring this atrocious war to an end.

I must add that I am shocked at the Army's decision to prevent a group of the veterans, mothers, and wives from holding ceremonies to honor U.S. war dead at Arlington National Cemetery. I regard this arbitrary decision as an outrage committed against these veterans, whom we should honor, and as an outrage against the U.S. Constitution, which guarantees the right of individuals to assemble peacefully. These veterans have a clear right, and in fact an obligation to honor their fallen comrades, particularly those who have been ordered to their deaths in a futile, purposeless war.

I call upon the House to rectify this wrong, to use the authority and the good offices of the Congress to see to it that the Vietnam veterans are permitted to enter and conduct mourning at the national cemetery, as all other citizens have always been allowed to do. Particularly, I call upon the Speaker to use his good offices for this purpose.

#### OVERTIME PAY FOR CAPITOL POLICE FORCE

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I addressed the House concerning what I consider to be a very grievous situation in our treatment of the Capitol Hill Police force. I was shocked to learn that we do not allow for overtime pay for these devoted servants.

In 1962, when I first came to the House, I was informed about a similar situation affecting the Metropolitan Police. When I contacted the chief, I was told these men volunteered for this extra service. With the march on Washington on August 28, 1963, Members will recall it

became a pretty bad situation. Some of us raised our voices, and we had that situation corrected.

I thought that action included the Capitol Hill Police force, but we found out after the bombing on the Senate side recently that this is not true. Men are working hundreds of hours without any compensation. Yet, we are the ones who set the fair labor standards for the country. We regulate business and employers and set up standards of pay and overtime.

Yet, here in the House we treat our police force very shabbily when we deny them overtime pay. This weekend and for a period of time the city and the Capitol Grounds will be literally under siege. We will demand and ask much of our protectors, the Capitol Police. Let us then do the least we can and give them justice—now.

#### PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

#### CLINTON M. HOOSE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1824) for the relief of Clinton M. Hoose.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2067) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

#### ROSE MINUTILLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2816) for the relief of Rose Minutillo.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### PAUL ANTHONY KELLY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3475) for the relief of Paul Anthony Kelly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON BEAUTY SHOP

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution 23 be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is House Resolution 23?

Mr. BOLLING. House Resolution 23 creates the Select Committee for Management of the House Beauty Shop. It was reported in error from the Committee on Rules. The matter is taken care of in other law. It is merely to clear the calendar that I make this request.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, far be it from me to interfere with the House Beauty Shop. I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5352, SUPPLEMENTAL MARITIME AUTHORIZATION, 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 355 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

##### H. RES. 355

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5352) to amend the Act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1971 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, and all points of order against said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 3, rule XIII are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be

considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule we are considering, as its reading made clear, makes in order consideration of a supplemental maritime authorization. That supplemental was reported, I understand, by the legislative committee, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, unanimously, without objection from anybody. It is also supported, as I understand it, by the administration. That being the case, I do not propose to take any further time, and I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the able gentleman from Missouri explained, House Resolution 355 makes in order for consideration of H.R. 5352 under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize certain supplemental appropriations for the operating subsidy program of the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1971.

The bill would increase the authorization from \$193 to \$273 million. The increase would be the total cost of this legislation—\$80 million. A total of \$40,300,000 of this increase would partially liquidate unpaid subsidies for 1968 and prior years. The balance of \$39,700,000 is for the President's new maritime program. Both provisions will speed up the payment schedule for liquidating accrued operating-differential subsidies for fiscal year 1971.

There are no departmental reports. The committee reported the bill unanimously.

I have no further request for time, but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered. The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 56]

Abourezk	Andrews, Ala.	Buchanan
Alexander	Ashley	Camp
Anderson, Ill.	Blackburn	Casey, Tex.
Anderson,	Blatnik	Chisholm
Tenn.	Brown, Mich.	Clark

Clawson, Del	Harvey	Rangel
Clay	Hastings	Rees
Corbett	Hays	Reid, Ill.
Coughlin	Hicks, Mass.	Reid, N. Y.
Davis, Ga.	Hillis	Rhodes
Denholm	Hollifield	Rooney, Pa.
Dickinson	Kazen	Rosenthal
Diggs	Lloyd	Roy
Dow	Long, La.	Scheuer
Dowdy	McCollister	Schmitz
Dwyer	McCormack	Schwengel
Edwards, Calif.	McCulloch	Sebelius
Edwards, La.	McKinney	Shriver
Fascell	Mailliard	Skubitz
Flynt	Mann	Smith, Calif.
Foley	Mathias, Calif.	Stafford
Gallagher	Metcalfe	Stagers
Gibbons	Miller, Calif.	Steele
Goldwater	Murphy, Ill.	Steiger, Wis.
Goodling	Nelsen	Symington
Green, Oreg.	O'Neill	Talcott
Green, Pa.	Pepper	Teague, Calif.
Griffiths	Pike	Vander Jagt
Gubser	Preyer, N. C.	Wilson, Bob
Halpern	Purcell	Wolf
Hanna	Quie	
Hansen, Wash.	Rallsback	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 339 Members have answer to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4724, MARITIME AUTHORIZATION, 1972

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 354 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

##### H. RES. 354

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4724) to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge there is no opposition to this rule or to the bill it makes in order. The bill was reported unanimously by the legisla-

tive committee and has the support of the administration.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 354 makes in order for consideration of H.R. 4724 under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize certain appropriations for programs of the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1972.

This bill authorizes \$507,650,000 for six specific categories and reflects the second year of expanded activities under the new maritime program. The six categories and amounts are as follows:

Acquisition, construction, or reconstruction of vessels and construction-differential subsidy and cost of national defense features incident to the construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of ships, \$229,687,000;

Payment of obligations incurred for ship operation subsidies, \$239,145,000;

Expenses for research and development activities—includes reimbursement of losses resulting from expenses of experimental ship operations—\$25,000,000;

Reserve fleet expenses, \$4,318,000;

Maritime training at the Merchant Marine Academy, \$7,300,000; and

Financial assistance to State marine schools, \$2,200,000.

There are no departmental reports. The committee reported the bill unanimously.

I have no further request for time, but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL MARITIME AUTHORIZATION, 1971

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5352) to amend the act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1971 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The motion was agreed to.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5352) with Mr. CHAIMO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5352, which would amend Public Law 91-247, the 1971 maritime authorization bill, to increase the authorization for ship operation subsidy by \$80 million.

The increase in authorization proposed by this bill is required to liquidate contract liabilities for operating-differential subsidy in the amount of \$80 million. About half of this amount—\$39,700,000—is required to implement the new subsidy payment schedule provided by the Merchant Marine Act of 1970. In the past, prior to the enactment of this new law, operators were reimbursed for operating-differential subsidies 3 months after the expense was incurred. The new procedure seeks to make the payment as current as possible. This will require the payment of 2 months additional subsidy in fiscal year 1971.

The remaining amount—\$40,300,000—is required for the liquidation of accrued but unpaid subsidy for fiscal year 1969 and prior years. Upon assuming office, the present Maritime Administrator undertook a determined effort to clear up a backlog which, in the case of some operators, went back as much as 8 or 9 years of amounts due for operating subsidy. This crash effort has resulted in agreement between the administration and the operators with respect to subsidy rates for prior years, and the amount here to be authorized would liquidate those accrued but unpaid obligations.

H.R. 5352 introduced on March 2, 1971, is identical to the bill as recommended by Executive Communication No. 334, dated February 25, 1971.

During the hearings on this bill, the Maritime Administrator thoroughly explained the purpose and need for these additional funds. Furthermore, representatives of the industry, both ship operators and shipbuilders, testified in support of this bill. In fact, all segments of Government and industry agreed that these funds were absolutely essential to the implementation of our national maritime policy.

The committee was unanimous in their approval of this bill, and it was reported by our committee in House Report No. 92-63 on March 24, 1971, without amendment.

I, therefore, urge the House to support this supplemental authorization bill for fiscal year 1971.

There are present members of both the majority and minority of our committee and they may wish to say a few words in connection with this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How did the shipping interests get along without the subsidy for fiscal year 1969 in the amount of \$40.3 million?

Mr. GARMATZ. Those were some of the debts that were incurred, as I men-

tioned, in previous years. In a period of 6, 7, 8, or 9 years these debts were incurred, and the Maritime Administrator is trying to bring his books up to date on the overall picture and start out with a clean slate. The other \$39 million will start them off in the 1971-72 program and keep them up to date on their book-keeping and give a subsidy to the ship-owners and the shipbuilders.

Mr. GROSS. Is this money being paid with interest? Obviously someone in the shipping industry absorbed those costs.

Mr. GARMATZ. That is correct. There has been no interest attached to it. There are no interest rates. The idea is to help the shipping people through by paying the subsidy payments up to date. In answer to your question, the shipping people did not lose this money it has just been deferred and will be paid up now.

Mr. GROSS. But they were able to get along to the extent of \$40.3 million during all of this time.

Mr. GARMATZ. That was divided up among quite a few companies, I might say to the gentleman from Iowa. I am informed at least 11 companies were involved in this indebtedness.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the 1971 maritime authorization bill, now Public Law 91-247 provided for an authorization of \$193 million.

The bill, H.R. 5352, would increase this 1971 authorization by \$80 million to a level of \$273 million as requested by the administration in an Executive communication dated February 25, 1971.

Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$40.3 million of this total supplemental authorization is needed in order to liquidate unpaid subsidies which have accrued for prior years, and \$39.7 million of the remainder would cover changes in the subsidy payment schedule for fiscal year 1971.

This bill provides for a monthly payment of 100 percent of wage subsidies and 90 percent of all other subsidies rather than the quarterly payment of 90 percent of all such items. Thus, this would require the payment of 2 months' additional subsidy in fiscal year 1971 which the authorization level of \$39.7 million would cover.

During the full committee deliberations and consideration of this request all concerned were of the opinion that the supplemental request was valid and consistent with the goals and objectives of the new merchant marine program. Accordingly, the committee unanimously approved the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to commend our chairman for his able work in reporting the bill out within a short period of time. I fully support the objectives of the bill and urge its overwhelming passage.

Mr. Chairman, a moment ago the distinguished gentleman from Iowa raised a point on which I think I can supply the information.

As indicated, \$40.3 million was for liquidation of accrued but unpaid operating differential subsidies, and in order to

bring these payments up to date there is required \$22.4 million which is included also in the 1972 budget.

The reason that these matters have not been settled in previous years was because of a difference of opinion between the operators and the Maritime Administration as to what the rate of subsidy should be.

Attached to the report, or included in the report I should say, there are statements as to the amount of the subsidy or the obligations. But the major areas of disagreement involved the determination of the wage rates for foreign competition, since this is a key factor in the determination of subsidies to be paid, consistent with the applicable formula.

Also, I should point out to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa the fact that this includes a 5-percent hold back for the finalization of the amount due under the 1936 Merchant Marine Act. In other words, there was a dispute with reference to the settling of this matter. However, an agreement was reached to the effect that 5 percent was held back.

Now, the new subsidy schedule, the \$39.4 million under the new law has a new wage index subsidy system which I think will simplify the adjustment of these subsidies and should end for years to come, I hope, the matter of not settling with the steamship operators, allowing these sums, without interest, to be delayed which, of course, involved the steamship operators in borrowing the money until they got paid.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think this is a fair bill and a good bill and I urge the Committee to support it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Washington yield?

Mr. PELLY. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I note that there are no departmental reports on this bill. Is there some particular reason why?

Mr. PELLY. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that the administration sent over a message asking for it and I assume, under the circumstances, we did not ask the individual departments insofar as I know for a special report. It is an administration request and we think a valid one.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING).

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5352, which would amend Public Law 91-247, the 1971 maritime authorization bill, to increase the authorization for ship operation subsidy from \$193 million to \$273 million.

As pointed out by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, this increase in authorization for the Maritime Administration is required to liquidate contract liabilities for operating-differential subsidy.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1970 was enacted in the last session of the Congress. That act provides for the payment of operating-differential subsidy on a

more current basis than has previously been the case. If the Maritime Administration is to implement the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, in this regard, it will be necessary to pay 2 months' additional subsidy in fiscal year 1971. The payment of this subsidy accounts for about half of the increased authorization—\$39,700,000.

The remaining amount—\$40,300,000—is required for the liquidation of accrued but unpaid subsidy for fiscal year 1969 and prior years. The implementation of the ship operation subsidy system, prior to the enactment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, resulted in a backlog of unpaid subsidy which went back as much as 9 years. The Maritime Administration has spent considerable effort in resolving these amounts, and the sum here to be authorized liquidates these accrued but unpaid obligations.

I am convinced that these funds are absolutely necessary if we are to successfully implement the new maritime program provided by the Merchant Marine Act of 1970. I strongly urge the House to support this supplemental authorization bill for fiscal year 1971.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of May 13, 1970 (84 Stat. 207; Public Law 91-247) is amended by striking out of paragraph (b) the figure \$193,000,000 and inserting in lieu thereof the figure \$273,000,000.*

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GIAIMO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5352) to amend the act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1971 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, pursuant to House Resolution 355, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MARITIME AUTHORIZATION, 1972

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4724) to authorize ap-

propriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4724) with Mr. GIAIMO in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ).

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4724, which would authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1972.

This bill was reported by our committee in House Report No. 92-62 on March 24, 1971, without amendment. H.R. 4724, introduced on February 22, 1971, is identical to the bill as recommended by Executive Communication No. 282, dated February 17, 1971.

In summary, the administration recommended a maritime appropriation authorization in the sum of \$507,650,000 in the following categories, and in the amounts indicated:

First. Acquisition, construction, or reconstruction of vessels and construction-differential subsidy and cost of national defense features incident to the construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of ships, \$229,687,000. This sum will be used for requirements of the second year of expanded ship construction under the new maritime program which calls for the construction of 300 new vessels over the next 10 years. Contract awards for 22 ships are anticipated during fiscal year 1972. The level of 30 percent year will be reached by fiscal year 1973.

I should point out that the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 made several drastic changes with respect to the amounts payable for construction subsidies. The statute sets forth guidelines for a reduction in the subsidy rates beginning with a maximum of 45 percent for fiscal year 1971 and reducing this amount by 2 percent each year until it reaches a maximum rate of 35 percent in 1976 and thereafter. Hence, the target rate for 1972 is 43 percent. For a number of years prior to the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, the ceiling on rates was fixed at 55 percent.

Second. Payment of obligations incurred for ship operation subsidies, \$239,145,000. This sum will provide for the continued payment of such subsidies to American operators to enable them to compete with their foreign-flag counterparts.

Again, it is important to note several significant facts with respect to the amount requested in this category. First, the introduction of new technology, par-

ticularly containerships, has enabled certain lines to operate profitably in some trade routes without operating subsidy.

Moreover, the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 effected several improvements in the method used in the determination and administration of operating subsidies. A system, called the index system, has been written into the law to provide incentives for operators to reduce their operating costs as much as possible and to establish a level of subsidizable wage costs consistent with the general level of wage increases throughout our economy.

Third, Expenses necessary for research and development activities—including reimbursement of the vessel operations revolving fund for losses resulting from expenses of experimental ship operation—\$25,000,000. This sum will be used for the continuation of key programs carried out in the areas of advanced ship operation and maritime technology.

Fourth, Reserve fleet expenses, \$4,318,000. This sum will be used for the continued preservation and custody of Government-owned vessels in the national defense Reserve fleet.

Fifth, Maritime training at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., \$7,300,000. This sum will provide for the continued operation of this facility.

Sixth, Financial assistance to State marine schools, \$2,200,000. This sum will provide for the continuation of this program.

Testimony was taken on this bill from both Government and industry. The record shows that the amounts submitted by the administration were satisfactory to all concerned. The committee was unanimous in its approval of all aspects of this bill.

Without amendment, the committee accepted all of the administration's recommendations.

The committee report sets forth in greater detail the matters involved in this legislation.

H.R. 4724 as a whole includes requirements for the second year of expanded activities under the new maritime program established by the Merchant Marine Act of 1970. Approval of this authorization will permit the Maritime Administration to expand its shipbuilding program, improve the ship operation subsidy program, continue research and development efforts designed to produce improvements and savings in the design, construction, and operation of U.S.-flag merchant vessels, and carry on related functions required by the Merchant Marine Act of 1970. The requested funds will also permit that agency to carry out its normal functions, pursuant to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and related statutes. Thus, we strongly urge the House to support this appropriation authorization.

There are present members of both the majority and minority of our committee and they may wish to say a few words in connection with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I submit a statement with respect to H.R. 4724 on behalf of the AFL-CIO Maritime Trades Department, which is the constitutional arm created

by the national labor movement to speak on maritime affairs, and with which are affiliated 42 national and international AFL-CIO unions with a combined membership of more than 7.5 million American workers; and the Seafarers International Union of North America, which represents licensed and unlicensed American seamen engaged in deep-sea operations on the Atlantic, gulf, Pacific, and Great Lakes coasts, as well as seafarers operating in the American system of inland waterways:

With this authorization legislation, the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee begins the first phase of a long voyage for the American merchant marine. This is the beginning of transition—transition from the narrow concepts of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which ultimately failed to meet the test of changing times and changing technologies; transition to the more sweeping, and more appropriate, approach to maritime affairs embodied in the Merchant Marine Act of 1970.

Since 1936, the multi-billion-dollar federal investment in building and operating commercial vessels was funneled through an artificially created "elite" corps of liner companies—companies whose ships comprised only one-third of the U.S.-flag fleet, and whose break-bulk cargo represented an ever-dwindling potential as America's (and the world's) waterborne commerce shifted more and more to bulk carriage, liquid and dry-bulk alike.

Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, the emphasis shifts away from the liner trade to embrace the entire fleet. But most particularly, it shifts in the direction of the bulk-cargo shipping companies, whose vessels comprise two-thirds of the U.S.-flag fleet, and whose cargo represents a significant opportunity for the return of U.S.-flag shipping to a position of dominance of the sea lanes of the world.

For the first time in the nation's history, we have maritime legislation aimed at establishing a fair and equitable program that will reach all segments of the U.S.-flag ocean-going fleet—dry-bulk, tanker and container operations as well as the declining liner trade. For the first time in the nation's history, we have maritime legislation that will make public funds available to all operators, engaged in all aspects of foreign commerce.

And, for probably the first time in a non-war situation, we have maritime legislation calling for a sharp increase in the number of tax dollars to be committed to American shipbuilding, and to the operation of U.S.-flag commercial vessels on a competitive basis with foreign-flag shipping.

All of this augurs well for the maritime industry—and particularly for the unsubsidized two-thirds of the American-flag fleet, whose vessels have grown old in the service of their country's commerce and defense, but who, until now, have been left out of the nation's maritime planning.

What challenges us now is this: To make the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 into the kind of a program which will work best for everyone:

For the American taxpayer, who deserves a dollar's worth of value for every dollar's worth of taxes invested in this industry.

For the American shipper, who deserves a merchant fleet capable of carrying America's imports and exports, capable of carrying them at rates more nearly competitive with those of foreign lines, and capable of carrying them with the maximum of speed and the minimum of delay.

For the American government, which needs a fleet which is the "first arm of our commerce" in peacetime, if it is to be the "fourth arm of our defense" in time of crisis.

For the American shipyard and its workers,

which, up until now, have suffered under a competitive situation vis-à-vis foreign shipyards, at least part of which competition resulted from the investment of one billion American tax dollars in modernizing these same foreign yards in the wake of World War II.

For the American ship operators and the American seaman, who have been the first, and most direct, victims of the past years of governmental and public neglect of this industry.

It would be helpful, of course, to be able to say that, with the passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, Congress has finally obliterated the lines of demarcation between one section of the American merchant marine and another—and that, in the process, it has healed the wounds that were inflicted on this industry by having one-third of it subsidized, and leaving the other two-thirds of it to shift for itself.

It would be helpful to be able to say that, having a law which holds out the promise of fair and equitable treatment, it would be possible, from this moment on, to treat all applications for subsidy—be it construction subsidy or operating subsidy—even-handedly.

But of course this is not possible. Not immediately. For the Congress and the Executive Branch have an obligation to right some ancient wrongs. The two-thirds of this industry which existed unsubsidized for 34 years; which limped along on its own dollars without any direct help from the federal government; whose ships are nearing—or have passed—their useful life span; who have had no opportunity, up to now, to put aside dollars into tax-deferred construction reserve funds; and who face the greatest competitive threat from foreign operators who have had America's bulk trade almost exclusively to themselves—this section of the industry cannot be expected to compete immediately on an equal footing with the one-third of the industry which has regularly dined at the taxpayers' table all these years.

And the reason why the unsubsidized operators cannot, at the outset, compete on an equal footing with the long-time subsidized operators is very simple: The footing is not yet equal. The prospects for the future are that, down the road, these two segments of the industry will finally enjoy co-equal status. But not now. Not yet. And not for some time to come.

It would be a travesty, therefore, to suggest that all of the American ship operators get in the same line, and be treated on the same first-come-first-served basis. It would be an even greater travesty if the subsidized operator, who during his years of elite status turned up his nose at the tramp trade, were now allowed to blossom out into that field of cargo movement—taking his tax-deferred construction reserves, his construction subsidy arrangement and his operating subsidy arrangement (all of long years' standing), in order to move in on this growing trade which is only now receiving recognition from the government in the form of tax dollars.

What must be done, then, is to begin to balance equities. We must consciously adopt a catch-up arrangement for the operator who existed so long without subsidy, and who is at the point of desperation.

If he has not filed sufficient applications for new ship construction, he must be encouraged to do so through the enunciation of a clear federal policy that he is going to have first position for the dollars which are available.

If he has not been able to put aside sufficient private capital in his tax-deferred construction reserve fund, some method must be devised—either to reach back into former earnings, through special tax credits, to enable him to build up the reserves he needs; or to grant him additional opportunities to do so out of current revenues. Whatever technique is devised, the catch-up principle should be the guide.

Further, every latitude should be given him in terms of having first-call on government cargoes for the immediate future—because until he can build subsidized ships and operate subsidized ships, the illusion of competing with the foreigner is nothing more than that: An illusion.

He should not have to compete for government cargo. Particularly, he should not be saddled with the uncompetitive position of bidding for government cargo against the subsidized operator who, because of CDS and ODS can underbid him by a matter of pennies, and walk off with what is, to all intents and purposes, a double subsidy. For government cargo moves at American rates; the subsidies make it possible for the recipients to carry goods at world rates. And no matter how you slice it, when you put these two programs together in the hands of the maritime industry's "elite" corps of liner companies, you have a double subsidy.

And finally, the American operator should not be saddled with the unrealistic economic philosophies of the Agriculture Department, the Agency for International Development, or the Department of Defense when it comes to procuring ships to move government-sponsored cargo. The American operator should not have to compete with the foreigner to carry the military hardware, the foreign aid supplies and the surplus agricultural products which our own government is shipping abroad.

There is something ludicrous about the federal government, on the one hand, embarking on a program to revitalize the American merchant marine, while on the other hand it forces the American ship operator to go, hat in hand, to that same government in search of its cargo. It is even more ludicrous for the government to exhort business and industry leaders in this country to "ship American," when the pattern over the years has been for the government, itself, to "ship American" only reluctantly, only in half-hearted fashion, often only as a last resort.

None of these points is dealt with specifically in H.R. 4724. All of these points are embraced implicitly in this legislation. For it is this authorization legislation that will provide the sinews of war for the merchant marine—the sinews of war that are needed to carry out the battle plan contained in the Merchant Marine Act of 1970.

We would hope, therefore, that in the report which accompanies this legislation, the Committee will make clear its intent to bring the long-unsubsidized segment of the U.S.-flag fleet into full partnership with the one-third of the industry which, up to now, has been the sole beneficiary of federal efforts to revive our shipping.

We would hope that the Committee indicates, in the strongest possible language, that such full partnership dictates that, for the immediate future, a conscious effort must be made to give preference to the long-unsubsidized operator—first, so that he can stay alive in the crucial period of transition; second, so that he can make his full contribution to the growth of the American merchant marine.

One final point:

At another time, and under other circumstances, the AFL-CIO Maritime Trades Department and the Seafarers International Union of North America, AFL-CIO, would have been inclined to challenge the adequacy of the funds called for in the authorization measure, and the number of ships which the measure envisions could or should be built.

We would have done so because we find the 10-year goal of 300 new ships at odds with the concurrent goal of carrying 35 percent of America's waterborne commerce by the middle of this decade—the goal enunciated by President Nixon in 1968, and which formed the basis for his maritime recom-

mendations which formed the core of the Merchant Marine Act of 1970.

We recognize, however, the difficult times in which America finds itself. We are in an era of economic troubles. Unemployment stands at critical levels. The cost-of-living index continues to move upward relentlessly. There are urgent demands being made by the American people for public services of all kinds—for the expansion of existing programs, for the adoption of new ones. And there are only so many tax dollars available.

For this reason, even though we feel that more should be spent now to launch this new maritime era, we accept the combined judgment of the Committee and the Administration on this issue. But we do so only for the present. Another year, and we shall be back to ask for a more realistic appraisal of our urgent needs, and an even larger commitment of our resources to meeting these needs.

For now, we feel that, inadequate as these funds are, they will at least make it possible for us to build the foundation for maritime's future growth.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY).

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I rise in full support of the passage of this bill, H.R. 4724, which, as the distinguished chairman has just indicated, would authorize appropriations in the total amount of \$507,650,000 for the fiscal year 1972 program within the Department of Commerce, the Maritime Administration, and effective implementation of the recently enacted Merchant Marine Act of 1970.

The decline of our merchant marine fleet has been apparent to many for a long period of time. Since the President issued his commitment to restore our merchant marine to its rightful position on the high seas—a speech, incidentally, given in my city of Seattle in 1968—both the administration, Congress, and the merchant marine industry itself have worked hand-in-hand to revitalize our merchant marine and to restore it to its proper place in interstate commerce.

Passage of this authorization bill would permit this country to expand its shipbuilding program at a greater rate than at any time in the past 20 years, and continue expansion of research and development efforts designed to produce both near-term and long-range improvements and savings in the design, construction, and operation of U.S.-flag merchant vessels.

This new merchant marine programs calls for reaching a construction level of 30 ships per year by 1973, and anticipates maintenance of that rate throughout the 1970's, in order to fulfill the commitment of the program to provide a total of 300 ships, which I mentioned. The 1972 authorizations in this bill would require construction of 22 new ships in 1972, an increase of three over the number planned for 1971.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The appropriations subcommittee which handles the appropriations that are being

authorized here today had hearings on yesterday. It originally appeared from the President's statement that the American merchant marine was going to have a 30-ships-a-year program; that it was just around the corner. The program that is presently being authorized in this bill covers only 20 ships; is that correct?

Mr. PELLY. There are 22 ships to be exact, and that is the way it was planned.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Does the distinguished gentleman from Washington know how many ships are being built in the current year?

Mr. PELLY. Yes, I do; and it will be accelerated. The point is that while we are designing ships, and they are on the drawing boards, we cannot start building new designs. So we will have an accelerating program, as I just explained, until we get to the average level of 30 ships a year, and then we will finally achieve over 10 years a total of 300 ships.

If the gentleman thinks he can make some partisan advantage of it, he may. I know at the same time the gentleman is a great supporter of the maritime fleet.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. As my distinguished friend knows, I am interested in getting ships built. We are woefully lacking in our American merchant marine. I have heard testimony that out of the money for ship construction subsidy appropriated in the current year, in the 1971 fiscal year, in which every nickel was appropriated that was authorized by the gentleman's committee, up to now we are going to have only three new ships out of 22, and seven or eight renovations. That is some boost to the merchant marine, I will say to the gentleman from Washington. This administration is surely doing fine.

Mr. PELLY. I will explain to the gentleman, since obviously he must not have heard the testimony, that the actual contracts in 1971, under the construction program, as of March 1971, provide for three new container ships, two conversions for the American Mail Line, five American President Line conversions, in the final process of construction, lash-type vessels for three steamship companies each which are also in the final stage of construction. Negotiations are in the process for bulk rate carriers for four different owners.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield further?

Mr. PELLY. I do not yield now, Mr. Chairman; I will when I finish.

The Maritime Administration anticipates contracts for six to eight lash vessels, six bulk carriers, for a total of 25 ships, both new and conversions.

The tentative 1972 vessel construction program provides for the following:

ship:	
Ore/bulk/oil carriers.....	8
General cargo/bulk.....	5
Barge carriers.....	5
Containerships.....	4
Total.....	22

In addition 29 or 30 ships are anticipated to be constructed in fiscal year 1973 and 30 ships per year from 1973 on.

Now I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, how many years from now will these ships be finally built?

Mr. PELLY. These ships will be built as rapidly as ships can be built.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman was listening to me with an open mind.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am going to be the first to admit that the present Maritime Administrator, or rather the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Maritime Affairs, Mr. Gibson, is by far the best Administrator in this area over all the years—and I have had something to do with these matters for a quarter of a century.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman has had a great deal to do with them, and I agree with him as to Mr. Gibson's qualifications.

Mr. Chairman, I simply continue by saying that if we proceed under this authorization bill, sufficient funding will be provided to expand and redirect our maritime research and development programs with emphasis on the practical application of new technology through coordination and cost sharing with the maritime industry. This research objective is directed toward the national goal of making our U.S. merchant marine fleet wholly competitive through practical advances in ship construction, design, and operation and through coordination with industry, government, management, and labor.

The committee, under the able leadership of Chairman GARMATZ, has moved very quickly, but with a great deal of foresight, planning, and analysis, on the administration's requested authorization levels. The committee, after due deliberation and consideration of the views of the industry, the Maritime Administration, and others, unanimously approved the administration's requested authorization level and unanimously reported the bill out for consideration by the House.

I lend my full support to passage of this bill and strongly urge the Members of the House to act favorably on H.R. 4724, so that this Nation can continue to move forward toward full implementation of the goals and objectives which we have set forth in the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, overwhelmingly supported by this body during the 91st Congress.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the remarks of the gentleman from New York as being critical of the present administration, and I say this as a Democrat, if it had not been for the Nixon administration, we would not have a program at all, period.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN).

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the passage of H.R. 4724, which would authorize a total of \$507,650,000 in appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1972.

I would like to limit my comments to those two activities of the Marine Ad-

ministration that requires about half of the total amount.

The first pertains to what is generally referred to as the vessel construction activities of that agency. The Merchant Marine Act of 1970 provides for the new maritime program that envisions the construction of 30 ships a year for 10 years. The year 1972 will be the second year of expanded ship construction under the new maritime program, and contract awards for 22 ships are anticipated in that year. The level of 30 vessels per year will be reached by fiscal year 1973.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1970 was enacted to revitalize the U.S.-flag merchant marine. New vessels are desperately needed to achieve this purpose. The requested authorization of \$229,687,000 for vessel construction will permit the Maritime Administration to carry out the new maritime program in this regard.

The second activity of the Maritime Administration that I would like to comment on is the vessel operation subsidy activities of that agency. Appropriation authorization in the amount of \$239,145,000 has been requested for this activity.

This sum will provide for the continual payment of operating subsidies to U.S.-flag operators in order to enable them to compete with their lower cost foreign-flag counterparts.

In recent years certain operators have found that they can operate profitably in some trade routes without subsidy, and have voluntarily gone off subsidy. This, however, is the exception, and if we are to have a viable U.S.-flag merchant marine operating subsidy continues to be required in order to compete in a world market.

I strongly urge the House to support this Maritime Administration authorization bill.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING), a member of the committee.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) for working together on this important measure. I would like to comment in support of H.R. 4724, the maritime authorization bill. It is a positive piece of legislation in all respects and one of its more important features is the construction differential subsidy funding which will be for the second year of expanded ship construction under the new maritime program—Merchant Marine Act of 1970—which has as its goal the construction of 300 new ships over the next 10 years.

There is another element in this bill, however, which I think deserves attention. It is the authorization of appropriations of \$25 million for research and development. This is the second consecutive year that this important research and development funding has been at such a high level. Obviously, it is necessary to authorize sufficient funds for viable ship construction and operating programs but these expenditures tend to be wasted if this vessel construction and operation is not buttressed by a

sound and forward looking research and development program and with a goal of advanced technology and increased productivity.

Unfortunately, in the past, merchant marine development has been inhibited by a lack of funds and interest in a viable progressive research and development program. Since R. & D. funding will be at a high level for the second consecutive year, it would seem that this weakness in our overall maritime posture is being corrected and that we will have adequate funding and sound programing for a healthy R. & D. program which is a bulwark of the U.S. merchant marine.

I believe this entire maritime authorization merits our support. Therefore, I urge passage of H.R. 4724.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. TIERNAN), a member of the committee.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I join in the remarks of my colleagues on the committee.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH).

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues in commending the chairman of the committee for the job he has done. After these many years, we are finally getting a maritime program that is worthy of the name.

I have in my constituency a maritime academy, which for years has played a very significant role in the educational excellence and environment we have in Massachusetts. One of her graduates is now the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Maritime Affairs. He is not a deck officer and he is not an engineering officer any longer. He is a Maritime Administrator, helping to steer a sound national course in the field of the merchant marine.

In fact, such is the vocation of many graduates of our maritime academies. They may not stay on board our merchant vessels for a lifetime, and, in many instances they are welcomed in other engineering and ocean or water-oriented sciences. We need them now and we will continue to need them in the future, if this free enterprise economy of ours is to survive in the merchant marine age that lies ahead of us.

We are gradually phasing out some of our space program and applying more funds to earth-related sciences, particularly in the broad and diverse field of oceanography. The men who graduate from Massachusetts Maritime Academy or our other State academies can contribute greatly to the success of ocean science programs as they try to satisfy the needs of our Nation.

We know that a starting class of 75 per year at the Massachusetts Academy was uneconomical. We could not justify the instructors to support such a small school with such a small enrollment. So we bravely forged ahead and built a larger institution, still primarily for the purpose of training merchant marine officers, but with a dual objective of increasing our inventory of well-trained men who could be engineers on the sea and by the sea. Now we are anticipating

freshman classes in the years ahead in the vicinity of 200 students.

Mr. Chairman, when the bill was heard in committee it appeared that as a national policy we felt we needed fewer officers for the narrowly defined maritime business. I believe this national policy discourages the development of these institutions. But then I find inconsistencies. Here we are discouraging larger numbers of cadets at five academies, while we authorized and are now going to support a brandnew maritime academy in Michigan. It says in the committee report that there is going to be a \$600 annual subsidy for each student, and it implies that the subsidy is for the year 1972. However, Mr. Gibson indicated in his testimony that he intended to base the subsidy on enrollment figures for the year 1965, with some adjustments for Michigan and perhaps for other States. The fact of the matter is that for the relatively little we spend we are getting a whale of a lot for our money.

In the Federal academy at Kings Point, it costs more than \$7,000 per student per year. In the State academy it costs about half that. And as far as the Federal Government's contribution is concerned, it is \$600 per student. We get a great deal for that \$600.

I believe we should continue to support the academy personnel on a per-capita basis based on whatever level they seek to fund. I believe that the Maritime Administration is dictating to us and, incidentally, I believe it is in this instance an unwise dictatorship. I base this belief on the Administration policy that says you have to take funding based on a 1965 level when the years 1972 and beyond will find these academies expanding their faculties, staffs, and student bodies in order to play a more important role in the great maritime and ocean science future we have charted. So I hope that the chairman could give us some reassurance in Massachusetts, Texas, New York, and in the Nation that the committee does intend to fund adequately and equitably, and in proportion to the numbers of students in these educational institutions at all academies—regardless of their locale.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I am glad to yield to the chairman.

Mr. GARMATZ. I might say out of six academies that are in existence today I would hope the special education training subcommittee will go into this thoroughly and come back with some sort of recommendation on the overall picture. I hope they will take into account the fact that quite a few seamen's and naval schools are run now by labor organizations and also the fact that a lot of shipping has come down as a result of the Vietnam situation. I hope that the Committee on Education will give us an overall picture on the State merchant marine academies and also, if necessary, go into the private academies which are run by various labor organizations.

Mr. KEITH. I appreciate the fact that the labor organizations are giving us many more trainees, but I do believe we need to keep this State system alive and well.

We are, in effect, relegating it to history just as we nearly relegated our merchant fleet to history. We cannot possibly keep up with the future, with the merchant force we are planning and with the conquest of the oceans that we envision without these excellent institutions.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time, as he may consume, to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI), a member of the committee.

Mr. BIAGGI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, I rise to support the position of my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH). The gentleman and I have discussed this at length. In my district we have the Fort Schuyler, N.Y., Maritime Academy. We have comparable problems to those academies located throughout the United States.

During the Vietnam war buildup, these schools were asked by the Federal Government to expand their enrollments—to increase drastically the number of students they would be able to train annually. They did so, and they did it with Federal help.

Now, in its infinite wisdom, the Maritime Administration changes course in midstream and decides it no longer wants expanded enrollment. But such a turn-about is impossible to accomplish in so little time. Moreover, it is completely contrary to the President's policy on the merchant marine. The administration talks about revamping or redeveloping a first-rate maritime service. These ships do not operate by themselves. The program is well underway. However, again, we find it necessary to continue to train personnel.

We are not talking here about just training men to sail ships though. We are embarking on new directions in the maritime field. More and more jobs are opening up in the ocean sciences. The whole perspective of maritime training is broadening and these schools are prepared to address themselves to the total overall picture.

The policy regarding the cutbacks is in itself totally inconsistent. We are advised that the 1965 levels will be the criteria. Well, if that is the policy, it should be followed, but it is inconsistent with the facts. It may apply to New York. It may apply to Massachusetts. But it does not apply to Michigan. They had no 1965 criterion. In fact, they were not even in existence until this year. And that in itself is amazing since the Maritime Administration claims it was advising schools to cut back. Likewise, it does not apply to Texas.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about \$650 times 250 students—a sum of \$150,000—a very paltry sum. Frankly it is almost a shame that we have to rise and discuss this matter. This kind of husbandry of funds is hardly the type of fiscal thinking that characterizes our country nor certainly this House. What type of economy is this, I ask you?

Now I share the same concern that my colleague from Massachusetts does as to what we will do with the problem that confronts us.

I am delighted to hear from the chairman that we will look into this matter, and we should do it expeditiously. We

should not suffer from a narrow view, thinking only in terms of providing captains on the ships which we have at present. In other words, today we are adopting a very shortsighted view and one day it is going to come back to haunt us.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIAGGI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DRINAN. Do I understand that the gentleman is preparing an amendment in the sum of \$150,000 which he plans to offer to this bill? The State of Massachusetts, as my distinguished colleague knows, has a maritime academy and there is another one in Maine. It seems to me that this is a very important program.

Does the gentleman propose to offer an amendment in the sum of \$150,000 to H.R. 4724, the bill now under consideration? If he does offer such an amendment, I would support the amendment.

Mr. BIAGGI. Yes; I plan to offer an amendment to that effect.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4724, the maritime authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1972.

It is all too clear that American-flag ocean shipping is in trouble. Today, the privately owned American merchant marine consists of approximately 725 ships and about three-fourths of these vessels have a speed of less than 20 knots.

It is an unfortunate fact that we have stood by and watched the United States drop from first position as a merchant marine power at the end of World War II to sixth place, and we rank around 15th as a merchant shipbuilding nation.

It is a rather sad commentary that while the world merchant fleet has increased enormously in the last 15 years, the U.S.-flag fleet has been dwindling to a dangerous point.

It will not be overly helpful to dwell in the past except inasmuch as it points out our past failures. However, we should be interested in the future. The Merchant Marine Act of 1970 passed by the last Congress gives hope for the rejuvenation of the U.S.-flag merchant fleet which is necessary for our national well-being. For we cannot ignore the fact that the maritime industry is vital to our national economy in terms of high employment and a healthy balance of payments. It is also of great importance to our national defense and the success of our foreign policy.

Indeed, we must note in this latter connection that there are few ports today that are not visited by the new and efficient ships of the Russian merchant marine. Last year with the landmark Merchant Marine Act of 1970 we got started on the right foot toward the rebuilding of this national asset.

This bill, H.R. 4724, which provides \$229,687,000 for construction differential subsidy, is a necessary step in the right direction. If we are able to continue this vital shipbuilding program which seems to be off to a proper start and if we can insure that there will be sufficient cargo

for these new, efficient U.S.-flag vessels, we may, in the future, find ourselves in our former position of preeminence in the merchant fleets of the world.

For the reasons outlined above, I believe it is necessary that the Congress enact this vital maritime authorization bill.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE).

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as the House discusses the maritime authorization of fiscal year 1972 because I am bothered by an oversight which, in my opinion, amounts to a false economy on the part of the administration that recommended it. Given the size of the figures involved in this budget and the number of important considerations which have had to be considered in arriving at this figure, it is easy to understand how the simple amount of \$250,000 could go undetected by everyone here today. But everything must be viewed in perspective and a \$250,000 cutback can mean quite a difference to a program on the receiving end. I refer specifically to the decision to eliminate subsidies for cadets attending the State maritime academies. I am particularly interested in this matter in view of the tremendous importance which the citizens of the Commonwealth I represent attach to the future as well as the past of the Massachusetts Maritime Academy. If my figures are correct, the country will save some \$79,000 by cutting back the subsidies which have in recent years been received by an entering freshman of the academy. The hardship which this will mean for those denied this subsidy far exceeds the \$79,000 savings for this Nation. In a real sense, what is at stake here is the continued success of the ability of the maritime academies to attract young men willing to enter a career in the merchant marines. The whole thrust of recent legislation in this Congress in recent years is to advance this country's maritime interests and be competitive with other nations of the world. It seems to me contradictory therefore that this administration should recommend such a small economy while at the same time going on record as favoring the expansion and increased competitiveness of our merchant marines. It just does not make sense to me to urge on one hand increased spending of millions of dollars—which I would be the first to favor—while at the same time urging on the other hand cutting out such a piddling small amount in the name of economizing. I think that the importance of this to the young men involved cannot be overestimated and I hope that this House will find it within its power to take action to correct this oversight and really show the young men we are trying to attract for this career that this country is not saving pennies at their expense.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER).

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill H.R. 4724. It has been said that the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ), and the committee have

done a good job. I do not quarrel with that. I do quarrel with the basic principle that has not really been considered this afternoon, and that is whether each year, year in and year out, the American taxpayer is going to pay hundreds of millions of dollars to operate and maintain the shipowners and the shipping industry. I submit that only a month ago this body decided to discontinue subsidizing the development of the SST, and I suggest that this body might consider a similar resolution of this annual shipbuilding subsidy we are confronted with today.

Mr. Chairman, the maritime authorization bill for fiscal year 1972 authorizes \$507.6 million. Of this amount, \$239,145,000 is earmarked for payment of ship operation subsidies.

While there is no excuse, at any time, for subsidizing this merchant marine operation, it is particularly objectionable now because our domestic priorities are badly underfinanced. We simply cannot afford to divert almost a quarter of a billion dollars from public programs and give this money away to private corporations. There are vessels flying the U.S. flag, today, that operate without a Government subsidy and show a profit. I can see no reason or justification for U.S. taxpayers continuing to support handouts to those private companies that operate inefficient vessels, some of which are unable to make a profit even with the subsidy.

To give an example of what it cost the U.S. taxpayers to keep afloat one passenger vessel, let me cite the history of the SS *Atlantic*. Quoting from the 1970 House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries report on H.R. 16498 permitting the sale of the passenger vessel *Atlantic* to an alien:

The SS *Atlantic* was constructed by the United States as the cargo vessel *Badger Mariner* in October 1953 for \$9,138,912.69. On April 15, 1957, American Banner Lines purchased the vessel from the United States for

\$4,764,000.33. This company converted the ship to a passenger vessel for \$13,379,943.18, of which the United States paid \$5,722,930.21 as subsidy. The vessel was operated in the trans-Atlantic service during 1958 and 1959, and showed an operating loss, after subsidy, of \$2,107,926. During that period, the Government paid a total amount in the form of operating subsidy of \$2,626,512.

The *Atlantic* was purchased by American Export Lines in February of 1960, in a transaction which included the assumption of two mortgages, with outstanding indebtedness in the amounts of \$3,215,741 and \$5,536,000, respectively, together with an unsecured loan from the Seafarers International Union in the amount of \$750,000, plus cash—a total purchase price of \$10,860,272. American Export then performed further reconstruction work on the vessel at a cost of \$2,422,205.36, of which the Government's contribution by way of subsidy was \$1,300,510.08.

American Export operated the vessel in the trans-Atlantic/Mediterranean service and cruises from 1960 to 1967. During this period, the Government paid the company operating subsidy in the amount of \$22,142,392, but even after subsidy the company showed a loss of \$6,556,804.

The vessel has been laid up since 1967, and costs the company approximately \$159,870 a year to maintain in such status. In addition amortization and interest costs account for an additional \$657,534.51.

All told, the owners of this floating palace received \$31,792,344.29 in Government subsidies. During its operating life as a passenger vessel, the SS *Atlantic* made a profit in only 1 year, 1960, when it earned the grand total of \$25,000. Here was a situation where the American Export Lines could not make a profit on the SS *Atlantic*, yet the Government continued to subsidize trans-Atlantic/Mediterranean cruises. Fortunately, Congress approved of the sale of the SS *Atlantic* which I hope will bring an end to this scandal.

The following tabulation shows the estimated amount in 1970 received by the 13 companies that are beneficiaries of the subsidy program:

ESTIMATED OPERATING-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY ACCRUALS, CALENDAR YEAR 1970

Operator	Cargo	Combination	Passenger	Total
American Export Isbrandtsen Lines, Inc.	\$20,607,352			\$20,607,352
American Mail Line, Ltd.	10,512,966			10,512,966
American President Lines, Ltd.	21,846,129		\$11,562,847	33,408,976
Delta Steamship Lines, Inc.	6,512,945			6,512,945
Farrell Lines, Inc.	11,313,708			11,313,708
Gulf & South American Steamship Co., Inc.	2,660,342			2,660,342
Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc.	30,336,390			30,336,390
Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc.	14,308,456			14,308,456
The Oceanic Steamship Co.	2,090,376		7,424,308	9,514,684
Pacific Far East Line, Inc.	11,015,217			11,015,217
Prudential-Grace Lines, Inc.	10,987,025	\$6,883,733	12,750,828	30,621,586
States Steamship Co.	13,346,872			13,346,872
United States Lines, Inc.	3,378,071			3,378,071
Totals	158,915,849	6,883,733	31,737,983	197,537,565

My colleagues may be interested in the corporate background of these companies. American Export Isbrandtsen Lines, Inc., is controlled by American Export Industries, Inc. The American President Lines, which controls American Mail Line, Ltd., is itself controlled by the Natomas Co. and the Signal Co. The Delta Steamship Lines, Inc., is owned by Holiday Inns; Gulf and South American Steamship Co., Inc., is 50 percent owned by the conglomerate, W. R. Grace & Co.; Lykes Brothers Steamship Co., Inc., is a subsidiary of Lykes-Youngstown Corp., a holding company which owns all the shares in Lykes Bros. and Youngs-

town Sheet & Tube Co; Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., is a subsidiary of a holding company, Moore & McCormack Co., Inc.; the Oceanic Steamship Co. is a subsidiary of Alexander & Baldwin, Inc., operators of the largest sugar plantation in Hawaii and land developers; Pacific Far East Line, Inc., is controlled by Consolidated Freightways, Inc.; Prudential-Grace Lines, Inc., is a wholly owned subsidiary of W. R. Grace & Co.; States Steamship Co. is owned by Pacific Transport Co. and the United States Lines, Inc., is a subsidiary of another conglomerate, Walter Kiddie & Co.,

Inc. I was unable to find any information for the Farrell Lines.

Mr. Chairman, the committee report states that the introduction of new technology has enabled profitable operation without Government assistance on certain trade routes. Giving corporations a subsidy, to the tune of \$239 million to continue inefficient operations represents economic waste, and I urge the rejection of this authorization bill.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, initially I was granted 5 minutes' time, and while I was asking for an additional 5 minutes the chairman of the committee was recognized. My question is this: Can I be, at the will of the minority member, recognized for an additional 5 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) has control of the time, and if he is willing to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts then the gentleman will be recognized.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good leader and I thank the House for its patience. But, Mr. Chairman, this is a terribly important thing to me personally as well as to our Nation.

No seed money is better spent than in the fields of education, and within the field of education none is better spent than in an understanding of the sea which covers seven-tenths or more of our earth's surface. Few men are much better equipped to understand the ocean and to utilize it than those men who graduate from our maritime academies.

There are hundreds of millions of dollars that we have invested and many billions of dollars yet to be applied to study and development in, on, and under the oceans and our coastal zones. These are investments and assets which are directly related to the oceans and these are studies that are receiving a great deal of attention at the Massachusetts Maritime Academy and, hopefully, by other maritime academies.

How can they better study such a broad spectrum of related subjects, as they must, if they are only going to have 77 men in an entire class? They must have the plant, the equipment and a sufficiently large student body to have the diversity of subjects that will enable them to play a proper role. This diversity and this role will come from 4 years at an educational institution such as the Maritime Academy. And this is what the administration has favored, a 4-year course instead of 3 years.

In the growing ocean-oriented field of oil research and development, who is going to run the new sophisticated rigs? Who is going to operate the vessels that go back and forth between these offshore points? Who is going to handle the oil

spills that could result in the future pace of this activity? Who is going to develop the resources of the Continental Shelf and who is going to man our Coast Guard and the Naval Reserves? These men graduating from these academies can and will do that. I really think we are being penny wise and pound foolish if we do not go ahead with the \$150,000 more which could enable us to do the kind of job that we really ought to do to protect, explore, and carefully use our ocean resources.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Brooks).

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with this great committee in recommending this legislation which means so much to the future of the maritime academies and the maritime industry of this country.

As a Representative of one of the greatest maritime States in our Nation, I support this maritime authorization legislation for fiscal year 1972 as reported out of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee under the very able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ).

In the last Congress, we committed this country to dramatically expand our merchant marine fleet. Without question, this expansion is required to meet a great national need. It will require the development and construction of many modern, up-to-date vessels and many additional college-trained maritime officers to man them.

Of particular concern to me is the item in this legislation providing assistance for students at our State maritime academies. Because of the nature of their studies, academy students have no opportunity to supplement their funds through part-time summer work. Nor do they have the usual opportunities for part-time, after school work during the academic term.

For this reason, we need to continue the Federal commitment for student support. If we fail to do this, then the burden of increased educational costs will fall increasingly on the shoulders of students pursuing their specialized maritime education. This would be unfortunate.

Since 1958, Federal support for State merchant marine academies has remained virtually stable, while State investment has increased threefold. The Federal Government should do its full share in supporting the students and the activities of the State merchant marine academies.

The Texas Maritime Academy, located in Galveston and operated by Texas A. & M. University, is today graduating many qualified men to meet the increasing challenges of an updated and modern merchant marine. We must continue to support the Texas Maritime Academy and the other State academies in their efforts to train men to fill highly technical and professional jobs in the maritime industry throughout the world.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New

York (Mr. MURPHY), a member of the committee.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my support to those who vote for the bill, H.R. 4724, to authorize appropriations for maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

I, for one, have been however deeply concerned over the fact that we are fast falling behind other nations in the world as a maritime leader. I am particularly disturbed by the progress that the United States has seen the Soviet Union make, with no comparable progress in its own fleets.

I am also particularly disturbed by another thing, and I will have an amendment to this legislation. It has to do with the NS *Savannah*.

If you will look at page 7 of the report, I think the language glosses over a very significant fact. Page 7, section 5, says, with reference to the NS *Savannah*, "and provides for a phased layup of the NS *Savannah*."

I do not think the United States should scrap its only nuclear propulsion program in the maritime field. I do not feel we have taken advantage of our naval nuclear progress, and particularly in the progress of its undersea propulsion power.

I think a basic nuclear program is necessary so that the United States can regain, recapture, or at least maintain some equity on the high seas of the world in moving its own commerce.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4724, the maritime authorization for fiscal year 1972.

Last year, the Congress—through the leadership and direction of the Merchant Marine Committee and our outstanding chairman, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ)—passed the Merchant Marine Act of 1970. This act has been hailed as the greatest boost for the shipping industry in this generation, and I agree.

But, we must implement this act, and we must follow up our good intentions with good deeds. The act of 1970 envisions a ship construction program of 30 ships a year for the next 10 years. For fiscal year 1971, the Congress appropriated \$187 million in order to begin construction of 19 ships. For fiscal year 1972, the administration has requested \$229.7 million to begin the construction of an additional 22 ships.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that overnight we cannot transform a shipbuilding program of 10 ships a year to a program of 30 ships a year. I understand that next year we anticipate reaching our goal of 30 ships a year. However, I am concerned that thus far, we have authorized the construction of only 41 ships and, thus, we are 19 ships behind schedule after 2 years.

Next year, I eagerly look forward to the construction of 30 new ships and I look forward to even greater construction in the following years.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the present U.S. merchant fleet consists of approximately 650 ships, which carry about

6 percent of U.S. oceanborne foreign trade. Approximately three-fourths of this U.S. foreign trade fleet is now over 20 years of age, having been constructed in World War II—this is compared to the world fleet, only one-fourth of which is 20 years old. The majority of U.S. ships are now past their useful economic life, and the Department of Commerce estimates that approximately 85 percent of them will likely be lost from the fleet by the end of 1973.

Mr. Chairman, American shippers and shipbuilders must compete with every other seafaring nation in the world. I think we can surpass them all if we cooperate, and if we have the ships. We must ship a far greater percentage of our own foreign-destined goods, and we can, if we cooperate. We must ship a far greater percentage of the world's cargo and we can, if we cooperate. We must build a far greater percentage of the world's fleet, and we can, if we cooperate.

The maritime industry, which we have allowed to sag, now potentially has a great future. We must implement the programs which we have enacted, and we must cooperate in the operation of these programs.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation as the appropriation Act may provide for the use of the Department of Commerce, for the fiscal year 1972, as follows:

(a) acquisition, construction, or reconstruction of vessels and construction-differential subsidy and cost of national defense features incident to the construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of ships, \$229,687,000;

(b) payment of obligations incurred for operating-differential subsidy, \$239,145,000;

(c) expenses necessary for research and development activities (including reimbursement of the Vessel Operations Revolving Fund for losses resulting from expenses of experimental ship operations), \$25,000,000;

(d) reserve fleet expenses, \$4,318,000;

(e) maritime training at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York, \$7,300,000; and

(f) financial assistance to State marine schools, \$2,200,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BIAGGI

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BIAGGI: On page 2, line 12, strike "\$2,200,000" and insert "\$2,350,000."

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, just a few moments ago I rose and I enunciated my position in connection with this particular phase of the bill. I do not think it is necessary for me to repeat that. But what I would like to point out is that we are talking about an authorization in this bill of some \$2,200,000 for State maritime academies. What we are ask-

ing for is \$150,000 more to permit an additional 250 students to partake in the State programs.

Just for a matter of clarification, subsidies are provided for all the classes in the academies now. This bill would continue those subsidies and also provide subsidies for a limited number of freshmen. What we are talking about is providing subsidies for the capacity of the institutions which were expanded on the basis of promises in the past. In Massachusetts, the 1965 level was 77; the desired result is 192; The difference is 115. In New York, in my district, the difference is 30; in Maine, the difference is 50; in California, it is 40; in Texas, 15. In all, a total of 250.

If we adopt the 1965 criterion, Michigan would not be afforded one dollar of student subsidy money. But they will get money, nonetheless. To illustrate further the inconsistency with the policy, even Texas has agreed on a negotiated figure. If the rule is to be firmly applied, let it be applied to all, not "to all except." However, it is wrong, fundamentally. The limitation is wrong, because you are talking about a concept which flies in the face of administration policy, which is to improve the merchant marine and to restore it to its proper place in the world.

Our merchant marine has been degraded and neglected over the decades. You do not restore maritime service just by building ships. You have to build the ships and also train men. In this case, we are talking about 250 additional men throughout the United States. It is so paltry a sum, it is shameful for me to find it necessary to rise and plead for it.

I ask for a small consideration here. I ask for \$150,000 for 250 students, 250 more students who would be able to get in if they were given \$600 a year—\$600 per person. There are some 1,800 now getting subsidies.

But moreover, these academies entered into an expansion of their physical plant and training facilities to meet the needs of a wartime America in the 1960's. They were asked to do this and they answered the call of their Government and their Nation.

Now we are telling them to forget about their new housing for so many students, forget about the improved training facilities, forget about the millions of dollars spent to provide these improvements, because they are not going to be able to admit all the students they anticipated. All because the Federal Government wants to save a paltry \$150,000. This is the most illogical form of mental process I have been confronted with in a long time.

I sincerely hope my colleagues here in the House will reason with me on the inefficiency and reckless shortsightedness of cutting this subsidy at this time. Let us continue the subsidy for another year and take a long hard look in committee hearings at the whole problem and the prospects for the future. The chairman has promised this and the ranking member of the committee from the minority side has affirmed it. However, bear in mind that it is harder to rescue a sinking ship than one that is already afloat.

A parsimonious vote in this Chamber today would certainly have the effect of driving holes into the hull of a fine and fully seaworthy ship—our State maritime academy system.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly in opposition to the amendment offered by my esteemed colleague. I rise in opposition in full cognizance of the strong support for Merchant Marine Training which my colleague has adhered to over these many years during our mutual service on the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

At this point in time, such a proposed amendment would have the effect of supporting further expansion of total State academy enrollment in a situation of heavy surplus of the school's product resulting from the winddown of the Vietnam action—a surplus which will continue for the foreseeable future even when the full impact of the new shipbuilding program under the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 is considered.

The purpose of the administration is to provide student allowances to the level of the number of average annual allowances paid to the classes entering the schools in fiscal year 1965, the last year prior to the Vietnam escalation. The enrollment in several of the State schools was expanded substantially over the last several years, and certain of the schools are indicating continued major expansion plans regardless of whether industry demand can sustain the resulting level of graduates. It is my understanding, for example, that the Massachusetts Maritime Academy plans to bring in a freshman class this year approximately double the size of last year's entering class.

During the executive review committee deliberations on H.R. 4724, this amendment or subject area was not presented to the committee for its consideration and subsequent action pursuant to the will of the committee. Certainly, had this point been raised in the committee, I would have given my full attention to the proposal which my able colleague is advancing now on the floor of the House. It may have been possible to have adequately handled this point during such committee deliberations, thus meeting the goals of the Congressman who introduced this amendment in striving to further the caliber of the men who operate and will operate our Merchant Marine fleet.

However, I must respectfully disagree with my colleague in light of the bleak job opportunity market at this point in time. Passage of this amendment would have the net effect of providing an incentive for all State schools, to increase enrollments as a result of being able to obtain additional Federal Government subsidy payments in a period of time when the job opportunity market is low. The effect would be for Congress to encourage payments to students to pursue a maritime education who may not be able to obtain employment in this technical field.

Though I certainly agree with my col-

league that the entire subject area of maritime training should be evaluated, and though I fully support the maintenance of State marine schools, who have done an excellent job in training men for the Merchant Marine, I must oppose this amendment for the reasons cited and urge the committee to defeat the amendment.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment just offered because the figures set out in the amendment are in an amount greater than the amount authorized for the State schools in the bill as reported out by the committee. In other words, these new increased figures were not considered to any extent by the committee at the hearings on the bill and were not presented to the full committee in executive session for its consideration.

In addition, these figures as set out in the budget and in the authorization bill reported out by the committee were established to conform to the realities of the maritime education training programs as they exist today. We are all aware that our merchant marine is in a depleted state and that seafit under the U.S. flag is at a low ebb. As a consequence, of course, there are fewer and fewer seagoing maritime job opportunities. Thus, it seems logical that enrollments at the maritime academies should be kept in proper bounds in accordance with the maritime job opportunities. For this reason, I think the Maritime Administration has wisely cut back modestly on the authorization for the State schools. In good conscience, I must support this current necessary curtailment of enrollments and oppose the amendment.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the formidable opposition we have aroused by this very simple amendment. I question the comment that was made by my good friend and highly revered colleague, the gentleman from Washington, to the effect that this was not discussed in committee. I personally raised this question with Administrator Gibson, and there was an exchange. Unfortunately, the committee hearings have not yet been published, or I could bring them to the attention of the gentleman now.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I must say I must correct my statement, to the effect that of course the gentleman for a long time, over many years, has pressed for more funds for training for the Merchant Marine. Also, as I recall, in a colloquy with the Maritime administrator he did raise this issue. But he did not make it in the form of an amendment.

Mr. KEITH. The gentleman may recall that I tried that a couple of years ago. I finally have to take it to the House.

I admire the courage of my colleague from the big city of New York. I see how he won his fame and his way into Con-

gress. We are sort of alone, but so, too, was the program 10 years ago. This Congress did not face up to the problem.

Now we have spent all this money and we have this investment.

But I am not just arguing for the merchant marine. I am arguing for environmental protection. I am arguing for proper utilization of the resources of the ocean, of the coastal zone, and of the continental shelf.

This is a great big ball of wax, this globe on which we live. It is all interrelated.

We have to have men who know the sea in order to make us superior on the sea. These men and their vessels are one of the best vehicles we have. We have to encourage the poor kids to go to college, and we must encourage them. For a piddling \$600 a year out of the vast Federal till we are getting real training in an area where there is nearly a void.

They may not stay in, because it is a tough and lonely career. They leave it not because the money is not good or the jobs are not there, but because their families want them at home. So we have to produce more than we may think we can use.

In addition to that, the Coast Guard has a requirement for these men, and so do the Reserves. They can get commissions in the Reserves. And they are valuable assets well worth having.

I say these are dollars well invested. I hope the House will take an extraordinary course today and reverse this decision.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BIAGGI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In response to some of the observations made by my esteemed colleague from Washington, who is also a member of the committee, in connection with employment, it seems to me to fly in the face of the programing. Either the administration policy of rehabilitating the entire maritime service is a genuine one, or we are participating in a farce. I assume it is genuine, and I have supported it, as well as all the other members of the committee. Hopefully, we are moving forward to a better and bigger merchant marine that will make America proud. I would anticipate that when we finally reach that stage we will need all the men we can possibly get. To start at that point to train our people would seem to me to be somewhat of a poor illustration of programing for personnel.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Permit me to say I know the gentleman realizes this new program anticipates fewer ships in the future than we have today. Their turn-around time and their efficiency will make it possible that they carry more cargo, but we are not going to have more ships under this program.

Mr. KEITH. I agree that it will require fewer ships, but the old ones are still there. The new program is still a long way down the road.

All the arguments advanced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) and myself, I believe outweigh those offered by the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know whether the gentleman wants to yield to me or not.

Mr. KEITH. I do not, usually, but I will take my chances.

Mr. GROSS. I do not understand what decks these new officers are going to walk, or what enginerooms they are going to occupy, with the ship layups we see and the lack of new ships coming on. What are these people going to do, who are specially trained in the operation of vessels?

Mr. KEITH. The ocean-related industries have never been more active than now. We have vessels all over the world, tending rigs off the shelf of Australia, the Philippines, and Southeast Asia.

There are energy-oriented economies, as you know. That means oil and that means offshore exploration, and that means engineering in the open water.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have not heard all of the remarks in support of the amendment or against it, but I would like to make the point that the State academies have relied on this \$600 per pupil stipend over the past 4 to 5 years. To take them now suddenly back to the pre-Vietnam level is not really justified in my opinion. Many of the benefits that the State academies provide to the United States are not paid for by any Federal funds whatsoever. For example, nearly all of the graduates go into the naval reserve, yet there is no appropriation whatsoever from the Defense Department for the training that the Navy benefits from for the graduates from these State academies.

This is not a great amount—only \$150,000. The budget amount for this year is really under that appropriated last year. We have an additional school in Michigan that has to be funded out of that amount. This amendment will only cover 250 students, and it will keep the State academies throughout the United States at about the same levels that they have been at for the past 4 to 5 years. I think it is unconscionable to cut them back to the pre-Vietnam war level when such a small amount can keep at the level of funding that they have been accustomed to. A lot of schools have made expansions based on the fact that they were going to receive this amount. They relied on that. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) and I have cosponsored bills to increase the stipend for all students based on the fact that \$600 a year is not really adequate. We feel that \$1,000 would be more realistic. We realize that the demand for trained

graduates fluctuates up and down. However, it was not too long ago that we were in a crisis situation with regard to Vietnam and had to hurry up graduation exercises at many of the schools so that we could get officers on the decks and in the engine rooms of merchant ships.

Although the demand at this moment may not be too high, we know that the United States has commitments throughout the world. We intend to expand our maritime fleet, and in the very near future I am sure the demand will be much greater. The demand will increase again so that this will turn out to be an investment well worth making.

Mr. GARMATZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HATHAWAY. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GARMATZ. Is it not true that a great number of graduates from the merchant marine academies do not go to sea at all but get shore jobs?

Mr. HATHAWAY. I agree that many do.

Mr. GARMATZ. So we are really subsidizing them to take shore jobs and not to go sea—the graduates from the merchant marine academies.

Mr. HATHAWAY. I know from my own experience at the Maine academy that it ranks higher than the Federal academy with respect to people who stay in the service even after a 3-year period.

Mr. GARMATZ. Do you know that only two out of six State academies are accredited?

Mr. HATHAWAY. Two out of six are accredited?

Mr. GARMATZ. Yes.

Mr. HATHAWAY. That may be true, but the accreditation process should be looked into. The reason why the Maine academy is not accredited is because it will not join with the University of Maine. The reason it will not join with the university is they do not want to get lost in the university's budget. They will not get any money from the State if they meld with the university.

Mr. GARMATZ. That is one reason why we want to have the Subcommittee on Education look into the State academies and the merchant marine academies.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HATHAWAY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BIAGGI. Is it not true that many young men educated in the military academies of this Nation do not make the military a lifetime career?

Mr. HATHAWAY. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. BIAGGI. And it costs substantially more to educate and train them?

Mr. HATHAWAY. That is correct.

Mr. BIAGGI. And it costs substantially more to educate them and to train them?

Mr. HATHAWAY. That is correct.

Mr. BIAGGI. And, the fact that many of them do drop out, insofar as the Maritime Academy is concerned, this proves the need for as many students as possible so that ultimately, in spite of

the dropouts, we will have some people who go to sea, not only from the standpoint of merchant shipping but from the standpoint of the ocean sciences. This is a whole new dimension that has been heretofore obscured or never even developed.

Mr. HATHAWAY. That is true. Even if the men do not go to sea or participate in oceangoing ships, the investment which we have made in their education has not been lost. They are still able to make a contribution to our society.

State maritime academy graduates can and do serve a multitude of purposes within the maritime community in such matters as ocean exploration and research, in merchant marine safety, in service with the Navy, the Coast Guard, the Army Corps of Engineers, and many others. Through their skills these men contribute significantly to well-being of the Nation.

At a time when both the administration and the Congress have committed themselves to rebuilding the Nation's merchant marine, it is folly to endanger our best source of properly trained individuals who will provide the type of responsible leadership necessary for the effective operation of a strong merchant marine.

Reducing subsidy support to State maritime academy students substantially threatens the financial stability of many of the schools. The Federal Government contributes only a small fraction of the total cost of educating a student at the State academies, the balance being borne by the respective States and the individual students. Yet it is difficult for the academies to get State aid and to attract students unless the Federal Government shows a willingness to at least maintain its share of the costs of maritime training.

The Federal share of the operating costs of the State maritime academies is minute in comparison to the contribution by the academies of qualified officers for the American Merchant Marine. The proposed cutbacks in student subsidies are contrary to the national interest, and risk the loss of a most valuable national asset. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI).

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Seventy-one Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 57]

Abourezk	Chappell	Flynt
Alexander	Clancy	Foley
Anderson, Ill.	Clark	Goldwater
Anderson, Tenn.	Clawson, Del.	Goodling
Andrews, Ala.	Clay	Green, Oreg.
Ashley	Corbett	Green, Pa.
Blackburn	Coughlin	Gubser
Boggs	Crane	Halpern
Boland	Davis, Ga.	Hanley
Brown, Mich.	Dowdy	Hanna
Camp	Dwyer	Hansen, Wash.
Casey, Tex.	Edwards, La.	Harvey
Celler	Evinas, Tenn.	Hays
	Fascell	Hicks, Mass.

Hollfield	Murphy, Ill.	Schmitz
Horton	Passman	Schwengel
Jonas	Pirnie	Sebelius
Kazen	Preyer, N.C.	Seiberling
Lloyd	Purcell	Shriver
Long, La.	Qule	Slack
McClary	Rallsback	Smith, Calif.
McCollister	Rees	Springer
McCulloch	Reid, Ill.	Staggers
Macdonald, Mass.	Reid, N.Y.	Steed
Mailliard	Rhodes	Steele
Mann	Riegle	Steiger, Wis.
Mathias, Calif.	Rooney, Pa.	Symington
Mayne	Rosenthal	Talcott
Miller, Calif.	Roy	Wilson, Bob
	Scheuer	Wolf

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GIAMMO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 4724, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 344 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to ask my colleague from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) several questions concerning his amendment.

The first question I would like to ask is during the course of the gentleman's presentation of his amendment the gentleman indicated that the \$150,000 additional money that you are asking for would take care of an additional 250 students who would be entering these academies.

How did the gentleman arrive at that figure?

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the amendment calls for an increase of \$150,000, from \$2.2 million to \$2,350,000.

The sum of \$150,000 deals with six merchant marine academies. The academies have geared themselves up at the cost of billions of dollars to the taxpayers of the Nation to accommodate the additional 250 students.

What has been done in this instance is that they are using the 1965 criteria, not simply for all of the academies, but all except two. If they use that 1965 criteria, Michigan would not get 1 cent. If they use that 1965 criteria, Texas would not get as much as it is now receiving. In New York the difference is, the academy which is located in my district would be dealing with 30 additional students, in Maine it would be 50, in California 40, Texas 15, and Massachusetts 115.

What is happening is that subsidies are provided for every class, and even the freshmen who are there now would be affected. However, they are limiting the amount for the incoming class. It is as if you had built a Cadillac and then made an arrangement where it would only carry one person because it costs too much money to buy the gas, that is the situation which is presented here.

The academies have been in touch with me and with my colleagues and are asking for tuition for funding based upon their current and anticipated operations.

The argument has been made that there are not enough jobs.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about an administration policy of rehabilitating the maritime service and moneys have been provided for a lengthy period of time which would provide not simply more ships but the development of whole new areas, such as oceanographic studies, ocean sciences, and ocean engineering, whereby we can funnel most of these people into such activities.

It has been said that we have dropouts, and that is true. However, we have dropouts in the military service. We have young men who do not go on and make a career of the military service. However, the point is if we provide enough graduates we will have enough men ultimately to man our ships and our other programs that deal with the future, that deal with oil development, that deal with the Continental Shelf, and that deal with all of the foodstuffs which we find in the seas today.

Mr. BRASCO. So, what the gentleman is saying is that the schools in question, in anticipation of full funding for their freshmen classes, have already expended money to expand classroom facilities?

Mr. BIAGGI. That is exactly right.

Mr. BRASCO. And we are cutting them off in the middle of the improvements which they have made in anticipation of Federal funding?

Mr. BIAGGI. That is right. In fact, cutting off those funds is a waste. It is poor business and poor economy.

As I said before, we have built all of the accommodations at these institutions and we have the instructors there now to help instruct these young men. Let us embark upon a program of performance. We are talking about \$150,000 for six academies.

It has been said that some of these academies are not accredited and that these are some of the academies that have been receiving money in the past. However, suddenly, their accreditation has come into question. Let us not have a study of this matter since such a study would probably cost a half a million dollars and we would not come to any better conclusion.

Even if each of these individuals never works a day on a ship or never gets involved in oceanographic work, imagine, it is only costing \$600 to educate some of the finest young men in the country and provide them an opportunity to improve themselves.

As I said before, and I say it again, it is sad to have to rise and argue for \$150,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) and I do so with a great deal of reluctance.

This money was originally appropriated for the training of deck officers and maritime officers to operate the ships at sea. As a practical matter, even when we get our brandnew fleet in the 1980's

we will have less need for these men than we have now. It seems to me that to take these young men into the maritime schools and to train them and tell them that they are going to be deck officers in the merchant marine is misleading, because when they graduate there just will not be the jobs for them.

It is true that there are ocean-related industries, and possibly they might be prepared for them, but I am not too sure their maritime training would qualify them for this field of work.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNING. I yield to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ).

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment just offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI).

These figures as set out in the budget and in the authorization bill reported out by the committee were established to conform to the realities of the maritime education training programs as they exist today. We are all aware that our merchant marine is in a depleted state, and that sealift under the U.S. flag is at a low ebb. As a consequence, of course, there are fewer and fewer seagoing maritime job opportunities. Thus it seems logical that enrollments at the maritime academies should be kept in proper balance in accordance with the maritime job opportunities.

Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNING. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I find it very difficult to oppose the amendment offered by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) but I think we should recognize this, that right today, at the King's Point Maritime Academy annually we graduate 200 of these deck and engineering officers. And in these marine schools which we are funding under this bill we graduate 400 a year. That is 600 marine engineering and deck officers for our maritime industry.

How much of our cargo, both export and import, are we carrying today in American bottoms? Less than 6 percent. It just seems to me we are doing something rather fallacious when we think of this amendment. Also there is no requirement whatsoever that a man ever goes to sea, none at all, if he is graduated from the Academy at King's Point, or one of the other schools.

Insofar as the sea grant program is concerned, concerning oceanography and oceanology, and related sciences, we have a program set up for this. This proposed amendment is not related to the marine sciences of oceanography or oceanology. We have a grant program for that in which many schools across this country, colleges, universities, and technical institutions participate. For these reasons I must oppose the amendment.

Mr. DOWNING. The gentleman from North Carolina is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time so that my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH), might comment upon this particular amendment.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much this chance to elaborate upon the arguments that have been offered by my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI).

We have in Massachusetts a maritime academy with a very great tradition of following the sea. The graduates from this institution are not necessarily restricted to the sea, and they can and do end up, for instance, as legislative assistants, such as Arthur Pankopf, who was on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and is now with the Senate Committee on Commerce. He was graduated from Massachusetts Maritime Academy. Or take an individual like Andrew Gibson, who is the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Maritime Affairs. Maritime graduates may become port captains, not, hopefully, like those in the Port of San Francisco, where vessels owned by the same line ran into each other. Other graduates might go into environmental areas such as the developing of our coastal zones, the Continental Shelf. You know, we reap hundreds of millions of dollars from offshore oil and mineral resources. These dollars are harvested from the Continental Shelf with the aid and assistance of men who have been trained in maritime industries, oceanology, or other related sciences. The oceans cover seven-tenths of the earth's surface, and we must be ready to meet the sea challenges of the future.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is an academy in the gentleman's home State and likewise we have the California Maritime Academy in my district which handles the west coast.

But, is it not a fact that the congressional assistance, the Federal assistance, for these academies has not changed since 1958 in spite of the fact that we have had a 60-percent increase in certain wages and cost of living in many particular categories?

Mr. KEITH. You have made a very good point. I believe the Federal appropriation was \$750 and it is now \$600; and they want to lower it even more. The academies have many more students and we have six different States helping us with Federal contributions of only \$600 per student per year. And the one Federal academy costs the taxpayers—at least the combined cost of the graduates from the Federal academy—more than

\$7,000 per student per year. In the State academy, it is about half that amount.

Mr. LEGGETT. I do not know if the gentleman's experience is different than it is in the West, but some 10 years ago these schools were supported better than 65 percent by the Federal Government and today the Federal share has reduced to about 35 percent. If the very ambitious amendment of our colleague, the gentleman from New York, is passed, the Federal share might be increased 2 percent additional. So this is really a monumental improvement and I want to encourage the passage of the amendment. But it certainly is not going to break the bank, and in all equity I certainly believe it will be good for those academies.

Mr. KEITH. I welcome your support. I might say that if one had gone to Valjeo and seen the maritime academy there, I am sure he would agree that it would have been a shame if that very fine institution had foundered.

I might say the policy is inconsistent of the administration and the committee when they sanction a brandnew maritime school in Michigan and when they sanction a very substantial increase in enrollment in the Texas Maritime Academy. Yet, schools like Massachusetts Maritime Academy will only be allowed 77 students in the next freshman class, and yet it has facilities for nearly three times that number of students. The Massachusetts academy has a good program, they have a million-dollar plant, and they want to go from 77 to 200 students per year. The Federal Government and the taxpayer could get the benefit of this program for less than half the cost of the Federal program.

The States are offering really a remarkably innovative means of educating people to take care of our responsibilities on the seas, under the seas and in the seas. It is a very commendable program, we should encourage it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his comments.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I will speak only briefly.

Mr. Chairman, some of the Members who are here now did not hear some of the statements that were made earlier.

First of all, I know my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) has long been a strong advocate of State marine schools. I commend him for it. But, I will point out that the man he has mentioned as being an outstanding graduate, Mr. Gibson, who is now the Maritime Administrator, testified before our committee that there is a diminishing need for these marine officers. As we progress with the growth of American-flag merchant marine on the seas, we will have more efficient ships and faster ships which will turn around more quickly and carry more cargo, but we will have less ships than we have at the moment. Therefore, along with the chairman of the committee and others, I would hope perhaps that we would have additional hearings in due course to ascertain the needs. But, in the meantime, the Maritime Administrator tells

us there is no need to double the enrollment at the Massachusetts training school, and I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I correctly understand that only two of these schools are accredited?

Mr. PELLY. I am sorry; I cannot say. I think the Federal Government has supported all of them.

Mr. GROSS. The chairman, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ), indicates that is correct, that only two of these schools are accredited.

Mr. PELLY. The Federal Government not only gives them \$600 per enrollee, but gives each school \$75,000. So I would think without some justification or documentation, we should not adopt this amendment because no need for it has been shown.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, what is the period of obligated service?

Mr. PELLY. None whatsoever.

Mr. GROSS. Except that at the Merchant Marine Academy there is, I understand, a period of obligated service in the Reserve or the active service, which is it?

Mr. PELLY. We are talking about Federal aid to State schools.

Mr. GROSS. Federal aid.

Mr. PELLY. There is no obligation.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: I am sure the gentleman knows that American money is building tankers in Spanish shipyards. Will those tankers be operated under the American flag and with American crews, or will they be operated by foreign crews under foreign flags of one kind or another?

Mr. PELLY. It all depends upon which company it is, but I would say that many of the tankers are operated under foreign flags.

Mr. GROSS. So that this also diminishes the need for any increase in the present output of deck and engineering officers at the various merchant marine academies, is that correct?

Mr. PELLY. The testimony before our committee was that the need for these officers was diminishing.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to my good friend from California.

Mr. LEGGETT. Is it not a fact that these schools have not been accredited because actually many of them are run like true trade schools, manned by marine officers, the courses taught by marine officers, and such as that? The gentleman does not have to respond to that question.

Second, I say this: If we do not have this reservoir of merchant marine officers developed perhaps in excess of current needs, if we should ever get into another World War II situation in which we are building 4 or 5 million tons of shipping and launching a ship in 17 days, would we not need merchant marine officers to take over those ships in

17 or 20 days, as we found we needed to do during World War II?

Mr. PELLY. I think we have the personnel at the moment to operate all the ships we will need.

Mr. LEGGETT. That is exactly the point. But do not the men come from those schools and is that not why we have adequate personnel?

Mr. PELLY. I think we are working to develop deck officers. In many cases they could just as well come from the ranks. We could graduate some of the lower personnel so that they could take advantage and have some incentive to study and to improve themselves.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is there some reason why the affluent State of Massachusetts cannot take care of the increased enrollment that it so ardently desires?

Mr. PELLY. I think costs are going up, but, as I have said, there is no need now to increase enrollment.

Mr. GROSS. The cost to the Federal Government has been minimized. Surely they should minimize the cost to the State of Massachusetts and other States which operate merchant marine training schools.

Mr. PELLY. I still think it is right—

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI).

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 42, noes 71.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF NEW YORK

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURPHY of New York: On page 2, line 7 add: "No funds in this section may be expended for the dismantling, or removal, of the nuclear propulsion plant from the NS Savannah."

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, each year in the maritime authorization bill the committee has received from the Maritime Administration and in some instances also from the Atomic Energy Commission, a very detailed explanation as to the costs and the efficiency of nuclear propulsion and in particular nuclear power development. This year when the gentleman from Virginia questioned the Administrator about the nuclear ship the NS Savannah, I felt that the answers did not go to the depths of the problem, to lay up an enterprise that has cost the American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars. So I decided to do some investigating.

Mr. Chairman, the Members will find on page 7 of the report, in paragraph 5, that there is a program to provide for the phased layup of the NS Savannah. In fact, what I determined this past week, after the committee had passed this legislation, is that the administration is scraping up funds not to lay up the NS Savannah, but to take the nuclear reactor completely out of the Savan-

*nah*—in others words, just to leave the *Savannah* as a hull.

Mr. Chairman, this ship is a creation of the Congress. This ship and the dollars to authorize it and the programs to train American seamen in nuclear propulsion are creations of the Congress. In our maritime academies we teach nuclear propulsion. Yet here we find a lay-up of the *NS Savannah*.

I feel if the *NS Savannah* is going to be not just laid up, but also completely denuded by this administration and turned into just a hull and the reactor taken out, that it is going to disappear quietly and bureaucratically. I think the Congress should say something about it and the appropriate committee or subcommittee of the Merchant Marine Committee should have a hearing as to what the intent is of this administration on the future of nuclear power.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from New York for bringing this to the attention of the Congress. To me it is a tragedy, a costly tragedy, to do what is proposed here. Definitely what does the gentleman's amendment provide for? I did not hear it read.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. It provides that no funds in this bill can be used to remove the nuclear powerplant from the *NS Savannah*. This does not mean that it cannot be let us say, deactivated or defueled, but the nuclear propulsion plant cannot be removed from the ship.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that during the hearing, while the gentleman appeared before the committee and attempted to explain it, I did not understand this. A few minutes later I contacted the gentleman whose company happened to build this, Babcock & Wilcox, and I found out how we simply did not get the facts at the hearing.

I think it would be a tragedy for this Congress to pass this bill without the gentleman's amendment, which I favor, and then we should look into this.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for what he is trying to do.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from North Carolina. This ship has a mission to perform. I understand that to lay it up will cost in the neighborhood of \$5 million.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. It is \$4 million.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I think we should all support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GARMATZ. What does the gentleman propose that we do with the *Savannah*?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, the future of the *Savannah* and the future of nuclear power in our fleet should certainly be the subject of an intensive hearing by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and perhaps with the cooperation of the Atomic Energy Commission, but I do not believe that bureaucratically we should see the *Savannah* completely dismantled and taken away without the Congress saying this should be done.

Mr. GARMATZ. I believe the Maritime Administrator said, if anything, the *Savannah* is outdated, and the nuclear powerplant could be installed in a new ship. I do not know what we could do with the ship if we take the plant out. We could leave it to rot.

No one has offered to run the *Savannah*. We have had requests, but none of them have any confidence. They will not run it unless the Government supplies all the money necessary. They can find no use at all for the *Savannah*.

It makes good sense for a new ship, but a new powerplant for the *Savannah* does not. It is outdated.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. The chairman is making the case for the amendment I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MURPHY of New York was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. The Maritime Administrator should have come before the committee and said that he was going to remove the nuclear powerplant from this nuclear ship. At that time he should have made the flat statement that an alternate type of plan would govern the future of the *Savannah*. Babcock & Wilcox, the company the gentleman from North Carolina just mentioned, built the reactor for the West German nuclear-powered ship, the *Otto Hahn*, a 15,000-ton freighter which is propelled by a much more efficient plant than the *Savannah*. I feel that this entire field is so complex that the Administrator could have made these statements to the committee but he did not at the time.

This should be the subject of hearings, and not just a bureaucratic disappearance of nuclear power from the American merchant fleet.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the nuclear propelled ship *Savannah* has been in operation for 8 years. We have learned a great deal from it, but now it is a fact we have learned everything from it in the way of operation we need to know. The powerplant is completely obsolete.

The testimony was given to our committee that the administration planned to skip the second generation engine and go right to the third generation engine,

and an up-to-date modern propulsion plant.

The Maritime Administration offered the *Savannah* for sale for \$1 million, and there was not a taker.

It just seems to me, at least, that what we should do is lay it up and make plans for a modern type of vessel that can use nuclear propulsion.

The Maritime Administrator says there will be nuclear propelled ships in economical operation within 10 years. A 12,000-ton ship—and, as I recall, that is about the tonnage of the *Savannah*—is not the type of vessel for nuclear propulsion. What is needed under nuclear propulsion is a 200,000-ton vessel.

I believe we ought to plan for it, and have a modern engine designed, and in due course we will see, as has been testified, nuclear propelled ships that are efficient and economical.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. Is not the real problem the fact that the Maritime Administration has a contract with a company down in Galveston, Tex., and that is where the cost is? If we can convince the Navy to take over this vessel, and put it in one of its nuclear-powered substations, we will have something tangible.

The gentleman said we offered to sell it for \$1 million. I believe that is what the gentleman said, the Government offered to sell this vessel for \$1 million. It would be better for us to give it to them, instead of turning around and spending \$4 million to deactivate it. I say, let us keep it another 6 months or 12 months until we can persuade the Navy to take it over.

It is the only nuclear powered merchant marine vessel that represents the United States—the only one.

Mr. PELLY. I would like to respond to the gentleman.

Mr. LENNON. Yes, sir; I wish you would. Somebody should.

Mr. PELLY. I do not believe that our Navy should be acquiring obsolete vessels, whether they are obsolete cargo or obsolete naval vessels. I think what we should do is to lay up this vessel and have private steamship operators or the Department of Defense come up with a nuclear powered cargo vessel that would be worth something but not spend a lot of money on this obsolete one.

Mr. LENNON. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. PELLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LENNON. You say they offered to sell it for \$1 million. Let us give it away instead of spending \$4 million to take out the nuclear plant. Let us have some company take it over free.

Mr. PELLY. I will say to the gentleman if any private shipping firm were willing to operate it at the losses per year that it would entail, I would be willing to give it to them.

Mr. LENNON. I would, too, but I do not want to have us spend more money on it than it would be worth. I do not think we should do this until we have inves-

tigated it and find out if a company will take it over free, with a free bill of lading from the Federal Government if they will operate it. We need the symbol of a nuclear vessel representing the United States. Other nations have it. Why should we not have one until we can build a more modern one?

Mr. PELLY. This is the first nuclear vessel that was built. It has served its purpose.

I respect the gentleman's views. He is on the Committee on Armed Services. If he can get the Secretary of the Navy to ask for it, I will gladly support it. But I do not think we should have any limiting language in this bill, because I do not think it is wise to keep this vessel in operation.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I will if I have any time left.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. When the Maritime Administrator came before the committee he did not present any evidence or even make a statement that private companies had been solicited to take it off the hands of the Government.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I think this issue is so critical as far as the nuclear future of the American merchant marine is concerned that it should be the subject of hearings and we should not just let the vessel, which has cost hundreds of millions of dollars, disappear by bureaucratic fiat without the Congress authorizing its burial.

Mr. PELLY. We know that we have the wrong type of vessel and the wrong type of propulsion plant here. The proper thing to do is start all over again. Then we will have a new generation modern type of engine which will operate very large vessels; then is the time to support a nuclear vessel.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 21, noes 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GIALMO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having under consideration the bill (H.R. 4724) to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, pursuant to House Resolution 354, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 360, nays 11, answered "present"—0, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—360

Abbutt	Crane	Heckler, Mass.
Abernethy	Culver	Helstoski
Abzug	Daniel, Va.	Henderson
Adams	Daniels, N.J.	Hicks, Wash.
Addabbo	Danielson	Hillis
Anderson,	Davis, Wis.	Hogan
Calif.	de la Garza	Horton
Anderson,	Delaney	Hosmer
Tenn.	Dellenback	Howard
Andrews,	Dellums	Hull
N. Dak.	Denholm	Hungate
Annunzio	Dennis	Hunt
Archer	Dent	Hutchinson
Arends	Derwinski	Ichord
Ashbrook	Devine	Jacobs
Ashley	Dickinson	Jarman
Aspinall	Diggs	Johnson, Calif.
Badillo	Dingell	Johnson, Pa.
Baker	Donohue	Jonas
Baring	Dorn	Jones, Ala.
Barrett	Dow	Jones, N.C.
Begich	Downing	Jones, Tenn.
Belcher	Drinan	Karth
Bell	Dulski	Kazen
Bennett	Duncan	Keating
Bergland	duPont	Kee
Betts	Eckhardt	Keith
Bevill	Edmondson	Kemp
Biaggi	Edwards, Ala.	King
Blester	Edwards, Calif.	Kluczynski
Bingham	Ellberg	Koch
Blackburn	Erlenborn	Kuykendall
Blanton	Eshleman	Kyl
Blatnik	Evans, Colo.	Kyros
Boggs	Findley	Landgrebe
Bolling	Fish	Landrum
Bow	Fisher	Latta
Brademas	Flood	Leggett
Brasco	Flowers	Lennon
Bray	Foley	Lent
Brinkley	Ford, Gerald R.	Link
Brooks	Ford,	Long, Md.
Broomfield	William D.	McClory
Brotzman	Forsythe	McCormack
Brown, Ohio	Fountain	McDade
Broyhill, N.C.	Fraser	McDonald,
Broyhill, Va.	Frelinghuysen	Mich.
Buchanan	Frenzel	McEwen
Burke, Fla.	Frey	McFall
Burke, Mass.	Fulton, Pa.	McKay
Burleson, Tex.	Fulton, Tenn.	McKevitt
Burlison, Mo.	Fuqua	McKinney
Burton	Gallifanakis	McMillan
Byrne, Pa.	Gallagher	Macdonald,
Byrnes, Wis.	Garmatz	Mass.
Byron	Gaydos	Madden
Cabell	Gettys	Mahon
Caffery	Gialmo	Martin
Carey, N.Y.	Gibbons	Mathis, Ga.
Carney	Gonzalez	Matsunaga
Carter	Grasso	Mayne
Cederberg	Gray	Mazzoli
Celler	Griffin	Meeds
Chamberlain	Griffiths	Melcher
Chappell	Grover	Metcalf
Chisholm	Gude	Michel
Clancy	Hagan	Mikva
Clark	Haley	Miller, Ohio
Clausen,	Hall	Mills
Don H.	Hammer-	Minish
	schmidt	Mink
Clay	Hansen, Idaho	Minshall
Cleveland	Harrington	Mitchell
Coiler	Harsha	Mizell
Collins, Ill.	Hastings	Mollohan
Colmer	Hathaway	Monagan
Conable	Hawkins	Montgomery
Conte	Hays	Moorhead
Corman	Hébert	Morgan
Cotter		

Morse	Rogers	Taylor
Mosher	Rooney, N.Y.	Teague, Calif.
Moss	Rostenkowski	Teague, Tex.
Murphy, N.Y.	Roush	Terry
Myers	Rousselot	Thompson, Ga.
Natcher	Roybal	Thompson, N.J.
Nedzi	Runnels	Thomson, Wis.
Nelsen	Ruppe	Thone
Nichols	Ruth	Tiernan
Nix	Ryan	Udall
Obey	St Germain	Ullman
O'Hara	Sandman	Van Deerlin
O'Konski	Sarbanes	Vander Jagt
O'Neill	Satterfield	Vanik
Passman	Saylor	Veysey
Patman	Scherle	Vigorito
Patten	Scheuer	Waggonner
Pelly	Schneebell	Waldie
Pepper	Scott	Wampler
Perkins	Seiberling	Ware
Pettis	Shiple	Watts
Peysler	Shoup	Whalen
Pike	Sikes	Whalley
Pirnie	Sisk	White
Poage	Skubitz	Whitehurst
Podell	Smith, Calif.	Whitten
Poff	Smith, Iowa	Widnall
Powell	Smith, N.Y.	Wiggins
Price, Ill.	Snyder	Williams
Price, Tex.	Spence	Wilson,
Pryor, Ark.	Springer	Charles H.
Pucinski	Stafford	Winn
Quillen	Staggers	Wright
Randall	Stanton,	Wyatt
Rangel	J. William	Wyder
Rarick	Stanton,	Wylie
Rees	James V.	Wyman
Reid, N.Y.	Steed	Yates
Reuss	Steiger, Ariz.	Yatron
Riegler	Stephens	Young, Fla.
Roberts	Stokes	Young, Tex.
Robinson, Va.	Stratton	Zablocki
Robinson, N.Y.	Stubblefield	Zion
Rodino	Stuckey	Zwach
Roe	Sullivan	

NAYS—11

Aspin	Hamilton	Pickle
Collins, Tex.	Hechler, W. Va.	Roncallo
Conyers	Kastenmeier	Schmitz
Gross	Lujan	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—0

NOT VOTING—61

Abourezk	Green, Oreg.	Preyer, N.C.
Alexander	Green, Pa.	Purcell
Anderson, Ill.	Gubser	Quie
Andrews, Ala.	Halpern	Rallsback
Boland	Hanley	Reid, Ill.
Rhodes	Hanna	Rooney, Pa.
Camp	Hansen, Wash.	Rosenthal
Casey, Tex.	Harvey	Roy
Clawson, Del	Hicks, Mass.	Schwengel
Corbett	Holifield	Sebelius
Coughlin	Lloyd	Shriver
Davis, Ga.	Long, La.	Slack
Dowdy	McCloskey	Steele
Dwyer	McClure	Steiger, Wis.
Edwards, La.	McCollister	Symington
Esch	McCulloch	Talcott
Evins, Tenn.	Mailliard	Wilson, Bob
Fascell	Mann	Wolf
Flynt	Mathias, Calif.	
Goldwater	Miller, Calif.	
Goodling	Murphy, Ill.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Fascell with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.  
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Steele.  
 Mr. Hanley with Mr. Mailliard.  
 Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Corbett.  
 Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. McCloskey.  
 Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Camp.  
 Mr. Holifield with Mr. Bob Wilson.  
 Mr. Hanna with Mr. Del Clawson.  
 Mr. Mann with Mr. Esch.  
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Goldwater.  
 Mr. Wolf with Mr. Halpern.  
 Mr. Boland with Mr. Rhodes.  
 Mr. Alexander with Mr. Lloyd.  
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Quie.  
 Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Talcott.  
 Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Brown of Michigan.  
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. McCollister.

Mr. Casey of Texas with Mr. Mathias of California.

Mr. Abourezk with Mr. Railsback.

Mr. Slack with Mr. Sebelius.

Mr. Symington with Mr. McClure.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Goodling.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Coughlin.

Mr. Preyer of North Carolina with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Gubser.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.

Mrs. Hicks of Massachusetts with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Roy with Mr. Shriver.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Schwengel.

The results of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4724 and on H.R. 5352.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

#### THE 14TH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE HEALTH RESEARCH FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-91)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 14th Annual Report of the Health Research Facilities Construction Program for activities during Fiscal Year 1969.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 20, 1971.

#### THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, in these days when it seems so many are not satisfied with growth and new ideas but want to destroy the sound things of the past, it is a real pleasure to review the wonderful dedication to our solid inheritance evidenced by the Daughters of the American Revolution.

In my own State, many fine people, too numerous to list here, have joined in this endeavor. This year's convention was presided over by Mrs. Dickson Peaster, first vice regent, serving in the absence of State regent, Mrs. Walter Johnson, who was ill.

One of my relatives, Mrs. Ione Brewer, has served in various local and national offices for this organization through the years as has one of my closest friends, Mrs. Lillie N. Henry of my hometown. Recently Mrs. Brewer sent me copies of the resolutions which were adopted at the State meeting of their society. They are excellent and only because of the space required and the resulting cost I shall not place their content in the RECORD in their entirety. But in bringing them together in my own words I want to state that this fine organization recognizes and in every action lends support to saving that which is good from the past, on which all future developments depend.

As I have pointed out on numerous occasions in talking to the youngsters of our Nation, the most recent occasion being a meeting of the class officers of the State of Mississippi, it would be a serious mistake for us to do everything exactly as our fathers and mothers did—just as it would have been a mistake for them to do exactly as their fathers and mothers had before them—for if such a course had been followed down through history, we would all be back to pre-civilization living.

On the other hand, it is equally as bad to strike down everything from the past without something better to offer in its stead. We need to build on the sound things that our ancestors made available to us. We do live in the moonship age but 999,999 of the 1 million things which made the flights possible were learned in the past.

Just as the DAR points out, we have a written Constitution in this Nation—written because the Founding Fathers recognized that in England, the mother country at that time, the judges—acting at the instance of the King in most cases—frequently announced the law for the first time, when there was no written document to prove or disprove its existence. Our forefathers thought this was taken care of when they produced a written document, a Constitution written in simple, everyday English—clear, concise, and reasonably short. Yet we have seen the errors of the past creep in, even with our written Constitution; and now the English language in it is held to no longer mean what it says but rather what each succeeding court wishes to say it means.

To date this has brought us to the point where law enforcement has broken down and many of our schools, including those in our Capital City, are providing almost everything except sound education according to those who work in the system. Now it appears that we are on the road to breaking down even further the things that have made our Nation great.

I hope the Members of this body—representatives of the people—will pause and pay tribute to the Daughters of the American Revolution, and take to heart the pledges of the members of that great organization:

To perpetuate the memory and the spirit of the men and women who achieved American independence, to promote the develop-

ment of an enlightened public opinion, and to foster patriotic citizenship.

These are the objectives of the Daughters of the American Revolution; and I commend them to you along with the resolutions of the most recent meeting which I shall file with the Clerk.

#### HOUSE DEMOCRATIC STEERING COMMITTEE PENDING PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will take up consideration of H.R. 5376, the appropriation to carry on the large public works projects which were originally enacted and expanded programs now pending. It is highly important that our Government immediately take steps to help finance the numerous and necessary public works projects which are now pending and waiting for the necessary funds for completion.

The House Steering Committee at a meeting previous to the Easter recess heard the testimony of the chairman of the Public Works Committee, Congressman JOHN BLATNIK, and I include his statement before our committee with my remarks. Other witnesses appeared before the House Steering Committee and the committee by a unanimous vote recommended that the Congress enact H.R. 5376.

The statement follows:

#### STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

The House Committee on Public Works after extensive hearings during the period March 15th-19th, reported favorably H.R. 5376 on March 24th. This bill includes three Titles. Title I will reactivate the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1962. Title II will extend to June 30, 1973, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; and Title III will extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

Today we have over 5 million unemployed—despite the existence of a large backlog of public works—at federal, state and local levels. Unemployment payments are expected to exceed \$5 billion in 1971. The President's budget for 1972 is not expected to improve the situation significantly. In fact, as we approach the end of the first quarter of 1971, the prospects for revitalizing the President's economic forecasts appear to be dimmer than they were when the Budget and Economic Report were first presented. Unemployment would be reduced to about 5% by December 31, 1971. This goal is far from satisfactory in light of the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946.

The purpose of Title I of H.R. 5376 is to extend and to modify the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 to meet the economic conditions confronting the nation in 1970. This program was created in September 1962 to stimulate the construction of Federal and local public works for the dual purpose of increasing employment in areas of greatest need and helping communities to provide the basic facilities such as water and sewer works, hospitals, road improvements, public buildings, and the like required to meet the needs of their citizens and at the same time pave the way for the further expansion of employment. The 1962 Act authorized the appropriation of \$900 million to undertake Federal projects authorized by the Congress and to make 50% grants (or up to 75% in

special hardship cases) for needed state and local public works.

Title I of H.R. 5376 would authorize the immediate appropriation of an additional \$2 billion for these grants, broaden the criteria for designating eligible areas, and liberalize the conditions under which assistance can be extended—all to the end that this Act may more effectively assist in attaining increased employment opportunities in those areas, both urban and rural, suffering persistent or substantial unemployment or underemployment. Areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce include "redevelopment areas and economic development centers," and those areas which the Secretary of Labor designates each month as having been areas of substantial unemployment for at least six of the preceding 12 months.

Unlike the Economic Development Act, Title I is intended to provide for the construction of projects that can be built quickly and therefore do not require extensive long term planning as do the projects constructed under the Economic Development Act of 1965.

It is intended to put people to work quickly and to utilize resources now used for unemployment compensation and public assistance payments for gainful employment in constructing badly needed public facilities at all levels of government—Federal, state and local.

Also under Title I the Federal Government would be able to contribute up to 80% of the cost of the project; also if the state or local government unit does not have effective taxing and borrowing capability to assume a share of the financial obligations required, the grant may be increased up to 100% of the cost of the project.

Title II extends the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 for two years. The total cost of the extension is \$1.9 billion. In addition it proposes modification of the criteria used for the purpose of designating redevelopment areas.

Title III extends the Appalachian Regional Development Act for four years except in the case of highways which is extended for a five year period. Additional authorizations are also proposed for airport safety and to institute a pilot program for rural waste clearance. There are also a few technical changes. The cost of this extension of the Appalachia program is \$1.5 billion.

The Committee does not propose Title I as a panacea to solve all economic ills. Budget, monetary, and economic policies must also be fully utilized if we are to attain full employment. However, based on the accomplishments under the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962, the Committee believes that it can provide gainful employment for people who want to work, and also stimulate the economy.

#### PROPOSED INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

(Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am refiling my bill today and I have 43 cosponsors of this legislation to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for a 50-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder, with the resulting benefit cost being borne equally by employers and employees and the Federal Government, and to raise the amount of outside earnings which the beneficiary may have without suffering a deduction from his benefits up to \$3,000.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is long overdue. The present recipients of social security

are frozen into a rather miserable position with inadequate checks. What does a 50-percent increase on \$70 a month mean? It just means that the benefits will be increased to \$105. If he is receiving \$90 per month, it will go up to \$135 per month. This, to me, seems to be a very meager amount.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the honor roll of those Members who are in favor of adequate social security benefits and who are cosponsoring this proposed legislation:

#### SOCIAL SECURITY HONOR ROLL

Cosponsors to legislation to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 50 percent, across the board increase in benefits thereunder, with the resulting benefit costs being borne equally by employers, employees, and the Federal Government, and to raise the amount of outside earnings which a beneficiary may have without suffering deductions from his benefits to \$3,000:

Frank Annunzio, Illinois.  
Edward P. Boland, Massachusetts.  
Frank J. Brasco, New York.  
Phillip Burton, California.  
James A. Byrne, Pennsylvania.  
Hugh Carey, New York.  
Charles J. Carney, Ohio.  
Shirley Chisholm, New York.  
Frank M. Clark, Pennsylvania.  
George W. Collins, Illinois.  
Jorge L. Cordova, Puerto Rico.  
Ronald V. Dellums, California.  
Don Edwards, California.  
Daniel J. Flood, Pennsylvania.  
Donald M. Fraser, Minnesota.  
Ella T. Grasso, Connecticut.  
Kenneth J. Gray, Illinois.  
William J. Green, Pennsylvania.  
Seymour Halpern, New York.  
Michael Harrington, Massachusetts.  
William D. Hathaway, Maine.  
Ken Hechler, West Virginia.  
Henry Helstoski, New Jersey.  
James J. Howard, New Jersey.  
Edward I. Koch, New York.  
Ray J. Madden, Indiana.  
Ralph H. Metcalf, Illinois.  
Parren J. Mitchell, Maryland.  
Thomas E. Morgan, Pennsylvania.  
Robert N. C. Nix, Pennsylvania.  
David R. Obey, Wisconsin.  
Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin.  
Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Massachusetts.  
Edward J. Patten, New Jersey.  
Claude Pepper, Florida.  
Bertram L. Podell, New York.  
Benjamin S. Rosenthal, New York.  
William F. Ryan, New York.  
Fernand J. St Germain, Rhode Island.  
Robert O. Tiernan, Rhode Island.  
Charles A. Vanik, Ohio.  
Charles H. Wilson, California.  
Clement Zablocki, Wisconsin.

#### ORDER AND PROGRESS: BRAZIL FROM MONARCHY TO REPUBLIC

(Mr. CAFFERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. Speaker, America, a national weekly published by Jesuits of the United States and Canada, in the December 12, 1970, issue, published an evaluation of Gilberto Freyre's most recent book, "Order and Progress: Brazil from Monarchy to Republic." A. A. Knopf, prepared by our friend and Acting Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives on Pan American Day for 28 consecutive years. The book review may be described as one of exceptional value

because it helps to throw light on the background of the Brazilian people and their government, a subject of perennial interest and importance for the people and Government of the United States.

It may be mentioned that Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., is the U.S. honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil. Moreover, on two occasions, he served as an official member of U.S. Special Diplomatic Missions to Brazil, assignments which won him warm commendations from the leaders of both countries, irrespective of party.

In the opening chapter of one of his own books, Dr. Thorning related the facts about the brilliant record of Ambassador and Mrs. J. H. Jefferson Caffrey during the critical years the latter served in Brazil. The same book, entitled "Builders of the Social Order," featured an exclusive interview, initially published in the Washington Post and then incorporated in the book, with the world renowned Foreign Minister of Brazil, Dr. Oswaldo Aranha, who later was elected President of the General Assembly of the United Nations. A granddaughter of Dr. Oswaldo Aranha, Mrs. Carlos Edwardo Paes de Carvahlo, now resides in Washington, D.C., while her husband holds a highly responsible position as Secretary of the Brazilian Embassy.

I submit Dr. Thorning's comment about "Order and Progress: Brazil From Monarchy to Republic" by Gilberto Freyre to be included in the RECORD together with a letter, published in America on January 16, 1971, under the signature of Brazilian Cultural Counselor Marcel D. C. Hasslocher, now stationed in the Brazilian Embassy, Bonn, Germany.

[From America, Dec. 12, 1970]

"ORDER AND PROGRESS: BRAZIL FROM MONARCHY TO REPUBLIC"—GILBERTO FREYRE

Gilberto Freyre, born in Pernambuco, established his reputation as an anthropologist and social historian by *The Masters and the Slaves* and *The Mansions and the Shanties*. The third volume in this series is *Order and Progress*. The author aims to complete his survey of Brazilian patriarchal society in a fourth book tentatively named *Tombs and Shallow Graves*.

The present work, covering some 50 years of history (1870-1920), describes in depth the transition from the Empire of Pedro II to the Republic, proclaimed in 1889. Paradoxically, the dethronement of Pedro II was triggered by the "Golden Law" emancipating the slaves, signed by the Emperor's niece, Princess Isabel, while her uncle was in Europe seeking medical treatment. Leaders of the new Republic, although retaining the green, gold, blue and white colors of their national flag, replaced the imperial coat of arms with a motto borrowed from the French Positivist, Auguste Comte, "Ordem e Progresso." In short, men of the quality of Joaquim Nabuco, Ruy Barbosa, the Barron of Rio Branco and Benjamin Constant da Magalhães, in recognizing the imperatives of change, never lost sight of the tradition of order which had been "one of the country's strongest and most unique characteristics," differentiating it from tendencies toward fragmentation in Spanish America. It is the author's contention that, after 1889, Brazilians brought about a workable combination of disparate elements: a democratic form of government, an aristocratic society and ethnic equality. As a result, Brazil attained "a cultural level" comparable to that of "the most civilized nations of the temperate zone."

*Order and Progress* is enriched by testimonies and impressions gathered by the author from a wide variety of contemporary national and international observers. Viscount James Bryce, for example, referring to the Brazil he knew at the turn of the century, wrote that he had found among Brazilians a far greater affection for their national literary traditions than in the corresponding countries of Hispanic America. Georges Clemenceau, who visited Brazil a few years later, placed a high value on advances in science, music, public health and techniques for the valorization of the huge coffee crop. The French statesman, like many another European, was familiar with the literary achievements of Joaquim Machado de Assis, Manuel de Oliveira Lima, Jose Verissimo, Euclides da Cunha and numerous other Brazilian intellectuals.

The period analyzed in this study was one dominated by the cultivation of sugar, cattle, cotton, rubber, cocoa, fruit, wheat and other farm products. Consequently, the author furnishes many insights into the psychology of plantation workers, sugar-mill owners, country squires, rural and urban merchants. These personalities had their counterparts among Brazilians who emerged as leaders in the growth of industry, in the much-needed revitalization of religious institutions and among men and women active in education, public welfare movements and politics.

In his chapter on "Catholicism and Progress," Professor Freyre credits the most effective leadership in this domain to "Catholic laymen." Outstanding in this role was Carlos Alberto de Menezes, general manager of a textile industry in Pernambuco. Thanks to his initiative, a large workers' corporation was organized in 1900. Freyre relates that this group represented "a mixed syndicate of management, office staff and factory workers from the highest executive to the most humble laborer." De Menezes, an engineer-entrepreneur, inspired the first Catholic cooperatives in Brazil. He also founded the Federation of Christian Workers at Recife in 1902.

The few typographical errors in "Order and Progress" are not the responsibility of Gilberto Freyre. Otherwise, superb is the word for the editing and translation by Rod W. Horton, professor of English at Temple Buell College, Denver, Colorado. The latter provides an enlightening historical outline and a note on monetary values.

JOSEPH F. THORNING.

**RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIGH INTEREST RATES**

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the question is being raised as to who caused the high interest rates. The truth is that under the administration of President Roosevelt and President Truman, the long-term interest rates did not go above 2.5 percent.

With the commencement of Mr. Eisenhower's administration, efforts were made to raise the rates and that almost caused a depression; so the action was held back a little while, but then it commenced for good. Mr. Eisenhower, as fine and as great a man as he was, a wonderful hero, did not claim to know anything about economic matters. He said the Federal Reserve was above Congress and could do anything it wanted to—and it did. Mr. William McChesney Martin was Chairman of the Federal Reserve at that time.

Of course, Mr. Martin took the President's attitude to mean that the sky would be the limit, and during President Eisenhower's administration the interest rates jumped up and up. Then, of course, it was impossible to get the rates back, and we have been suffering from the Eisenhower interest rate policies ever since.

Mr. Speaker, the monetary history of the United States proves conclusively that interest rates can be kept down in all types of economic conditions—if the administration and the Federal Reserve System so desires.

Nothing illustrates this better than an analysis of the period 1939 through 1952, a period which involved every conceivable type of economic condition. This is a period in which the Nation suffered severe depression, heavy wartime expenditures, massive postwar problems and a reentry into wartime conditions in the Korean episode. We had everything ranging from depression to strong inflationary pressures.

Yet, the Federal Government—under the administrations of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman—was able to keep interest rates down. In fact, the yields on long-term Government bonds were kept around 2½ percent and less throughout this period. And the average annual yield on 91-day Treasury bills never did exceed 1.76 percent in the 1939 to 1952 period. Obviously these low interest rates saved the Nation—the taxpayers—billions of dollars in interest charges. Once again, let me emphasize that these low rates were maintained in the face of impossible economic conditions. So people who argue today that high interest rates are necessary because of wartime conditions, because of inflation, or other economic conditions are just making excuses. We had all of these conditions in existence from 1939 to 1952 and we kept interest rates down. It could be done now if the administration had the courage.

Even more important is the fact that low interest rates were highly important to the post-war transition. As we moved from a wartime economy to peacetime—with millions of returning veterans—low interest rates contributed to the stability of the Nation. Veterans were able to buy homes, to enter small businesses, to go to school, and to enjoy the fruits of American life because of the economic conditions maintained through sane monetary policies and low interest rates.

This marked the only time in history that a major nation was able to move from a full-blown massive wartime economy to peacetime without suffering a severe and crippling recession or depression. The credit for this transition—without recession—can be attributed to the low-interest policies.

Mr. Speaker, this administration—even though it is Republican—could learn a lot by studying the efforts of President Roosevelt and President Truman to maintain monetary stability during this period of time. We cannot expect a successful transition to peacetime and a return to economic stability so long as the interest rates remain at their present high levels. It is unfortunate that so many politicians and monetary experts

seem willing to accept the present high level of interest rates as "reasonable."

After a few interest rate reductions, they now seem willing to say that rates have bottomed out and that they will stabilize at their present levels. The present high level of interest rates are unacceptable if we really want economic recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize the public interest handling of monetary policy in the 1939–52 period. I hope the Members will study the following tables which show the interest rates maintained on long-term Government obligations and on 91-day bills during this period.

*Yields on long-term Government bonds 1939 to 1952*

Year:	[Percent per annum]	Yield
1939	-----	2.36
1940	-----	2.21
1941	-----	1.95
1942	-----	2.46
1943	-----	2.47
1944	-----	2.48
1945	-----	2.37
1946	-----	2.19
1947	-----	2.25
1948	-----	2.44
1949	-----	2.31
1950	-----	2.32
1951	-----	2.57
1952	-----	2.68
Average for 14-year period (1939–52)	-----	2.36

*Average annual yield on 91-day Treasury bills*

Year:	Yield
1939	0.023
1940	.014
1941	.108
1942	.326
1943	.373
1944	.375
1945	.375
1946	.375
1947	.594
1948	1.040
1949	1.102
1950	1.218
1951	1.552
1952	1.766

Average yield (14-year period) - .645

These figures are even more startling when they are put up against the performance after President Eisenhower let William McChesney Martin take off the interest rate lid. Following are the yields on long-term government obligations during the Eisenhower years, 1953 through 1960, and the 91-day bill rates for the same period:

*Yields on long-term Government bonds (Percent per annum)*

Year:	Yield
1953	2.94
1954	2.55
1955	2.84
1956	3.08
1957	3.47
1958	3.43
1959	4.08
1960	4.02

*Average annual yield on 91-day Treasury bills*

1953	1.931
1954	.953
1955	1.753
1956	2.658
1957	3.267
1958	1.839
1959	3.405
1960	2.928

## TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. Of the 10 largest dams in the world, the United States has built five.

## FREE TRADE TRUTHS AND MYTHS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject I am about to speak on.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time, although I do not intend to take the full 30 minutes, but I will be willing to answer any questions that may be asked of me regarding the subject matter I am going to discuss. I am going to talk about trade, so-called free trade, truths, and myths. This is a book written by a former official of the U.S. Government who had to do with trade, Howard S. Piquet.

I might say at the outset this book seems to me to be a highly impractical, utopian concept for a perfect world. Unfortunately, we do not live in a perfect world. Rather, it is an imperfect one populated by human beings. If this article is a sample of the advice that the United States has been operating under for the past years, it becomes clear why a favorable balance of payments in trade has dwindled almost to the vanishing point.

It also offers at least a partial explanation for some of the current unemployment.

The people of the United States came from all over the world. Their productivity stems from the free atmosphere that once prevailed in this country which allowed man to use his initiative and imagination without limitations and to be rewarded for his efforts. This is why the people of the United States in 200 years have accomplished more than all the other people in the entire world have in 2,000 years.

Another of the reasons the United States is the world's largest and richest market is the comparatively higher wages paid its people.

A careful reading of this utopian article seems to indicate that the people of the United States should willingly and magnanimously sacrifice their honestly won and tremendous advantages so that other lands can exploit the U.S. market.

Why should our people be expected

to lower their high standards won by their own efforts? Should not the way be found that would allow the people of the United States to keep what is rightfully theirs and let the rest of the world profit by the U.S. example and raise its own standards?

Evidently, Howard S. Piquet, author of "Free Trade Truths—and Myths," is not aware of the drastic changes which have taken place in the world's economy since the depression, when our retreat from the Smoot-Hawley protectionist policy began.

In the 1920's and 1930's the United States, in spite of a higher standard of living than most industrial nations, could compete in world markets on manufactured goods because of superior technology, particularly in the field of automation. We no longer have that advantage.

The technology of industrial nations such as Germany and Japan is at least equal to and sometimes superior to that of our own. They have the equipment and very highly skilled people, and their advantage lies primarily in wages which are very much lower than those paid in the United States.

It is difficult to think of any manufactured article in which there is any significant labor content where the United States can compete. How, then, do we manage to enjoy a so-called trade surplus? It is primarily because we are exporting an enormous quantity of raw materials and agricultural goods.

I must take specific issue with statements such as: "We must avoid building protective fences around these weak industries and aggressively strive to open markets for lines of production in which we are strongest."

The steel industry and all of the steel fabricating industries can hardly be referred to as weak. However, in spite of the fact that we have the raw materials—Iron ore, coal, limestone, and so forth—we simply cannot compete with Germany, Japan and other countries when they wish to sell in the United States.

One could go on and on, listing various labor-intensive industries and seeing the same trend developing.

What about reducing wage costs? Do you know of any industry which has succeeded to any degree? In most cases—especially recently—wage costs have far outstripped productivity, with consequent inflation. This approach, although desirable, will not work.

Like most free trade writers, the author raises the specter of retaliation, overlooking the fact that most other nations now have much greater trade barriers than the United States, and it is we who would be retaliating and not vice versa.

I do not agree that import quotas, like tariffs, necessarily result in higher prices to consumers. Prices can be held down, and often are determined in domestic competition, by the lowest price seller. I agree, however, that tariffs yield revenue.

There is great danger that the specialty steel industry of the United States which is presently severely depressed could, within 5 years, be reduced to a very limited number of firms unless restraints are placed on the rising tide of foreign imports. Although we have been talking about this for some time, it is now clearly apparent to all that we are in a trade war.

It is startling to realize that the tremendous expansion program going on in the Japanese steel industries will by 1975 give Japan capacities far in excess of anything we are producing in the United States. In the stainless steel industry, Japan now has capacities exceeding those of this country. In addition, there is a substantial increase in capacity under construction in Europe, and more contemplated. I am not pointing a finger at Japan only—their data are readily available in print, and they are the largest importers.

Overall world capacity is anticipated to increase 27 percent in the next 5 years. Of even more importance to the specialty steel producers is the fact that in 1970 the Japanese Stainless Association estimated that their yearly output of stainless will be 1,200,000 tons. This is compared to one of the largest production years in U.S. history of 900,000 tons of stainless steel in 1969. In 1970, this was down to 700,000 tons. Further complicating the future is the fact that in 1971 another fully integrated Japanese stainless steel plant with an output of 20,000 tons per month will be in production.

This is a very somber picture considering the present import situation. In 1970, imports had already captured 66.5 percent of stainless rods, 53 percent of stainless wire, 34 percent of the stainless sheet business, and 11 percent of the stainless bar market. The experience is that when over 50 percent of a market is captured by imports, domestic producers are irrevocably impaired and can no longer compete.

That threat has since become so severe that on February 3, 1971, the international officers of the United Steelworkers of America, their district directors and local presidents joined in a conference with management teams from 32 of our country's specialty steel companies in Washington, D.C. Present also at the conference were Government representatives including the Department of State, the Commerce and Labor Departments, and the Tariff Commission.

Last July, I made the categorical statement that we were in a trade war. That war has now become so intensified that it is having dire consequences for all stainless and tool steel, low alloy steel and tubular steel producers in this country.

The earnings reports bear this out.

Many companies showed losses for 1970, others marked reduction in profits—some in the magnitude of a 34- to 200-percent drop from their previous earnings levels.

Crucible, of course, is a major producer of stainless, so that most of the data I

will present to you directly reflects on our markets.

The effect of the rising tide of imports is felt not just on the volume of sales—imports also reduce price structures and weaken the ability of American producers to survive in an already troubled market.

Imports affect our ability to provide jobs, our ability to expand our facilities, our ability to carry out our obligation to be good citizens and support community projects.

I think you realize the need for corrective action, so that the stainless and tool steel industry does not fall by the wayside, as did many American producers of pottery, radios, electronic equipment, watches, shoes, textiles, and utensils.

The effect of foreign imports of specialty steel first became apparent in 1968. Through the efforts of our Congress, and negotiated by our State Department, a voluntary agreement was concluded with the European coal and steel community and the Japanese steel producers. This agreement called for a reduction of approximately 22 percent in tons of all steel imports shipped into the United States in 1969—from 18 million tons to a level of 14 million tons in 1969.

This agreement was to take into consideration existing product mix and geographical location. The language of the agreement read:

During this period, Japan will try not to change greatly the product mix and distribution as compared with the present.

Subsequently, it was agreed that increases of 5 percent over rollback levels of each preceding year would be allowed.

I have statistics that show actual totals of all imported steel from 1964 to 1970. It shows the rapid growth in tons to the peak of 18 million tons, the reduction to 14 million tons and the further decline to 13,363,000 tons in 1970.

You can readily see the change in the dollar value of imports, reflecting the switch to large tonnages of stainless, tool steels, and other specialty steels with a higher cost per ton. I want to interject here that in 1969, specialty steel production in this country was only 1.1 percent of total steel tonnage, but represented 7 percent of the dollar volume of sales.

The fact is that the foreign producers did not live up to the agreement as it applied to product mix.

Chart No. 2, which I will include at the end of my remarks, shows that imports represented only eight-tenths of 1 percent of our domestic market in 1958 but had increased to 21 percent in 1970.

Statistics illustrate all stainless and tool steel imports from 1964 to 1970, exclusive of ingots, blooms, billets, and slabs. A large portion of these, of course, are converted in the United States into semifinished products and are shipped back to the country of origin. So, they are excluded from the data on this chart.

There was no major reduction of imports of stainless in 1969 although overall steel imports dropped to the agreed-upon level—this in spite of worldwide limited nickel supply.

It is important to understand that specialty steels are products requiring much higher inputs of manpower than basic steels. Specialty steels are melted in electric furnaces and vacuum furnaces; they require special equipment to process; they call for a much higher degree of technology. Generally, man-hours in specialty steel are six to eight times the manpower required for carbon steel.

On the average, labor costs account for 40 percent of every sales dollar. These costs can range from \$350 to \$4,000 per ton of product.

As such, stainless and tool steels are abnormally vulnerable to import competition. In the United States, the effect of high labor costs in these products cannot be overcome through belt-tightening and capital investment alone.

As an illustration, table No. 1 shows the labor cost as of 1967 between the United States and various competitors in the steel industry. Although there have been wage increases of substantial magnitude in foreign countries, it had been hoped that their catching up in costs of living and inflationary cycle would bring them closer to that of the United States. Unfortunately, our galloping inflationary wage levels have not made this so. Wage increases are well in excess of increases in productivity. You will see for example in 1967 the difference between United States and Japanese wages was \$3.54—increased to \$3.88 in 1970—with West Germany, \$2.79—increased to \$3.13 in 1970—and with France, \$3.11. In 1970, U.S. employment cost was \$5.68 per hour versus \$5.375 per hour in 1969, \$5.03 in 1968, and \$4.758 in 1967.

As Roger Ahlbrandt, president of Allegheny Ludlum Industries, said at the Washington conference:

Price, and price alone, is the basic reason foreign steels undersell domestic steel 15 to 20 percent here in the United States.

Let us look further at what this surge in imports means to us. Statistics show from 1958 to 1970. In 1958, three-tenths of 1 percent of the domestic market was imported steel, as compared to 34 percent in 1970. I have statistics that show a more detailed look at this increase. Here, a marked reduction in domestic shipments can be seen, and the marked increase in imported tons is readily apparent. Only the nickel shortage in 1969 temporarily halted the increase in imports.

Statistics illustrate hot and cold rolled imports show this growth factor even more clearly.

How do these figures compare with the agreed-on voluntary limitations?

In 1968, imports of stainless and tool steels totaled 141,645 tons. In 1969, under the agreement, there should have been a 22-percent reduction. Actually, foreign producers exceeded their quota by 27 percent. In 1970, the quota was exceeded by 39 percent.

In imports of cold rolled sheets, quotas were exceeded by 16 percent in 1969, by 34 percent in 1970.

Hot and cold rolled sheet and strip—the quotas in 1969 were exceeded by 35

percent, in 1970 by 51 percent, as the statistics show.

I also have statistics that show imports of stainless steel by country of origin. From 1964 to 1970, Japan increased its imports by 56 percent. If we excluded the categories of ingots, blooms, billets, and slabs—mostly from Canada for conversion—of course, this percentage figure would be much greater.

Let us look at a few other items. Imports have already captured 66.5 percent of stainless rods, 53 percent of stainless wire, and 11 percent of the stainless bar business. Statistics show what the effect has been on tool steels. Here it can be seen that imports have gone from 8.3 percent in 1964 to 16.9 percent in 1970.

Another area of particular concern is seamless stainless and heat tubular products, as well as welded stainless tubular products.

For seamless stainless tube, current domestic production is about 18,000 tons per year. In 1970, imports were about 6,400 tons, or 35 percent of the domestic production. In welded stainless tubular products, production in the size range of three-eighths inch through 4.5 inch in diameter in 1970 was about 28,000 tons. Imports in 1970 were about 4,600 tons, or over 16 percent of the domestic market. This is about double the imports of 1968, as the figures will show.

The facts of life are that steel technology and worldwide availability are such that, with the exception of a few exotic grades of steel, the basis for competition is price and price alone.

In this specialty steel industry, we can estimate that payrolls are on an annualized basis of \$400 million and purchases of raw materials and supplies are in the magnitude of over \$600 million a year. Of course, the effect on suppliers and subsidiary firms such as machine shops, fabricators, and transportation is manifold more than this cost. Other specialty steel producers include: United States Steel, Armco, Allegheny Ludlum, Carpenter Steel, Cyclops Corp., Latrobe Steel, Vasco Steel, Jessop, Washington Steel, Sharon Steel, Joslyn, Ingersoll, Eastern, Babcock & Wilcox, Bethlehem, Braeburn, Columbia Tool Steel, Jones & Laughlin, McLouth, and Republic. These firms employ many thousands of people. In Pennsylvania, whole communities like Midland, Brackenridge, Latrobe, and Washington are dependent upon this industry.

I suggest that our Government's policy on reciprocal trade was designed for circumstances that no longer exist.

We live in a different world than we did a few years ago. Then we were rich in resources and our technology was far ahead of other nations so that we could afford our higher labor costs. Free trade and no tariff barriers or quotas were distinctly to our advantage then. Our exports exceeded our imports. Conditions have changed slowly, but drastically. We are now an importer of most of our needed minerals. We are short on energy sources—gas, oil, high grade coal, and electricity.

Massive infusion of American dollars and technical know-how have made the

industries of the overseas producers and combinations of producers equal or superior to our own. It is time we thought in terms of protecting our employees and our industries, stockholders, and taxpayers before it is too late.

To be effective for the specialty steel industry, import restrictions must be by "product form" and limited to dollar amount rather than tons. We are asking for a system of voluntary restraints limiting specialty steel imports to 10 percent of the domestic market in each product form. Our foreign friends have no compunctions about restricting, limiting, or prohibiting our exporting to their countries.

As you know, U.S. producers pay full income taxes, receive no export rebate, do not benefit from loans to cover the cost of extending credit, do not receive low-cost capital equipment loans or rapid depreciation allowances. In some foreign nations—Japan is a good example—the steel industry receives actual subsidies from Government. Their expansion into the world market is a joint effort—cartel—of the Japanese Government and Japanese business. The European Community Market provides protected markets for its member countries. We are not a member and many markets are closed to us. A vast number of industries now demanding full access—and getting it—to American markets were created by U.S. loans or outright gifts for which we are still paying taxes. We as American taxpayers are bearing the expense of defending other countries. In the case of Japan, this is around 80 percent. Our workers are also paying substantial income taxes for the defense of Europe.

Many knowledgeable people in our industry believe that, although great efforts are being undertaken to obtain adherence to the voluntary agreement in its third and last year, Japanese and European producers will not make any changes in their practices unless they are forced to do so. All their marketing efforts today indicate that they will put their emphasis on an increase in selling effectiveness and a decrease in their pricing.

Joseph P. Molony, vice president of the United Steelworkers of America, has put forth a three-point program at the meeting in Washington which I think deserves our close attention and support.

Mr. Molony advocates a rigid enforcement of the voluntary agreement in its third year; he recommends an extension but also an improvement of the agreement for another 2 years; and third, he proposes that legislative quotas be imposed if the voluntary agreement is not extended.

I might say that Mr. Molony's program was completely endorsed by all management and union representatives at the Washington conference.

An aggressive, expansionist policy carried out by Japan and the European steel community countries now threatens the very existence of an industry vital to our national security if allowed to continue unabated with controls or duties.

It is better to practice preventive medicine now rather than resuscitate a dead patient. Many Members of Congress think so, the unions think so and industry thinks so. It is hopeful that the executive branch of our government will insist on the necessary action and that legislative quotas will be made by Congress. Free trade must be fair trade.

I include the following table:

TOTAL STAINLESS (INDUSTRY DATA)

	Exports (tons)	Estimated imports (tons)	Imports as a percent of domestic market
1958.....	14,740	3,705	0.8
1959.....	17,666	6,925	1.1
1960.....	41,281	14,081	2.6
1961.....	32,974	12,577	2.3
1962.....	37,737	27,102	4.4
1963.....	61,588	55,589	8.5
1964.....	75,554	79,352	10.2
1965.....	55,008	112,868	12.0
1966.....	55,777	135,327	13.4
1967.....	65,771	149,321	16.2
1968.....	51,363	171,871	18.3
1969.....	41,323	182,224	17.3
1970 (estimated).....	47,813	178,885	21.2

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and AISI.

Someone tell me in this day and age which lines of production we are strongest in. The steel industry and all of the steel fabricating industries can hardly be referred to as weak organizations, as weak industries. However, in spite of the fact that we have the raw materials, iron ore, coal, limestone, and so forth, we cannot compete with Germany, Japan, and other countries when they wish to sell in the United States. The only limit to the importations into this country is the limit of other countries to produce. Nothing else holds them back, and as fast as they are able to produce they find a ready market in the United States. One could go on and on.

What about reducing wage costs, we are told? Do you know of any industry which has succeeded to any degree, and in most cases especially recently, in reducing wage costs. Wage costs have very far outstripped any other area or period in the history of this country because of the fact that living costs have gone up, not primarily because of wages which, perhaps, contribute to it, but wages usually follow the high cost of living but do not induce it.

Like most free traders, of course, they always fall back on the old, old cliché, "How can we exist in a world isolated from the rest of the world?"

We are not asking for isolation. We are not asking that we be set aside as a people of our own. But, we are refusing to participate, and this individual is refusing to participate any longer in a program of affluency for the American people in the matter of the provision of goods and production of goods for their use from people that are enslaved all over the world, at wages that were never paid in the balmy days of wage exploitation in the United States.

I just came from a foreign country 3 weeks ago, and I found there a plant producing for the United States of America a product that is more American than anything you can think of—base-

balls for the recreational and playground leagues that play throughout the United States. They were paying the workers in that factory \$1 a day for men and 70 cents a day for women, and the women had to hand-sew 40 major league baseballs an hour.

Who were these workers? I will tell you who they were—they were the descendants of slaves that we bought from southern plantations in an attempt before the Civil War to send out of this country the slaves that had been brought into it by buying them from the plantations in the South, and sending them to this country. They have now populated that nation.

Here we are, we who destroyed slavery in America, and rightfully so, providing for ourselves the labors of these same slaves today without blinking an eye, without standing up once and saying in fairness, "What has gone wrong? Where are we? What has happened to us?"

There is not a line of endeavor from the largest manufactured product and production facility to the weakest in this entire country that is not hit by this scourge of imports from foreign low-wage industries.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with what the gentleman is speaking of, and would the gentleman tell us what those baseballs were sold for in that country, and also in this country?

Mr. DENT. I understand that they sell for \$3.75 apiece here. I bought one on the open market down in this little country at a gift shop for 25 cents.

Mr. GAYDOS. Would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DENT. I yield further to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAYDOS. What is the average wage for the workers who produce those baseballs?

Mr. DENT. First I would like to give you a little history. When I was a young man in the U.S. Marine Air Corps I served 2 years in this country I spoke about, and at that time they were paying labor a gourd, which was their dollar, which had a value of 20 cents American money, and that is still the value of a gourd today. We employed these people at the air base, and paid them 40 cents, or 2 gourdes a day. However, the top wages were anywhere from 3 to 4 gourdes, and the top wages today are 4 to 5 gourdes for men.

I stayed in a hotel there, and my bill was something like \$32 a night, and they were paying the help \$1 a day for the men and 80 cents a day for the women. If one hotel room was rented for one night it paid the entire wages for the whole kit and caboodle of all of the help they had in the place.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DENT. I yield further to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAYDOS. Is the gentleman making the point, then, that the workers are now getting gored by the gourd?

Mr. DENT. They are getting gored by the gourd. For 30 years the glass industry of the United States complained to Congress because of the impact on their particular industry of cheap imports. For 30 years the glass industry appealed through the Tariff Commission of the United States for relief, and to the President and to the Congress. For 30 years not one word of help or encouragement was given to the glass industry. For 30 years not one bit of help came from this Congress or any other Congress, and not one bit of help from any President, or the Tariff Commission.

Finally, after closing down some 36 of the 41 glass plants in America, I read where the Tariff Commission has finally found that American glass producers are being injured by Japanese glass imports. However, this notification came too late. That is just one instance.

In Laconia, N.H., the New Hampshire Ball Bearing Co. said that 100 workers would lose their jobs permanently as a result of the plant shutting down. And this ball bearing company has been up in New Hampshire since time immemorial.

They have complained and asked for relief from the Tariff Commission. This is the irony of it—a White House decision to provide protection to this American miniature ball bearing industry which was announced last week came too late, with too little.

Do you know what it costs to maintain the workers and their families on welfare? You hear of the cost of welfare. We, in the Congress, are hounded every day by demands that we cut out welfare. What do you do with the families of those 100 people? Their jobs have been taken by foreign workers. I say this country cannot survive and it will not survive. The things I said 10 years ago were laughed at and, yet, not one has failed to come true. Even the worst predictions I made were not even up to 90 percent of the havoc that has been created in America by excessive imports.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania when he was pointing out where baseballs for Americans are being manufactured today.

I would also for the edification of the Members here inform them that you cannot buy an American-made baseball glove in the market today. I have looked through many of the stores in this Nation and I fail to find any baseball gloves being manufactured in our country today.

When the gentleman is talking of wages in Korea—the average wage of a male worker in the shoe factories and in the textile factories and the electronic firms, is 10 cents an hour for male workers.

The average wage of a female worker is 7 cents an hour.

The average wage for a 10-year-old child—and they have them standing on boxes there working, is 6 cents an hour.

These plants in Japan, the manufacturing industries in Japan today, are now building factories in Taiwan and Korea. They will not allow those goods to come into Japan, but they are manufacturing them there so as to take advantage of the low tariffs in this country and they are glutting our markets with all of these goods and creating high unemployment throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He has been in the vanguard fighting and bringing the attention of this Nation to this great problem. He deserves a great deal of credit for his fine statement here today.

Mr. DENT. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take too long because we have others who are interested and who want to take part in this discussion.

But I want to point out a very serious matter that faces us now. If we can convince the Congress and if we can convince the President by executive order or the Congress by action on this floor legislatively, then we can save this industry I am talking about. But, if we cannot convince them, believe me when I say here today that this Nation will be incapable of having any kind of economic prosperity industrially and in time of war we could no longer stave off defeat than a man can fly to the moon on a paper kite. This industry is the basic industry of all manufacturing in this line—heavy, intermediate, soft goods, hard goods or whatever you want to talk about—the tool steel industry of the United States—the special steel industry is the basic ingredient for an industrial complex to survive in any business or war.

Let me show you what has happened in 2 short years. In 1969 the specialty steel imported into the United States was 1.1 percent of American consumption.

In 1971 the specialty steel industry was impacted by nearly 71 percent.

Today by the end of this year, three companies I know of, and I will not mention their names because I do not want to start a wave of stock selling that may shove them down the drain before their time comes—by the end of this year three major tool steel companies will go out of business unless we do something now—right now—and not tomorrow.

Let me show you why this is so. The differences between the wages of a steel worker in Japan and they are largest and most destructive competitors—the difference between the Japanese wage and the American wage including fringe benefits is \$4.20 an hour. Just using the \$4 figure in order to make our arithmetic very easily understood—it takes 6,000 men to produce 1 million tons of ordinary carbon steel.

It takes 13,000 men to produce 1 million tons of tool steel, specialty steel. So using just the figures for carbon steel, which is the lowest cost steel, 6,000 men working at \$4 an hour differential results in \$24,000 in one day. I used the figure \$3.80, and it comes out to \$48 million a year, which represents the difference in wages paid in Japan and the wages paid in America to steelworkers. Because of the difference between steel imports and steel exports, 146,000 Ameri-

cans were out of work last year in the steel mills.

For every American worker who loses his job in production, three other workers—in Government, in service industry, in education, in the professions, and in the nonproduction industries—lose their jobs. So instead of having 140,000 workers out of work because of steel imports alone in this country, we find ourselves in the position of having 560,000 workers put out of work by the imports of steel alone.

Let us talk about ceramics. Ninety-three percent of all tableware you put on your table is imported. Sixty-eight percent of all the beautiful plywood they sell throughout the country for home and institutional decorations all over the country is imported.

My friend from Massachusetts has spoken about the shoe industry. In the months of January and February there were 28 million more pairs of shoes imported into the United States than there were last year in January and February. By the end of this year, every man, woman and child can be fitted with three pairs of imported shoes.

Now, it is all right for us to say, "Well, we have got to live with our neighbors." We want to live with our neighbors, but they have got to learn one thing. The basis of America's growth, the basis of the affluency of this society, the basis of the greatness of our entire concept of a democracy has been the fact that we recognize that along with high production there had to be high consumption, and the only way you can get high consumption is to pay wages.

These countries can produce. They have the same facilities we do. They have the same kind of people we have. There is no question of their productivity per man. But they cannot consume. How can you expect the steelworker in Japan to consume the goods that a steelworker in America consumes?

I have a great deal of criticism of American labor. I came from labor. When a man making \$5.20 an hour stands up and demands the right to buy a shirt made by a Hong Kong worker who is paid 17 cents to 19 cents an hour, he is not honest, he is not fair, because the shirt worker in America making \$2.40 an hour is entitled to a living in this country.

I do not say that we owe you a living. I do not say the country owes me a living. But it is my concept the country owes me an opportunity and every other person in this country willing to work an opportunity to work.

To show you the inconsistency of the thinking of free traders, free traders will march up here and be the first to vote against opening up immigration. They do not want to open up immigration because, you see, if we let too many people come into the country, there will be too many persons looking for jobs, and they will take the jobs of our American citizens.

What is the difference? What is the practical difference in this economy? If you do not allow a foreign worker to come into the country to take your job, then why do you allow the product he makes over there to come into this country, in turn, takes your job anyway?

I say in a final warning—and I say this to you, my colleagues, who are sitting here tonight, and there are darned few of you sitting here—I say most of you are in sympathy with this program and are in accord with my argument. But I want to say to you that unless we do something, the question of Vietnam will fade off into the shadows.

The question of our economic well-being will fade off into the shadows. The thing that will become the prime issue in the American Nation will be the question of jobs. Nothing takes the place of jobs.

If I could, I would enlist the young people in this country to change the direction they are flowing into and start worrying about their future. We are too old to worry about it. My future is behind me. Whatever I have been able to achieve I have achieved. Whatever I hope to do will be now an anticlimax.

This much I know, and I know it as sincerely as I am standing on this floor today, that we have more unemployment as such, we have more people today who are doing absolutely nothing in the way of creating or giving services or producing goods, than we have had at any time in our history.

We talked about Hoover. I talked plenty about him. I happened to be a Democrat, and I nailed across his back all the crosses I could during the depression, because I was a young man looking for a job, a young man with a family. But I want to say to all of you, I apologize to Mr. Hoover. He was a great manager compared to what we have today.

You see, he had this situation: Everybody who could breathe, everybody could walk, was counted as unemployed if he did not have a job. So he had a terrible unemployment situation. But he did not have 13 million people drawing relief. He did not have 11 million people being fed through the military services. He did not have 26 million people on social security, receiving social security payments. He did not have 10.8 million other workers working in the various governments under civil service, with guaranteed jobs and guaranteed income. He did not have all of these things.

If he were alive today, if he had the same conditions and the same laws and the same lack of supporting props in Government that he had then, the unemployment in this country would be so great that there would not be any apples to sell, because people would be stealing them.

I want to say to all of you, in spite of everything we have tried to say for 10 years, I am afraid that what my father said to me when I was a young boy is true. I told him about something that happened at Harrisburg when I was in the senate, and I said I was amazed by it, because the man who promoted the idea was a great educated man, and he had all kinds of degrees. My dad said, "You know, son, one of these days you are going to learn when schools are too free people get pretty darned dumb."

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAYDOS. I should like to join my good colleague, who joined me in visiting Midland and the coal industry and the Crucible Steel plant. It is important that he not overlook what we found. I am calling my colleague's attention to the fact that we had indisputable evidence of the fact that we had a 50,000 job loss in the specialty tool industry since 1966.

Mr. DENT. That is right.

Mr. GAYDOS. I believe we also had very clear evidence regarding the stainless steel rod portion of specialty steel, and my colleague could expand on that.

Mr. DENT. That came about because of our State Department, which, of course, runs everything. It is the supervisory supercargo of our Government, running the war, telling when to bomb Vietnam or not to bomb Vietnam, telling when to pull the fellows out or when to put them in, telling them when to ship something out and when to ship something in. The State Department is becoming a supercargo department running everything in the country.

They negotiated a deal. They let the steelworkers sit down around the table for a couple of days, and they negotiated a deal with the Japanese and said, "Look, you are up to 18 million tons of imports of steel to this country. If you do not come to a voluntary agreement Congress is going to do something about it."

The Japanese knew we could not do anything about it. We are impotent when it comes to that, in that particular phase, in trade. We could not do anything about it. But they decided to go along.

Any time you find a Japanese who does not have a camera around his neck or an ace up his sleeve, he is a faker; he is not a Japanese, but maybe a Korean.

They went along and signed the agreement for the voluntary cutback, and went to 14 million tons of steel. They did. But I will tell you what they did. They were bringing in at that time tonnages of carbon steel, which is the lowest priced steel that there is.

Then in the next 3 years they shifted the mix of their exports to the United States into specialty steels which sell for dollars a pound compared to dollars a ton, and they succeeded in getting almost 50 percent more money for less steel because they shipped in the high-priced steel.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes, I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GAYDOS. Are you saying, then, that the voluntary arrangement which has been in effect in this country with Japan and with some of the common bloc countries since 1968 is not working and is a farce?

Mr. DENT. It was a farce when it started and it continues to be a farce, and if they sign another one, that will continue to be a farce.

The cotton agreement was also a farce. For instance, it said that they would ship only so many billions of yards of cotton textiles into the United States, but the Japanese very cleverly covenanted them. Here is what they said. They said that any product that will come under the limit imposed by this treaty between this

and other nations, including Japan, that that textile had to contain no less than 51 percent of cotton. So they shipped in I do not know how many billions of yards, and then all of a sudden we found ourselves with twice as many billions of yards of textiles coming in. We complained, of course, and said "You have a voluntary agreement. This is your limitation. Look at what you are shipping in." "Oh," they said, "under the agreement it says 51 percent of cotton is all you count against the quota. So what we are doing is putting in 51 percent of man made fibers and 49 percent of cotton. There is no limit on it at all."

Anybody who makes a voluntary agreement with the Japanese ought to have his head examined.

#### INTERFERENCE WITH STEEL WAGE NEGOTIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROONEY of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GAYDOS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. GAYDOS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, no American, regardless of political affiliation, delights in disagreeing publicly with our President over issues of national importance. I think this is particularly true of those of us in the Congress who appreciate the demands of that Office and admire the courage of the man who holds it in view of the crucial decisions he is called upon to make. But, as elected Representatives of our people, neither can we be derelict in our duty to them. We must not remain mute when our President acts in a manner we hold to be detrimental to our constituents and to our Nation.

That is why I am here today because I cannot, as the Representative of one of the greatest steelmaking centers in the world, keep silent in the face of a raw and reckless display of power on the part of the President. I cannot ignore his interference into wage negotiations within the steel industry that could affect the lives of thousands of steelworkers in my 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania and hundreds of thousands across the country.

President Nixon's veiled warning that steelworkers must cushion their request for wage increases and other benefits, or be accused of contributing to inflation, is a grossly unfair and unjustified attack upon hard-working Americans who seek only that to which they are entitled. They did not create the current high cost of living. They are not the villains of inflation. They are the victims.

I do not pretend to understand President Nixon's apparent antagonism toward the steel industry and the steelworker. But it is not a new thing. Three times in the past 15 months he has used either the industry or labor as a whipping boy. Three times he has threatened to use unrestricted foreign imports to force his will on the industry and its workers. It is a risk that steel, to date, has not seen fit to take because both labor and management well know the con-

sequences could be fatal to one of our Nation's most vital industries.

By interceding in the negotiations between steel management and labor, Mr. Nixon may jeopardize what otherwise could be an amicable agreement by both sides. His meddling could destroy the spirit of collective bargaining which is the vital ingredient in any negotiation.

Perhaps unwittingly the President has driven a wedge between the two sides of the steel industry. He has succeeded, I believe, in driving them apart, creating a spirit of distrust and causing each side to stiffen their back. I am afraid they will refuse to compromise their respective positions and adopt instead the policy of unconditional surrender. Who would win or lose is anybody's guess. There are too many signs already that management and labor are girding themselves for a long and bitter fight. The President's interference may well prove to be the catalyst which will trigger a costly strike beneficial to no one.

He has implied the steelworker will be furthering the cause of rampant inflation by seeking wage increases and benefits already granted workers in other industries. I would not attempt to render an opinion as to what the steelworker is or is not entitled to receive in the upcoming negotiations. Mr. Paul McCracken, head of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, also has wisely declined to give any opinion. So should Mr. Nixon.

The question of wage increases and benefits is something to be settled by labor and management. That is what collective bargaining is all about. The talks should be, in fact must be, a free and unrestricted exchange of facts, positions and information between the parties involved. They do not need, nor should they be subjected to, the ominous shadow of the President looming over the negotiation table as a third party sitting in judgment over whatever decision is reached.

If the President is finally leaning to wage and price controls to curb galloping inflation, he has waited too long. Congress gave him the authority to do this in December 1969, but for reasons of his own he chose not to exercise that authority. Subsequently, but significant, the third party shadow was not present at the bargaining tables with the teamsters, longshoremen, auto workers, or construction workers when they negotiated new contracts over the past year. These unions were not made to toe the line, tone down their requests or face the wrath of the White House. The administration was conspicuous by its absence.

However, when it comes to steel negotiations it is a different story. Why should the industry and its workers be pointedly subjected to White House policy pronouncements in the form of an inflation alert when other industries were left to bargain without intervention. Is it because this administration and its advisors have deftly ignored statistics compiled by its own agencies which indicate that steelworkers are not cake eaters but bread and butter workingmen. These facts were published in the March issue

of U.S. News & World Report. They include the average weekly pay of certain workers before taxes, their gain or loss over 1970 and their "real" pay after tax deductions. The information, the magazine reports, was compiled from data received from various sources, including the U.S. Departments of Labor and Agriculture, the Civil Service Commission, the National Education Association, and the Veterans' Administration. I will include the entire report at the end of my remarks but for the moment let us look at some of the winners in the battle for wage increases:

	Average weekly pay before taxes	Gain or loss over last year	"Real" pay after taxes
Federal employees.....	\$193.70	+\$21.75	+\$12.49
Meatpackers.....	184.95	+20.00	+11.44
Construction workers.....	199.11	+18.11	+10.87
Soft coal miners.....	197.69	+15.15	+7.86
Oil refinery workers.....	198.23	+13.06	+5.61

Those were some of the winners, here are some of the losers:

	Average weekly pay before taxes	Gain or loss over last year	"Real" pay after taxes
Steelworkers.....	\$169.22	+\$1.17	\$4.28
Aluminum workers.....	162.99	+5.43	-1.47
Tire factory workers.....	182.25	-6.47	-12.51
Farmers.....	98.80	-10.70	-11.85

What this means, of course, is there are many workers taking home fatter paychecks today but with less buying power. U.S. News & World Report points out one of the industries where the purchasing power has dropped is basic steel.

Why then has the steelworker been singled out for special Presidential pressure when he is doing nothing more than playing catchup ball in Mr. Nixon's economic game plan? Is he to be used as a stepping stone in the President's campaign to achieve a low-wage economy?

Whatever his reason, it seems the President has selected the steel industry and the steelworker for the guinea pigs in his experiment. It is not the first time he has tried to make it knuckle under to his will. In 1970 and again early this year, Mr. Nixon threatened to unleash a torrent of foreign steel upon the country, flooding the domestic steel market and drowning the American steelworker in the process, if the steel industry—Bethlehem Steel—did not roll back scheduled price increases. With such a gun to its head, and cocked, industry retreated and the President won his way. But at what risk? Was it really necessary for an American President to look to foreign nations for allies in a domestic confrontation?

Other Presidents have faced similar showdowns with the steel industry and did not go that far. President Kennedy, in 1962, "eyeballed" the industry into calling back price increases. President Johnson in 1965, vowed to give Government contracts only to those steel firms who held the line against price increases. They won their point and did it without threat-

ening to put a major American industry on the sacrificial altar under a samurai sword.

This administration's past record fortifies my grave concern that the specter of foreign imports may well again be used to squeeze out a wage settlement in the forthcoming basic steel negotiations. To think otherwise would be unrealistic and a gross disregard for the facts; particularly, in light of the veiled threats of unrealistic price increases contained in the recent inflation alert issued by the Council of Economic Advisers. Should this occur, the loser is sure to be the steelworker and his family.

I am including in conjunction with my statement the following items which present in detail pertinent information and opinions regarding this subject matter. These reports include inter alia a news release by I. W. Abel, president of the United Steelworkers of America, press release dated April 13, 1971; press release by George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, dated April 14, 1971; statement by George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO before the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions, dated April 7, 1971; excerpt from U.S. News & World Report, dated March 15, 1971; and an article from the Wall Street Journal, dated November 14, 1968:

#### NEWS FROM THE USWA

PITTSBURGH, Pa., April 13, 1971.—President I. W. Abel of the United Steelworkers of America (USWA) today issued the following statement on the inflation alert issued by the Council of Economic Advisers:

"A careful reading of the facts does not support the statement issued by the Council of Economic Advisers. The facts clearly demonstrate that Steelworkers have been the victims of inflation, not the cause of inflation. The facts clearly show that the purchasing power of Steelworkers has declined. Therefore, Steelworkers have no intention of acquiescing voluntarily in any effort that would deny them an equitable settlement in negotiations with the Basic Steel Industry. The collective bargaining policy of our Union has been formulated and we intend to implement it at the bargaining table.

"The average worker today is on the short end of the economic stick because of the disastrous economic policies of the present Administration which have given us both inflation and unemployment. It seems to me that the Administration is trying to cover up its failures by singling out the worker as the fall guy. Instead of proposing programs to restore the purchasing power of workers and put America back to work, the Administration busily engaged in granting tax concessions to industry.

"It also seems to me that the Administration speaks from a wobbly platform, since the President himself has seen his own salary increase 100% since he took office. Slightly less, but nevertheless substantial, salary increases also have been granted the Vice President, members of the Cabinet and members of Congress. We are proposing much more modest increases for workers in our basic industries.

"We are going to the collective bargaining table with a clear conscience determined to obtain a settlement we can be proud of."

#### NEWS FROM THE AFL-CIO

Following is the transcript of a speech delivered today by AFL-CIO President George Meany at the convention of the Utility Workers Union of America at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.:

I cannot speak to you this morning with-

out referring to the tremendous loss that this organization suffered in the death of my old friend, Bill Pachler.

Bill Pachler and I came from the same part of the world. We came from the Bronx. I knew his father and I knew his background and I got to know Bill quite well. And he exemplified, as far as I am concerned, the very best type of American trade union leader and I am sure this organization misses him and I can say to you that the AFL-CIO misses him greatly.

These are very interesting days and I could talk to you this morning on any number of subjects. There is a great deal going on. We have the affair in Southeast Asia where there seems to be complete agreement now on everybody's part that the best thing for America is to get out of there. And the only disagreement seems to be when, how fast and in what way.

It is quite obvious, however, that the President is keeping his pledge to wind the war down and turn it over to the South Vietnamese.

Then we could talk about drug problems, health problems, women's lib, mini-maxi and hot pants and a lot of those things, I guess, but our No. 1 problem, as trade unionists, is the same problem it has always been.

Our business is jobs and decent working conditions on the job and an adequate income as our share of the wealth that the economy produces. This has always been our business. And everything we do—organizationally, legislatively, politically—is directed toward this basic simple idea—decent jobs at decent pay and a fair share for the worker in the economy.

So when we look at the economy today, we realize this presents us with our No. 1 problem. And let's look back from where we are to see how we got where we are and perhaps get an idea of where we would like to go.

We are in trouble in this country, economically—in deep trouble. We find the cost of living at its highest point in history. We find six percent unemployment—over five million Americans officially looking for work. That does not represent the full figure because those who get sick and tired of looking for work and don't apply at the employment offices, are more or less dropped. Those who are working part time are figured in the computations as if they are fully employed.

And then, of course, the figures do not reflect, in basic human terms, the problem as we see it.

A great many of these presently unemployed are running out of their unemployment insurance payments and, as far as that goes, they are out of the market as consumers and more and more are turning to welfare.

And this, to me, is a disgrace in this the richest and greatest nation on earth. Now, how did we get into this situation?

In January of 1969, when the present Administration came to office, we had experienced 94 months of uninterrupted economic progress—going from the very early days of the Kennedy Administration—progress measured by every economic indicator used by the experts. Over 90 months of uninterrupted, forward progress. I think our unemployment figure, if I am correct, was about 2.7—the lowest it had been in a good many years.

Then a new Administration came to Washington on the 20th of January, 1969, and, of course, they had some new ideas. They felt that one of the things that had accompanied our progress, the increased cost of living, was something that they could do something about. They felt that inflation must be halted. So they came in with the so-called Nixon Administration economic "game plan." It called for fiscal and monetary policies designed to cool off the economy, restrict credit, restrict the flow of

money into the economy. And this was to be done with no increase in unemployment.

Every student of economics would tell you that when you tighten up on the money supply, when you restrict credit and thereby prevent business expansion in the normal fashion, that unemployment is going to ensue.

However, we were told by President Nixon—in fact, he put it in writing in a letter to the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO in February of 1969—that he was going to cool off the economy, he was going to bring down prices and he was going to do it without compelling the worker to pay for it, as he said, with increased unemployment.

This was the "game plan" of the President's chief economic adviser, Dr. Arthur Burns, who had been around here in Washington back in the Eisenhower days and who always seemed to have a better answer for our problems than anybody connected with the Johnson or Kennedy Administration. So this was his "game plan." He was going to bring inflation down and he was going to do it without—as we were assured by the President—increasing unemployment.

Well, what happened? They cooled off the economy all right. They restricted credit and, within two years, we had 2,200,000 more people unemployed than we had in January of 1969.

We had the highest interest rates in 100 years, drastically affecting the housing industry and adversely affecting all the small businessmen in the country, who could not borrow under the restricted rates, and adversely affecting everybody who had to buy or would like to buy a new home. Interest rates went as high as 10 percent—7½ percent, 8 percent and then they add on a few points—and we got to the situation where the costs were driven up and even a man in the \$15,000, \$16,000, \$17,000-a-year class could not afford to buy his own home.

Well, what did we get when we got to this point? What did we get from the Administration? Did we get concrete proposals to create jobs, to restore confidence and to enhance the mass purchasing power of the American people which, after all, is the major ingredient in this dynamic economy that we boast about? Did we get any of these measures? No. We got rosy predictions. Every new figure that came out that was considered important as an economic indicator was interpreted by White House spokesmen as being favorable.

So we got a lot of rosy predictions and a lot of rhetoric.

And what did we find with this unemployment after two years in this restricted activity on the part of business and these tremendous interest rates? What did we find when we looked at the major objective of this plan to bring down prices? Well, all during the two years prices continued to rise up, up and up.

So, adding it all up, after two years, the Nixon Administration's financial fiscal and monetary economic plan was a complete, absolute, miserable failure. There is no other judgment you can pass on it.

So then we have Dr. Burns, who is the architect of this failure, and still the fair-haired boy of the Administration on economics. Well, what was his reaction?

Now, incidentally, for his failure he didn't get fired. If he was in the Soviet area, he would be sent to Siberia. He didn't get exiled. In fact, he got promoted. He was promoted from presidential economic adviser to chairman of the very, very powerful Federal Reserve Board.

Now, we are now starting to see some of the consequences of his advice. They did nullify, temporarily, the Davis-Bacon law and found out that that didn't work—that it didn't do anything to meet the problem of inflation and that it created chaos in the entire industry. So they came up with some

new gimmick and they re-instated the Davis-Bacon law for the construction trades.

Now they come out with the so-called "Inflation Alerts." These are studies made by the Administration's Council of Economic Advisers and they are supposed to pinpoint various areas in the economy where conditions are bringing about an increase in prices.

So, what did they do here yesterday? They came out with an "Inflation Alert" that condemns the United Steelworkers settlement in the can industry, where they dealt with several corporations for collective bargaining contracts a few weeks ago covering 40,000 of their members. And this "Inflation Alert" says that if this pattern is carried into the steel industry it will be disastrous for the economy.

What does this mean? This means the Steelworkers, representing 450,000 workers in steel, are going into their contract negotiations with the employer—and the employer is the U.S. Steel Corporation, Bethlehem, Jones and Laughlin, all the big steel giants—they are going into those contract negotiations with a government edict or a government pronouncement that the money they got—the 9 percent from the can companies—is too high. In other words, they are going into negotiations with government definitely on the side of the employer.

How is that for interfering with collective bargaining? Well, the Steelworkers, I am quite sure, are going to take care of themselves. I think that they are going to insist that at least their membership make up what they lost in purchasing power through inflation since the last agreement.

And I don't see anything wrong with workers wanting to keep pace with the rest of the economy insofar as their purchasing power is concerned. However, in this "Inflation Alert" issued yesterday, there was an indication that there is a study being made by an Administration executive task force, as they call it, of the problems in connection with the steel industry and other industries. As we read this, it means they are moving in the direction, advised by Dr. Burns in his speech in California—the direction of compulsory arbitration. In other words, they are moving to the point where it is quite possible that they will move into steel and impose a government settlement on the workers and try to enforce it by some sort of court injunction.

Well, I don't think the Steelworkers are going to buy that and I don't think the American trade union movement is going to buy that.

Did he apologize for the failure? Did he explain the failure? Did he say "sorry about that. We will have to do better next time?" Oh, no, he didn't talk about those things at all.

He went out early in January to a little college in California, Pepperdine College, and he made a speech. And his answer at that time, after these two years of miserable failure, was that we had to crack down on labor. His first suggestion was compulsory arbitration of disputes in important industries, quite evidently pointing at the steel industry; and repeal of the Bacon-Davis law.

The Davis-Bacon law is a law which governs the expenditure of public monies—your money and my money—in building public facilities paid for by the federal government. And the purpose of it is quite simple—that public money should not be used to depress wages. That the government itself, as an employer, should be a good employer. He should be as good as the best employer, and not be an employer competing on a low wage basis with other low wage employers.

So, he said, this law should be repealed, which guarantees the payment of decent wages on government projects.

Then he said something should be done about the minimum wage law. Now, we know

what the minimum wage law is all about and the purpose of it, because we are the architects of that law. Oh, it doesn't affect our members—or, if it does, very, very few of them because very, very few of our members are down at that minimum scale. We started with 25 cents an hour in 1938 and we gradually raised it and gradually widened its coverage, bringing millions and millions of more people in, until about four years ago or five years ago, we brought it up to \$1.60 an hour. This is not a wage on which people can live on, but it is better than what they were getting in the various industries that still exploit the workers in this country.

Now, under this minimum wage law people working for employers in what we call low-wage industries get \$1.60 an hour.

But Mr. Burns had a suggestion on that. He pointed to the unemployment figures which vary according to categories. For instance, unemployment among heads of families is down about 3 percent; Negro unemployment is somewhere about 10 percent or 9 percent; construction workers up in that area; and teenagers well above 10 percent. Of course, one of the reasons for the teenagers percentage being higher is a normal thing. They come in from school to the work force and they register for employment and, of course, they don't get employment as quickly as people with more experience.

So, Dr. Burns' brilliant idea was "let's take care of the teenagers." Let's eliminate or reduce the minimum wage for the teenagers so that the employer who is now compelled to pay \$1.60 an hour for his employees, could lay off the \$1.60 an hour employee and hire teenagers for \$1.10 or \$1.20 an hour. This was another one of Mr. Burns' suggestions.

And then, of course, he had something for business. This was a little fast tax write-off on business investment and equipment as an incentive to business.

This was the fellow, as I said, who was the architect of our complete failure and he comes out with the proposal to crack down on labor.

We have said to this Administration as we said to the previous Administration, if they feel the necessity of imposing wage price and income controls because the situation in the country calls for this action, and if the controls are across-the-board—they control prices, wages, every form of income—that American labor is prepared to go along in the interest of the country with that sort of a program.

The response from big business has been: "No comment."

So here we have an Administration moving toward a crack-down on labor at a time when they are giving big business tax incentives, increased speed of investment write-offs, all of the little gimmicks that they can do; at a time when the banks of this country are making profits beyond anything they ever dreamed of, at a time when, executive salaries are reaching new heights, they are going to try and make labor the scapegoat.

What they are pointing toward, if they are successful—I don't think they are going to be successful—is the establishment of a low wage economy in this country. And, if they look around the world, yes, everywhere in the world where wages are lower, they will see what a low-wage economy means. Over the history of this country in the last 50 years, the best customer for American industry is the American worker.

We don't sell abroad more than seven percent of our production at any time. So, when you drive around the outskirts of our big cities, you see television aerials over every little home and you realize that if they have a television, they have the other things that make life a little more comfortable. And they have them because of the mass purchasing power in the hands of the American people and they have them because organized la-

bor, over the years, fought to develop that mass purchasing power.

Who would buy these things if only the \$20,000 a year class and up could buy the equipment? Who would buy the devices that we can produce that make life a little more comfortable?

So when they are trying to beat down labor, when they are trying to make labor the scapegoat, they are launching a direct attack on the purchasing power that is needed to keep this economy going.

Well, this is what we face. I am sure that the Steelworkers are not going to be intimidated. I am sure the AFL-CIO, I am sure the Utility Workers are not going to be intimidated.

We are going to continue to demand our fair share of the wealth that is produced by this economy in which we live. And we are going to move ahead despite the actions of this Administration.

We have got a lot of things to do. A lot of things along the line that we have been doing for many years—things that affect all of the people because we take the position that anything that affects all of the people of this country has got to affect us because we represent quite a sizable percentage of the citizenry of this country.

So we are interested in the nation's health. We are interested in a national health plan that will make it possible for people who are ill to face that illness without the tremendous economic worry that comes from their inability to pay for being sick. And this affects all of the people of this nation.

Today health care—the available health care that we have—the best, I would say, in the world, can't be delivered, except to the very, very wealthy and the very, very poor who are objects of charity. The great majority in between can't afford the hospital bills, they can't afford the doctor's fees and something has got to be done about it.

Yes, and we are going to push the minimum wage up again. We are going to push it up to \$2 and that still is not enough—but that looks like it's all that is possible to get out of this Congress—because your family needs, according to government statistics, for any kind of a decent living, are well above \$2 an hour.

Then we have got the pollution problem, the environmental problem that affects all of the people of this great country.

So we are going to play our part as the peoples' lobby, looking to protect the people at every step of the way because that means protecting our own, protecting ourselves.

And we are going to do this by the traditional methods that we have done in the past. We are going to sharpen up our political machine which I think is good and I think is as good as there is around this country, but we are going to make it better because the answer to a lot of the problems that we are facing is political action.

We are preparing in 1971 for the political action which is so important in 1972. I am sure that in this fight, in these efforts, we are going to have complete cooperation in the American trade union movement. And I am sure we are going to have the complete cooperation of this organization—the Utility Workers Union of America.

Thank you, very much.

STATEMENT BY GEORGE MEANY, PRESIDENT OF THE AFL-CIO, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

The AFL-CIO supports the general aims of S. 1201—to extend the legislation, adopted in 1969 and 1970, that provides the President and the Federal Reserve Board with authority to stabilize the national economy.

This is not a new position for the AFL-CIO. We endorsed the purposes of the original legislation, when it was pending before the Congress. We support its extension. We believe that the economy urgently needs government

action to achieve full employment and a reasonably stable price level.

Economic distress is continuing to spread. Millions of workers are adversely affected by unemployment and by production cutbacks, which reduce working hours and weekly pay checks. All Americans are suffering from the rapid rise of living costs, which continue to wash out much of the buying power of their incomes.

The time is long overdue for the Administration to stop playing with misguided "game plans" and take the necessary actions to restore the economy to health. It is time for the Administration to cease its double-standard—one for workers and another for the banks and big business—and pursue evenhanded, equitable policies.

The government's reports of the past few weeks reveal that stagnation persists in most parts of the national economy, following the general economic decline of 1969-1970. Let me call to your attention these few benchmarks of economic stagnation:

There were 5 million unemployed in March, after accounting for seasonal changes—up 1.4 million from a year ago and 2.3 million from January 1969, when the Administration took office.

Substantial unemployment has spread to 50 major industrial areas in March—from six in January 1969—and to 662 smaller areas.

The cost-of-living in January and February was 5% above a year ago and 11.6% more than in the same months of 1969.

The buying power of the weekly after-tax earnings of the average nonsupervisory worker, in January and February, was hardly any greater than a year ago, less than in the early months of 1969 and even below 1965.

Although the Administration attempted to blame the high unemployment of the October-December quarter on the effects of the auto strike, the rebound of auto production in the January-March quarter brought no improvement in the unemployment situation. Approximately 5 million people were unemployed in both quarters and the number of jobless, 15 weeks and more, has risen to 1.1 million. Moreover, the Labor Department report for March states that "full-time employment was down by 190,000 from the last quarter of 1970, mostly among adult men."

Yet the Administration persists in its optimistic rhetoric. Instead of positive actions to turn the economy around from stagnation to sustained and rapid expansion, the Administration has given the American people a diet of rosy predictions that have not been achieved. Instead of directing its attention and policies to real problems in the economy, the Administration has tried to make workers in general—and construction workers, in particular—the scapegoat.

Chairman Arthur Burns of the Federal Reserve and much of the Administration's leadership have been engaged in the shocking and blatant use of a double standard. To cover their record of failure in economic policy, with its tragic consequences for millions of American families, they try to pin the blame on workers, while providing subsidies and aid for the banks and big business.

Let me cite a few examples of these double standards:

\*Since the cash-flow to corporations moved down after mid-1969, as a result of the Administration's engineered recession—following a 91% rise from 1960—the Administration has proposed a step-up depreciation, which would cut corporate taxes by \$3 billion to over \$4 billion a year in the next few years. But workers' wage increases to offset the accelerated rise of living costs and to gain some improvement in buying power are denounced as inflationary.

When exports lag, while imports continue to rise, the Administration proposes, as it did last year, to provide business with a mechanism to defer taxes on profits from exports, at a cost to the Treasury of hundreds

of millions of dollars. But when organized labor seeks economic justice for workers, it is attacked as exercising "excessive market power."

In recent months, billions of American dollars from wealthy people and corporations have been transferred to other countries for personal gain. The only Treasury response (announced on April 1) of trying to bring some of that money home is to reward these people. Treasury will sell \$1.5 billion of 3-month government notes to foreign branches of American banks at an interest rate of 5%—about 1.5 percentage points more than for similar borrowing in the U.S. But workers are told they should be restrained in seeking wage increases, which are singled out as the primary inflationary factor.

When bank profits shoot up—like 21.9% for J. P. Morgan and Co. and 18.1% for Chase-Manhattan in 1970—there is not even a hint of government guidelines for the banks. And the New York Times reports that "the heads of the nation's largest banks—which enjoyed sharp increases in profits during the recession year of 1970—generally were rewarded with higher salaries last year." No Administration spokesmen admonished the bankers but workers are told that their wage increases are supposed to be held down.

Soaring land costs and financing charges have resulted in sharply rising housing costs (see Appendix). The cost of financing on FHA homes has risen 356% in the past 20 years and land costs have gone up 296%, while structure costs (which include on-site labor) has risen 65%. However, the Administration tries to pin the blame solely on construction wages and attempts to institute specific and immediate wage restraints. It offers only a vague promise of some future restraints on construction prices and profits and no mention at all of the major inflationary pressures of soaring land and financing costs.

The AFL-CIO rejects such lopsided double standards. They are unfair. They are unbalanced. They are not workable.

Back in February 1966, the AFL-CIO Executive Council adopted a policy statement which declared:

"If the President determines that the situation warrants extraordinary overall stabilization measures, the AFL-CIO will cooperate so long as such restraints are equitably placed on all costs and incomes—including all prices, profits, dividends, rents and executive compensation, as well as employees' wages and salaries. We are prepared to sacrifice as much as anyone else, as long as anyone else, so long as there is equality of sacrifice."

This statement has been reiterated by the constitutional conventions of the AFL-CIO in 1967 and 1969 and on numerous occasions by the Executive Council.

Mandatory government controls are never desirable, but at times, they may be needed. If such controls are deemed necessary by the President and are even-handed, across-the-board on all costs, prices, rents and incomes—including profits, dividends, interest and executive compensation, as well as workers' wages and salaries—they would be both equitable and workable.

It is our view that one-sided curbs on workers' wages, and with no effective restraints on prices or the incomes of other groups in the economy, are neither a balanced and equitable stabilization program nor a workable policy in a free society.

It is also our view that government measures to restrain wages—or both wages and prices—in one industry or sector of the economy are also inequitable and unworkable. In this complex, interdependent and huge American economy, it is not possible to single out one industry or sector, in the hope of curbing price pressures, when all other parts of the economy are free of similar restraints.

How can the government, in good conscience, apply wage restraints on workers in one industry—to single out one group of workers—when the prices of the food, clothing and other goods and services they buy are free to move up? Such a measure smacks of punitive action, rather than a stabilization policy.

Moreover, how can the government hope to stabilize prices in one industry, alone—such as construction—when that industry depends on materials and services it buys from other industries, whose prices are free to rise? It just can't be done.

On April 1, only a few days after the President's Executive Order "Providing for the Stabilization of Wages and Prices in the Construction Industry," the Labor Department reported that wholesale prices of building materials shot up in March.

"Most of the advance for industrial commodities in March was due to price increases for commodities used in construction," the Labor Department report stated. "Lumber and wood products rose sharply again.... Almost all non-metallic mineral building materials were higher in price, with particularly large gains registered for asphalt roofing and concrete ingredients."

The costs and prices of the construction industry cannot be isolated from the price pressures in the rest of the economy. The prices of no industry can be isolated, for very long, from the pressures on the prices of the materials and services it requires.

The recent report of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress indicated recognition of the inter-dependence of the economy's various industries and sectors, when it declared: "If a freeze is imposed, it should be general. A freeze should not be imposed on only one industry, nor should it be applied to wages without also being applied to other costs or prices."

A basic prerequisite for a genuine stabilization program, in our view, is that it must be across-the-board, equitable and even-handed.

For that reason, we endorse the bill's extension of the standby authority "to stabilize prices, rents, wages and salaries," with provision for "such adjustments as may be deemed necessary to prevent gross inequities."

We believe the Congress must make it abundantly clear that this authority is for overall, across-the-board and even-handed measures, rather than for singling out one industry or one group of workers. In addition, in the event that across-the-board economic controls are imposed, the Congress should immediately adopt an accompanying tax mechanism on profits, dividends and capital gains to assure genuine, overall and equitable stabilization. A balanced, fair and workable stabilization program must include overall restraints on all costs, prices and incomes—including profits, dividends, and capital gains—as well as wages, salaries and rents.

The AFL-CIO endorses the bill's proposed extension of authority to the President to establish selective credit controls. Such selective credit controls and interest-rate ceilings were urgently needed in 1969 and most of 1970—to curb the inflationary extension of credit for land speculation, business mergers, conglomerate take-overs, gambling casinos and investments in foreign subsidiaries, while providing increased credit for housing, community facilities and the regular operations of business. Selective credit controls will become urgently needed, in the months ahead, if the Administration does what it talks about—pursues expansionary measures to rapidly lift the economy.

The AFL-CIO also endorses the bill's provision for variable bank reserve requirements in order to allocate the flow of bank credit to where it is most needed, while restraining

the extension of credit for low-priority purposes.

We recommend that the Committee examine the Federal Reserve's operation of this provision, within a year of its enactment. Moreover, we repeat our request that the Congress engage in a detailed study of the structure and policies of the Federal Reserve system, as the basis for a thorough reform of this key economic agency of the federal government.

In addition to authority for stabilization measures, America now needs expansionary economic policies to achieve and sustain full employment. The needed rise in output will, in itself, reduce inflationary pressures by boosting productive efficiency and easing the pressures on unit costs and prices. Moreover, such immediate measures to lift the economy out of its present stagnation would create jobs for the millions of unemployed and underemployed, restoring confidence and health to the economic foundation of American society.

In sum, then, this is the position of the AFL-CIO:

We want inflation ended. We want full employment restored. We are prepared to sacrifice to meet these goals—as much as anyone else, for as long as anyone else. But we will not be the scapegoat for the economic mess created by this Administration's ill-conceived "game plan."

APPENDIX I.—INCREASES IN COSTS, FHA HOUSES, 1949 TO 1969

	1949	1969	Percent increase
Land.....	\$1,144.00	\$4,525.00	296
Structure.....	7,176.00	11,850.00	65
Financing.....	520.00	2,370.00	356
Overhead and profit.....	1,560.00	2,800.00	79
Sales price.....	10,400.00	21,545.00	107
Monthly mortgage payment.....	55.15	168.00	205
Cost of structure per square foot <sup>1</sup> .....	9.44	13.88	44

<sup>1</sup> Excluding land, the average number of square feet of the structure increased from 980 in 1949 to 1,226 in 1969.

Source: Journal of Homebuilding, June 1970, p. 31.

Note: In the 20 years, 1949-69, the size of the structure increased and the cost of the structure—materials plus on-site labor—rose 65 percent, while the cost of overhead and profit went up 79 percent. But the major inflationary cost increases, by far, were the cost of land which rose 296 percent and the cost of financing which soared 356 percent. These cost increases in combination, resulted in a 107 percent rise in the sales price. The additional costs to the homebuyer of closing fees and charges which are not examined here, probably rose by a somewhat similar percentage or more.

Moreover, the homeowner's monthly mortgage payments jumped 205 percent—nearly double the 107 percent rise in the sales price of the FHA house. This resulted from the additional impact on the homeowner of the sharp rise of mortgage interest rates—from an effective rate of 4.34 percent on FHA new home mortgages in 1949 to an effective rate of 8.19 percent in 1969. Essentially as a result of the inflationary increases of land costs and financing charges to the homeowner, as well as the developer and builder, the price of the FHA home more than doubled, between 1949 and 1969, while monthly payments on the mortgage more than tripled. The 205 percent rise in the homeowner's monthly mortgage payments was almost 4 times greater than the 54 percent increase in the overall cost-of-living, as measured by the Consumer Price Index.

APPENDIX II.—CHANGES IN BUILDING COSTS, SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSE, 1949-69

(In percent, except sales price)

	1949	1969
Structure.....	70	56
On-site labor.....	33	18
Materials.....	36	38
Land.....	11	21
Overhead and profit.....	15	13
Financing.....	5	10
Average sales price.....	\$9,780	\$20,534

Footnotes on following page.

Source: National Association of Home Builders Economics Department, Congressional Record, vol. 115, pt. 24, p. 32260.

Note: This breakdown of building costs is slightly different from the FHA, sec. 203, houses examined in app. 1, but the changes in cost components are almost precisely the same.

In the 20 years, 1949-69, the average sales price of this typical house increased 110 percent. But the total wages and fringe benefits of on-site construction workers fell from 33 percent of the price of the house to 18 percent and the cost of materials increased from 36 to 38 percent.

The major inflationary increases were land costs which rose from 11 percent of the price to 21 percent and the cost of financing to the developer and builder, which increased from 5 to 10 percent of the price.

On top of the 110 percent rise in the sales price, the home-buyer also paid the sharply increasing closing costs, which include a variety of fees, charges, and taxes. In addition, interest rates on home mortgages approximately doubled from 1949 to 1969. As a result, the homeowner's monthly payments on principal and interest charges of the mortgage approximately tripled.

This process of compounding cost and price increases has priced most families out of the market for new houses. Since a similar process has affected costs and rents of apartment units, most families have also been priced out of the market for new apartments. The result has been a growing housing shortage in a period of serious urban problems.

**HOW WORKERS ARE DOING IN RACE WITH PRICES**

Just about every group of workers in the U.S. is taking home fatter pay envelopes, but more and more are finding that their actual buying power is less than it was a year ago.

Most of the decline is the effect of the 5.2 per cent rise in living costs.

Among the industries where purchasing power has dropped are some that will be facing big wage demands from labor unions this year. Basic steel and telephones are examples.

The decline in "real" wages will complicate the bargaining, as union leaders will be under pressure from the rank and file to win big raises. Strikes could be a result.

An industry-by-industry survey of workers' incomes by the Economic Unit of "U.S. News & World Report" is shown in the accompanying chart.

**THREE WHO LOST**

Only three of the industry groups studied had a decrease in weekly earnings of their employes—before adjustment for the rise in living costs and Social Security taxes.

The three groups are tire-factory employes, farm operators and workers in nonelectrical-machinery plants.

In tire making, a big drop in weekly take-home pay resulted from a slacking off of 3.8 hours in the average workweek. Hourly earnings were up 24 cents. Drops in income of some other groups also were caused by cuts in weekly hours.

Workers in the tire plants, as the chart indicates, took a loss of \$12.51 a week in buying power. Their average earnings of \$182.25 were down \$6.47 in January, 1971, from weekly earnings a year earlier.

Farm operators suffered a loss of \$11.85 in "real" income as their earnings dropped \$10.70 to \$98.80 a week.

Employes of plants making nonelectrical machinery have had a drop of 18 cents in weekly pay—to \$155.96—and this amounts to a loss of \$5.40 in purchasing power.

But, aside from those three, the actual incomes of groups studied have risen. In more than 60 per cent of the cases, the average "real" pay also was above a year earlier.

At the top of the list of winners in this race against inflation are the employes of the Federal Government. Their average pay of \$193.70 a week is up \$21.75, with buying power \$12.49 ahead of the previous year.

Workers in meat packing came second, with a rise of \$11.44 in "real" pay, and weekly earnings of \$184.95. This industry granted pay raises last year.

Construction workers placed third. They averaged \$199.11 a week, a gain of \$10.87 a week in purchasing power. Many in this field

got big raises last year, while wage agreements for about a half million employes expire in 1971. The Administration is seeking to slow down the raises here.

Soft-coal miners, also due to write new pay contracts this year, show up with a gain of \$7.86 a week in "real" terms. The average pay is \$197.69.

Oil-refinery employes—who negotiated a raise in January—found their buying power \$5.61 ahead of a year earlier. Current pay: about \$198 a week.

One group to bargain this year—the metal miners—is getting an average wage of \$170.61 and is enjoying a net gain of \$2.26 a week in buying power. Included are miners of copper and other non-ferrous metals.

**SITUATION IN STEEL**

A major slowdown this year involves workers in basic-steel mills. The survey shows this group of workers now is taking a buying power loss of \$4.38 a week, compared with last year. Their weekly earnings averaged \$169.22 at latest official tally.

Telephone workers, moving into a wage battle this spring, are getting \$132.06 a week, on the average, with buying power down \$3.37 in the year.

The Steelworkers Union won a wage increase in one can-manufacturing firm but struck three others on February 15, over wages.

Metal-can workers have been earning \$175.80 a week but their buying power was down 63 cents in the past year.

Another bargaining crisis due this year involves aluminum, where the average pay is \$162.99 weekly—and buying power is down \$1.47.

Auto workers won a first-year raise of 51 cents an hour at General Motors last November. The increase, designed to catch up with inflation, was repeated later at Ford and Chrysler.

Official figures available at the time of the Economic Unit survey did not reflect the auto raises.

Most of the Labor Department statistics used as a basis for the study are for January, 1971, except for some fields where December earnings are the latest available. For the tax calculations in determining buying power, a family of four persons is assumed.

**WHO'S AHEAD, WHO'S BEHIND IN "REAL" PAY**

	Average weekly pay now, before taxes	Gain or loss in pay from year ago	Change in "real" pay—after allowing for higher prices and taxes <sup>1</sup>
<b>GAINERS</b>			
Federal Government employes.....	\$193.70	\$21.75	+\$12.49
Meatpackers.....	184.95	20.03	+11.44
Construction workers.....	199.11	18.11	+10.87
Soft coal miners.....	197.69	15.17	+7.86
Veterans on full disability compensation.....	118.00	13.00	+7.54
Oil refinery workers.....	198.23	13.06	+5.61
Schoolteachers.....	178.20	12.15	+3.10
Ordinance workers.....	155.77	11.04	+3.73
Cigarette factory workers.....	113.48	7.09	+2.74
Metal miners.....	170.64	9.07	+2.26
Electric, gas utility workers.....	177.64	9.22	+2.05
Local bus/drivers.....	143.62	7.94	+2.02
Bank employes.....	104.06	5.07	+1.44
Chemical workers.....	156.26	6.14	+1.23
Laundry workers.....	79.97	4.67	+ .88
Machinery workers (electrical).....	135.38	7.23	+ .87
Furniture makers.....	109.59	4.17	+ .82
Wholesale trade employes.....	142.09	7.42	+ .74
Textile mill workers.....	101.20	4.40	+ .62
Retail trade employes.....	83.58	4.09	+ .46
Retired Federal employes.....	76.00	4.00	+ .26
Papermill workers.....	148.16	6.12	+ .11
Printing, publishing employes.....	150.63	7.37	+ .06

	Average weekly pay now, before taxes	Gain or loss in pay from year ago	Change in "real" pay—after allowing for higher prices and taxes <sup>1</sup>
<b>LOSERS</b>			
Tire factory workers.....	182.25	-6.47	-12.51
Farmers.....	98.80	-10.70	-11.85
Machinery workers (nonelectrical).....	155.96	- .18	-5.40
Steelworkers.....	169.22	1.17	-4.38
Telephone employes.....	132.06	1.19	-3.37
Instrument makers.....	135.98	3.95	-1.60
Social security pensioners.....	30.00	-----	-1.56
Aluminum workers.....	162.99	5.43	-1.47
Apparel makers.....	85.26	2.19	- .99
Aircraft workers.....	177.61	4.72	- .79
Farm laborers.....	78.50	3.00	- .71
Metal can workers.....	175.80	6.58	- .63
Oil, gas field workers.....	158.12	4.75	- .37
Lumber workers.....	114.13	3.48	- .03

<sup>1</sup> After Federal income taxes and social security taxes and allowing for 5.2 percent rise in consumer prices. Assumes a family of 4 for tax purposes.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 14, 1968]

**THE UNIONS ARE NOT TO BLAME**

In the first nine months of 1968 negotiated wage increases reached a new high of 18.2 cents an hour, according to the Bureau of National Affairs, a private research organization. In the same period the index of consumer prices rose at an annual rate of more than 4%.

A good many people see in such figures a cause and effect relationship. Unions win wage boosts that push up the costs of business, which then tries to recoup by lifting prices. This is the "cost-push" inflation theory, a theory that supposedly has helped justify past Government efforts to stabilize the economy with wage-price "guide-posts."

Perhaps the most obvious trouble with the theory is that it simply does not square with observable facts. As Alfred Malabre pointed out in this newspaper recently, many of the largest price increases have come in areas where workers are weakly organized or are not organized at all. A number of price declines have occurred in areas that are firmly unionized.

For example, only a relatively small proportion of maid and hospital workers are organized. Yet the prices of maid service and hospital service, as measured by the consumer price index, have risen much faster in the past decade than the general level of prices.

At the same time, prices of radios and television sets have actually declined in the past 10 years, when quality improvements are taken into account. Yet radio-TV is about as thoroughly organized as any industry in the nation.

One reason that labor costs and prices do not always rise hand in hand is that the importance of those costs varies widely among industries. Wages are plainly more significant for hospitals than for TV manufacturers. The latter, moreover, are much more likely to be able to offset higher wages through increased productivity.

An even more serious objection to the cost-push idea is that it tends to overlook the competitive facts of life. This problem is discussed by Milton Friedman, professor of economics at the University of Chicago, in a new book, "Dollars and Deficits" (Prentice-Hall).

Suppose shoe manufacturers, in an effort to recover higher labor costs, decide to raise the price of shoes. If there has been no change in demand, customers will buy fewer American shoes, switching instead to imported shoes or spending on something else. U.S. shoe firms will hire fewer workers and

other resources and these will seek employment elsewhere, tending to stabilize or drive down wages and prices in other industries.

A price rise in shoes, in other words, will be at least partly offset by price declines outside the industry. It's questionable, too, just how long U.S. shoe firms will cling to their higher prices in the face of reduced demand.

Thus the key is demand. If the Government is or has been busily inflating demand with artificially easy money and heavy budget deficits, the shoe makers will find it a lot easier to make price increases stick. That of course is precisely what has been happening in recent years.

If the Government, in this sort of situation, largely ignores fiscal and monetary influences and tries instead to restrain specific labor costs and prices, the result is obvious. It will be much like a small boy, all alone, trying to plug not just one but thousands of holes in a dike.

If wages and prices are restrained in one industry, demand will spill over into many other areas. In an economy as complex as ours, attempts by the Government to keep up with the spillover are foredoomed to defeat.

In any industry where wage-price restraint even temporarily succeeds, furthermore, the result is to distort the economy. The industry is unable to attract the workers and other resources that it might use to build up supply and lessen the upward pressure on prices. The resources are at work elsewhere, in all probability in places where they are less productive.

Where do the unions come in? Well, to the extent that their monopoly powers allow them to push up wages faster than productivity they do add to the distortions in the economy. Union officials, though, are political leaders, anxious to please their members if possible. It's more accurate to say that rising consumer prices cause rising wage demands than it is to state the reverse.

In this post-election period inflation remains a clear and present danger. And it won't be diminished one whit by efforts to put the blame solely on the labor unions.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAYDOS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MORGAN. I want to agree with both of my colleagues from Pennsylvania, my good friend, JOHN DENT, and the gentleman in the well whose congressional districts are near mine in the great State of Pennsylvania.

I think the very able president of the Steelworkers of America, SWA, is going to be able to handle the negotiations of the new contract for the steelworkers without the interference of the President of the United States.

I think the gentleman put it very bluntly when he said that the steelworkers are not the cause of inflation, but they are suffering from inflation. This is true, I know, in the great steel country in the Monongahela Valley.

I do not have very many steel mills located in my district but I do have bituminous coal mines that produce coal which furnishes the carbon to make the steel. We are vitally interested in the coming wage negotiations with the United Steelworkers. However, I have a great deal of confidence in the great and dynamic leadership of the steelworkers and that negotiations are going to come out to the benefit of the steelworkers

without question and without any great inflation in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I think the policy of threatening to use foreign steel and threatening to use other economic measures on a union that has been very, very faithful in producing and keeping this country alive is a false policy and one which should not be used.

Mr. GAYDOS. I appreciate my colleague's remarks. I think he echoes the sentiments in my district.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAYDOS. I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania ought to know that the steel industry is one of the most serious things in this whole discussion that has been going on in the newspapers and the President threatening to interfere in the steelworkers' negotiations. We have learned and have been taught to believe in free enterprise and the free labor system.

Many courts have upheld the proposition that negotiations with labor and management are properly held under the Constitution and under the laws of this country and it was conceived, because of this, that men and women who work were able to get together for their own mutual advancement and protection and to better their working conditions, and industry was then in the position of having to meet certain demands. Industry could not be tempted to do as they did at the turn of the century, exploit the consumer as well as the worker.

Now the new thought that the President has injected into this—and I am so happy that the gentleman in the well of the House has brought this before us today, the new philosophy that the President has injected or expounded is the kind of philosophy which they have in foreign countries where the government sets the wages, where the government sets prices and where the government subsidizes exports and the government limits imports. In other words, the government ruins everything.

We have succeeded so far in coming further than any nation, as I said earlier, in 200 years than all the nations of the world put together in 2,000 years because of the rights of man, because of the right of man to buy and to go in business, the right of men to congregate together and try to get better wages in order to give their families more of the things that they produce.

Mr. Speaker, if these other nations were allowed to have free unions, they would have better wages and would be able to buy some of the products that they make. They would have some of the advantages and some of the luxuries which we have been able to obtain in this country because of our free enterprise system and free negotiations. But the unions of these foreign countries are controlled by the government. The industries are controlled by the government. However, this President for the first time in my lifetime—and I have been through quite a few summers but not so many winters—injects into the question the

Davis-Bacon proposition with the trades and craft unions and construction workers, an entirely new philosophy.

It seems that instead of being a President who himself must obey the laws of this Nation he is one who can set aside the laws, the provisions that Congress has made, the interpretations of the court upholding the laws made by the Congress, and he can say that he can set them aside, the negotiations cannot go on. We cannot afford to have any increases—and the increases have already taken place in other negotiations, and that this puts the steelworkers in the position of opening a new wedge in the so-called inflation drive, but in fact they are only catching up with wages that have already been negotiated by other unions before them, and there are many other unions who have not negotiated as yet. And remember the unorganized worker of America has to depend on the negotiations or organized labor for his way of life, and what he gets insofar as wages. I am chairman of the committee right now that is trying to pass a \$1.80 to \$2 minimum wage for the unorganized workers in this country, the worker who is at the lower end of the totem pole. All of organized labor supports them, and they are going to have an awful time getting that little bit of an increase—and I defy anybody to live on that kind of a wage in this country today.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) for his interpretation, and it has been an excellent interpretation of what we are trying to say here today. Hopefully, we wanted to have more people present, but this is particularly important for those people who have stayed in the galleries.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the last 2 years under a Republican administration have seen unemployment streak to record highs, while the economy grinds to a slinking pace.

Prices are screaming out of sight and the administration can offer no more than a rather feeble explanation that "a certain amount of unemployment is necessary to tone down our inflationary economy."

Hogwash.

You know it was none other than that great Republican death wish, Calvin Coolidge, who said:

When you have a large number of people out of work, unemployment occurs.

That is just great, Calvin.

Of course, what could you expect from Coolidge, or any other Republican President for that matter?

Unemployment was symptomatic of the Coolidge regime. It was even more serious in the Herbert Hoover term in office. In the Eisenhower years of the 1950's unemployment rose as high as 7 percent.

Republicans traditionally have taken the attitude that "we can live with a certain amount of unemployment." What that amount is, I have to my sorrow learned, is whatever the current rate of unemployment happens to be. The Nixon

administration has a fairly high degree of tolerance for unemployment. When Mr. Nixon took office, he inherited a low unemployment rate of 3.3 percent from the Johnson administration. Within a year, using "Nixonomics," the President's personal brand of economic policy, he had parlayed that 3.3 percent to 4.2 percent. An administration spokesman, at that time, viewed the situation calmly and said, you guessed it, "A certain amount of unemployment is to be expected," and he suggested that this was a necessary hedge against inflation.

Now the unemployment rate has risen 6 percent, after declining slightly from a 9-year high of 6.2 percent. With 5.2 million workers now on the jobless rolls, administration officials are still optimistic and the unemployment rate grows.

What is the President doing about it? Very little it appears.

He is not using the power that Congress, and my Banking and Currency Committee, gave him to exercise controls on wages, prices, and rents.

He has refused to exercise this authority, to impose a freeze on wages, prices, and rents so that we could adopt policies to stimulate the economy without the danger of heating inflationary fires.

Last year, he vetoed, a much needed public service manpower bill that, in these difficult times, would have established the Federal Government as the employer of last resort and simultaneously provide personnel and money for many services that localities cannot now afford. In addition to this, the bill contained a retraining provision that would assist those whose work experience could not be fitted into prevailing job demand categories.

The House shortly will complete hearings on a new emergency public service employment bill and that bill should be ready for the floor soon.

Congress has come to expect vetoes and obstructionism from President Nixon.

But there is a revolt brewing in Washington, among Democrats and Republicans who believe that the President is not attuned to the needs of the American people. It appears as if the President is hearing the drums of somebody or some group that does not have its ears to the voice of the Nation.

He cannot or will not listen and can provide no answers to those who face high prices, low wages, and ultimately unemployment.

This cannot continue. And from the signs I have seen in Washington the Democratic Party, with assistance from some Republican allies, will not let it continue.

The coalition of Republicans and Democrats that I speak of is tired and angry.

We are tired of Presidential vetoes of bills which create jobs, build hospitals, and supply family doctors.

We are tired of backsliding on funding and implementing the occupational health and safety bill.

We are tired of an administration that freezes congressional appropriations for badly needed housing, urban develop-

ment, and construction and uses this freeze as a bald-faced attempt to blackmail Members into voting for its revenue-sharing provisions.

We are tired of attempts to split the Labor Department and other agencies and then regroup them into bureaucratic monstrosities that would defy attempts at efficiency and muddle rather than clarify the lines of decisionmaking.

We are tired of tunnel-visioned national health bills that bear the stamp of the American Medical Association.

We are tired of an administration, which faced with the massive troubles in the auto insurance field, suggest that Congress merely pass a resolution urging the States to handle the problem.

Finally, we, and I might add many Republicans to our number, are distressed over the President's refusal to pick a date for the overall withdrawal of American troops from Southeast Asia, an act I believe will lead to the release of American POW's, and a final solution to the one event most responsible for the economic and social problems in the United States today, the Indochina war.

Of course, it is quite easy for me to come before you and say we are tired of this and we are tired of that. You should ask, "What is your alternative, MOORHEAD? What can you offer in substitute?"

Well this is what is going on in Washington today. This is what the Democratic Party is offering as some answers to your needs and those of all of the other working men and women in this Nation.

You all know that the Voluntary Restraint Agreement with Japan and the Common Market countries is due to run out this year.

The agreement, primarily as it affects Japan, is looked upon as the reason that many specialty steel producers have come upon dark days.

The Japanese have shifted their exports to the higher priced specialty steels and, while maintaining their level of exports, have grabbed a larger dollar share of the U.S. market.

It is my understanding in talks with the State Department that the Japanese are willing to take two steps that should bring a certain degree of relief to the specialty steel producers.

In recent weeks, the Japanese, in statements in Japanese trade journals, have expressed a willingness to limit 1971 exports to their 1970 levels. In addition there is further evidence that the Japanese voluntarily will accept a limitation of exports within categories. I think if we can move toward this objective, your industry will be far the better for it and some of the long faces and red ink will disappear to be replaced by jobs and profits.

Recently, I took over as chairman of the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee. Certain activities of the State Department are under the jurisdiction of my subcommittee.

Last week, I contacted the State Department and requested from them a report on the status of negotiations with

the Japanese on voluntary steel export agreements and I further requested from them ways in which the trade agreements can be forged to include categorical, in addition to gross, export limits.

As soon as I hear from them, I will contact your Washington representatives.

Let me strike one note of concern. It is my understanding that the administration may be holding up the talks with the Japanese as a sort of blackmail for a small settlement in your wage talks this summer. I assure you that the moment this is confirmed as more than a rumor, I will take your case to my colleagues and the floor of the House.

Speaking of blackmail, let us talk about environmental blackmail. This is one of the cute tricks of industry when they refuse to invest in necessary environmental protections for plants and factories and suggest instead that they will have to close the facility rather than make the necessary investment in clean air and water.

This is ransom of the cheapest variety.

The ploy is obvious. They know that you, quite naturally, will be concerned over the loss of jobs should a plant close down and they hope that you, by interceding with appropriate State authorities for your jobs, will save their bacon.

In this regard, I am watching Senator MUSKIE very closely for he has recognized the duplicity of the owners in this regard and he is suggesting public hearings to prove corporate "poormouthing."

If the owner truly cannot afford to make the needed corrections then this should be ascertained publicly. However, if this is merely an excuse to avoid doing their share for cleaning up our land and a left-handed way of firing people, this too should be brought into the public domain.

In regard to this, it is interesting to note that this administration, knowing the state of the economy, has no program to provide assistance for workers who would be displaced by environmental control requirements.

They have no program to ease the transition of workers who are displaced because obsolete plants may be closed.

The Nixon administration has no relocation assistance programs, no temporary unemployment programs, no short-term emergency loan programs, no corporate programs, no public service employment programs, designed to serve the twin purposes of meeting important public service needs while meeting the job requirements of hundreds of thousands of people. This is the Nixon reaction to your plight.

Compare that to the work JOHN DENT has put in on your behalf. I am pleased to have worked with and sponsored many of the bills that JOHN DENT has introduced. And his two latest efforts are no exception.

We all are concerned about protecting employee benefit funds.

The very nature of our modern economy makes an employee's ability to fulfill plan eligibility requirements contingent on forces usually beyond his control. In all too many cases, the pension promise is nothing more than this: if you remain in good health and remain

with the same company until you are 65, and if that company is still in business, and if your department has not been abolished, and if your job has not been made technologically obsolete, and if you have not been laid off for too long a time, and if there is sufficient money in the fund, you will get a pension.

Labor Department officials have testified that one out of every three participants in a pension fund never receive a benefit. From what material has come out of hearings on the bill, that figure looks a bit conservative.

In low-paying high-turnover industries, experts have pointed out that only 1 in 10 employees ever receives a pension.

The time for generalities is over. Congress is committed to making the private welfare and pension system perform its proper function, that of providing a meaningful supplement to social security for the millions of workers already covered by them and the millions who will be covered as the system expands.

The bill forged by JOHN DENT is the bill I am supporting. It will establish minimum standards of conduct for plan trustees and administrators and guarantee that benefits accruing to employees with significant periods of service with an employer shall be irrevocable.

I look forward to the visit to Washington of some 300 of your number for the hearings next week on JOHN's bill. My office is always open to the steelworkers and any of you coming to the Capitol that day should feel free to stop in and speak to me or my staff about pension protection.

Congressman DENT is also responsible for another piece of legislation I favor and one that has broad support among House Democrats. This is a bill to raise the minimum wage to \$2 and to extend coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to about 7 million more workers.

This bill to raise the current \$1.60 minimum wage to \$2 should be ready for a vote in the House in about a month.

The House is not the only place where things are happening.

In the Senate, two important insurance bills wait the masterful touch of Senators KENNEDY, HART, and MAGNUSON.

I could not agree more with the AFL-CIO social security director, Burt Seidman, when he said:

Every American citizen, whether he's rich or poor, black or white, blue-collar or white-collar, has a basic right to a decent standard of health care.

I question whether the AMA agrees with this, since I note that AMPAC, the political arm of the American Medical Association, has put up over a million and a half dollars to oppose Senator KENNEDY's health insurance package.

I once heard that the only writing utensils in the AMA offices are quills. One look at their legislative objectives and that observation does not surprise me.

We know very well the dismal health record of the United States compared to the other major industrial nations of the world. Year after year, the statistics tell us how little progress we have been making in health care in recent decades.

In spite of the fact that our vaunted research and technology are unequalled by any other nation in the history of the world, America is an also-ran in the delivery of health care to our people. In the midst of the rising cost of health care, we have endured a decline in the overall quality of the care we give our citizens. The figures are shocking:

In infant mortality, among the major industrial nations of the world, the United States today trails behind 12 other countries, including all the Scandinavian nations, most of the British Commonwealth, and East Germany.

We trail six other nations in the percentage of mothers who die in childbirth.

Tragically, the infant mortality rate for nonwhites in the United States is twice the rate for whites. And nearly five times as many nonwhite mothers die in childbirth as white—shameful evidence of the ineffective prenatal and postnatal care our minority groups receive.

The story told by other health indicators is equally dismal. The United States trails 17 other nations in life expectancy for males, 10 other nations in life expectancy for females, and 15 other nations in the death rate for middle-aged males.

Almost every family knows the cruel burden of worry, frustration, and disappointment that mark our search for better health care. The average American citizen lives in dread of illness and disability. He lives with the uncertainty of not knowing whether to seek medical care, or when to seek it, or how to obtain it. He lives with postponements and delays.

Above all, he lives in fear of the cost of health care. How many millions of Americans have gambled with their health to avoid the high cost of care they need? How many have endured suffering that might have been relieved? How many have had to sacrifice their hopes and plans because of the high price they had to pay for the care they received?

Despite massive sales of private health insurance, most of the expenditures for personal health services must still be borne out-of-pocket by the patient at the time of illness or as a debt thereafter. Nearly all private health insurance is partial and limited. In 1968, in spite of the fact that health insurance was a giant \$12 billion industry, benefit payments in the aggregate met only about one-third of the private costs of health care, leaving two-thirds to be paid outside the framework of health insurance.

Private health insurance—through a thousand private carriers competing with each other, and through a bewildering array of insurance policies—had done no more than this to ease the impact of cost of medical care on American families.

The private health insurance industry has failed us. It provides sickness insurance, not health insurance; acute care, not preventive care. It gives partial benefits, not comprehensive benefits. It fails to control costs. It fails to control quality. It ignores the poor and the medically indigent.

Mayors from Philadelphia, New York, and Baltimore testified before Senator

KENNEDY's subcommittee last week and told a tale, not unfamiliar in a dozen other major cities in the Nation. They told of rapid decline of health care, a shortage of doctors and nurses, and a situation bordering on the calamitous.

I think the facts are clear in this regard. The Congress must and I think will pass a national health insurance program that will guarantee decent and low-cost health care for every American.

We cannot tolerate the current situation, made worse I might add by a Presidential veto last year of a hospital construction and doctor training bill.

While on the subject of insurance, I remember last year when I was the first Member of the House of Representatives to introduce the no-fault auto insurance. I said that this trio of bills was not only long overdue, but necessary since the insurance industry had done nothing to lower its prices or streamline its policy techniques.

I still believe this and I still believe that the limited no-fault plan operating in Massachusetts has already shown that this system can work.

To date in Massachusetts, the only State except for Puerto Rico with a functioning no-fault plan, not only have there been fewer claims filed but claims have been lower, dollarwise, than at a similar time last year and courts have been less clogged by the nickel and dime suits that in other States have buried an already overcrowded court calendar.

Speaking of the Puerto Rican no-fault plan, I do not know if you know that the man responsible for that very successful program is Herb Dennenberg, the present Pennsylvania State Insurance Commissioner.

Mr. Dennenberg has already filed notice that he is going to try and get the Pennsylvania State Legislature to pass a no-fault plan. Naturally, if the Congress passes a bill, this would preempt any State action. I am hoping we can get such a bill through Congress this year.

A number of the items which I have talked of so far and will speak of in the remainder of my speech are intertwined.

Hospital vetoes, doctor shortages, health insurance, auto insurance, pension protection, they are related, if by no more than the simple fact that in one way or another they directly affect your life and well-being.

But there is another subject which I know you are interested in and which affects you in the most direct manner—your job safety.

We waged a tough fight with the administration last year in getting the occupational health and safety bill passed, but we managed to do it, while defeating the Nixon-backed industry-oriented proposal.

Although we did not pass the bill which would have given great power to the Secretary of Labor, we did push through a bill that when funded and operative will have tremendous impact on your personal safety and protection.

I noted on the floor of the House on March 17 that the administration was requesting a supplemental appropriation for the program. I asked that the pro-

gram receive immediate funding. This was not favorably received by the Appropriations Committee because the committee had not been told that they were going to be asked to consider the health and safety bill on that day. This non-contact wrangled some powerful individuals on the subcommittee and the administration went away emptyhanded.

I think this problem has been cleared up and apologies made around and there should be no funding problems now. However, the program must wait until the new fiscal year, beginning July 1, 1971, for money.

I am not as disturbed by this fact as I am about what appears to be HEW's lethargy regarding the health and safety program. They seem content to let the Labor Department name its representative to the Institute of Occupational Health and Safety, while they do nothing.

I am hoping that the administration prods the departments which must participate in this landmark program and gets them on the ball. Because I am sure if they do not, the Congress will.

There is another bit of administration sleight-of-hand that may result in a lawsuit against the President with the U.S. Congress as the plaintiff.

This involves money that the Congress has appropriated, and the President has refused to spend. Much of this money is for badly needed housing, urban renewal, mass transit facilities, and other vital programs.

More than \$600 million in aid to cities has been frozen. Can there be anyone, in Government or out, who does not realize the crisis our great urban centers are faced with? The President surely does. He himself laid before us a category of despair in his March 5 message to the Congress: "a sorely inadequate supply of housing and community facilities, vast wastelands of vacant and decaying buildings, acre upon acre of valuable urban renewal land lying empty and fallow, and an estimated 24 million Americans still living in substandard housing."

A tragic picture to contemplate. And how the withholding of desperately needed funds from HUD's \$3.4 billion budget can do anything but move us still further backward is beyond me. There are \$200 million in urban renewal and \$200 million in water and sewer facility grants on this preliminary report, and I have been informed that an updated report will reveal the freezing of \$192 million for public housing and hundreds of millions more for model cities.

Well over \$7 billion is being withheld in Federal assistance for transportation, much of it for acute needs that will not wait. Commuter service is in crisis around the Nation, and the President paid lipservice to the problem by recently pointing to "this decline in mass transit—at the same time that the need for fast, convenient, economical public transportation has become greater than ever before." It is hard to reconcile this statement with the current freeze of \$200 million in mass transit funds, just as it is difficult to comprehend the rationale for impounding of \$970 million in Federal

Aviation Administration appropriations and \$39 million for the Federal Railroad Administration, while at the same time calling for greater initiatives toward a balanced national transportation system.

National priorities cannot be deferred until 1972 but must be addressed immediately. The Congress has exercised its responsibility, and the executive should do no less.

I hate to admit that there is little Congress can do about making the administration spend money that we have appropriated. But a law suit forcing this has been suggested by Senators MANSFIELD and I understand that he is actively looking into the possibility.

I mentioned before that everything which I addressed myself to today seems intertwined. Well, there is a common source to much of this travail, at least as far as a single matter can be isolated as the root cause for many of the dilemmas in American society today.

Naturally I am speaking of the Vietnam war, or the Laos-Cambodian war, as it now has become.

My stand on this issue is clear. I have spoken against our involvement in Vietnam since March of 1968, when Lyndon Johnson was still our President and when many of today's critics were silent.

I am not adopting a holier-than-thou attitude. But I think that the sooner we are out of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, the sooner every American combat and support troop has to worry about no more than dodging potholes on the parkway, rather than mortar shells on Highway 9, the faster this Nation can truly put our country back on the road of emotional and social recovery.

This year, I have introduced a resolution demanding that all U.S. troops be removed from Southeast Asia by December 31, 1971.

A similar resolution was defeated in the Democratic caucus by one vote. That is how close we came to expressing the will of the House Democratic membership that New Year's Day, 1972, should find no American boys in Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia.

But there was a very important resolution adopted by the caucus. This resolution picked the end of the 92d Congress, January 31, 1972, as the date that we want our Southeast Asian adventures to end.

Granted, there is a degree of partisanship in some of the cries to end the war. But how could any man take note of the despair, division, and disillusion in our country, caused by this war, and not do all in his power to end it tomorrow?

The President offered nothing last week. He increased his withdrawal rate by 2,000 but that is not enough.

I am not going to lend myself to his plan to leave 50,000 GI's in Indochina and allow them to suffer acceptable casualties each week while he runs for office next year. I ask you, What is an acceptable casualty? One dead GI a month is one more than I will accept.

All of the health care, auto insurance, pension protection, funds for housing, and steel trade agreements combined will not help us if we allow our Nation to

crumble because of dissent and division over the war. I pledge my efforts to ending the war. I hope you will help me.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration's latest inflation alert is clearly aimed at influencing the steel wage negotiations currently in progress. By threatening the steelworkers with the prospect of increased foreign steel imports and the unemployment that would result, the administration hopes to hold down the wages of steelworkers.

This latest action by the Nixon administration is another attempt to pin the blame for inflation on the workingman, instead of putting the blame where it really belongs—on the Nixon administration itself.

By issuing an inflation alert against the wages of workingmen, President Nixon is attacking the tail of the inflationary spiral. The President is treating the symptoms of the disease rather than the causes.

It sounds good on paper to say that wage increases should correspond to productivity. But steel productivity is down because of a slowdown in the economy as a whole. This economic slowdown was created by the conscious efforts of the Nixon administration. Administration policies have caused a recession without controlling inflation.

Who gets hit the hardest by inflation—the workingman and people on fixed incomes such as our senior citizens. Mr. Speaker, the steelworkers are entitled to a wage increase sufficient to offset the skyrocketing cost of living.

#### DOUBLE AMPUTEE HAS ALREADY PAID DEBT TO COUNTRY

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROONEY of New York). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, William T. Richardson, a constituent and a brave patriot, stepped on a land mine while serving in Vietnam, and as a consequence, both legs had to be amputated above the knees. Sergeant Richardson, who is 24 years of age and is married, was hospitalized for over a year.

Through an error by the Army paymaster, the allotment which Sergeant Richardson asked be sent to his wife was not deducted from his own paycheck. His wife nevertheless did receive for a period of 6 months a check for \$150. As a consequence, the Army paid this brave soldier \$900 more than he was entitled to receive.

The Army was not even aware of this debt until I inquired about a smaller debt of \$212.34, which the Army was attempting to collect from Sergeant Richardson. This small collection, but one which I consider to be unconscionable, was brought to my attention by several of Sergeant Richardson's coworkers in a Springfield, Ill., manufacturing plant. They felt it entirely unjustifiable. I contacted the Army, and, instead of correcting this injustice, the Army compounded it by asking Richardson to pay not just \$212.34, but \$1,167.30.

Sergeant Richardson has now paid the original debt of \$212.34. Although he does not know whether the Army's computations are correct, whether in fact he was overpaid, he sent the Army a check for \$212.34 because, to use his own words:

I didn't want to get in any trouble.

From his years of service, he knew the Army was mighty hard to fight.

The Army acknowledges that the overpayment to Sergeant Richardson was entirely the fault of the Army paymaster. The Army assures me that they have no reason to believe that there was any fraud, misrepresentation, fault, or lack of good faith on Sergeant Richardson's part. In fact, Sergeant Richardson told me that until notified of the debt by the Army, he was totally unaware of it or of any overpayment.

I find collection of either part of this overpayment indefensible and unconscionable—a grave injustice to this young man—and I am certain that others feel likewise.

A soldier critically injured, hospitalized and recovering from extensive surgery far from his family can hardly be expected to notice promptly pay record errors. My understanding is that neither he nor his wife knew of the error until it was brought to their attention in the form of collection efforts, long after much of the money had been spent. Whether or not Army records are accurate, Sergeant Richardson does not today know whether he was overpaid. All he knows is that the Army says he was and that now he must pay his country back.

Sergeant Richardson already has been called upon by his country to sacrifice much more than most other Americans. For the rest of his life he will daily carry his sacrifice with him. His legs cannot be restored, but at the very least, this comparatively small financial debt caused by the Army's oversight must be wiped from the books.

At my request, Defense Secretary Melvin Laird has temporarily suspended collection of the remainder of the debt owed—over \$950—pending consideration by the 92d Congress of the bill I am today introducing. This measure would order the Secretary of the Treasury to repay to Sergeant Richardson the \$212.34 which he has already paid to the Army, and it would erase the remainder of the debt from Army ledgers.

Secretary Laird has personally written to me expressing his support for my proposal. His letter shows a sincere recognition of the wrong done to Sergeant Richardson and a willingness to correct it. I am hopeful that Congress will act upon this bill at an early date to repay Sergeant Richardson, in some small way, the great debt of gratitude which it owes to him.

The text of Secretary Laird's letter follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,  
Washington, D.C., October 27, 1970.

HON. PAUL FINDLEY,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAUL: This letter is in reply to the inquiries in your letters of October 9 and October 20, 1970 about the indebtedness of Sergeant William T. Richardson.

As you have already been advised, Sergeant Richardson's indebtedness reflects a small overpayment of basic pay, erroneous payment resulting from excess leave, overpayment of subsistence allowance, and payment of a \$150 a month allotment for his wife over a six month period without a corresponding reduction from the pay he himself received. The net total indebtedness was \$1147.55. Sergeant Richardson has paid the sum \$212.34, leaving a balance of \$935.21.

I fully share your sympathetic concern for Sergeant Richardson because of the unfortunate circumstances underlying this case, and can understand your suggestion that the total indebtedness be waived. Accordingly, all matters regarding this indebtedness have been reexamined to determine what relief can be provided. As a result of this examination, it has been found that a policy of the Comptroller General permits an indebtedness to be suspended upon the request of a member of Congress pending the early introduction of private relief legislation. Since you plan to introduce such legislation in behalf of Sergeant Richardson in the first session of the 92d Congress, we will apply the Comptroller General's policy which is reflected in his decision of February 17, 1970, B-168579. In making this determination, collection action on Sergeant Richardson's indebtedness has been suspended until the 92d Congress can take appropriate action.

As to your request that we waive the indebtedness and return the amount already paid by Sergeant Richardson, unfortunately we have no legal authority to do so. Public Law 90-616, to which you alluded in your letter of October 20, applies only to waiver of indebtedness of civilian employees, as indicated by statements of the Comptroller General in Parts 201.2 and 201.3 of Chapter III of the Code of Federal Regulations. We have been urging the enactment of similar legislation to cover military personnel. H.R. 13582, which would permit us to waive indebtedness up to \$500 and the Comptroller General to waive larger amounts, passed the House on February 16, 1970 and is now pending in the Senate. Enactment of this legislation would relieve us of the unfortunate duty of seeking repayment of overpayments in cases such as Sergeant Richardson's.

I hope that early favorable action will be taken by Congress on your bill to assist Sergeant Richardson, permitting refund of the amount he has repaid and waiver of the remaining balance.

Sincerely,

MEL LAIRD.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 7567

A bill for the relief of Sergeant William T. Richardson

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Sergeant William T. Richardson, of Springfield, Illinois, who suffered the loss of both legs as the result of hostile action in Vietnam, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$1147.55, representing the total amount of overpayments paid to him while a member of the United States Army, as a result of administrative errors which occurred without fault on his part. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for the amounts for which liability is relieved by this section.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said William T. Richardson an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts already paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated in subsection (a) of this section in excess of

10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

#### THE SPRING OFFENSIVE: A COMMUNIST CAMPAIGN TO DEFEAT THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, last week, on April 14, Jerry Gordon, one of the five coordinators for the National Peace Action Coalition, denounced charges that the NPAC is subject to Communist influence, citing the presence of numerous non-Communist personalities in NPAC's roster of leaders and supporters. If the past is still a reliable guide, many people will doubtless be deceived by Gordon's superficially comforting words and will conclude once again that charges of Communist influence are probably groundless, merely resurgent "McCarthyism" or some other such cliché-ridden characterization.

Nothing could be farther from the truth.

NPAC is not merely subject to Communist "influence." It is nothing less than a front for the Socialist Workers Party, a Trotskyist Communist organization that stands for the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government.

Gordon's disclaimer, emphasizing the non-Communists who serve by design as window-dressing to lend an aura of legitimacy to the NPAC, is a classic Communist argument used to deceive the unwary. It is trotted out by the Communists whenever the truth is in danger of being exposed.

As a matter of fact—and everyone acquainted with the internal security field knows this full well—a Communist front must by definition include in its ranks non-Communists. Otherwise, it could hardly be a mere front; it would be a purely Communist organization, which the NPAC, as a coalition of diverse groups, manifestly is not.

The question is not whether everyone connected with NPAC is a Communist. The question is whether the predominant influence in the group is exercised by Communists, whether Communists exercised the major influence in setting up the organization and in setting its policies. By these tests, which have historically proved reliable, the NPAC stands indicted of being a blatant Communist front.

NPAC was formed last year in June at a conference held in Cleveland, Ohio. Hosted by the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council—CAPAC—this conference was completely dominated by the SWP, its youth arm, the Young Socialist Alliance, and the YSA-controlled Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, every one of the national offices of which, according to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, is controlled by

SWP/YSA members. Chicago Police Department officer Thomas West, who infiltrated the YSA at the behest of the Chicago Police, testified before the Committee on Internal Security last year that, to his certain knowledge, all SMC chapters around the country are controlled by the YSA. In fact, the YSA assumed control of the Chicago area SMC by simply appointing their own members to the SMC staff, a fact which indicates the tightness of the YSA's control of the SMC.

And what is the YSA? It is the youth and training section of the Socialist Workers Party, which West also testified—from first hand experience—advocates the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government. YSA members are taught in special classes, conducted largely by members of the parent SWP—which indicates the SWP's influence over the YSA—that their entire reason for being is the promotion of the revolution, which must, by the very nature of our society, be a violent one. This, of course, is the typical Communist line of violent revolution.

Careful study of original literature disseminated by the involved organizations, as well as an analysis of articles appearing in the Communist press, especially in the *Militant*, official newspaper of the SWP, leads to the inevitable conclusion that the organizational genius behind the Cleveland conference was the SWP, acting through the YSA and the Student Mobilization Committee. The Trotskyist press and Trotskyist groups gave all-out support to this conference, a fact which is extremely significant, especially when taken in conjunction with statements in the CPUSA's *Daily World*, which denounced the Cleveland conference as a vehicle for Trotskyist splitting policies in the peace movement.

The action proposals at the Cleveland conference were advanced by representatives of two major antiwar coalitions, the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council and the Detroit Coalition to End the War Now. Both coalitions, by definition, embrace many organizations, many of them by no means Communist and certainly not Trotskyist. But the operating fact here is not which groups are non-Communist, but which groups set the policies. In both cases, policies are in complete harmony with those advanced by the SWP. Both coalitions consistently advocate mass, single-issue antiwar demonstrations as opposed to actions centered both on the war and on such allegedly related issues as poverty, racism, and political "repression," a favorite theme of the CPUSA in recent years.

The policies adopted by the June 1970 Cleveland conference were those of the SWP, YSA, and SMC. The conference which formed the NPAC to carry out its programs, proposed the organization of mass antiwar protests centered solely on the war and on the withdrawal of all American forces from Southeast Asia. This proposal was denounced by the CPUSA and its allies in the peace movement, who wanted multi-issue demonstrations centered on the war and on such related issues as those mentioned above.

The leadership of the NPAC reflects the Trotskyist domination of the coalition. Of the five coordinators, the two most active as spokesmen for the coalition are Donald Gurewitz and Jerry Gordon. Gurewitz has been known for some time as a member of the Socialist Workers Party and the Young Socialist Alliance, a fact documented in the Committee on Internal Security's hearings on New Mobe in April 1970.

Information developed by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1961 revealed that Gordon had at one time been the Ohio chairman of the Labor Youth League, a now defunct CPUSA youth organization, and that he had even attended closed and secret meetings of the Communist Party itself. The fact is that Gordon at one time was a member of the Communist Party. Gordon's affiliation with the CPUSA, however, has presumably ceased in recent years, as he has emerged as a major spokesman for the Trotskyist position in the peace movement. An article in the CPUSA's *Daily World* on June 25, 1970, in fact, specifically identified Gordon as the leader of the "Trotskyist group" within the New Mobilization Committee which was at that time in process of coming apart at the seams because of the factional struggle led primarily by members and partisans of the SWP and CPUSA. Gordon has also been among the strongest supporters of the SMC, especially since its takeover by the YSA.

In addition, many key staff people in NPAC are members of the Trotskyist movement. Leader of the NPAC's Third World Task Force, for example, is Herman Fagg, a publicly avowed member of the SWP, while logistics are being handled by SWP 1968 Presidential candidate Fred Halstead, who is a member of the national committee of the SWP. Another leader of the logistics committee is Matilde Zimmerman, who is married to Joe Miles, one of the most prominent YSA activists in the peace movement.

It is significant that the April 1971 issue of *Political Affairs*, official theoretical organ of the Communist Party, U.S.A., refers to the "Trotskyist-led NPAC," a characterization that has appeared numerous times in publications of the CPUSA and in the pages of the independent Communist newspaper, the *Guardian*, one of the most consistently authoritative sources for information on Communist activity in the peace movement.

Further, no matter what Jerry Gordon or any other NPAC spokesman may say with regard to the role of the SWP in the National Peace Action Coalition, the SWP itself in the November 27, 1970, issue of the *Militant*, made the categorical assertion that—

The Socialist Workers Party is the only major left-wing group giving active support to NPAC.

This statement is certainly borne out by the available evidence, especially when one takes into account the fact that the other major groups operating to set the NPAC's policies—such groups as the YSA, SMC, CAPAC, Detroit Coalition to End the War Now, and New York Peace

Action Coalition, among others—all function under substantial SWP domination.

The plain fact is that, no matter how many non-Communists may be involved in NPAC's projected April 24 demonstrations, and no matter how many misguided liberals, including members of Congress may have alined themselves with NPAC in this effort, the National Peace Action Coalition is nothing more than a vehicle for Trotskyist agitation in the peace movement. Conceived by the SWP, and organized largely by the SWP, YSA, and SMC, the National Peace Action Coalition is the outstanding SWP front organization of the moment and represents the high point of Trotskyist influence in the peace movement, influence that is at all times used to further Communist purposes and to render maximum aid and support to the Vietcong.

In this connection, it is significant that Thomas West testified before the Committee on Internal Security that the official policy of the SWP and YSA in the peace movement is to advance the cause of the National Liberation Front because the NLF represents a vital force in the furtherance of the world Communist revolution, a revolution to which the the SWP and YSA are by their very nature actively committed.

But this is not the whole story. The NPAC is not the only group actively promoting the so-called spring offensive demonstrations. The other major organizing force behind the April and May activities is the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice, which, like the NPAC, is a lineal descendant of factions within the old New Mobe.

The PSPJ is the successor to the National Coalition Against War, Racism, and Repression, which was in turn the outgrowth of the Strategy Action Conference, held in June 1970 in Milwaukee, Wis., with heavy participation by members of the Communist Party, U.S.A. The SAC was followed by numerous regional conferences, out of which eventually emerged the NCAWRR, which represented the major vehicle through which the CPUSA operated to implement its multi-issue line in the peace movement.

It is not claimed that the CPUSA was by itself the absolute controlling force in the NCAWRR. Rather, it is claimed that the NCAWRR represented the degree to which the New Mobe, after the defection of the Trotskyists, had fallen into the hands of the Communist Party and a group of activists, such as David Dellinger and Rennie Davis, whose views on multi-issue protest happened to be in accord with the program being advanced by the party.

The nature of the NCAWRR and its successor PCPJ is such that the lines of influence and control are not as clearly drawn as is the case in the NPAC. Thus, while it is true that in the Midwest the leadership of the PCPJ tends to be in the hands of the clique of CPUSA members in control of the Chicago Peace Council, nationally the control seems to be in the hands of the coalition of CPUSA members and other militant activists mentioned above. Nevertheless,

It is fair to state that of the organizations represented in the PCPJ coalition, the most consistently influential is unquestionably the Communist Party.

The leadership of the PCPJ is in the hands of a coordinating committee which includes such people as the following: Irving Beinin, a staff employee of the Communist newsweekly *Guardian*; Renne Davis, an avowed supporter of the Communist cause in Vietnam and a prominent advocate of disruptive tactics that have consistently led to violence; Dave Dellinger, a self-professed Communist; William Douthard, who maintains close ties with the Communist Stockholm Conference on Vietnam; Carlton Goodlett, a one-time member of the Communist Party who remains a strong supporter of the Communist cause. Goodlett is also a member of the Presidium of the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council; Gil Green, a top leader in the CPUSA; Terence Hallinan, a member of the CPUSA; Dave Iffshin, president of the National Student Association; Sylvia Kushner, a member of the Illinois State Committee of the CPUSA; Sidney Lens, a pro-Castro propagandist and one-time leader of the dissident Communist Revolutionary Workers League; Irving Sarnoff, leader of the CPUSA-controlled Peace Action Council of Southern California and identified leader in the Southern California District of the Communist Party; Jack Spiegel, a leader in the Chicago Peace Council and member of the Communist Party; Jarvis Tyner, a member of the national committee of the CPUSA; and Cora Weiss, an avowedly pro-Hanoi activist in Women Strike for Peace who serves also as chairman of the Committee of Liaison with Families of Servicemen Detained in North Vietnam, an organization formed in 1969 as an offshoot of the Communist-dominated New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

Another key member of the PCPJ coordinating committee is Prof. Sidney Morris Peck of Cleveland, Ohio. Peck, who initiated the conference in 1966 that served as the founding conference of the November 8 Mobilization Committee, a Communist-dominated coalition that was the first predecessor of the New Mobe, was at one time a member of the Wisconsin State Committee of the CPUSA and is one of the most influential people in the peace movement—and one of the most dedicated of the Communist activists who today actually manage to control its major operations.

Peck, who is on record as favoring a Communist victory in Vietnam, has a long record of loyal service to the Communist cause. He was an active member of the American Youth for Democracy, a now-defunct CPUSA youth front, from 1946 to 1949. From 1948 to 1952, he was affiliated with the Wisconsin Progressive Party, a CPUSA front group, and in 1963 he was active in the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, also a Communist Party front organization, now known as the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation. In June 1965, he was a speaker at an open forum conducted by the Cleveland branch of

the Socialist Workers Party; and, also in 1965, he helped several members of the SWP to organize the Cleveland Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

Peck's identification with the more militant confrontation wing of the peace movement, as represented today by the PCPJ, is no accident. In 1968, he prepared a so-called working paper which he disseminated to his students. The subject of this paper was "Strategy and Tactics of the Movement Against the War." In it, he suggested various disruptive tactics designed to adversely affect the war effort in Vietnam, including the destruction of the Nation's six largest induction centers.

Furthermore, other elements involved in the PCPJ-NPAC demonstrations are actively committed to forms of protest that must inevitably lead to confrontation and violence. Indeed, there is evidence that has recently come to my attention that certain elements are planning specific violence.

According to an item appearing in the authoritative anti-Communist publication *Combat* on March 1, 1971, instructions have been handed down by Bernardine Dohrn to members of the Weatherman group, instructions that they are to surface for the Washington demonstrations with the object being that they are to cause as much disruption as possible. This instruction makes it quite clear that members of the extremely violence-prone Weatherman group will be present in Washington as part of their current program of reentry into the peace movement. Given the commitment of the Weatherman to violence, how can anyone claim that all plans for these spring offensive actions are peaceful?

In addition, I am informed—highly reliably—that certain people involved in planning for the May demonstrations, which are being sponsored primarily by the PCPJ, are not just discussing stall-ins and other such supposedly nonviolent tactics designed to disrupt the operations of Government. Rather, they are also known to be discussing—and on a serious basis—the use of explosives.

It is also significant that the spring offensive demonstrations are being actively supported by international Communist elements. It is fair to state that the schedule of activity occurring this spring in Washington and other cities is part and parcel of an international Communist-directed campaign against our policies on Southeast Asia, a campaign designed to subvert dissent to the service of Communist objectives in Southeast Asia and around the world.

It is no accident that the NPAC and PCPJ, after months of bitter squabbling, managed to achieve unity on a mass demonstration in Washington and San Francisco this April 24. The following chronology demonstrates that the supposedly native American peace movement is actually identified with the Communists in North Vietnam and the NLF to such a degree that they have in fact achieved this unity—almost literally overnight—at the behest of the North Vietnamese:

On February 27, 1971, the executive committee of the Communist-run Stock-

holm Conference on Vietnam met in Stockholm to consider problems related to the peace movement, particularly in light of the incursions into Laos. Present at this meeting was William Douthard, a national coordinator for the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice. Douthard announced that the spring action program of the PCPJ was to be worked out at a meeting in Washington that same weekend. According to an information letter issued by the Stockholm Conference on March 17, 1971:

The Executive Committee [of the Stockholm Conference] decided unanimously to conform its proposals for action to the lines of the decisions to be taken in Washington.

Also on February 27, Xuan Thuy, chief North Vietnamese negotiator in Paris, issued a strong appeal for unity in the American peace movement. This appeal, quoted in the Communist newsweekly *Guardian*, called on "the progressive American people and all antiwar organizations in the United States to unite closely" to create "a wide and strong movement" against alleged American aggression in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Xuan Thuy then wished the peace movement in the United States "every success" in their Spring Offensive. This, of course, is nothing new, since the Communists in North Vietnam and in the NLF have always wished their allies in the United States "brilliant success" in these demonstrations, thus demonstrating the degree to which the world Communist movement views the American anti-Vietnam war movement as a valuable ally, the "Second Front" of the Vietnam war," in the words of WSP leader and CPUSA member Pauline Rosen of New York in an interview quoted in the May 21, 1970, issue of the CPUSA's *Daily World*, in which Rosen was quoting Communist Vietnamese representatives at the March 1970 Fifth Stockholm Conference on Vietnam.

On February 27-28, 1971, the continuations committee of the PCPJ met in Washington, as previously indicated. This meeting resulted in a firm decision that the PCPJ cosponsor the NPAC's April 24 marches in Washington and San Francisco. The Communist *Guardian* reported on March 6 that Xuan Thuy's urgent plea was instrumental in convincing participants that "the need for unified action was paramount."

Then, on March 2, 1971, leaders of the PCPJ held a press conference in the Rayburn House Office Building in Washington to announce this unity of action for April 24. Present were such key Communist peace leaders as David Dellinger and Sidney Peck, along with several others, including NSA president David Iffshin, who had participated in the signing of the so-called Peoples Peace Treaty, a Communist-serving propaganda document drafted in Hanoi and signed by representatives of Vietnamese and American student groups. It is known that NSA representatives met with official representatives of the North Vietnamese Government in executing this project, which is being actively promoted by the PCPJ.

It should be obvious to any reasonably objective observer that the so-called

spring offensive is nothing more or less than a Communist-led effort to undermine America's position against Communist aggression in Asia. Both the NPAC and PCPJ are firmly under the domination of Communist elements. Additionally, the PCPJ includes in its ranks activists from certain groups that are bent on fomenting violence, even, as previously indicated, through the tactical use of explosives.

There can be no such thing as a selective endorsement of particular aspects of this program. Any Senator or other person who thinks he can merely endorse the April 24 demonstrations without, at least inferentially, also endorsing those planned subsequently in May is guilty of the most startling naivete, to put it charitably.

For all these organizations are manifestly in this together. No matter what Jerry Gordon or other NPAC spokesmen may say about peaceful intent for April 24, the cold, hard fact is that the NPAC has aligned itself with the PCPJ, with all this portends in terms of disruption and possible—even probable—violence in the Nation's Capital this spring.

Members of Congress who align themselves with the NPAC must now do so with their eyes open. I call upon all of my colleagues in this House and in the Senate to repudiate these apostles of discord before it is too late. There is no excuse for anyone, especially members of the legislative branch of our Government, lending support to this movement which has as its primary purpose the rendering of aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States. Whether the war be declared or undeclared is of no moment; the meaning is the same.

#### FORCED BUSING OF SCHOOL-CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MIZELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court has today ruled that the policy of forced busing of schoolchildren, as applied in the case of Swann against Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, is acceptable and constitutional.

This decision is destined to be met with dismay and with outrage by the vast majority of the American people, and its ramifications will certainly be felt by each of us sitting in this Chamber when the people begin to make their voices of displeasure heard.

I have today issued a statement regarding this matter to the people of the Fifth District of North Carolina, whom I am pleased to represent, and to the communications media.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I include the text of my statement in the RECORD.

#### STATEMENT BY MR. MIZELL

Today's decision by the Supreme Court upholding the policy of forced busing of school children away from their neighborhood schools is a devastating blow to the

orderly process of education in America, to the concept of local control and to the cause of freedom itself.

This precedent will have far-reaching, chaotic and totally unnecessary effects on educational systems throughout the country. Quality education—which is supposed to be the goal of the schools, courts, and of every American—cannot be achieved while overwhelming additional expenses and administrative duties are required to implement court-ordered busing.

My goal has always been, and continues to be, providing a quality education for every American child, black or white, and it's time we returned to that central, basic concern. It's time we returned to reason.

To speed that return, I will introduce in the House of Representatives a constitutional amendment, declaring that forced busing is not an acceptable policy, and that the right of school children to attend their neighborhood schools shall not be taken away by any court or by any other agent of the government.

#### SOLIDARITY IN WEST ORANGE, N.J.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MINISH) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, in the small hours of the morning this past Sunday, the West Orange Jewish Center was ravaged by a bomb blast. However, with this desecration of a house of worship in my home community, we were brought even closer together in our common rejection of such a repugnant and senseless act of violence.

The police and firemen, local officials, the Christian community and area Jewry, all have been united by this tragic event. It has been made abundantly clear that there is no fertile soil for bigotry of any kind in the community of West Orange.

The Jewish Center had occupied the bomb-damaged premises for 18 years of service to the total community. When I visited the premises Sunday morning and walked over shattered glass and sagging beams along paths I had often walked before, I could not help but reflect on the significance of the No. 18 to the Jewish people. In Hebrew, the corresponding letters to the numeral 18 spell the word "life."

I hope that the lively and glorious spirit of the congregation will be reborn, and that the atrocity perpetrated against the members of the congregation will serve to reaffirm their faith.

I include below newspaper articles concerning the shameful event taken from the Monday, April 19 editions of the Newark Star-Ledger and the Newark News:

#### MEMBERS BEGIN REBUILDING BLAST-SHATTERED TEMPLE

(By Bruce Bailey)

Members of the West Orange Jewish Center rolled up their sleeves yesterday and began temporary repairs to the damage caused by a bomb blast in the vestibule of the center complex early yesterday morning.

The front of the center was shored up, some glass was replaced and plumbers were called in to repair damage caused by the explosion, which could be heard for several miles.

Serving as spokesman for Rabbi Harold Mozeson was Robert Kohler, a member of the congregation and director of the New Jersey Anti-Defamation League.

Kohler said the congregation was "shocked by the explosion but no one is upset or frightened. We just have to get to work, make the necessary repairs and get back into operation."

Assemblyman David Goldfarb (R-Essex) said he was "shocked and appalled" by the bombings and demanded that "an immediate investigation be conducted by members of the municipal, county and state law enforcement agencies in determining the cause and apprehending the persons who have contributed to this most deplorable action."

Goldfarb, who recently introduced legislation on the control of explosives, said, "It is extremely pitiful and sad that houses of worship should be trespassed upon or damaged in this fashion."

The explosion, which occurred at approximately 12:20 a.m. yesterday, could be heard for miles and within a matter of minutes police and firemen were at the scene.

The blast device, according to authorities, were carefully placed beneath a heavy air conditioner in the vestibule of the center.

Kohler said the resulting explosion "blew forward" toward the sanctuary, shattering the temple proper and the areaways leading to other departments in the center's complex off Pleasant Valley Way.

The center's classrooms and recreation area were not damaged by the blast, according to Kohler.

One of the first persons on the scene was Rabbi Mozeson, who could give authorities no reason why the explosive device would have been planted at the center.

The rabbi said the center had not been the target of any anti-Semitic acts except for a few incidents of rock throwing which broke a number of windows several years ago.

Kohler acknowledged that the controversial leader of the militant Jewish Defense League, Rabbi Meir Kahane, has been scheduled to speak at the temple last night, but he said a conflict of dates was discovered two weeks ago. Kahane will make an appearance at the temple early next month, said Kohler.

Kohler said the congregation saw no connection between the bombing and Kahane's scheduled appearance. "My son will be barmitzva here in two weeks, and you could say, as easily, that the bombing was directed against him."

"No one can say because of a charismatic figure, that the bombing was related or unrelated.

"It is quite obvious that here we are dealing with a demented person. We have utmost faith in the local police authorities and feel sure they will find the culprit with all deliberate speed."

"It was definitely a professional job," said Mayor Louis Falcone, who was among those living more than a mile away who heard the explosion.

Police said it was apparently a timed fuse and a survey of nearby hospitals was made to check the possibility that the perpetrators set the bomb off too soon. The check was fruitless, Falcone said.

"This was not the work of a kid who doesn't like Sunday school," Falcone said.

"The whole community, gentile and Jewish is upset by this."

Kohler said the congregation "has enjoyed a happy relationship in West Orange for the last 10 years and we are at a loss to explain why this happened."

"It's obvious, though," he added, "that it is the work of a nut—but a painstaking, clever nut."

Kohler said there was no estimate of dam-

age as yet, but added "it was quite extensive."

After a meeting yesterday at the temple, officers and trustees of the congregation set a tentative date of April 28 to hold an all-faiths rally on the temple lawn at 8 p.m.

A meeting will be set up with Catholic and Protestant leaders to see if the date for the solidarity rally is agreeable.

Meanwhile, members of the West Orange police and fire departments were joined at the scene yesterday morning by an agent from the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

They sifted through the debris in an effort to determine what kind of a bomb device was used to touch off the blast, which left explosive powder clinging to several steel beams in the vestibule.

Firemen reported there was no fire caused by the explosion, which also wrecked a gymnasium.

While police refrained from comment, an ordnance squad from Ft. Monmouth searched the rubble and pinpointed the area where the bomb had been placed but could not determine its kind.

Police said no telephone calls were placed either to West Orange Police Headquarters or Rabbi Mozeson's home prior to the explosion.

#### PROBE TEMPLE BLAST

(By Diane Ouding)

Members of the West Orange Jewish Center, which was rocked by a mysterious explosion, early yesterday, have made emergency repairs and plans to continue most of their program elsewhere.

Police and FBI agents pressed their investigation of the explosion, which caused \$250,000 damage to the building. The synagogue was unoccupied at the time, and there were no injuries, although the blast was heard for miles.

Officials and members of the congregation pitched in yesterday to make emergency repairs, as curiosity-seekers streamed past the damaged building.

A number of other institutions offered their facilities to the congregation, and officials said all scheduled activities would continue in other locations.

#### KAHANE SCHEDULED

The bombing occurred the night before Jewish Defense League leader Rabbi Meir Kahane was scheduled to speak. Kahane, however, had canceled the engagement more than a week ago. Police said no bomb threats had been called in.

"We aren't going to make our decision subject to his kind of hooliganism," Rabbi Harold Mozeson, leader of the center, said "We decided that Rabbi Kahane's invitation for May 2 still stands."

Murray Gottlieb, Jewish Center president, said he was called to the scene immediately by West Orange firemen from the firehouse across Woodland Avenue from the center. He accompanied them as they rushed in to rescue the Torah and sacred scrolls soon after the blast. Police, firemen and members of the Ft. Monmouth bomb squad, who were called to the scene, then picked through the rubble for most of the night looking for clues.

Fire inspector Capt. James Cohrs, who headed the fire investigation squad, said the bomb contained "a goodly amount, an excessive amount of explosives." Cohrs said, "If anybody had been in the building, he'd be dead." He said the department had determined the bomb to be one of two types but could not release the information. Final lab tests, he said, would be completed today.

The FBI released a statement last night saying it was "maintaining a liaison with the West Orange police to determine if there was any indication of the breaking of federal laws." But, there was "no indica-

tion of the breaking of federal statutes so far," the FBI said.

"It was definitely a professional job," said Mayor Louis Falcone. "This was not the work of a kid who doesn't like Sunday school. The whole community, gentile and Jewish, is upset by this."

#### RALLY PLANNED

Meanwhile, public officials and leaders of the West Orange Jewish Community met yesterday down the street in the Goldman Hotel to determine a course of action. A rally to be held on the grounds of the bombed out synagogue is tentatively scheduled for 8 p.m. Wednesday.

A man present at the meeting, who declined to give his name, said the rally was set to "show support of the Jewish community and reaffirm the ideals of the right to worship, in fact, the existence of the democratic process here."

Also present at the meeting were Mayor Falcone, and members of the Board of Education as well as representatives from the police and fire departments.

Gottlieb reported that Hebrew classes would continue in West Orange's Redwood School, and due to the many offers of help, the center would not have to curtail its activities. He said seven area communities had offered facilities to the center.

"But," Gottlieb added, "it will be many months before the center is totally repaired, and we are recovered from the effects of the blast."

The center, a one story building, was completed in 1955, and is set back in a large open tract 200 feet from the roadway. Rabbi Mozeson has been spiritual leader of the center since 1945.

#### THE ROLE OF THE LAW AND THE LAWYER IN OUR FREE SOCIETY. LAW DAY ADDRESS BY THE MAJORITY LEADER REPRESENTATIVE HALE BOGGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. FLOWERS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 17, the distinguished majority leader, Mr. Boggs, delivered a thoughtful Law Day address before the faculty and student body of the University of Alabama Law School, Tuscaloosa, Ala.

Mr. Boggs had a great deal to say about the role of the law and the lawyer in our free society. I am inserting his remarks in the RECORD and commending it to the attention of my colleagues:

#### REMARKS BY MR. BOGGS

I am honored to be here today and to have this opportunity to make your Law Day, 1971, address.

In preparation for this talk I thought about the multitude of options open to a young lawyer today.

I found that, in the course of enumerating these options, I had mentally separated private practice, public interest practice, and public service.

I hope I may be forgiven for those distinctions. To the extent that those distinctions exist in fact, fundamental improvements in our system are made enormously more difficult.

A private practitioner should be as much a servant of the public interest in his everyday work as any publicly supported anti-poverty lawyer, or any elected official.

No lawyer serves himself or his client well when, by his counsel, the public interest suffers.

A lawyer not active for the public good is unworthy of the legal vocation. He is a special impediment to social progress because, like any warrior schooled in the art of combat, he can use his training wittlessly, thoughtlessly—and effectively—in the service of evil.

The expression "if you are not part of the solution you are part of the problem" is especially true of lawyers.

Lawyers who are part of the problem—and there have always been many and are many today—deserve all of the colorful scorn heaped on them through history.

Jonathan Swift, in his classic satire *Gulliver's Travels*, described lawyers as:

"A society of men among us, bred up from their youth in the art of proving, by words multiplied for the purpose, that white is black and black is white, according as they are paid."

And John Milton had occasion to describe a particular lawyer as:

"A serving man and solicitor compounded into one mongrel—an apostate scarecrow, a vagabond and ignominious, a beetle, a daw, a horsefly, a nuisance and a brazen ass."

One of Shakespeare's characters uttered the chilling if probably popular suggestion that:

"The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers."

You may recollect that it was our profession which inspired Charles Dickens to describe Temple Bar as a "leaden-headed old obstruction" and place the High Court of Chancery "at the very heart of the fog."

It is sad but all too true that were Dickens to reappear for a courtroom visit today he would likely discover similarities to the Chancery Court he observed over a century ago, namely a place where judges and lawyers are:

"Mistily engaged in one of the ten thousand stages of an endless cause, tripping one another up on slippery precedents, groping knee-deep in technicalities, running their goat-hair and horse-hair warded heads against walls of words, and making a pretense of equity with serious faces."

Fortunately for all of us, there have been critics. Without the check of sharp criticism, legal practitioners might long since have made of the law an even more impossible confusion of statutes, precedents and procedures—and reaped even greater profit from the confusion.

Just criticism of the legal profession has not been confined, I needn't add, to the Star Chamber and the debtor's prison.

Louis Brandeis, who became one of our great Supreme Court Justices, once lamented that:

"Able lawyers have, to a large extent, allowed themselves to become adjuncts of great corporations and have neglected their obligation to use their powers for the protection of the people."

"We hear much of the 'corporation lawyer'" he said, "and far too little of the 'people's lawyer'."

Brandeis would certainly be pleased at the rising interest of the bar today, particularly among younger lawyers, in the protection of the rights of the poor, and the disadvantaged, and the consumer, against infringement by those accustomed to ignoring those rights.

The rise in popularity in the causes I just mentioned has an important collateral benefit. It helps us to see the nobler possibilities of our profession.

If a lawyer seeks no more than to gain for his client an economic advantage over a competitor, he may be a good capitalist, but he is not a great lawyer.

If his only test for this prosecution of a cause is the standard fee in advance, he is a hired gun, a mercenary, and he demeans the profession.

If he views himself as a functionary who, once engaged, merely carries out his client's wishes, he is a marionette, not a lawyer.

If he is content to use improper means toward a proper end, he is a cynic, not a lawyer.

If he takes undue advantage of the frailty of the legal process to promote, or persecute, some political view, he is not a lawyer but a petty tyrant.

Of course, if a lawyer thinks he can right all wrongs, heal all wounds, abolish all injustice, then the poor fellow has the delusion of divinity.

A real lawyer tries, in whatever the cause, to bring order out of chaos, not for the sake of order, but for the good of his client and, by extension, his fellow men. The law has never served any man well without serving all men well.

The best leaders lead by example. Lawyers are no different. We are best instructed in the law not so much by casebooks, nor by hornbooks—nor even by speeches—but by an examination of the life of great lawyers.

Who are the great lawyers? Most we will never know about. They are daily going quietly about their work.

Some we do know about, and one of the greatest of these is a distinguished alumni of your own institution, Mr. Justice Hugo Black.

Hugo Black, in my opinion, has undertaken no more important cause than that of seeking to remove the price tag from justice.

In *Griffin v. Illinois*, Justice Black set the stage for his later landmark opinion in *Gideon v. Wainwright* when he said that:

"In criminal trials a State can no more discriminate on account of poverty than on account of religion, race or color . . . There can be no equal justice where the kind of trial a man gets depends on the amount of money he has."

What is true of criminal trials is, in my view, no less true of civil trials and civil actions short of trial.

It is a very serious defect of our system that we have yet to solve the problem that those commanding the largest financial resources have an overwhelming if not altogether decisive advantage over their adversaries.

In such circumstances, persons unaware of their rights are kept in ignorance by powerful interests; those injured by private or governmental heedlessness or deception are bullied with relative impunity; if tempted to assert their rights, they are easily intimidated by the staying and delaying power of well-financed opposition.

Even those determined enough to engage in litigation to the end frequently find that the dollar cost of justice is all out of proportion to the underlying controversy.

Lately, the experience of the OEO Legal Services Program and similar programs has demonstrated that legal rights are an illusion unless safeguarded by effective counsel and, when necessary, asserted by effective advocacy.

I do not have the answer to this problem. I do believe that something must be done about it.

We must examine, for example, the possibility of legal insurance to perform a function similar to that of health and medical insurance.

We must find ways of extending the effective advocacy made available to the poor to those of greater but still modest means who cannot presently afford adequate legal counsel when necessary.

We must better educate people to their rights so that they are less likely to be victims of the unscrupulous.

We must improve the effectiveness of those regulatory agencies of government, State and federal, whose responsibility it is to protect the public.

We must seriously consider the establish-

ment of publicly provided ombudsmen to take up individual claims in instances of abuse or neglect of governmental responsibilities.

We must reduce the awful complexity of the law itself. It is a scandal, for example, that millions and millions of ordinary Americans find it necessary to pay advisors to help them comply with our income tax laws. Businesses, too, are frequently entangled in complex, conflicting, redundant, unnecessary and even abusive statutory schemes whose ostensible purpose is to assist them.

By these suggestions I favor no "Big Brother" society where private initiative and enterprise is stifled by overzealous legal watchdogging.

But I do hope for a society in which the law—which is after all the assent of the people to rules of good conduct—really serves the public interest. And a society in which legal practitioners—however they characterize their particular practice—likewise serve that public interest.

As much as one may admire those who will bring their legal talent to public interest law firms, or legal aid and legal services programs, we must come to see the private practice of law, as well, for the remarkable opportunity it affords for service to the common good.

Woodrow Wilson expressed it this way, fifty years ago:

"You are not a mere body of expert business advisors in the field of civil law or a mere body of expert advocates for those who get entangled in the meshes of the criminal law. You are servants of the public, of the state itself. You are under bonds to serve the general interest, the integrity and enlightenment of law itself, in the advice you give to individuals. It is your duty also to advise those who make the laws—to advise them in the general interest, with a view to the amelioration of every undesirable condition that the law can reach, the removal of every obstacle to progress and fair dealing that the law can remove, the lightening of every burden the law can lift and the righting of every wrong the law can rectify."

#### SUPREME COURT AFFIRMS FEDERAL OWNERSHIP OF CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, reminiscent of the days of Earl Warren, the latest Republican Chief Justice, Warren Earl Burger, has now ruled that parents and local communities have no control over their children if their forceful transfer from one group to another is deemed by a Federal judge to be in the best interest of achieving racial balance. And, of course, if the child involved is in a Southern State.

It stymies one's imagination to believe that the American people have been misconstruing the Constitution for 182 years by ignoring the mandate to force busing of schoolchildren in Southern States to achieve racial balance. It is little wonder we constantly face appeals for more and more judges because of backlogs of dockets and delays—our judiciary is too concerned with dreaming up new theories of social justice and sectional harassment to dispense with justice as outlined under their constitutional mandate.

If we are now to consider that racial

balance is a constitutional goal, duty, and right, then distance must not be considered a legal factor. The attaining of true social justice, by pure racial balance must be just as legal and desirable a goal from State to State or section to section as it is from school to school or across town. Any other conclusion would not be logical nor in keeping with the equal protection provision of the U.S. Constitution.

In July 1969, I had introduced a resolution to establish a select committee to conduct a full and complete study of the demography—racial breakdown—of the United States with a view toward providing relief from racial tensions through an equal distribution of underprivileged racial groups throughout the several States as well as in the political subdivisions of each State.

Informed Americans know that the Negro comprises only 11 percent of our national population. Yet, in some sections of our country, large cities, and in the rural South, the Negro population exceeds 50 percent and in some areas extends to 80 percent. Attaining social justice in these heavily impacted areas understandably presents a much more difficult task than in other areas of our Nation which fall far below the 11-percent national average areas, such as South Dakota, Montana, Maine, and Minnesota.

If the Supreme Court is now to adopt the role of equalizer of men, it must also become the distributor of races, otherwise it will be denying the constitutional right of a white child in the North to achieve racial balance if that child is forced to attend a school without the proper racial balance of 11 percent Negro.

Northern politicians and, in fact, northern parents cannot be expected to appreciate the need for their becoming activists in achieving racial balance; so the Court in its new role, must spread the races throughout the Nation. The individual rights and wishes of our people be hanged—only groups count.

That the nonjudicial bureaucrats and the northerners will not voluntarily comply with the imaginative new Court law can best be demonstrated by the complete failure of any support for House Concurrent Resolution 172, which called for a sense of Congress "that each officer or employee of the Federal Government who is residing and working in the District of Columbia and who has a child qualified to attend an elementary or secondary school should send such child to elementary or secondary school to the public school system in the District of Columbia."

Not only has this resolution which calls for voluntary participation in racial balance by our Nation not received the first offer of support from any of the egalitarians and liberals, but the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare refuses to take any action to equally apply the Federal laws and guidelines to the District of Columbia which he enforces at present in Southern States. Secretary Richardson's excuse is that the

District of Columbia is desegregating under an order of the U.S. district court and as such it qualifies as being in compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This, despite the fact that segregation in our Nation's Capital was de jure, that is by law, and not de facto. And further, that the attendance records—see my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 19, 1971, at page 3350—indicate more segregation in 1971 than in 1970.

The Supreme Court has now pre-empted HEW as the greatest threat against the family and individual liberty in America.

I include a copy of House Resolution 497, a letter from the HEW, and a news clipping as follows:

H. RES. 497

*Resolved*, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Not more than five members of the committee shall be members of the same political party. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of the demography of the United States with the view toward providing relief from racial tensions by more equal distribution of underprivileged racial groups throughout the several States and in the political subdivisions of each State.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,

April 5, 1971.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RARICK: Thank you for your letter of March 2 concerning school desegregation in the District of Columbia.

The only authority that this Department has to require school desegregation by local educational agencies is under the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Under regulations of this Department for the implementation of Title VI, a school district is considered to be in compliance if it is subject to a final order of a court of the United States for the desegregation of its schools and provides an assurance that it will comply with such order. Inasmuch as the District of Columbia is desegregating under an order of the U.S. District Court for the District of

Columbia in the case of *Hobson v. Hansen*, it qualifies under this provision.

Apart from the question of whether the District of Columbia technically meets the requirements of Title VI and our implementing regulations, I can well appreciate your concern that integration of student bodies in the public schools of the District has not been effectively achieved as a practical matter. The problem is, of course, very much compounded by the fact that the student population in the District is over 90 percent black and that there is also a high degree of residential impactation by race. These problems, however, while perhaps more severe in the District, are not essentially different from those in other large municipal systems that have previously been operated on an officially segregated basis. While we do in our enforcement efforts under Title VI, ask the school districts to take reasonably practicable steps to correct the racial isolation of students caused by the segregated system, we have not, as you suggest in your letter, sought to compel a strict racial balance among the various schools in the system.

With kindest regards,

ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON,  
Secretary.

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 20, 1971]  
SUPREME COURT UPHOLDS BUSING—JUSTICES  
TAKE TOUGHER STAND ON INTEGRATION  
(By Lyle Denniston)

The Supreme Court today unanimously ordered school officials to increase efforts to end segregation, using busing and crosstown transfers of pupils if necessary.

Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, announced the series of four rulings as all other members sat silently on the bench beside him.

The chief justice wrote the opinions.

Surpassing in importance anything the court has done on school desegregation in 17 years, the ruling firmly requires school officials in the South, watched over by federal judges, to go further to see that "no pupil of a racial minority" is barred from any school because of his race.

It signaled, at least for some Southern communities, a major move away from the "neighborhood school" as the norm.

At the least, ruling seemed sure to disappoint the Nixon administration, which had wanted the court to embrace neighborhood schools even if that meant substantial segregation remained in some school systems.

NO BINDING DUTY

But the court did make important gestures toward some parts of the administration's school policy.

It said that there is no "substantive constitutional right" to have "any particular degree of racial balance or mixing" in any given school.

And, it said that there is no binding duty to see that no schools attended by only one race or virtually one race are left in a community, at least for a short period.

But the firmness of the new declaration that federal judges have "broad equitable powers" to take steps to wipe out segregated school systems does mean that the administration and local school officials will have less flexibility than current government policy suggests as they fashion further plans for integration.

Burger's four opinions today were filled with comments reaffirming the duty to move ahead in dismantling Southern school systems which had separate sets of schools for whites and blacks.

Recalling the 1954 decision which first ordered an end to segregation, Burger today said the objective remains the same: "To eliminate from the public schools all vestiges of state imposed segregation."

While cautioning judges that their rule does not put them "automatically in the

shoes of school authorities," Burger declared that judges must step in when local school officials "fall in their affirmative obligations" to continue to work for an end of dual school systems.

Today's ruling is, almost entirely, a decision affecting Southern school systems. The suits were filed to overturn official, formal actions of school officials desegregating schools.

Burger said flatly that the court was not deciding whether it is necessary to integrate schools where segregated education results from actions other than those of school officials.

In other words, so-called "Northern-style segregation" resulting from isolation of blacks in separate neighborhoods is not affected by today's action.

ONE NATIONAL NORM

The administration had repeatedly argued that its "neighborhood school policy" was designed to deal with school systems in the North as well as the South. It had hoped that the Supreme Court, in its new action on racial separation, would embrace its policy fully so that there would be one national norm in dealing with separate education.

Burger's opinions were, on the whole, generalized discussions of the goals and techniques that figure in ending officially segregated education. At a number of points, the chief justice made qualifying remarks to indicate that hard-and-fast rules were not being handed down.

"Conditions in different localities," Burger said at one point, "will vary so widely that no rigid rules can be laid down to govern all situations."

The court made a major concession today to the practical problems that school officials would face in trying to degregate classrooms and keep them integrated even as the community changes.

School officials and federal judges, the court declared are not required to make adjustments every year in the racial makeup of student bodies once it has been proved that they have desegregated their systems.

"In the absence of a showing that either the school authorities or some other agency of the state have deliberately attempted to fix or alter demographic patterns to affect the racial composition of the schools, further intervention by a district court should not be necessary."

SPECIFIC RULINGS

In specific terms, these are the rulings the court issued today:

It upheld all parts of a desegregation and busing order issued by a federal judge for the city of Charlotte, N.C., and surrounding Mecklenburg County—and order partly opposed by the administration.

It struck down a North Carolina anti-busing law that was passed in the state in reaction to the desegregation effort in Charlotte.

It ordered a new plan, involving more crosstown busing, to desegregate the entire school system of Mobile, Ala., requiring more efforts than the Nixon administration had wanted in that community.

And, it upheld a desegregation plan for Clarke County, Ga., and the city of Athens, Ga., which assigns students on the basis of race to schools away from their neighborhoods in order to get more integration. The Justice Department had not opposed that plan.

In addition, the court firmly rejected the idea that a 1964 federal law curbed the power of federal judges to order integration by busing students to achieve a "racial balance."

That law, Burger said, does nothing to restrict or withdraw the powers of courts to take steps to end dual school systems based on race.

Burger's main opinion today was a 28-page statement written to deal primarily with the Charlotte situation, but going beyond it to

issue general guidelines for desegregation of all southern school systems.

He declared that local school officials and federal judges have had practical problems in trying to end official segregation.

"Nothing in our national experience prior to 1955 prepared anyone with dealing with changes of the magnitude and complexity encountered since then," he said.

The problems, he said, "make plain that we should now try to amplify guidelines, however, incomplete or imperfect, for the assistance of school authorities and courts."

Besides noting the practical problems, Burger did note that there had been "deliberate resistance" and "dilatatory tactics" in school systems.

In fashioning guidelines, the court dealt with four issues in desegregation. These were the results:

1. It said that there is no constitutional requirement to achieve balance. If federal judges insist on a specific ratio of a matter of constitutional duty, they would be wrong, the court said.

The constitutional command to desegregate schools does not mean that every school in every community must always reflect the ratios of composition of the school system as a whole."

But the court added, judges may use ratios as "a starting point in the process of shaping a remedy, rather than an inflexible requirement."

2. It is not illegal to permit the continued existence "of some small number of one-race, or virtually one-race, schools within a district."

But, officials and judges should understand that there is "a presumption against schools that are substantially disproportionate in their racial composition," and must carefully "scrutinize" one-race schools to make sure that school officials have not caused such racial results by official action.

3. Judges are free to order the "gerrymandering" of school districts and attendance zones so that widely separated areas of town might be linked in order to end school segregation.

They are thus free to draw school boundaries that may be awkward, inconvenient and even bizarre."

4. It is legal to require the busing of students to schools away from their neighborhoods if that is necessary to achieve integration.

"Desegregation cannot be limited to the walk-in school," the court said.

However, without being specific, the court said that judges must consider the possible risk to the health of children or disruption of the educational process in deciding whether to order busing. The key factor in analyzing the impact of busing is the age of the students, the court said without elaboration.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S RULING ON ABORTIONS IN MILITARY HOSPITALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the recent order of President Nixon limiting abortions for military personnel and their dependents is an arbitrary exercise of personal prejudice to mandate a public policy that violates the rights of women.

Mr. Nixon's action was bad enough, but with his accompanying personal comments on abortion, he appears to have pulled another Manson case faux pas.

Surely the President must know that 24 State legislatures are currently considering abortion laws, and that his description of abortion as "an unacceptable form of population control"—coming from the President of the United States—will give heart and strength to the opponents of reform.

Surely he knows too that the U.S. Supreme Court recently heard arguments on the constitutionality of a District of Columbia abortion law—United States against Vuitch—and that it is now in the process of arriving at a decision.

The President's statement that he opposes abortion because of his personal beliefs in the sanctity of human life, including the life of the yet unborn can be filed away with his description of himself, in regard to the war in Vietnam as a deeply committed pacifist. Mr. Nixon is rapidly becoming a master of "the big joke."

The President is, of course, entitled to his personal opinions in a private capacity but he should not use his Presidential Office or his post as Commander in Chief to impose his views on women or to interfere with their right to control their own bodies and their lives.

Mr. Nixon falsely invokes the issue of States rights to justify his order requiring U.S. Armed Services military physicians to conform to State laws on abortion. This is a particularly weak argument when applied to members of the Armed Forces who have no choice in their assignments to military duty. Under this latest decree, the wife or daughter of a serviceman who has the bad luck to be assigned to Virginia for example, will not be able to obtain a legal abortion, whereas those assigned to New York will.

What is most disturbing in the President's statement is his apparent ignorance of the reality of women's lives or the real issue in abortion. It is not, as the President implies, a question of "to abort or not to abort". Abortions have always been performed on a wide scale in every State in this country, and this practice will undoubtedly be continued. The issue is whether thousands of young girls and women are to be condemned to back alleys, secret, illegal abortions that are hazardous to their own lives or whether they are to be allowed the dignity and freedom of a legal, simple, safe medical procedure.

In New York City, a report issued by the Health Services Administration April 5 showed that nearly 98,000 abortions have been performed in the city since the liberalized abortion reform law was enacted last July. The report showed a continuing trend toward earlier, safer abortions and also evidence that the number of criminal abortions has declined.

More than half the women undergoing abortions in New York City came from out of State. They came from States where for the most part they faced the humiliating choice of seeking a criminal abortion at an exorbitant price and at risk to their own lives, or of bearing an unwanted child.

President Nixon's order will perpetuate this humiliation of women.

The decision to have an abortion should be up to the woman. It should certainly not be up to the President of the United States.

I believe that all women should have access to legal abortions. Accordingly, I will introduce an amendment to the United States Code providing that there be a uniform policy on abortions for female military personnel and for dependents of servicemen and that they have free access to abortion procedures in military medical facilities.

I include in the RECORD at this point an editorial published in the New York Times on April 5, 1971:

#### RETROGRESSION ON ABORTIONS

President Nixon, in ordering limits on the freedom of military physicians to perform abortions, has pronounced abortion an "unacceptable form of population control." He says he cannot square abortion on demand with "my personal belief in the sanctity of human life, including the life of the yet unborn."

Without disputing the genuineness of the President's conviction, we believe that any actions at the Federal or state level to make it the basis for public policy would be both cruel and regressive. Issues affecting the "sanctity of human life" are far more involved in the Vietnam war than they are in the removal of legal obstacles to abortion.

The chief sufferers under laws making abortion a crime are always the poor—mothers and unwanted children alike condemned to deprivation and despair. Astonishing, indeed, is the President's assertion that America "will open its hearts and homes" to these unwanted children. He, more than most, has reason to be aware that the nationwide conservative revolt against the cost of welfare is centered on the tens of thousands of children born out of wedlock in welfare homes. To deny mothers in these homes the same freedom of choice as wealthier women on whether to have children or not have them is an act of inhumanity and social irresponsibility.

#### REVENUE SHARING AND IMPOUNDING OF FUNDS

(Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress returns after its Easter recess, the first order of business still appears to be the controversy surrounding the concept of revenue sharing. This week, more than any other, seems to be a crucial week in the history of this concept in view of the decisions being made in the Ways and Means Committee on what many feel to be a preferable alternative to "blank check" government, namely welfare reform and take-over by the Federal Government.

A few weeks ago, I had occasion to address the House on the same subject and indicated then that I felt the tide of revenue sharing had reached its peak and was beginning to taper off. I indicated that cities and towns around the country were beginning to express serious reservations about the concept and were beginning to shop around for al-

ternatives as the details of the administration's plan were being leaked out.

Today I would like to insert into the RECORD a copy of the resolution of the city council of the historic city of Cambridge, Mass., on the subject of revenue sharing. The criticisms contained therein I feel are compelling. I also feel that the resolution addresses itself to a very serious problem in calling for the immediate full funding of existing grants-in-aid programs. Each Member of Congress is painfully aware of the serious impact on the communities he represents of the administration's decision to deliberately hold back funding of programs specifically appropriated by Congress.

Whereas, the Nixon Administration has submitted a plan for major reorganization of the Federal Government and the program it manages, and

Whereas, this reorganization involves a two part program of so called general and special revenue sharing, and

Whereas, under the general revenue sharing there are absolutely no guidelines set forth concerning how this money should be used nor any machinery for monitoring its use, and

Whereas, under special revenue sharing many present categorical grant-in-aid programs would be replaced by a system of "block" grants to be administered by the State which could result in the loss, by the City of Cambridge of its ability to deal directly with the Federal Government, and hence render effective citizen participation at the local level a nullity, therefore be it

*Resolved*, That this City Council go on record as being cognizant of the urgent need for a substantial increase in the flow of Federal Funds to the states and local governments, and supportive of the immediate full funding of existing grant in aid programs, and be it further

*Resolved*, That this Council go on record as being opposed to any and all forms of revenue sharing proposals or programs that lack front end specificity, machinery for periodic congressional audit, as well as the safeguards of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and be it

*Ordered*, That copies of this resolution be posted to the members of our delegation in the Great and General Court and as well as those in our Congressional delegation.

While I am on the subject of helping out the cities and towns of this country today and tomorrow, not years from now, I would like to also insert into the RECORD at the same time a copy of the resolution of the Massachusetts Association of Housing Authorities protesting the impounding of \$150 million appropriated by Congress for construction and management of low-rent housing in the 1970 Housing Act.

#### RESOLUTION OF MASSACHUSETTS ASSOCIATION OF HOUSING AUTHORITIES

Whereas: One hundred and fifty million dollars was appropriated by U.S. Congress for construction and management of low-rent housing in the 1970 Housing Act; and

Whereas: These funds have been and are being unwarrantedly withheld by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget and not dispersed to the local housing Authorities and Communities for housing, development and management purposes; and

Whereas: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has issued a circular with a requirement for National Public Housing Tenant Lease; and

Whereas: This action is deemed to violate the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 as amended, which in fact reposes maximum responsibility in local Authorities in the operation of the low rent housing program and would result in fiscal disaster for Housing Authorities; and

Whereas: The Mass. Association of Housing Authority Officials believes that these actions of the Dept. of Housing and Urban Development and the Office of Management and Budget are deleterious of the proper operation of the Low-rent Housing Program nationally;

Be it resolved: That the Mass. Association of Housing Authorities Officials call upon the Secretary of U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Attorney General of the U.S. Department of Justice to have the U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development and the Office of Management and Budget rescind the present policy of withholding funds and assist the local communities to meeting the national housing shortage crises, and;

It be further resolved that the Mass. Housing Authority Officials empower National Association to protest in the name of the Mass. Association of Housing Authority Officials such funds and request the release of such funds to implement the Housing, Community and renewal programs enacted by Congress.

I have been deeply upset with the developments over the past few months in the Office of Budget and Management. It's clear that they are frustrating the intent of Congress and indeed, in doing so may well be acting unconstitutionally. I have on several occasions in the past joined with my colleague on the Floor criticizing the holding back of funds—whether the holdback is designed to influence the current debate on revenue sharing or to save a few pennies in an already huge deficit for fiscal year 1971. Congress in each instance voted these appropriations only after the most serious consideration and fullest debate. A decision was made when the appropriations were granted that there were crying needs which needed the spending of funds here and now. For the administration to step in and substitute its view of the seriousness of the situation for that of Congress is extremely difficult for me to accept.

The arrogance of the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development is downright galling for a Congressman to behold. In discussing the holding back of \$200 million in urban renewal funds, the Secretary indicated that the appropriation exceeded the levels of previous years. This seems to me to be entirely reasonable, the way costs alone have risen. Why should we stand still in an area like this? The Secretary is going directly against the mood of the country and the concern and conviction that more is needed here and now to relieve the problems of our cities and towns, when he says:

We do not intend to use these extra funds this year to increase a program scheduled for termination in 1972.

It seems to me he assumes quite a bit in making this statement. From what I can detect, Congress is not about to terminate urban renewal programs.

Again and again in the area of water and sewer grants, I have been rebuffed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Again the Department is holding back \$200 million in appropriations with the explanation, "We do not intend to accelerate a program scheduled for termination." These are but two examples of how the Department and the administration are using the funds appropriated by Congress in an out-and-out power play to influence votes on the various revenue sharing measures. The need of the cities and towns for funds is immediate and they will not take a back seat while the administration plays politics with needed funds to influence votes on legislation which has a very slim chance at best of passage some time in the distant future. The Members I have had contact with of late surely have not been favorably impressed by these tactics.

Today, in short, I want to associate myself with the Members of the House from the Speaker on down who have protested vigorously the administration's impounding of funds and trust it will not be necessary to go into the constitutionality of this question before the administration sees the errors of its ways and releases these funds forthwith.

#### A RESPONSIBLE VIETNAM VETERAN SPEAKS

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a former Army lieutenant, who has honorably concluded his service in Vietnam as well as in the military service.

Former Lt. Roger L. Williamson of Columbus, Ohio, whom I have known personally since he was about 10 years old, wrote to me about the Calley trial and conviction.

It is refreshing to have the views of a responsible young man who has experienced conditions nearly identical to those of all combat Vietnam veterans, and I am happy to share his thinking with the other Members of Congress, as well as the Nation. Mr. Williamson's letter is as follows:

LAUREL, MD.,  
March 29, 1971.

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE,  
Sam Rayburn Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DEVINE: The following thoughts were generated upon hearing the fate of a fellow Viet Nam Veteran, Lt. William L. Calley, Jr. . . . :

Military justice is no longer in existence in our country. Lt. Calley was the Army's scapegoat for a common occurrence in the Viet Nam Conflict—the killing of "innocent" civilians.

I called in my share of air strikes, helicopter gunship raids, mortar fire, and artillery fire. Each time that I employed these weapons, I directed their fire into areas which may have contained "innocent" civilians. In many cases, I never learned of their fate.

However, during my tour of duty in Viet Nam during 1969, I did see the seemingly

innocent faces of the deceitful "innocent" civilians in Phu Hoa Dong (pronounced "foo waa dong"), III Corps, RVN, during the cordon and search of January, 1969. Those same "innocent" civilians were feeding and assisting the Viet Cong and NVA soldiers who passed through their village for years during their infiltration into Saigon from the north. During the search of Phu Hoa Dong, one middle-aged woman denied any knowledge of the NVA or Viet Cong having passed through the area. But, when told to move from her seat upon a wood pile, she resisted. Under her was found a Chinese machine gun. And these were "innocent" civilians. There are no innocent civilians in all of South Viet Nam in the eyes of any U.S. infantry soldier who has been there.

As U.S. soldiers, we were trained to question the actions and motives of all Vietnamese people, regardless of their age, sex, or apparent good intentions. We were also told that everyone was the potential enemy.

A classmate of mine from Officer's Candidate School at Fort Benning, Georgia, was told that he would not go to Viet Nam because he looked too much like "one of them." Lt. Yoshino is an American of Chinese parentage. But, looks are too deceiving; and one cannot accurately identify a person's true nationality, political views, or innocence by his physical characteristics.

While living and working with the Vietnamese Infantry as an advisor, I was aware of the fact that in our unit (2nd Bn., 7th Regt., 5th ARVN, Inf. Div.) about 5 per cent of our troops were Communist sympathizers. They could never be individually identified. However, the members of our advisory unit lived in constant fear that we could be shot in our sleep any night. It would have been so easy to roll a grenade into our bunker.

The first time I saw Vietnamese soldiers actually running from a battle with the enemy, my infantry-trained mind made me feel ashamed of their cowardliness. The leaders of this hasty retreat were thought by us to be Communists. But, in the confusion of battle, individuals were not singled out.

I can more than empathize with Lt. Calley for his actions. I was there. I was a Lieutenant who was used as a "Yes, Sir!" man for all available captains—some of whom were good tacticians, some of whom made decisions dangerous to all of their subordinates.

Lt. Calley was told to kill *all* of the people in My Lai. They were all potential enemies. The order was followed out to the letter. The stresses he was subjected to are not describable. Calley did what he was told to do under severe conditions of stress and frustration. Now he has been convicted and awaits the decision of death or life imprisonment. Totally beyond me . . .

Please, as my Congressman, make your voice heard *now!* Do not accept this decision passed upon Lt. Calley. Do everything in your power of office to get the decision reversed.

Yours in peace,

ROGER L. WILLIAMSON.

#### CONGRESSMAN MICHEL'S QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report the results of my 1971 questionnaire based on more than 15,000 responses to 10 questions which were mailed to my district in the early part of March.

By a wide margin residents of the 18th Congressional District approve of Pres-

ident Nixon's program for withdrawal from Vietnam and they also want the U.S. troops protected by American air power while the war deescalates. This is evidenced by the margin of 83 percent in favor compared to 14 percent against the President's plan for troop withdrawal, as well as 81 percent for and 15 percent against unrestricted use of air power to support the withdrawal operation.

I was particularly pleased to note that the "no opinion" responses averaged only about 5 percent per question which indicates to me that a great majority of my constituents are closely evaluating these problems and are not hesitant in expressing their views.

I include the breakdown of the responses in the RECORD at this point:

#### 1971 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

[In percent]

Question	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you support the President's plan for our withdrawal from Vietnam?	82.7	13.8	3.5
2. Do you favor unrestricted use of our airpower to support our withdrawal?	80.7	15.4	3.9
3. Do you think it's possible to maintain an adequate defense without the draft?	32.5	62.9	4.6
4. Do you favor the imposition of wage, price, and credit controls?	61.6	33.1	5.3
5. Should the Federal Government continue to develop the SST?	29.8	64.9	5.3
6. Should the entire welfare program be taken over by the Federal Government?	33.8	60.7	5.4
7. Do you favor a national health insurance program to cover catastrophic illnesses for everyone, financed by an increase in social security taxes?	36.6	59.0	4.4
8. Since motor vehicles are the biggest air polluters, should we require installation of anti-pollution devices by 1975?	80.7	15.7	3.6
9. Do you favor selective tariffs on imported products?	58.6	33.7	7.7
10. Should we continue manned space flights?	44.0	50.2	5.8

#### ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE IN WILLIAMSBURG, VA.

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include the address of the President of the United States to the Republican Governors' Conference in Williamsburg, Va.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon yesterday appealed to the Republican Governors meeting in Williamsburg, Va., to support the fundamental welfare reforms which he has proposed to the Congress. I was privileged to be present and can report the intense interest of the Governors in this growing problem, which affects all our State governments. I am inserting in the RECORD the text of the President's remarks on welfare and his proposed change of direction:

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, WILLIAMSBURG, VA.

The last time we were together we talked about revenue sharing. Our seven legislative proposals for revenue sharing have now gone to the Congress, and I would say I am more optimistic about success now than I was then.

Revenue sharing, when it is enacted, will go far toward alleviating the financial burdens of State and local government. But it is hardly enough to make such great efforts to solve these problems on one hand, while on the other we pursue policies which compound the problem. I am speaking of the present disastrous system of public welfare. Rising welfare costs are not only placing heavier and heavier burdens on the Federal budget, they are crushing our States and cities. And they will continue to do so until something is done about it.

What we need is not a tinkering with the present welfare system which would merely relocate the financial disaster areas from the States and cities to Washington. We need an entirely new approach that will reach to the reasons for soaring welfare costs, and not deal simply with the results as we are doing now.

As you know, we have an entirely new ap-

proach in this administration's proposal for welfare reform which is before the Congress. I consider it our most urgent legislative proposal, because the welfare problem, allowed to run unchecked, would soon erode the benefits to be gained from reform in other areas. The House of Representatives has recognized its importance by designating it House Resolution number one. And it is going to be White House Priority number one until it is enacted.

We in this administration have urged welfare reform for three years. We discussed it in the 1968 campaign, and the country responded—and I mean the whole country—not just the taxpayer who sees his money going down the drain, but also many of the welfare recipients who see their lives going down the drain.

While we're trying to bring some order into this chaos at the Federal level, some of you have moved on your own at the State level with the same purpose. I want especially to commend Governor Reagan and Governor Rockefeller for their efforts in this area—for biting a bullet the entire country is going to have to bite if we are going to bring the financial—and worse, the human—costs of the present welfare system under control.

The abuses in the system are not only unconscionable, but contagious as well.

It is a system which not only destroys the incentive of those who are on welfare to get off it, but attacks the motivation of those who are not on welfare—the working poor—to stay off.

It is incredible that we have allowed a system of laws under which one person can be penalized for doing an honest day's work and another person can be rewarded for doing nothing. It can happen and does happen under the present system. The person on welfare can often have a higher income than his neighbor who holds a low-paying job. Tragically, these situations often exist in the same neighborhood, side by side in the same apartment houses—and the effect is corrosive. It creates bitterness on the part of the worker. In the end, I suspect, it causes resignation—and we end up with another person on welfare.

At a time when we see all about us the problems of the disintegration of the family, we continue with a system that encourages family disintegration. A man out of work, or one struggling to support his family on a low income, sees that his family can have a

higher income on welfare—and yet he is torn by the knowledge that they cannot qualify as long as he is there. So he leaves. His children grow up either entirely without a father, or with a father who sneaks in and out of the house one step ahead of the welfare worker. What conclusion should his children draw about the morality and the compensation and the justness of a system which forces their father to desert them in order to feed them?

The fact is that the welfare establishment and system in the United States is a monumental failure. It makes the taxpayer furious. It makes the welfare recipient bitter, and it inflicts the distillation of all this anger and bitterness on the children who will inherit this land. It is a disgrace to the American spirit.

So I do not advocate broadening welfare. I do not advocate simply refining the system. I advocate a fundamental change of direction.

I do not advocate putting more people on welfare rolls as some have contended—I advocate getting more people off welfare rolls. And the way to get them off is to provide incentives and disincentives which will make them get off—while providing an opportunity for people to recapture the sense of dignity that comes with knowing that what you have, you have earned. I have been guided from the outset by that principle and I reaffirm my commitment to that principle now.

I do not believe in a guaranteed annual income. I do believe in a system which insures that a man is rewarded for working and not penalized, and I think it is a very sensible investment to insure that that reward is there in order to keep people safely out of the reach of welfare.

I advocate a system which will encourage people to take work. And that means whatever work is available. It does not mean the attitude expressed not long ago at a hearing on welfare by a lady who got up and screamed: "Don't talk to us about any of those menial jobs." I am not sure what she considers a menial job but I have probably done quite a few in my lifetime. And I never thought they were demeaning.

If a job puts bread on the table and gives you the satisfaction of providing for your children and lets you look everyone else in the eye, I do not think that is menial. But it is just this attitude that makes others—particularly low-income workers—feel somehow that certain kinds of work are demeaning. Scrubbing floors or emptying bed pans is not enjoyable work, but a lot of people do it—and there is as much dignity in that as there is in any other work to be done in this country—including my own. In the course of reforming the welfare system, we have to re-establish the recognition of that fact.

I do not think we can tolerate a system under which working people can be made to feel like fools by those who will not work. To the contrary, I think those who refuse to register for work and accept work or training should be ineligible for welfare payments, and we have written such a stipulation into our welfare reform proposal.

In addition, we have urged including in this proposal the language of Section 208 of the Social Security Act which clearly defines fraud, and establishes fines and other appropriate criminal punishment for abuses of the new welfare system.

So to those who see our present welfare reform proposal as a simple refinement of the old program, let me say as strongly as I can that this is not the case. We have no intention of measuring the success of this Nation's welfare programs by the money spent and the number of people supported. We are going to measure it by the money saved and the number of people who are given back the incentive and the opportunity to support

themselves. We are going to measure it by the dignity it promotes, and not by the dole it provides.

One of the great strengths of America has always been that we believed in the value of work—and we need a system of caring for the poor that rewards and encourages work.

Another great strength of America is that we believe in a helping hand for those in genuine need. The Bible tells us that charity is the greatest virtue—and, by charity it means love. It blesses both the giver and the receiver.

But it is not charity to maintain a system which permits or encourages human beings to let die within themselves the energies, the dignity, and the drive that give meaning and satisfaction to life itself.

It is not charity to bind human beings into a cycle of despair and dependence when with a little courage and a little imagination and a little common sense we can end this cycle.

A long time ago this Nation proudly acquired a reputation as a refuge for the tired and the poor. Those "huddled masses" who sailed into New York Harbor so they might hold their heads up again have their counterparts today in slums all over this Nation—and our task, together, is to provide a system that will help them to raise their heads in pride and dignity—a system fair to the poor, fair to the taxpayer, and true to the spirit of independence that has built America and made it great.

#### PING-PONG DING-DONG

(Mr. WAGGONER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly share the sentiment of the National Review when it says in the current issue, "if we read or hear one more time that this springtime tour of China by 15 American ping-pong players is a 'significant breakthrough', we'll throw up."

The left, of course, always the sycophant of Mao and the Chinese Communists, is having a field day in the national liberal press and on television. The campaign is to convince the American public that Mao is a nonperson, that he did not slaughter tens of millions of his fellow Chinese; that he did not turn the Red Guards loose on a rampage that almost literally destroyed the vast continent. The campaign is to convince the American people that Red China did not attack India, invade South Korea, did not foment uprisings in Indonesia and Africa, did not attack Tibet, not shell Taiwan's offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu, arm the Communists in Cuba, and did not promote insurrection in numberless Asian and Latin American nations, including our neighbor to the south, Mexico.

The interest of the left and their deluded followers is to erase history and pretend it never existed.

Membership in the U.N. is the goal, as if membership in that enunch organization will alter Red China's malignant attitude toward the world. This premise appears like Banquo's ghost in every discussion today of the U.N. membership question. It has no more substance than the shadow of that Scottish thane.

The United Nations is supposed to be, and I repeat the words, supposed to be, an organization of peace-loving nations. If we are now going to permit the seating of Communist China and drop even the pretense of being a peace-loving club, then the U.N. has no function worthy of the effort and money this Nation pours into it every year.

For myself, I say, if Communist China absolutely must have a seat in the U.N., then give them ours.

In one of the blackest pages of this Nation's history, we betrayed the Nationalist Chinese Government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek during and after World War II. The White House, the State Department, and the liberal press forced this great man to take the Communists into his government, forced him to abandon his fight against the Chinese Communists and the result was we lost the continent to Mao Tse-tung. We are getting ready to repeat the sorry performance 25 years later and attempt to breast-feed the Communist viper.

It will be, I sadly predict, a repetition of that degrading chapter of our history, but it will not have my blessing and I will not avert my eyes or turn my head while it is done. I want the RECORD to show that this was one Congressman who wanted no part of this new ping-pong ding-dong.

Two items of interest on this same subject which appeared in the press within the past few days follow:

[From National Review]

Dammit, if we read or hear one more time that this springtime tour of China by fifteen American ping-pong players is a "significant breakthrough," we'll throw up. Significant, yes; breakthrough, no way.

Consider. In Communist countries, sport—most particularly, international sport—serves primarily political purposes. The skill of the athlete, the enjoyment of the audience are strictly secondary. The chief end is the glorification of the People's Republic of Whatever in the eyes of the world, and the planting in credulous minds of the suggestion that any country that can produce such able and sportsmanlike athletes and such friendly spectators must be okay in other respects as well. The free peoples, especially Americans with their traditional belief that sport is for its own sake, are sadly vulnerable to such psywar operations.

Thus when Mao invited our ping-pongers to paddle in his parlor, the kindly old gent who leads our team hastened to opine that the Chinese had no ulterior motives at all, that they "extended to us the invitation for goodwill and good sportsmanship." And so off our innocents flew to see the sights, tour a Potemkin Village or two, drop a few anti-American remarks (one mothminded teenager on the team announced that there's "more individuality here than in the United States" and that Chairman Mao is "the greatest moral and intellectual leader in the world today"). Three handpicked American newsmen were even allowed to accompany the group.

Whereupon the press had a field day, and the Significant Breakthrough pinged and ponged its way up and down the Republic. Herblock sketched a rotund, jolly Chairman Mao jumping over a fortified tennis net. Dispatches emphasized the "warmth" and "friendliness" of the Chinaman-in-the-street. Everything, clearly, was hunky-dory. The news analysts, cheerfully conceding the point that the tour had a political purpose, hailed

China's "move away from isolation," her effort to "advance the cause of understanding between the two countries." President Nixon, known to be reassessing our China policy, volleyed by lifting our twenty-year embargo on trade with China. By some accounts, diplomatic exchanges, unrestricted trade and tourism, and peace in our time are just around the corner, now that bilateral ping-pong is at last a reality.

What this new dawn is, of course, a carefully calculated diplomatic ploy. The masters of China hope to convince the American people that we should all be friends, that only the reactionary ruling circles in Washington stand in the way of an eternal friendly game of ping-pong between us and the jolly players across the water. If Americans believe what they read in the papers, Mao and his henchmen may already have won their point.

And the ping-pong team? They lost—but those nice Chinese let them keep a little face. "Chinese Tact Lets Us Lose Gracefully," said the *N.Y. Times*. Said the kindly old gent: "They provided entertainment for thousands of people rather than trying to destroy us with a quick victory." Obviously the State Department has been lying to us all these years.

[From the Washington Post]  
PEKING PING-PONG PLOY  
(By Joseph Alsop)

In the past week or so, what is called "Ping-Pong diplomacy" with Communist China has produced a sort of euphoric delirium. The only possible comment is to suggest that everyone ought to try to see the skull beneath the skin.

As to the skin, it is very pleasant. The only rational U.S. posture has always been complete readiness to enter into relations with the Chinese Communists, the very moment the Chinese Communists wanted to have relations with the U.S. If all this Ping-Pong means that rational and equal relations are beginning to be possible, it is a large net plus.

As to the skull, it is very unpleasant. In the Johnson and particularly in the Nixon administrations, the U.S. posture towards China has always been the rational one, above-outlined. It is the Chinese who have changed posture, not the Americans. And the guts question is why they have done so.

The main part of the answer to that question is to be found on the Sino-Soviet frontier. After years of laborious and costly military build-up, the Soviets now have in place on the frontier everything that is needed for a surgical strike to emasculate China as a major power.

The surgical strike, if it is ever attempted, would have to be nuclear. Its aim would be to destroy the Chinese nuclear capability. There is no doubt at all that in Moscow, China's approaching status as a serious, quite independent nuclear power is regarded by many leaders as quite intolerable.

The wisest American analysts agree that in 1969, when the build-up on the frontier was still incomplete, the Soviets came very close to attacking the Chinese Communists. Since then, the Soviets have pulled back a bit politically, while continuing the military build up. Sino-Soviet state relations of a sort have been resumed.

That does not change the iron rule, however, that when active, costly preparations are being made to do something, important persons want to do whatever is being prepared. There is clearly a powerful faction on the Soviet government that favors making a preventive strike against China, no matter what the international cost.

Like all great governments, the Soviet government is unlikely to make any very hard and painful decision—like this one about China—until a decision is really unavoidable. The moment when it will be "now

or never!" for the Soviets will not come, in fact, for about three years.

It will come then, because by that time the increase of Chinese nuclear power will threaten to change the orders of risk for the Russians. Rather naturally, the Chinese therefore want to change the orders of risk in another direction. And they want to do this before the time of "now or never!" in Moscow, by re-entering the world community in a big way.

That is the real skull beneath the skin—the true underlying meaning of all this Ping-Pong diplomacy, and the other Chinese moves of the same sort. That does not exclude other meanings, as well, of course.

One such lies in the simple fact that Communist China is now rapidly recovering from the paranoiac spasm of the "Cultural Revolution." Father Mao Tse-tung has retired into his worship-temple, as he did after the paranoiac spasm of his "great leap forward." Chou En-lai and the chief of staff of the army, Huang Yung-hseng, are the people who appear to be really in charge in Peking.

Rational policy-making is therefore possible again. Rationality demanded an end of China's former isolation. Rationality further demands a Chinese seat in the United Nations, plus as many foreign embassies in Peking as will go there.

These are ends in themselves; but they will also serve the useful purpose of making the Soviets think a long time about it, when they must finally decide for or against doing what they have already prepared to do on the frontier. It will be an interesting gauge of Chinese apprehension about this future moment, when we see whether the Chinese Communists also want state relations with the U.S.

In simple justice, it should be added that President Nixon was mainly responsible for making the present change possible. Beginning with changes in the silly trade restrictions, he went on to the big changes in passport regulations which produced the Ping-Pong tournament. Wisely Nixon will probably go as far as the Chinese choose to go.

WARSAW GHETTO DAY

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, April 19, marked the anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto uprising. In 1943, the Jews consigned to the Warsaw Ghetto rose against the bestiality of their Nazi rulers, who were in the midst of perpetrating one of mankind's greatest obscenities—the systematic, methodical eradication of an entire people.

To many Americans today, caught up in the problems of today's world, that event 28 years ago seems a dim episode of history. That is their misfortune, for in the Warsaw Ghetto a brave people struck a blow for freedom and for the perseverance of the human spirit over misfortune, which should remain a message and a lesson for us all. There is, after all, in human nature an abhorrence for evil, and the Jews of the Warsaw Ghetto, though they died, demonstrated that while evil may prevail temporarily, it inevitably must succumb.

There is sad irony in the fact that the Jews of Europe again are faced with frightening repression. The Soviet Union, home of several million Jews, is intent upon destroying the Jewish identity of its citizens. Their culture is suppressed, their religious expression stifled. Yet, they too are opposing this repression.

Thousands of Jews are defying the Soviet Government. They are conducting a civil rights movement aimed at securing their right to exist as Jews whether in the Soviet Union or by emigration to Israel or elsewhere.

As we commemorate the bitter struggle of a not-so-distant day, we pay homage not only to those brave people who fought then, but we also affirm that never again will such a blasphemy be allowed to be perpetrated as the Nazis pursued.

BRIEFING ON STRIP MINING

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to invite Members of Congress and their staffs to attend a briefing by West Virginia Secretary of State John D. Rockefeller IV and several of his friends on the issue of strip mining in West Virginia. The time is 8:30 a.m. to 9:45 a.m. on Thursday, April 22, and the place is room 2325 Rayburn Building. Members and their staffs are invited to come either for the entire session, or to drop in at any time during the briefing which will conclude in time to go to most committee meetings.

Representative JOHN SEIBERLING of Ohio will introduce Dr. Theodore Voneida of Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, who will show a remarkable series of slides of strip mining in Ohio.

Secretary of State Rockefeller's remarks will be confined to the situation in West Virginia and State legislation, rather than Federal legislative proposals.

STRONG HEALER IN FAMILY OF MAN

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, since I grew up at Camp Hill, Ala., I was very much interested in an article of March 28, 1971, in the Birmingham News, which tells the story of a revered doctor whom I knew as a boy, Dr. Robert B. Garlington, who has given 24 years of his life to the practice of medicine in Camp Hill. It also mentions another great and good friend, a man who like his father ahead of him, Dr. H. T. Hamner, has given his life to the service of the people of Camp Hill and the surrounding area, now 78 and ill, Dr. L. H. Hamner. This article also points up the problem of obtaining adequate medical care in the small communities of our country, a matter which should be of the most grievous concern to us all. Mr. Speaker, I include the article in the Birmingham News entitled "Revered Doctor, Strong Healer in Family of Man" appear in the RECORD following my remarks:

REVERED DOCTOR: STRONG HEALER IN FAMILY OF MAN

(By Anita Smith)

Wives of some of the old-timer coal miners in Marion County remember Dr. Robert B.

Garlington. He got out of bed many times in the middle of the night to come to their homes to deliver their babies, to sit with their dying elders, to set their broken bones.

The folks in the small Tallapoosa County town of Camp Hill also know Dr. Garlington well. They have come to him with their arthritis, high blood pressure, diabetes, sick youngsters—even their family problems. Dr. Garlington has listened, treated, and healed.

Dr. Garlington's old black doctor's bag is getting a bit tattered around the edges now. In 25 years of practicing in Marion County and the past 24 years in Camp Hill, Dr. Garlington says he has already worn out one, maybe two, doctor's bags.

Tall, erect, white-haired and alert, Dr. Garlington is 81 years old now, and still is seeing a few patients. In fact, he made a house call for a patient Tuesday night. His wife Fay drove him to the patient's house, because Dr. Garlington says "I don't see as well to drive as I used to."

#### SCARCE FIGURE

In Alabama today, Dr. Garlington is somewhat of a symbol—a symbol of a scare figure in the rural communities. That figure is a family doctor. As some of the old-timers give up their practice, small communities find it hard to attract any young doctors who are willing to come to small towns.

"I'd be willing to give it all up now and retire, if they could find somebody to come here and take my place. I'm ready now, 'cause I've got a lot of fishing I want to do," said Dr. Garlington.

But Camp Hill Mayor H. E. Conine shakes his head in concern. He knows how many Camp Hill people depend on Dr. Garlington. He's the only doctor practicing in Camp Hill right now. The other doctor, Dr. L. H. Hamner, is 78 and has been quite ill in a Montgomery hospital.

"No, Dr. Garlington, the people here just won't let you retire," says Camp Hill druggist Francis Tucker.

The shortage of family doctors for small communities is no new problem in Alabama. But the urgency of the issue has been renewed with a new hue and cry of late in the state capital where there's talk of a new medical school in Mobile, plans for new community medicine programs in Huntsville and Tuscaloosa, and plans for new programs at the state's only existing medical school, at the University of Alabama in Birmingham. Some of the political talk not only is about how to turn out more doctors, but also about how the state is going to budget its dollars to do it in the most practical way.

#### NOT JUST SHORTAGE

In Alabama, as in other states, the problem is not just a total shortage of doctors. The problem is how the doctors are distributed, with more and more doctors going to the city. Jefferson and Mobile Counties, for example, have 44 per cent of the state's doctors, and 28 per cent of the state's population. While many rural areas have a pitifully short doctor supply.

In Chilton County, there are seven doctors to serve 26,000 people. In Cleburne County, there are only two physicians for the entire county. In Wilcox County, there are five physicians for 19,000 people. The national average for physicians in non-metropolitan areas is one for every 1400 people.

Competition for doctors is still between the cities and the small towns. Some say that Alabama is at least 1,100 doctors short right now, and even Birmingham and Mobile say they have a shortage, especially of family doctors. As one well-versed urbanite said, "Sure, we have more doctors than the rural people as far as numbers go. But look how many of our doctors are not available to give general medical care to the public—look how many are so specialized they just treat one part of the body. Look how many teach at the Medical Center and don't see many pa-

tients. And look how many are in the military."

Meanwhile, residents of small towns who love the "good, quiet life" away from the hustle and bustle of the city cannot understand why doctors will not come to them.

Dr. Jon Sanford, who at age 30 is the only doctor in Gordo and is practicing six miles from doctorless Reform, thinks he has some answers:

"I love it here in Gordo myself. But I think lots of young fellows don't want to go to small towns to practice because they've never been exposed to small town medicine. They trained in a big city, and they stay in a big city to practice.

#### NEED TO BE ASSURED

Too, Dr. Sanford says some young fellows are afraid they can't treat patients with competence if they're "isolated" miles away from a Medical Center. They're afraid they'll see medical problems they can't handle and have no other doctors to help.

"I think doctors need to be assured that they are well trained, that they can handle by themselves about 95 per cent of the cases they will see," said Dr. Sanford. "And I don't feel so isolated here . . . The UAB Medical Center is setting up more and more programs to help the rural doctor."

Dr. Sanford makes an average of two house calls a day. He says he loves getting to know his patients, and wouldn't trade the small town life which he has for himself—and his wife and three children—for anything in the world.

"I haven't really surveyed my subconscious, but I think I might get satisfaction, too, from knowing that small towns like Gordo need doctors so desperately . . . I think I might like knowing that the people like to have me around."

At the UAB Medical Center, the wheels are turning this spring for new programs to help make life easier for the family doctor in the rural town.

Beginning this week, the first group of physician's assistants in a UAB program called MEDEX begin on-the-job training with rural doctors throughout Alabama and four other Southeastern states.

These physicians' assistants are all former medical corpsmen in the military. They average 17 years' experience caring for the wounded on the battlefield, caring for the whole ship-loads of military personnel, taking care of the medical needs of military in distant spots such as radar sites in Canada.

#### HANDLE ROUTINE

The mission of the physician assistant will be to do some routine care of patients under the supervision of the rural doctor, to make the doctor's time go further. Dr. Jon Sanford in Gordo has one of these first physician's assistants assigned to train under him.

"If this idea works, we'll be able to deliver a lot more medical care to people we heretofore have had to turn down," said Dr. Sanford. "Hopefully, this physician assistant I'll have will be able to give routine care for colds, minor respiratory infections, follow-up care for diabetic patients, minor emergency work—all under my supervision."

Dr. William R. Harlan, director of UAB's new Division of Family Practice and Ambulatory Medicine, says other programs also are under way at UAB to boost community medicine.

He points, for example, to a cooperative pilot program between UAB and Lawrence County physicians, beginning this spring. UAB is providing Lawrence County physicians with teams of health workers to make the doctors' time go further and to give more medical care to more people, with some team members actually going into the patients' homes. Nutritionists, physician's assistants, public health nurses, etc., will be members of the team.

And, finally, Dr. Harlan says UAB medical

students in the future will be exposed more to rural medical practice while they're in training.

If these programs work, what kind of family doctor will be produced in Alabama for Alabamians? Will the doctor be the traditional image of the old-time doc who sits up nights holding the hands of the sick? Who leaves his office to make house calls all over the county?

"If you mean will we have a Dr. Marcus Welby, the answer is No," said Dr. Harlane. He was referring to the popular television family doctor portrayed by actor Robert Young. "Dr. Welby bothers me a bit, because he seems to have time to do all these things . . . But if you're asking will we have physicians who will be concerned about people, the answer is Yes."

#### EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, for many years I supported the proposed Equal Rights Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. I think it should have been proposed by the Congress many years ago. I heartily commend the efforts of all those who are still working so diligently and dedicatedly to induce the Congress to adopt this amendment to the Constitution. One of those who has rendered magnificent service to this great cause is Mrs. Adele Weaver, member of my law firm in Miami Beach, Fla., president of the National Association of Women Lawyers, a distinguished lawyer, and a great lady. Mrs. Weaver appeared before the Judiciary Committee of the House on March 31, 1971, and gave an able presentation in support of this amendment. I commend Mrs. Weaver's able argument to my colleagues and to all those who read this RECORD. I include Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Weaver's address in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

#### STATEMENT FAVORING PROPOSED EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT (By Adele T. Weaver)

The National Association of Women Lawyers has for many years been on record as favoring the proposed Equal Rights Amendment to the United States Constitution providing that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex.

So much has been said and so much has been written about this proposed Amendment that it seems almost unnecessary to add to the millions of words that have been expressed in its favor. I do wish, however, to take this opportunity to express the desire of the National Association of Women Lawyers that the Equal Rights Amendment be enacted during this session of Congress.

I note that this Committee has under consideration several bills, three of them being variations of the Equal Rights Amendment. With respect to H.J. Res. 35, 208 and 231, I can only say that of the three, H.J. Res. 208 seems to be preferable, essentially because of its simplicity. However, I do want to make the main thrust of our position clear, and that is, that an Equal Rights Amendment to the United States Constitution is needed.

With reference to House Resolution 916, the "Women's Equality Act of 1971", I think this is a marvelous step forward, one that we need also, but jointly with the Equal Rights Amendment to the United States

Constitution and that we need H.R. 916 as the teeth for enforcement of the Equal Rights Amendment.

This leads to the question, of course, of why an Equal Rights Amendment should be needed when the "Women's Equality Act of 1971," that is, H.R. 916, would appear to bring sex discrimination within the jurisdiction of the Civil Rights Commission, strengthen the powers of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and provide for injunctive relief against sex discrimination? The fact is, of course, that Title VII can only afford relief to women who are in employment affected by this Federal Law. Furthermore, even though the District Courts of the United States are enabled to provide for injunctive relief against sex discrimination, and even though the Attorney General is authorized to institute suits to eliminate sex discrimination in public facilities and public education, and the Civil Rights Commission is given jurisdiction over sex discrimination, and even though this bill would hopefully eliminate or prevent sex discrimination in federally assisted programs, and would insure equal employment opportunity in the hiring of state and local government employees and bring educational institutions within the equal employment opportunity laws, a tremendous segment of the female labor force would not be aided by these provisions.

Moreover, and the most important reason why we need an Equal Rights Amendment to the U.S. Constitution is for its moral and persuasive value. The provisions of Title VII, and of course, of this "Women's Equality Act of 1971" (if it is enacted) are not matters of common knowledge to the ordinary layman. The general public has no knowledge of the provisions of Title VII; the average person would not know the provisions of the Women's Equality Act. "Title VII" is a fairly esoteric term to the average layman. But he certainly does know that we have Amendments to the United States Constitution—that for example, it was an Amendment to the United States Constitution that gave women the right to vote. He also knows it was an Amendment that created prohibition and that it was an Amendment that took away prohibition. They also know that an Amendment to the Constitution provides that a President can serve no more than two terms. The average person realizes the importance of an Amendment to the United States Constitution. He knows it declares the policy and the basic premises upon which our laws are founded. For this reason alone, I think it is imperative that the United States of America enact an Amendment to its Constitution calling for the equality of rights under the law. It is the impact of an Amendment to the United States Constitution that is needed to eventually gain for women the equality of rights under the law that we desire. Without that impact, neither Title VII nor the Women's Equality Act of 1971 will ever erase the second-class citizen status of the female sex with regard to employment and the opportunity for employment, not only in the trades, but in business and in the professions.

I have in my hand a letter I just recently received from a young woman who writes on behalf of the Women Law Students of the Duke University School of Law. She informs me that despite the fact that the Association of American Law Schools has recently amended its Charter to include provisions prohibiting sex discrimination, and despite the fact that several of the country's foremost law schools have recently established policies against sex discrimination, nevertheless, women law students are still being discriminated against, and I quote, "As the number of women increases, the discrimination seems to be worse, and in this past interviewing season, it became apparent that the

law firms were becoming more subtle in their methods than ever before." Now, private discrimination against women, especially denial of equal employment opportunity would not be covered at all, of course, under the Women's Equality Act.

Obviously, even an Equal Rights Amendment will not eliminate all discrimination. It is going to take a long time to eliminate all prejudice towards the female sex in the area of employment and equal opportunity. As a matter of fact, I feel it is going to take as long to eliminate the prejudice against the female sex as it is to eliminate prejudice against the black race—perhaps longer, because not as many people appreciate the seriousness of the problem. Therefore, I urge this Committee to recognize the fact that women need to have their equality of rights under the law recognized in an Amendment to our Constitution. They need further to have those rights implemented by a bill such as H.R. 916—and they need this Congress to enact such relief in this session without further delay. This is the view of the National Association of Women Lawyers and I know that that view is shared by most other women's organizations.

Last May, it was my privilege to testify before a Senate Subcommittee at which time my remarks were limited to the legal impact of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment in the areas of political rights of women, disabilities of women, the fields of family law, divorce, alimony, custody and military service for women.

Summarizing my previous statement, let me state that there are fewer and fewer areas of legal impact that might be termed controversial:

#### 1. SUFFRAGE

At one time *Suffrage* was considered controversial. Women did not receive the right of suffrage in the United States until fifty years ago when the Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution was ratified. It is to be noted that the Fifteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, ratified 100 years ago on March 30, 1870, provided that the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state on account of *race, color or previous condition of servitude*. And the Fourteenth Amendment, ratified two years prior, designed for the purpose of insuring to negroes their rights of citizenship, has a wider meaning than it originally had and is applied to all "persons" equally, but *not* equally to *women*.

It is worthy of comment that the political, social and legal rights of women are running generations behind the rights of black people. For this reason alone, the Equal Rights Amendment is vitally necessary to insure woman taking her place in today's society. Prior to the Nineteenth Amendment, the Courts had taken the view that the status of women as citizens did not confer upon them the right to vote, and that right could be constitutionally limited to males. This first recognition of woman as a person and citizen was only achieved by a constitutional amendment, and she will achieve her potential as an equal member of our society only by another Amendment.

#### 2. JURY DUTY

The view has been taken that the Nineteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution guaranteeing the right of suffrage, does not require states to admit women as jurors. Therefore, though most states have now enacted jury duty statutes automatically qualifying women for jury duty and have eliminated the necessity of women having to volunteer for jury duty as was the case in my State of Florida until 1967, the proposed Equal Rights Amendment to the United States Constitution would make unconstitutional any discrimination against women in that regard so that any state not

yet having provided for automatic selection of persons for jury duty without discrimination as to sex would be obliged to enact such legislation.

#### 3. MARRIED WOMEN'S DISABILITIES

Many common law restrictions regarding a married woman's legal capacity and their statutory modifications have resulted in the enactment of Free Dealer laws and their equivalents. Such Free Dealer laws would become unnecessary and would be eliminated by the Equal Rights Amendment. The necessity for free dealership or free agent statutes is an anachronism in this era when the majority of married women work, generally to contribute to the support of the family, many of them being in professions and businesses requiring them to contract, to bind themselves legally, to sue and be sued, etc. The only proper questions with regard to a woman's contracts or right to contract with third parties should have nothing whatsoever to do with her marital status, but should relate only to her own personal responsibility for her contract, i.e., her own personal credit rating, ability to pay, etc.

Heretofore, only under Free Dealer laws or specific legislation has a woman been able to convey or encumber her own separate property without joinder by her husband. The Equal Rights Amendment should eliminate the discrimination against either sex in this regard.

#### 4. DOWER

It would, of course, affect dower laws or their counterparts where the equivalent right of courtesy or its counterpart is not given to the husband. There is no reason whatsoever why a married man should not have at the moment of his wife's death a right to a portion of her property equivalent to the right of dower she has in his property. In states that do not recognize dower, the statutory share of the spouse's property to which the surviving spouse is entitled should be identical. In community property states there would appear to be no problem that cannot be solved by some form of the community system of property, assuming that there is no discrimination as to sex. Generally, the effect of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment would be to eliminate any discrimination whatsoever in the area of the right to convey or encumber one's separate property and the right to dower, courtesy, community property or an equivalent right of inheritance between the spouses.

#### 5. RIGHT TO SUPPORT

Generally, the support of a wife or child is the legal duty of the husband and father, and some states even make it a criminal offense for a husband to withhold support from his wife or child. Yet courts have consistently interpreted the obligation of the husband to support his wife with due regard to financial conditions, earnings capacities and other circumstances of either spouse that bear upon the discharge of his obligation. The argument of some opponents of the Equal Rights Amendment that it would allow a man to escape from his obligation of support is not a valid argument. The legal effect of the Equal Rights Amendment would be to make the obligation of the husband to support the wife consistent with actual practice. Obviously, it should be the legal duty of either spouse to support the other more dependent spouse. The Equal Rights Amendment in the area of child support would be to place the responsibility upon both spouses with due regard to their respective contributions to the marriage and their respective abilities to be self-supporting.

#### 6. ALIMONY

While the Equal Rights Amendment would make unconstitutional an award of alimony to a wife based simply on the ground of sex, there would be no deterrent to such an award on grounds such as the following:

(a) Her financial contributions or their equivalent in homemaking services to the marriage partnership;

(b) years of duration of the marriage;

(c) need for support on inability to be self-supporting;

(d) age;

(e) lack of education or training;

(f) lack of availability or need for services that dependent spouse is capable of performing.

Using the above or similar guidelines, it is obvious that either spouse who, having dedicated many years to the marriage partnership without remuneration and with resulting depreciation of value in the labor market, is entitled to support by the other spouse; such support or alimony should, of course, be commensurate with the need of the dependent spouse and should be based upon the employed spouse's ability to pay. As a matter of fact, these are the guidelines generally used in our courts today by judges accustomed to hearing and deciding matters of support and alimony in divorce cases.

#### 7. CUSTODY OF CHILDREN

At common law, the husband was automatically entitled to custody of his child. Gradually the concept of making a determination of custody solely "for the best interests of the child or children . . ." came into effect. Generally, neither parent has priority as to custody, although many courts follow the rule that the best interests of a child of tender years are served by granting custody to the mother, with reasonable rights of visitation to the father. An Equal Rights Amendment should have no effect whatsoever upon the existing law and practice in our courts.

#### 8. MILITARY SERVICE

Amongst other possible legal effects of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment would be the eligibility of young women for military service. While it may jolt one a bit at first to think of the young girl of eighteen being drafted, the fact is that many thousands of our young women went into the military service of their country in World War II, wore their uniforms with pride and rendered immeasurable service to this nation. There is no reason whatsoever why any healthy young woman should not serve her country for a year or two in any capacity for which she is physically, mentally and emotionally suited. No young man is required to do more. While we may not wish for our young women to be placed in hazardous battle areas, the fact remains that our military nurses are and have been subjected to such hazards. The legal effects of the Equal Rights Amendment would seem, moreover, to be beneficial not only to women, but to society generally.

I have stated before that the American woman today really does not recognize her own value as a person and a human being, and until she is accorded the constitutional right to equality under the law in every respect, she will not begin to free herself from the bondage of centuries of self-depreciation. She must assume the full responsibilities as well as the full rights of citizenship and until she does this, this great country of ours will be deprived of the benefit of the service, the brains and the talent of a half of our population—woman!

#### VIETNAM WITHDRAWAL

(Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined in sponsoring a resolution to provide that all Amer-

ican troops should be withdrawn from South Vietnam 9 months after the release of all prisoners of war.

I feel strongly that, should the Congress pass legislation expressing its will about final withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam, the adoption of this resolution would be a clear statement to the North Vietnamese that they will have to share the responsibility of establishing a timetable.

I feel that the South Vietnamese are making progress in their ability to handle their own affairs and assume the major burden of repelling the enemy from their country. President Nixon has set us on a course of withdrawal of our forces and I agree with his recent statement that one of the major factors to consider as we continue to wind down the war is the American prisoners held by North Vietnam.

By acting decisively to identify and release American prisoners of war, the North Vietnamese could insure a definite date by which our troops would be withdrawn.

Secretary Laird has stated that our troops could be physically withdrawn from Vietnam in 9 months, and I believe we should move with all possible speed to withdraw them as soon as the prisoners are released. It is also my strong belief, in accord with the President's recent statement, that we should leave no permanent residual force in South Vietnam such as we presently have in Korea.

I therefore urge that the House consider this resolution and act upon it at the earliest possible date.

#### STRIP MINING THREATENS NAVAHO AND HOPI LANDS

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there have appeared articles concerning the havoc and atmospheric pollution resulting directly and indirectly from the Black Mesa strip mining project in Arizona. Of interest are four: "Hello Energy—Goodbye, Big Sky" by John Neary and appearing in the April 16, 1971, issue of Life magazine; "Whites Say That the Navahos Have No Sacred Shrines . . ." by William Eastlake and appearing in the March 1971 issue of Earth magazine; "Power Needs Jolt a Western Scene" by David W. Hacker from the February 1, 1971, issue of the National Observer; and "Ecological Shootout at Black Mesa" by William E. Blundell and appearing in the April 13, 1971, issue of the Wall Street Journal. The cited authors all write of the destruction of Navaho lands and in particular the destruction of the Black Mesa, a sacred mountain, for the benefit of electrical consumers in Los Angeles and Las Vegas. A threat is posed to the natural beauty of northeast Arizona, and to the clean air of that State and its neighbors. The magnitude of destruction, both present and potential, is outlined in the

articles I present below for the information and use of my colleagues.

#### HELLO ENERGY—GOODBYE, BIG SKY

(By John Neary)

The tough old Southwest, a place of deceptive beauty canopied by a Cinerama sky, has always been a battleground. Long before men started in on the area, volcanoes blasted it, glaciers honed it and seas tided across it, sculpting the mesas where dinosaurs left their big-toed tracks. Civilization sets uneasily on the land even now, tentative and merely temporary, barely able to hold its own in this place. Here are bears, rattlesnakes, tarantulas as big as hand grenades, cactuses tough enough to spike through a \$20 boot. Here are pale scorpions fond of cuddling into sleeping bags away from the night chill and gangs of crazy coyotes that scream into your dreams like sad lost banshees in the mountain dawn. This old land has always scaled men down fast—those foolish enough to fight it—and it abounds in mocking reminders of the arrogant intruders who wandered in looking to conquer it: some broken armor, some potsherds, some battered icons, some flaked flint points. Coronado was here hunting for the Seven Cities of Cibola; others since have come looking, too, with more luck, finding gold, silver, copper, lead, uranium and oil. But the land prevailed.

In recent years a new generation of seekers, outfitted with equipment that would dwarf Coronado's armada, has arrived to harvest no such glittering booty. They are after coal to fuel the enormous electrical generating plants they are constructing nearby. And what burning that coal does to the air will change the look of the land forever.

My friend Rex Arrowsmith, geologist and Indian trader, knows intimately the old conflicts and the present struggles. In his shop in Santa Fe, crowded with pieces of Spanish harness and worn carbines, polished silver and old smooth turquoise, Arrowsmith showed me a thick study by the Arizona Bureau of Mines reporting the presence of an estimated 20 billion short tons of coal at Black Mesa, near where the four corners of New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado and Utah meet.

Hello, energy. Goodbye, big sky.

One crisp morning last fall in Los Alamos, N. Mex.—which is some 7,000 feet above sea level, about 30 miles north of Santa Fe—I walked out into the backyard of my in-law's house where I have visited off and on for the past 12 years. I walked down through the big pines, scuffing through the thin mantle of needles that carpeted the soft tuff rock, toward the rim of the little canyon at the foot of the lot. Accommodating the profusion of nature—the ornate detail of tree bark, and the delicate hue of a lichen rock, the astounding blue sky through the grainy etched tapestry of the trees—takes as much getting used to as does breathing the thin sharp air. I stopped at the rim and looked out across the Rio Grande valley to the Sangre de Cristos mountains, 40 or 50 miles to the southeast. And it was not the way it used to be.

When I first came out here from the East a dozen years ago it was like having the bandages taken off after an eye operation. As I stepped out on the platform between cars on the Super Chief rolling into Lamy, the bright red soil and the brilliant green sage slammed my vision with a clarity and force I'd never seen before. Folks back home who'd never been here, I realized sadly, grew up and died without ever having really seen. Then, you could stand where I was standing now and make out every detail on those massive mountains, just as, from the slope above Los Alamos after sundown, you could see the twinkling lights of Albuquerque about 55 miles away.

But this morning the mountains were just a silhouette in ink wash, a vague gray somberness, like the mountains in Pennsylvania or West Virginia. Above the tips of the pines across the canyon was just a hint of a heavy grayness, that same darkening of tone you can see looking from the Atlantic toward Long Island and New York City—a shadowy, smudgy cobweb of smog lying on the horizon.

Standing here on the mesa where Los Alamos is, on the edge of Pajarito Plateau, you now realize that you know something absolutely awful: that very same dark miasma, that overhanging penumbra of soot and dirt and ash and photochemical smog, stretches all the way now. All the way across the North American continent. All the way from the lip of the Atlantic across the Alleghenies and the Piedmont, across the prairie, over the Rockies and beyond, to the Pacific ash-trays of Los Angeles and San Francisco. Now you know that the last stretch of wide-open space we had left, the American Southwestern skyscape, is gone, too.

I met Jack Loeffler, a writer who lives on a low bluff outside Santa Fe; his living room window gives onto hundreds of square miles of forbiddingly lovely terrain, fenced in only by the mountains. "I've been looking out that window for four years," Loeffler said, "and that view diminishes annually."

This rather subjective determination by Loeffler and me, that we couldn't see as far as we used to, has been reached by a more expert observer, Joe Devaney of Los Alamos. Devaney, a physicist who likes to fly his own plane, noticed the visibility of the area was deteriorating when, one day in 1966 on his way back from a hop to the Grand Canyon, he glanced down at where his instruments said the city of Farmington, N. Mex., should have been. No Farmington. Devaney's watch was right and so was his math; the problem simply was that thick blanket of heavy smoke covering the earth beneath his wings, pouring out of the stacks of the new electric plant at Fruitland, not far from Farmington.

Curious as how far the smoke went, Devaney proceeded to follow it. "I'd been flying around like a guy born into money," he marvels now. "We had clean air—the cleanest air possible. Before '66 the curvature of the earth was the limiting thing. We could see 120 miles and more at 10,000 feet. Last summer visibility at Los Alamos dropped to as low as seven miles."

The Fruitland plant, Devaney discovered, was filling up the vast natural basin between the Rockies and the Jemez Mountains like a backed-up bathtub drain, and the area's winds were sloshing the smoke around all the way from Taos to Albuquerque. Worse, Devaney discovered, much of the smoke is made up of tiny, submicron-sized particles of fly ash which, unlike the heavier chunks that settle quickly to the ground, stay in the air for days, weeks, months, perhaps even longer.

Joe Devaney decided to do something about this situation. First he shot pictures of the effects of the smoke upon the vistas he saw through the windscreen of his plane, and he showed the pictures to any audience he could persuade to sit still. Then he began speaking to "anyone who would give me a hearing"—which meant two trips to Washington to buttonhole New Mexico's congressional delegation, 15 trips down to the state legislature and uncounted evenings before local service clubs. Devaney totes up his success to date: "Zero, or nearly so."

Despite his efforts—and he was joined by such groups as the John Muir Institute, the Sierra Club, the League of Women Voters, the Central Clearing House and the Black Mesa Defense of Santa Fe—Devaney and his fellow antimoggers see Southwestern air pollution increasing. To understand exactly how this can be so, it is necessary to head north from

Los Alamos, to take a look at the Fruitland plant.

The odometer read 7440 when I first spotted the plume of smoke from the plant, just after I had passed the Huerfano trading post near the turnoff to Chaco Canyon. But it was not until another 50 miles had passed that the plant itself came into view. You get to it by driving down the narrow two-lane black-top through Fruitland, under the drooping willows and cottonwoods, past the yellow-blooming chamis and the roadside stands aglow with heaping baskets of Golden Delicious apples. Then across the skinny little San Juan River and head up the hill onto Indian land. Here, on the Navajo reservation, lies the black magnet that has drawn the power company: coal.

Thirty miles off to the west sits Shiprock, high as the Empire State Building, an ancient landmark for travelers across these badlands. Today, however, it is as dimly visible as the towers of Manhattan's Battery in the harbor smog, because Shiprock is awash in the drifting smoke from the coal-burning power plant's stacks. Nearly 300 tons of coal ash a day come floating up out of those stacks, the unfortunate by-product of the manufacture of 2,085 megawatts of electricity for consumers in Albuquerque, Phoenix, El Paso, Tucson and Los Angeles (where, ironically, such a plant could not now be built).

For many of the Navajo Indians, who own the land upon which it sits, and their paleface neighbors, the plant is a welcome newcomer to the area in spite of all the smoke. The reason is simple: money. Informed of the fact that still another plant was to be built nearby, the Farmington *Daily Times* rejoiced on its editorial page: "Whee! We'd like to add our reaction to the news that there's going to be another mammoth power plant in this area. An \$11-million-a-year payroll for 450 workers, which is the estimate during construction, will be a welcome stimulant to our economy, as will the more than half-million-dollar payroll after the plant goes into operation. That's what we call progress—and we're all for it. Whee, again!"

Still more plants are projected for the vast region surrounding the "Four Corners" area. A single mine, atop Black Mesa, will supply coal for two plants, one at Page, Ariz., on the shore of Lake Powell, and another named Mohave on the California-Nevada border. Others are being considered for the Kaiparowits Plateau across Lake Powell and for Huntington, Utah. To assuage conservationists' fears that the Four Corners region will become another Hoboken, the power companies say they are doing everything possible to cleanse their stack emissions of dangerous matter—both visible and invisible.

For example, by the end of this year, stacks at the Farmington plant will be outfitted with new, more effective precipitators that will reduce the present fly-ash output of almost 300 tons by nearly 90%. But even with the best possible pollution controls, former Los Alamos engineer Mike Williams estimates, all six projected power plants will, when operating, be pumping daily some 2,160 tons of sulphur dioxide and 850 to 1,300 tons of nitrogen oxide (both of which are key ingredients of smog). And despite such improvements as those at Farmington, says Williams, there will still be as much as 240 tons of coal ash—only 50 tons less than New York and Los Angeles combined—emitted into the air each day. Whee!

Some Indians, unaware of both the economic and the ecologic impact of all this, are mystified by the sudden change in a landscape that had been as changeless as their legends. Buck Austin, a 64-year-old Navajo who has always lived on the windy crest of Black Mesa, paused in the building of a new hogan to tell me through a translator that Navajo Mountain—an important tribal shrine that had been visible 50 miles to the

north as long as he could remember—had simply vanished in the filthy air.

Other Indians are angry over the mine and the power plant. "It's just genocide," said one young Yakima Indian, who moved to the Southwest from the West Coast to join the fight against the power plants. "L.A. and Phoenix have more population, so if the Hopi and the Navajo have got to go so that somebody in L.A. can watch color television, that's the way it is—that's the way it's always been."

But there are other Indians, too, who suspect there might be some good in the coal mines and the power plants. Newly elected Navajo Tribal Council Chairman Peter MacDonald is one; he wants to review the leases between the power companies and the tribe to see "if there is a way to have the Navajo tribe gain as much from these operations as the coal and power companies." They, MacDonald estimates, will realize close to a billion dollars over 25 years, while the Navajos will get only \$15 or \$20 million. "That," says MacDonald, "is something the Navajo needs to reconsider."

Still, to some Indians, there are even more important things than millions or billions of dollars or the white man's infatuation with electricity. Wiry, compact Fred Kabotie, 74, mused upon this as he stood in the sun-washed showroom of the Hopi Cultural Center that he persuaded his tribe to build. Kabotie, who travels regularly to New York to advise the Louis Comfort Tiffany Foundation on the training of young artists, spoke of the danger that something called "the slurry line" will drain the water table on Black Mesa and thus parch the tribal grazing land. The slurry, an 18-inch buried pipe, will suck 120,000 gallons of water every hour from deep beneath the grazing land atop the mesa, mix it with the 660 tons of finely powdered coal and sluice it across the desert to the Mohave plant. Kabotie also wondered whether Indians will really get jobs in the mine and at the power plant.

The power companies vehemently contend they have taken into consideration all these concerns in placing, designing and operating their mines and plants. Wells to feed the slurry will go far deeper than the water level tapped by Indian herders, they say, and they have made assurances that once the coal has been mined, careful reseeded and landscaping of the strip mine area will be carried out—if the profits allow it.

But always the primary pressure is the power companies' well-justified apprehension that unless they move fast, good old Reddy Kilowatt just might not be there with the juice when some new customer throws the switch. It is a perfectly reasonable position. Says L. M. Alexander, associate general manager of the Salt River Project, a public authority charged with providing water and electricity to meet Arizona's burgeoning demands: "Our responsibilities as utilities are to make certain there is enough electricity to operate every air-conditioner, heater and other type of electrical appliance our customers may want to use. They dictate—it is up to us to respond."

It is, of course, that fearsome prospect of a power shortage and not some malevolent intent which has brought the utilities into such harsh conflict with those Southwesterners who put their land and its beauty above convenience and progress.

The electric power people and the mining companies operate under overlapping and often confusing sets of pollution controls set by federal agencies, counties and states—each jurisdiction zealously cautious lest it drive away a potential bonanza by too-stringent regulations. New Mexico's Clinton P. Anderson plans to begin holding Senate Interior Committee hearings next month to determine, as an aide puts it, "what's wrong and what will go wrong. It's mind-boggling, trying to figure out just who has done what."

It's a mess." Power companies and their opponents now appear to be heading for a courtroom resolution of their differences, irreconcilable though they may seem.

Defining the venue of the case will be difficult: local, state or federal? Which locality, which states, and if federal, then are not all of us potential jurors? Can any of us, we operators of electric toothbrushes, Water Piks, slot car sets, electric carving knives, hair dryers, lathes, television sets, divest ourselves of our complicity? Or our bone-deep stake in the perpetuation of the beauty of our own Southwest? Can any of us who can see really declare, as plaintiff and defendant pick over the venemen, that we know nothing of the case—have smelled nothing? Do we not all have a conflict of interest?

Heading out of Albuquerque one evening, I found myself driving into one of those three-ring, 3-D, cycloramic scenic extravaganzas the Southwest stages every few sunsets. It was not one of those paltry pink fizzes we exult over back on Long Island, but the kind of sunset performance you could expect from an earth that had taken a few million spins to whomp it up. It had a little bit of everything. The lights of the city lay behind me and I saw in the rear-view mirror a winking, blinking earthbound constellation of electrically powered red, gold and green—a man-made nightscape all our own. Ahead, the sunset lay on the northwestern skyline like molten iron. Far off, flat gray clouds flecked the deep orange of the sky, while nearer, a fat little smoke-puff of a rain cloud loosed a shower toward the burnt and empty land, down onto the silhouettes of tumbleweed. Venus shone brightly through the pale gray-blue of the sky above me, and a crescent moon glared through a misty cloud head directly beneath it. The layered mountains to my right were almost completely curtailed off by the storm.

It was a sky so wide my eye could not scan it, so wildly beautiful, so variegated in color and emotion from ferocious storm to gentle calm, that I could not comprehend the idea that anyone could think of selling it.

#### WHITES SAY THAT THE NAVAJOS HAVE NO SACRED SHRINES

(By William Eastlake)

Lukachukal (the Male Mountain) and Black Mesa (the Female Mountain) are the yin and yang of Navajo existence. To the Navajos and Hopis who live in the shadow of these mountains, they are sacred places. Without them, the world would come unbalanced. I went to Black Mesa to find out why we are destroying the Female with a strip mine.

This is what I learned: Coal from Black Mesa will fuel seven power plants to be built in Arizona, New Mexico and Utah. The project will destroy the environment of the whole Southwest, and with it the traditional culture of the Navajos and Hopis. We need the power plants to supply Los Angeles and Las Vegas with more electricity for tooth brushes and 20-story casino signs.

I wanted to find out how this could happen. I learned that the Tribal Councils of the Navajos and the Hopis had given Black Mesa away. The Councils were established by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1935. The Hopis, at least, did not want a Council; but the Indian Agent pushed it through. Recently, the Bureau ran another "election" to permit off-reservation Indians to vote as a means of undermining the strength of traditional Indians. The Tribal Councils, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the off-reservation Indians gave Black Mesa to the Peabody Coal Company.

Most of all, I wanted to find out how the Indians felt. I talked first with a Navajo. He wore a University of Arizona T-shirt and was well educated. He said the Peabody Coal Company is a subsidiary of the Kennecott

Copper Corporation, and that now that Kennecott can no longer make colonials out of the South Americans they are making colonials out of American Indians.

"You really believe that?" I asked.

"I do."

We talked about the difference between "traditional" Indians—those who follow the old way—and the "progressives"—those who, however regretfully, follow the white man's path.

"Will the traditionalist Indians stop the white man on Black Mesa?" I said.

"No."

We were sitting in the Keams Canyon Trading Post Cafe.

"No, because the traditionalist Indians don't know — from Shinola," he said.

"I don't think it helps very much to attack your own people," I said. "I talked to John of the Badger Clan and Chief Mina Lansa of the Parrot Clan at Old Oraibi and Thomas Banyaca at New Oraibi. They talked of the white man's insult to life. They talked of their need for the earth. They talked of a tomorrow that will not come for them. They talked of their religion that is of the earth and not of outer space. They talked of their hunger for the spirit that is Indian. They call the white man doom and they have seen the city where the white man lives and that is doom and they have felt of the spirit that dwells in the white men on Black Mesa and that too is a doom. So the traditional Indian knows," I said.

"He knows, but what the hell good is it going to do him? He gets all these statistics fed to him by white liberals. How dark the Grand Canyon will get."

Dark as death from polluted waters.

"How much smog the power plants will spew."

Because of the plants, an area extending from Southern California to the Rocky Mountains will be as smoggy as the Los Angeles Basin.

"And how much money Kennecott will get."

\$750,000,000.

"But what the Indian does not know," the intellectual Indian said, "and what the white man does not know is that the white man and the Indian are both on a space ship called Earth."

"Wait . . ." I said.

"And the white man and the young progressive Indian have entered into a compact with death."

"Wait . . ."

"And if it is not the Black Mesa they are destroying they will find another . . ."

"I was . . ."

"Because the white man and the lost Indian both have abandoned the earth. . ."

"Wait," I said, "You talk like a traditionalist yourself."

"Yes," he tapped his saucer with his spoon. "Yes, I guess." He stood up. "Jesus Christ," he said, walking away. "I guess I do."

My friend Dan Budnick met me at Keams Canyon and we began the trip to the Mesa through the spectacular Navajo Country via the Hubbell Trading Post at Grand Canyon de Chelly and the Rough Rock Indian Experimental School. Hubbell's is one of the few real trading posts left. I remembered it from the time I lived in Navajo Country. The people there were not very concerned with Black Mesa, just sad.

I continued on my way in the snow up to the Black Mesa and the Dot Klish Canyon. The snow was beginning to run black. It would run black downhill and into the water wells of the Hopis and the Navajos.

We wound and slid across the top of the Mesa, past trucks larger than houses, up to the drag line crane, which was gouging a strip thirty feet wide, fifty feet deep through the Mesa Verde formation. The overburden was thirty-five feet deep. The earth was removed by the machine with a child's play

motion, the machine eating easily into the cheap, dirty coal. The coal was lifted into the trucks larger than houses, transported through the black snow to the slurry mixer standing like a primordial, skeletal framework of the future over the sacred Female Mountain, where the coal is ground into a black slurry mix, then the monster has a diarrhea that is pumped into a black pipeline and shot westward to where it will finally arrive in the form of electricity and smoke in the power plants of sunny California. During the breaks in the gusting snow storm, you could see where Peabody had gouged and torn the piñon, greasewood, sage and rabbit brush into a miasma. . . .

Farther along the escarpment of the Mesa, before it sweeps down into Hopi country, I could see the remains of hogans that had been bulldozed down. One still stood by a long strip-mining trench, the trench sixty feet deep, leaving the hogan on a tall island.

Getting down on the escarpment we followed the flood as it made its way down to the virgin desert, to the country of power plants that use 110,000 tons of coal a day and release 283 tons of particulate matter, 1,365 tons of sulphur dioxide and 1,192,000 pounds of nitrogen dioxide.

We interviewed and we looked and after we thought we had found out what we came to find out we headed for home. On that last day, before leaving to catch my plane at Flagstaff, I dropped into a tourist trading post on the highway. The place was crowded with hippies and Indians. They were staring at each other across a pile of fake turquoise. They were dressed alike—the same Levi outfits, sandals and red bands around bobbed, Joan of Arc hair. They talked about the mine.

"What are you going to do about this?" a Hopi asked.

"We're going to blow it up," the hippie said.

"No, we're going to lie down in front of the drag line," said another.

"If they run over you," the Hopi said, "it would be squashed hippie. It's better that we lie down in front of it. Then it would only be squashed Hopi. You can always go back to Los Angeles. We got no place to go."

I got a flat tire after leaving the trading post. There were two shepherders nearby. One said in a few years all the Navajos would be dead. He said the Hopis would be dead too. He said the earth would continue in some form without The People but, he said, The People cannot continue without the earth. He said *Dine*, the Navajo's name for themselves, means The People. I said I had to catch a plane in Flagstaff. The Navajo laughed and said carefully, "How would you catch a plane?" and then he looked up at the blue sky that was heavily black-streaked from the coal power plant at Four Corners and said, "It would be a good trick." The other Navajo said his name was Young Hoski and that the old one, his father, was named Old Hoski. Young Hoski said that Old Hoski was not putting me on. He said that Old Hoski was dying and that his brain wavered and he really did believe that I was going to try to catch a plane.

"I am," I said.

"It would be a good trick," Old Hoski said.

Young Hoski said, "What are you doing here?"

"I am here for Earth Magazine," I said. Old Hoski smiled now that he knew that the white man, who was going to catch a plane, worked for the earth. It was understandable. I was insane.

"Let me tell you," Young Hoski said, "we are crazy too. We belong to the Indian background. Peabody thinks we are watching our sheep, but we are watching Peabody."

"Peabody bought a lease," I said.

"Peabody bought a war," Young Hoski said.

"I think so," I said.

"Now you will listen to the Indian under-

ground," Young Hoski said. The Old Hoski smiled at this good trick, at any white man listening to any Indian. It had not happened in the last one hundred years that he knew anything about.

"You have a horse," I said. "You could go on the horse to the trading post and fetch me a lug wrench to fix my tire."

"You could use the horse," Old Hoski said to Young Hoski. "We could use the horse to catch a plane." His crazed face smiled again at this crazed idea.

"Listen," Young Hoski said. "We Indians have lived here since anybody can remember. The Indians have fought the white man's wars since anybody can remember. This time we will fight against the white man and everyone will remember." Young Hoski paused to watch the black smoke torn from the insides of the great sacred Female Mountain that was dying.

"The whites say that the Navajos have no sacred shrines like crosses and stuff and altars. The whites say the Indians have no religion. The whites say the Indian's past is a collection of stories for children." Young Hoski's yellow eyes dropped away from the black streak. Soon there would be seven of them, seven power plants producing smoke to fall on the sacred Female Black Mesa that was being chopped up.

I remembered what the old people at the Hopi villages had told me, that the end was near for everyone. They thought it was amazing and a white man's trick that the ending would occur here where man had begun. The Hopis are absolutely certain, and so are the white scientists, that the Hopis are the longest dwelling-in-one-place mankind to be found on this continent and the Hopis believe this and Mr. Peabody believes this, and the Hopis believe that Mr. Peabody is the same dangerous animal that brought the roads and the electricity and the cars and the other improvements like modern war to the world, like smoke signals that never erase and mean nothing, and planes people try to catch, and primordial monsters that rip down sacred female mountains. This I was told by the underground Hopi people of Oraibi and this I was being told by the underground people of the Navajo.

Young Hoski got up and walked through the cloud of sheep to his plebeian horse that was tethered to a mesquite, mounted and made off for the lug wrench.

"You see," Old Hoski said in his cracked hundred-year-old voice, leaning toward me secretly, "we did not fight the white man on time. The white man said you can buy anything on time. The white man has bought death on time."

"Explain that," I said.

"I am too old," Old Hoski said. "I am too old to explain anything, but I can tell you a story."

"Tell me a story," I said.

"This story is about my father who had to catch his horse. He didn't have many horses so he had to keep what he had. The white man was stealing his horses. The white man was from Leppe. Do you know where Leppe is?"

"Yes," I said.

"My father, Hoski Nez, caught his horse by killing the white man from Leppe. That solved the problem."

"But you can't go on killing," I said.

"Why not?" the Old Hoski said. "It is a simple solution."

"Me?"

"Why not?" He repeated the words in a cracked voice. "You are a white man on Indian land."

"But I have come to help."

"Every white man comes to help." As he said this Old Hoski stood up and I stood up and he took a knife from his belt and he felt along the edge with his thumb and said, "I am not going to kill you now." And then

he said, "But I wanted you to know what was in my heart for the white man."

"I have been to the Black Mesa," I said, "and I know what is in your heart."

Then the knife fell to the ground. I picked it up and handed it to him and the knife fell to the ground again. I would leave it this time.

"It's only a knife," he said. "Is it true about the black smoke?" he said.

He had blind eyes as well as shaking hands. "Yes," I said, "it's true."

"Is it true," he said, "that the white man is killing himself?"

"Yes."

He seemed to hover his hand out and I took it. He grabbed me with a firm grip. Nothing was shaky now as we stood there together. Together the last and final witness to the death of a planet. Standing against the implacable blue, isolate, catching, both catching, the last look of Female Mountain, my eyes sharing with him through joined hands the last stand of Black Mesa in death, bleeding and alone.

#### POWER NEEDS JOLT A WESTERN SCENE

(By David W. Hacker)

Californians are reaching into the arid, desolate, timeless, Indian lands of sweeping vistas in the Southwest to satisfy their hunger for electricity.

High-tension lines plod across the landscape. Service roads slash through the area. Smokestacks finger into the clouds. And carpets of smog unroll across the sky.

The pollution issue, in fact, is more than a small cloud on the horizon. One of the seven plants planned by 1977 for the new Western power grid has been operating since 1963 at Fruitland, N.M. It is the Four Corners plant, and it has been called the world's biggest single polluter.

This plant burns 22,000 tons of coal a day, and though the plant tries to control its fly ash, 300 tons of dust escape into the air every day, and so do 290 tons of sulphur dioxide and 220 tons of oxides of nitrogen.

So spectacular are these emissions that a satellite photograph in 1966 showed a plume from the Four Corners plant hovering over an area of 10,000 square miles.

The Arizona Public Service Co. has promised to clean up its Four Corners smokestacks by Dec. 31, by controlling most of the fly ash. Conservationists, however, are concerned over the other six plants. If the plants aren't tightly controlled the worriers say a smog blanket could extend from Denver to the Pacific Ocean and from Mexico to Wyoming.

The Central Clearing House of Santa Fe, a conservationist group, is fighting this array of super power plants. One of its members, Terrence Moore, a free-lance photographer, says the burgeoning power plants are "exterminating or messing up one of the nation's most culturally rich and esthetically beautiful areas."

Mr. Moore used to live in Santa Fe, 175 miles from the Four Corners plant, and he recalls, "I used to get up in the morning and see a brown layer that was at least 50 miles long out of my living room window." Then he moved south to Albuquerque, where, he says, the smog situation is just as bad."

Last November, the Mojave electric-power plant in southern Nevada, across from Bullhead City, Ariz., went into operation, and this introduced another environmental threat. This plant is being fed by coal from the Black Mesa in northeastern Arizona. The Peabody Coal Co. has leased 64,858 acres on Indian reservations from the Navajo and Hopi tribes. Over 35 years, Peabody plans to strip 337,000,000 tons of coal from open mines.

The company promotes its "Operation Green Earth." Says Peabody in a brochure on the Black Mesa operation, "Peabody is required under its lease to return Black Mesa

to the tribes in as good condition as received, except for ordinary wear, tear, and depletion incident to mining operations."

Peabody sluices the crushed coal to the Mojave plant through a 275-mile underground pipeline, and will use a \$40,000,000 railroad to feed another power facility, the Navajo power plant, when it opens up 80 miles away at Page, Ariz.

There, on the shores of Lake Powell, the Colorado Plateau's most serious problem may occur, according to Mike Williams, a former engineer for the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory. He says that, under present regulations, when the two planned power plants are built, they will discharge into the air a total of 1,109 tons of sulphur dioxide a day, 113 tons of fly ash, and up to 735 tons of oxides of nitrogen.

Comments Mr. Williams: "Thus, in what used to be wide-open spaces, we will have more sulphur dioxide than [emitted] in New York City, more dust than in Los Angeles, and oxides of nitrogen comparable to those emitted by all the autos of Los Angeles." Mr. Williams points out that "Los Angeles considers its problem with nitrogen dioxide so severe that it has banned any further construction of large fossil-fuel power plants."

Peabody's five deep wells in the water-short area are causing concern too, though the company insists the Indians' water from shallow wells won't be disturbed. The U.S. Geological Survey says, however, that over a 30-year period, the water table at Kayenta 20 miles north of Black Mesa, will drop 100 feet as a result of the strip mine.

This budding complex of super power plants is supposed to help out the impoverished Indians and bring industry. Peabody will hire about 100 Indians, and pay them \$1,000 a month each.

The two tribes will get about \$3,000,000 a year in royalties at the rate of 25 cents a ton of coal. There are 120,000 Navajos and 5,000 Hopis, and this figures out to about \$24 a person a year.

Besides these concerns, Mr. Moore and his Friends of the Earth workers in Santa Fe worry over what the mine operation and huge power plants will do to the quality of the water. There will be some acid drainage from the mines, and sulphuric acid created by the power plant emissions will wash out of the sky in greater and greater quantities. Eventually, it may seep down to the water table.

In a flyer passed around the reservations, one Navajo laments:

"When the last of the coal is gone, the plants will stop, the money will stop, and then the land will be dead. The sun will be dim. The water will stink. Will the grass be gone? Will the people still know how to walk in beauty?"

#### ECOLOGICAL SHOOTOUT AT BLACK MESA

(By William E. Blundell)

BLACK MESA, ARIZ.—In the clear air the country below is visible for 50 miles, red rock bluffs fading away to the north, canyons hiding the ruins of cultures that flowered and died before Columbus sailed. These are sacred lands, literally the center of a universe.

They are also becoming the center of what may be the most significant environmental struggle of the decade.

The power shovels of Peabody Coal Co. bite into a small part of the mesa now. It is a strip mining operation, a technique that is bitterly resented by many traditional Indians, those who follow the old ways. "It is prophesied that the Indians will have their lands confiscated or ruined, by force or by lies, and that the Hopi lands would be the last to go," says David Monongye, a leader of the Hopi village of Hotevilla. "Now it is happening to us too. It also is prophesied that if the Hopis and their friends cannot

stop this, the world will end. It will turn over. And none will survive, none."

Though controversial in itself, the Black Mesa issue is but a small part, a symbol, of what environmentalists fear is a looming disaster—the fouling of the entire Colorado plateau by pollutants from six huge coal-fired power plants now operating, under construction or planned in the area. Black Mesa already provides coal for the Mohave plant, which is in partial operation, and will also feed the 2,300-megawatt Navajo plant now building. The rest will use their local coal supplies.

They are dirty. Black Mesa coal has a relatively low ash content but the local coals it ranges to above 20%. But they are very cheap.

Also, by building big, the utilities and other power suppliers realize certain economies that can lower generating costs still further. (Kaiparowitz, still in planning stages, would be the biggest steam plant in the country and might generate as much as 6,000 megawatts.)

#### THE AREA OF "FALLOUT"

Great gulps of the Colorado River and its lakes and tributaries will be needed to cool these colossi—perhaps a quarter-million acre feet a year. And because of the low-grade fuel they will use, and their great size, they will be polluters on a grand scale; none would be permitted to operate in New York and certainly not in Los Angeles, which will get a healthy share of the power they generate. Their area of fallout, as it were, may include six national parks, including the Grand Canyon; 28 national monuments; the big national recreation areas of Lake Mead and Lake Powell and the historic Indian lands of the Southwest.

So the stage seems to be set for the familiar old ecology shootout. Over here, in the black hat, industry, greedy, rapacious, insensitive as stone to everything but the bottom line on the income statement. Over there, in the white hats, the conservationists, bent on heading off black hat before he shoots up the town.

There are plenty of white hats, ranging from the battle-wise platoons fielded by the Sierra Club to informal outfits like the grandly titled Black Mesa Defense Fund, which consists of three men working out of a donated office in Santa Fe, a couple of girls who help out and a big black dog.

But this melodrama lacks a clearly identifiable, hissable villain. The struggle basically involves two groups of honest men with different sets of values, not robber barons and butterfly chasers. If the conflict proves any thing at all, it is the correctness of Pogo's message: "We have met the enemy and he is us."

Jack Pfister, an executive with the Salt River Project, an Arizona power and irrigation agency that will manage the Navajo plant, puts it this way: "Sooner or later, everyone is going to have to realize that we have to pay some environment price to live in the way we've grown accustomed to live. Maybe this is where and when we learn what the price, the tradeoff, is going to be."

The utilities have been forced into the open spaces of the Southwest by a combination of social and economic considerations difficult to resist. They face huge projected increases in power demand that far outstrip present capacity. They are increasingly unwelcome at home. Authorities in the Los Angeles area, for example, have again and again scotched plans for fossil-fuel plants in the inversion-prone basin and have rejected nuclear plants on safety grounds.

Fuel is a factor too. Several years ago the utilities foresaw a shortage in the natural gas and low-sulfur oils that could permissibly be burned in metropolitan areas, and they looked to the untapped coal reserves of the West.

For efficiency, they decided to build big plants, with several suppliers sharing the cost and the output. In this regard they were right in line with the desires of the Sierra Club; the conservationist group has long favored big regional facilities outside of metropolitan areas.

Water came into play. The plants needed coolant and the only large supply in the area was the Colorado River system. Then came politics. Says Mr. Pfister of the Salt River project: "When we were looking for a place to put what later became the Navajo plant, a lot of influential Arizona leaders made it pretty clear they wanted that plant to stay in Arizona; the state wanted that tax base. And the Navajo tribe wanted the plant so they could get jobs. The only feasible place left was where we put it"—at Page, near Lake Powell. Howard Allen, vice president of Southern California Edison Co., says Nevada officials were similarly solicitous when Edison, which manages Mohave, was settling on a plant site.

#### UNWANTED IN THE CITIES

So the utilities, unwanted in the cities, moved out to the country where the population is thin—and now stand accused of grossly polluting or preparing to pollute the scenic wide open spaces.

The environmentalists are not without appreciation of their foe's plight. This, of course, has not prevented them from waging a furious battle. Their assaults have helped prompt stiffer air pollution standards in Arizona, New Mexico and Nevada, and have prompted some companies to go a bit further than they originally intended in their commitments to pollution control.

One special target of the environmentalists has been Arizona Public Service Co., which manages the big plant at Four Corners and owns the three smallest of its five generating units. Those three pour out a cloud of pollution that makes the plant New Mexico's dirtiest and one of the nation's dirtiest as well. The ash-laden plume from the plant was visible on a photo from space as a smear more than 100 miles long, and its pollution has been tracked by plane into the Grand Canyon, half a state away.

The first three units of Four Corners, which have mechanical separators, are being fitted with new pollution control equipment that will remove far more ash; units four and five, which already have relatively efficient precipitators, will get better ones. The result, APS says, is that the plant will produce only about 30 tons of ash a day compared with 300 tons or more at full operation now.

In some cases, the plant builders have found themselves quickly overtaken and passed by advancing technology and stiffened air quality standards. "When we started to build Mohave," says Mr. Allen of Edison, "the equipment we agreed to put in was the best and met standards that for that day were stringent. But then you had the great environmental crunch and a considerable effort in technology, and between the time we started building and the time we went on line our precipitator was outdated by about 1%—and that's a lot of extra tons thrown into the air."

The result: Edison has had trouble getting Mohave to meet stiffened pollution standards, and the authorities that welcomed the company to Nevada now are citing it for exceeding permissible pollution emissions. It is a distasteful experience for Edison, which has a reputation as a far-sighted utility in the field of pollution control.

Peabody, developers of Black Mesa, also find bad publicity from environmentalists not to their liking. At a press conference last January in Phoenix they rolled out their own PR artillery, garnering highly favorable stories in *The New York Times* and *Newsweek*.

Peabody has leased the land under an

agreement with the Navajo and Hopi tribal councils. (Some of the lease lies in Navajo territory, some in a joint Navajo-Hopi area.) The councils do not represent the views of many of the traditional Indians. Particularly, a large number of Hopi view their tribal council as an invention of the white man that has no authority over them.

The old Navajo believe that Black Mesa is the body of the Earth Mother and that the power shovels are damaging it cruelly; the traditional Hopi, who have shrines on the mesa and consider themselves stewards of all the land here, say the mining is a desecration. They also believe the pumping of well water from below the mesa, for the slurry pipeline that carries crushed coal to Mohave, threatens their farms; these are in the washes on the south side of the mesa near the villages where they live.

The most ancient of these is Old Orabi, which has been continuously settled since at least 1150 and possibly long before. Its chief is a diminutive but spirited old woman named Mina Lansa, who has no use for the Peabody royalties paid her tribe. "What is money? It comes quickly and is quickly spent and gone," she says. "But the land is there forever. What good is money compared with land? If it is torn up, and if the water is taken, our people will starve."

But again the villain slips away. Peabody is going to unusual lengths to preserve what it can here; its wells are sunk deep below the surface sources used by the Indians. All the wells will be returned to the tribes. Peabody is paying what it says is the highest coal royalty ever paid on public or Indian land, 25 cents a ton. Before it begins mining a new strip, archeological surveys are made and any ruins found are excavated. It has promised to reclaim all its mine strips and is experimenting with forage plants to cover the earth left bare after grading.

And it will provide up to 300 jobs, about 75% to 80% of those available, for Indians at United Mine Workers' scale—roughly \$10,000 a year. The Indians who already are working here thus have a far different view of the project than the traditionalists. "I know they say the stuff we are putting out here is going to make smog," says Chester Interpreter, a welder. "But if it didn't come from here it'd just come from someplace on white man's land. Why shouldn't we get the money and the jobs?"

If Chester Interpreter has understood and accepted what the price, the tradeoff, for the money and the jobs will be, many of his white brothers still have not. They have raised enough ruckus to force U.S. Senate hearings on the whole Southwestern power question, in late May.

There is some sentiment now that the utilities should build where their markets are. "We made a wise decision in this part of the country. We decided to devote a lot of it to recreational use, to the Indian, to beauty. Los Angeles is not entitled to foul up all of this just so a neon sign can blink 'Eat at Joe's' all night," declare Brant Calkins of the Central Clearing House in Santa Fe, a primary foe of the power buildup.

#### BLUNTING ELECTRICITY DEMAND

Others have a wider view. They hope against hope that the relentless hunger for more electricity can be blunted by rationing, regressive rates, anything. "The real question is, are we going to continue a cultural trend, the drive to consumption that technology breeds, that is destroying the biosphere? We have to start reversing our course, and we have to start now," says Jack Loeffler of the Black Mesa Defense Fund.

The power companies contend that if all the electric toothbrushes in the U.S., all the electric knives, juicers and pencil sharpeners stopped tomorrow it would make almost no difference on the total electrical load. Industry, commerce and home heating and air

conditioning are the basic power consumers and will continue to be. And the utilities oppose the idea of zero growth or forced regression in electrical demand.

From the 1970 annual report of the Arizona Public Service Co.: "The no-growth or slow-growth philosophy is a concept that could threaten our entire economic system. It would magnify, rather than alleviate, poverty and unemployment. And it is a direct contradiction to those fundamental instincts which motivate people to compete, to acquire and to improve their way of living."

More figures, this time on the total maximum pollutants that might be expected from the six big power plants if all are built and operating at full steam—fly ash, 240 tons a day (compared with 130 tons released in Los Angeles County and 182 tons in New York City), sulphur dioxide, 2,186 tons a day (compared with 250 tons in L.A. County and 1,040 in New York), oxides of nitrogen, between 845 and 1,300 tons a day, compared with 1,050 in L.A. and 930 in New York.

That seems to be the tradeoff.

### STRIP MINING—COAST TO COAST

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in the April 19, 1971 issue of the Nation, Mr. Harry M. Caudill, Whitesburg, Ky., attorney and author of "Night Comes to the Cumberlands," warns the country of the growing baleful effects of strip mining.

Mr. Caudill, for years has been spokesman for the environmental conscience of the southern Appalachian Mountains, warns that the rapidly growing practice of strip mining coal and other minerals will irreparably destroy vast areas of the only land we have. I present this article for the information and use of my colleagues:

#### STRIP MINING—COAST TO COAST

(By Harry M. Caudill)

Some developments in recent weeks inspire a faint hope that at last—at the eleventh hour—this mineral-rich country may save itself from virtual ruin at the hands of strip miners. America is so abundantly endowed with ores and fuels, world demand for them is so great, and earth-moving technology is so efficient that strip mining—until recently associated primarily with coal and Appalachia—has become a reality or an imminent prospect for every state and nearly all counties. An ecological nightmare of unimaginable dimensions suddenly looms everywhere.

Since 1950, according to Census Bureau figures, the nation's population has swollen by more than one-third. During that time the land area has not grown by a single inch. On the contrary, the amount of land available for crops, forests, recreation and other uses has been effectively and permanently diminished. Highways, housing developments, shopping centers and man-made lakes are insatiable consumers of land, but they have the virtue of being continuously useful to large numbers of people. However, strip mining is a land use that threatens to devour the continent in a single-benefit operation. Before most urbanized Americans are aware of what is happening, the land on which they depend may have been ruined past technology's capacity to restore it.

From coast to coast the United States is marvelously blessed—or cursed—with valuable stones, clays, ores and solid fuels. Beneath the ancient and varied forests of Appalachia are gigantic coal beds, vast ledges of limestone and silica sand, iron ore, clays, marble, granite and such seldom mentioned

substances as gneiss, grahamite and gibbsite. In Florida there are huge beds of phosphate. Georgia has kaolin and Texas and Wisconsin have iron fields. Coal is abundant across the Great Plains in West Kentucky, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Iowa and Kansas. It strates the hills of Colorado, alongside immense deposits of oil shale. Low-grade coal and lignite are found under hundreds of thousands of acres in Arizona, Utah and the Dakotas. California and Nevada boast gold and silver; Arizona has copper. And nearly everywhere, sand and gravel can be scooped up for an endless variety of construction projects.

In short, something mineable can be found practically anywhere, and the pressure on natural resources is so great in our highly industrialized society that all of them are practically certain to be mined. These facts are of the gravest consequence to the nation.

The cheapest way to obtain solid-state minerals from the land is by strip mining. This revolution in the technology of earth moving has swept the world in the last two decades. A combination of nitrate fertilizer and diesel oil makes a cheap and potent substitute for dynamite. Some bulldozers now plow into the soil with blades 7 feet high, and near Cumberland, Ohio, a super-colossus looms over a devastated county like an all-consuming titan. It is "Big Muskie," the planet's largest earth-moving machine, with a boom 310 feet long and a bucket that lifts 325 tons at a gulp. Not far away in the same state slightly smaller machines, "The Gem of Egypt" and "The Silver Spade," work their way through wooded hills as easily as a hungry man devours a steak and potatoes.

In stripping, the overlying strata of soil and rock—and their flora and fauna—are blasted and shoved aside to expose the mineral. It is then loosened by explosions, lifted into trucks and hauled away. The effect on the ecology has been widely documented, but remains indescribable.

For example, in mountainous eastern Kentucky much stripping has been done for coal. A 1955-59 study by state and federal agencies compared two adjacent watersheds. The valley that remained in timber yielded 27.9 tons of silt per square mile annually. The other, which had been "disturbed" by stripping, flooded its silt basins with 30,000 tons of acid-reddened mud from each square mile!

In 1967 the Interior Department sent to Congress its little noted study, "Surface Mining and Our Environment." It reflected conditions as of January 1, 1965, when 3.2 million acres had already been surface mined. Hawaii claimed only 10 acres of stripped soil; at the other end of the scale, Pennsylvania reported a massive 370,202 acres. Coal and lignite accounted for 40 per cent of the total. An area equal to that of Connecticut had been devastated.

Congress disregarded the report and the last five years have seen an unprecedented mining boom. Today the equivalent of two Connecticut lies as maimed as Flanders in 1917.

Half the states have no compulsory laws for reclaiming the land after the strippers have finished with it, and no state enactment approaches the strict, no-nonsense requirements of Germany and Great Britain. In such ravaged states as Kentucky, Tennessee, West Virginia and Ohio, enforcement is a farce in which the industries generally select the reclamation officers.

Surface mining kills every living plant and drives out, initially at least, all wild life. It pollutes water and permanently degrades it. Most important, perhaps, it produces unnerving ugliness.

Any serious national commitment to save our deteriorating environment would treat surface mining as an exceedingly grave problem. It would outlaw stripping where prompt and complete restoration of the land to its original and natural purpose cannot be

achieved. It would require an industry to restore completely lands it is permitted to tear up, and would impose a severance tax on future mining to finance reclamation of America's ghastly backlog of plundered acreage.

The word that best fits the climate of West Virginia is "benign." Its mixed mesophytic forests have embraced and sheltered nearly all plant forms that the ancient ice shields pushed down from the north. Its 2,000 varieties of flowering plants make it a botanical wonderland without parallel anywhere outside the tropics. But all this profuse, interwoven and indescribably old web of life has been for twenty years under a brutal assault by corporations digging fuel for domestic and foreign electric power plants and steel mills, and for hundreds of chemical byproducts. The very life of the state is threatened by industrial processes that leave its splendid land as dead and piteous as the bloody carcass of a flayed lion.

West Virginia is fortunate, though, in that it has been adopted by two remarkable men whom voters have had the good sense to elect to public office. John D. Rockefeller IV—"Jay" to West Virginians—came to the state as a VISTA worker when Lyndon Johnson was building the Great Society. He stayed to serve a term in the state legislature and is now Secretary of State in the dingy capitol at Charleston. Unless his latest undertaking brings him to grief, this scion of New York's wealthiest family is likely to be elected governor as a Democrat in next year's election.

What he is attempting requires a breathtaking boldness. He has endorsed Sen. St. Galperin's bill to outlaw strip mining in the state "completely and forever," and has set off a political earthquake in the process. The bill challenges the state's vast absentee mining interests head-on in an "us-or-them" battle. Most West Virginians undoubtedly support the Rockefeller faction, but they are divided and generally inexperienced, whereas their opponents are tightly organized, unbelievably well heeled, ruthless and resourceful.

The first tactic of the mining cabal was to flood Charleston with lobbyists toting heavy satchels, and with hundreds of people who claim to make their living by strip mining. The strippers said that their activities employ 6,700 persons who support an additional 16,300 women and children. As the "abolitionists" promptly pointed out, these figures show the tiny stake West Virginians have in the industry that is wrecking their state. Even if the statistics are correct, only 1 per cent of the people derive economic benefits from stripping. Actually, if Galperin's bill becomes law, new deep mines will promptly provide employment for many times as many men—men now on welfare and food-stamp rolls. For another generation or so, Appalachian coal is an economic imperative which will have to be mined by other means if strip mining is banned as ecologically unacceptable.

The state's other good angel is its Congressman from the Fourth District, Ken Hechler, another New Yorker and a one-time college professor turned politician. Hechler brings a formidable background of achievement to the service of his constituency. In 1969 he fought through a reluctant Congress a stringent—but as yet unenforced—new federal mine safety bill. On February 18 he dropped into the legislative hopper a bill bearing the names of twenty-nine co-sponsors and designed to outlaw strip mining for coal totally and everywhere in the United States.

These bills will probably be crushed between the wheels of public apathy and industry alarm. In fact these two able and dedicated men may find themselves driven from public life by sustained, lavishly financed campaigns. In any event, their efforts provide some measure of the despair that grips intelligent people when they compre-

hend the immensity of the destruction being visited on their native soil.

The Nixon Administration has made some gestures toward control over this runaway industry, but they are so gutless as to inspire no fear among strippers and little support from conservationists. Amid an almost limitless outpouring of rhetoric concerning our deteriorating environment, the most serious of all such problems has been largely ignored. Now the true scope of our national peril is recognized by growing numbers of people in and out of office who are willing to lay everything on the line in a struggle for survival. They see, clearly and with horror, that our present methods of obtaining minerals is incompatible with timber growing, wildlife, farming, potable water, natural beauty, and continued human occupancy of mined areas. That a third of our coal, to name but one mineral, is extracted by this ruinous practice outlines the magnitude of our reliance upon it. But does a high standard of living built by such means represent progress in any real sense?

Ken Hechler's colleague, freshman Ohio Rep. John Seiberling answered the question this way: "The Romans created a desert and called it peace. We create a desert and call it progress." The desert Mr. Seiberling referred to is the only land Americans will ever have.

#### LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MURPHY of Illinois (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for April 7, 8, and 19 through April 24, on account official committee business.

To Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. CHAIMO), for week for April 19, 1971, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WALDIE, for 1 hour, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. DEVINE, Thursday, April 22, for 1 hour.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FORSYTHE), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter to:)

Mr. FINDLEY, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK, today, for 30 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN, tomorrow, for 30 minutes.

Mr. MIZELL, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio for 15 minutes, April 21.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BERGLAND), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter to:)

Mr. MINISH, today for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOWERS, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. RARICK, today, for 15 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG, today, for 5 minutes.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. MONAGAN), to extend his remarks immediately after those of Mr. MONAGAN on House Resolution 387 today.

Mr. MICHEL, and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FORSYTHE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RAILSBACK.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. ROBISON of New York.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. REID of New York.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. DENNIS in three instances.

Mr. LANDGREBE in two instances.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. ZWACH in two instances.

Mr. MCCLORY.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.

Mr. BELCHER.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. KEMP in four instances.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas in five instances.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. SCHERLE in 10 instances.

Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.

Mr. MCCLURE.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. RHODES in five instances.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BERGLAND) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. DRINAN in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. DENT in two instances.

Mr. MONTGOMERY in two instances.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. ROYBAL in 10 instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. CARNEY.

Mr. SEIBERLING in 10 instances.

Mr. OBEY in 10 instances.

Mr. STOKES in two instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. DOWNING in two instances.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.

Mr. KLUCZNSKI in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. LINK.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mrs. ABZUG in three instances.

Mr. KAZEN.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.

Mr. BLATNIK in two instances.

Mr. BOLAND in two instances.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts in four instances.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in four instances.

Mr. TIERNAN in two instances.

Mr. FISHER in three instances.

Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

Mr. EDMONDSON in three instances.

Mr. FLOWERS in three instances.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 21, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

599. A communication from the President of the United States, proposing supplemental appropriations for fiscal years 1971 and 1972, together with a letter from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (H. Doc. No. 92-92); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

600. A communication from the President of the United States, proposing amendments to the request for appropriations and other provisions for the fiscal year 1972, together with a letter from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (H. Doc. No. 92-93); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 2598. A bill to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 2600. A bill to equalize the retirement benefits for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are retired for permanent total disability; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 5765. A bill to extend for 6 months the time for filing the comprehensive report of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia; (Rept. No. 92-130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6417. A bill to reduce the number of class A retailers' licenses issued and outstanding under the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverages Control Act, to establish the number of such licenses that may be issued and outstanding under such act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 388. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2166. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 92-133). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 389. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 5674. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 to provide an increase in the appropriations authorization for

the Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse; (Rept. No. 92-134). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 390. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 6444. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 10 percent increase in annuities; (Rept. 92-135). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NIX: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, H.R. 135. A bill to provide for periodic pro rata distributions among the States and other jurisdictions of deposit of available amounts of unclaimed postal savings system deposits, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 92-136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 2894. A bill to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America; (Rept. No. 92-129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6105. A bill for the incorporation of the Merchant Marine War Veterans Association; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. ZABLOCKI, and Mr. CAREY of New York):

H.R. 7507. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 50-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder, with the resulting benefit costs being borne equally by employers, employees, and the Federal Government, and to raise the amount of outside earnings which a beneficiary may have without suffering deductions from his benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 7508. A bill to enlarge the Sequoia National Park in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 7509. A bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a Student Loan Marketing Association; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 7510. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a program of grants to medical schools to provide scholarships to students who will provide service to communities determined to have a shortage of and need for physicians; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7511. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first \$5,000 of the income of a retired teacher shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 7512. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage rate required under that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 7513. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 7514. A bill to require no-fault motor vehicle insurance as a condition precedent to using the public streets, roads, and highways, in order to promote and regulate interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 7515. A bill to assist school districts reduce crime against children, employees, and facilities in the elementary and secondary schools by providing financial assistance for the development and implementation of locally approved school security plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 7516. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 7517. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7518. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which a taxpayer may elect to exclude gain from the sale of his residence from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 7519. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to continue and broaden eligibility of schools of nursing for financial assistance, to improve the quality of such schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STOKES:

H.R. 7520. A bill to amend section 403 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to allow reduced-rate air travel for airport employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 7521. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that individuals be apprised of records concerning them which are maintained by Government agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 7522. A bill to regulate interstate commerce and to provide for the general welfare by requiring certain insurance as a condition precedent to using the public streets, roads, and highways in order to have an efficient system of motor vehicle insurance which will be uniform among the States, which will guarantee the continued availability of such insurance, and the presentation of meaningful price information, and which will provide sufficient, fair, and prompt payment for rehabilitation and losses due to injury and death arising out of the operation and use of motor vehicles within the channels of interstate commerce, and otherwise affecting such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7523. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for more effective control of aircraft noise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7524. A bill to assist in reducing crime by requiring speedy trials in cases of persons charged with violations of Federal criminal laws, to strengthen controls over dangerous defendants released prior to trial, to provide means for effective supervision and control of such defendants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 7525. A bill to revise the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7526. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act in order to assure re-

habilitation services to older blind persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7527. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 7528. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7529. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to continue and broaden eligibility of schools of nursing for financial assistance, to improve the quality of such schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7530. A bill to protect ocean mammals from being pursued, harassed, or killed; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 7531. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pension of \$125 per month to World War I veterans, subject to a \$2,400 and \$3,600 annual income limitation; to provide that retirement income such as social security shall not be counted as income; to provide that such pension shall be increased by 10 per centum where the veteran served overseas during World War I; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.R. 7532. A bill to establish a Criminal Justice Reform Administration in order to provide assistance to encourage States and localities to undertake comprehensive criminal justice reform in order to strengthen police protection, improve the prosecution of offenders, expedite overcrowded court criminal calendars, and strengthen correctional systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7533. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 20 to 10 years the length of time a divorced woman's marriage to an insured individual must have lasted in order for her to qualify for wife's or widow's benefits on his wage record; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 7534. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a special program of transportation research and development utilizing the unique experience and manpower of the aerospace industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 7535. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, to exclude from coverage by the act every household which has a member who is on strike, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. SEBELIUS):

H.R. 7536. A bill limiting the use of publicly owned or controlled property in the District of Columbia, requiring the posting of a bond for the use of such property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 7537. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record, to eliminate the special dependency requirement for entitlement to husband's or widower's benefits, to provide for the payment of benefits to widowed fathers with minor children, and to make the retirement test inapplicable to individuals with minor children who are entitled to mother's or father's benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7538. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of regular widower's insurance benefits (actually reduced the same as widow's benefits) at age 60, and to eliminate the special dependency requirement for entitle-

ment to widower's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 7539. A bill to amend section 274 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to allow the imposition by a State of more restrictive standards relating to the discharge into the navigable waters of the United States of radioactive materials; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7540. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase by 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 7541. A bill to provide that Interstate Route 80 shall be known as the 80th Division Memorial Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H.R. 7542. A bill to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 to provide that all passenger train discontinuances must be in accordance with the provisions of section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7543. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER (for himself, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. MCKEVITT, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. CORDOVA):

H.R. 7544. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands shall each be represented in Congress by a Delegate to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCLODY:

H.R. 7545. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code in order to provide that committing acts dangerous to persons on board trains shall be a criminal offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. DENT, Mr. DOW, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ELBERG, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NIX, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 7546. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that cosmetics containing mercury or any of its compounds bear labeling stating that fact; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURTON, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. HATEAWAY, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. PODELL, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. HAWKINS):

H.R. 7547. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that cosmetics containing mercury or any of its compounds bear labeling stating that fact; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 7548. A bill to provide for comprehensive management of the Nation's forest

lands through the application of sound forest practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NIX (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BADDILLO, Mr. BRESTER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MELCHER, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REES, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 7549. A bill making an appropriation to provide support for the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer support program for the summer of 1971; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. NIX (for himself, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. RYAN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 7550. A bill making an appropriation to provide support for the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer support program for the summer of 1971; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. NIX (for himself, Mr. KOCH, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. REES, and Mr. BURTON):

H.R. 7551. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the life and work of a man of peace, Martin Luther King; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H.R. 7552. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 7553. A bill to provide for a program of Federal assistance in the development, acquisition, and installation of aircraft anti-hijacking detection systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 7554. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to continue and broaden eligibility of schools of nursing for financial assistance, to improve the quality of such schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BYRON, Mr. COTTER, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GROVER, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HULL, Mr. KING, Mr. MCKINNEY, and Mr. MITCHELL):

H.R. 7555. A bill to protect ocean mammals from being pursued, harassed, or killed; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. POAGE, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. SLACK, Mr. STEELE, Mr. TERNAN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. GALFANAKIS, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 7556. A bill to protect ocean mammals from being pursued, harassed, or killed; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 7557. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Lincoln Home National Historic Site in the State of Ill-

nois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 7558. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971-72; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 7559. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exempt from the overtime penalty any employee of a retail or service business who receives at least twice the minimum wage for all hours worked; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 7560. A bill limiting the use of publicly owned or controlled property in the District of Columbia, requiring the posting of a bond for the use of such property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 7561. A bill to eliminate percentage depletion deductions after cost has been recovered; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 7562. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit an employer corporation to establish a plan under which its employees may purchase and hold stock in such corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 7563. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to make all elementary and secondary school students eligible to participate in followthrough programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLANTON:

H.R. 7564. A bill to limit the sale or distribution of lists of names or addresses of persons for the purpose of commercial solicitation by Federal agencies, States, or private persons; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD (for himself and Mr. BROVHILL of North Carolina):

H.J. Res. 557. Joint resolution expressing a proposal by the Congress of the United States for securing the safe return of American prisoners of war and the accelerated withdrawal of all American military personnel from South Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.J. Res. 558. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning October 10, 1971, as "National Records Management Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. BELL, and Mr. BURTON):

H.J. Res. 559. Joint resolution to establish the Tule Elk National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H.J. Res. 560. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. LANDGREBE, and Mr. ASHBROOK):

H.J. Res. 561. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to freedom from forced assignment to schools or jobs because of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.J. Res. 562. Joint resolution instructing the Secretary of the Interior to call for an international meeting on the preservation, con-

servation, and protection of endangered species of fish and wildlife; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLANTON (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee):

H. Con. Res. 266. Concurrent resolution to direct the Federal Trade Commission to investigate and study certain anticompetitive practices in the Nation's energy industries, concerning the supply and price of coal, oil, gas, uranium and other energy resources, and to report the facts obtained by such investigation and study to the Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, and Mr. CORMAN):

H. Con. Res. 267. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the House with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 268. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the proposed "proportionate repatriation" plan for obtaining the release of American prisoners held in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATRON:

H. Con. Res. 269. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the congressional intent in the enactment of the black lung benefit provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON (for himself, Mr. ROE, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H. Con. Res. 270. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that our NATO allies should contribute more to the

cost of their own defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H. Con. Res. 271. Concurrent resolution to authorize the loan of the Freeman Thorpe portrait of Abraham Lincoln to the city of Brainerd, Minn.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H. Res. 391. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to opportunities for people-to-people contact between the citizens of the United States of America and the citizens of the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H. Res. 392. Resolution on dismissal of professional air traffic controllers by the Federal Aviation Administration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROE:

H. Res. 393. Resolution to provide free Federal telecommunications system service to patients in veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 7565. A bill authorizing the President to award the Medal of Honor to Harry S. Truman; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 7566. A bill for the relief of Brother

Michael Colavito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 7567. A bill for the relief of Sgt. William T. Richardson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 7568. A bill for the relief of Duane M. Leisinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 7569. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor D. Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 7570. A bill for the relief of Jerald E. Bloom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 7571. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sheila L. C. Tompkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7572. A bill for the relief of Blagoje Nikola Zlatkovic and his wife, Nevenka Zdenka Zlatkovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 7573. A bill authorizing the President to award the Medal of Honor to Harry S. Truman; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7574. A bill for the relief of Ronald Gordon Bullen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 7575. A bill for the relief of Youngdahl Song; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 7576. A bill authorizing the President to award the Medal of Honor to Harry S. Truman; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### CLEARCUTTING IN NATIONAL FOREST LAND OF MAJOR CONCERN TO CITIZENS OF WEST VIRGINIA AND OTHER STATES—SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS HOLDS HEARINGS ON FOREST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND CLEARCUTTING—EDITORIALS SUPPORT POSITION OF SENATOR RANDOLPH

#### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the issue of clearcutting in our national forest land is becoming increasingly an issue with more and more citizens throughout our Nation.

The Forest Service, which has done limited research into the detrimental effects of clearcutting apparently ignores the evidence which suggests that nutrient values and regeneration abilities may be adversely affected by the practice. We know how it looks—much like B-52 devastation, that on many sites which the Forest Service has supposedly intensely managed there has been irreversible soil erosion and that the Multiple Use, Sustained Yield Act passed in 1960 by Congress has been violated.

Multiple use cannot be achieved if even-aged management, or clearcutting, is the policy on the general forest zone. In discussing the issue, many persons

talk only of timber production to the total exclusion of multiple use.

The Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands held 3 days of hearings this month on forest management practices, including clearcutting. On the opening day of the hearings, I testified in opposition to clearcutting. I have been active in this effort for many months. I commend the chairman, the distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), and the other members of the subcommittee for this in-depth study.

West Virginians who testified included: Ralph O. Smoot, Camden-on-Gauley, a retired professional forester; Lawrence W. Deitz, Richwood, representing the West Virginia Forest Management Practices Commission; Howard Deitz, Richwood, representing West Virginia Division, Izaak Walton League of America; David H. McGinnis, Huntington, also representing the commission; George R. Shook, Athens; Nick Barb, Parsons; and George Langford, of Pittsburgh, representing West Virginia Highlands Conservancy.

While the practice may be permissible in some areas, it should not be the policy of timber management on the general forest zone, as has been the case on the Monongahela National Forest in West Virginia since 1964. In some areas clearcutting should never be practiced except to salvage burned, diseased, or otherwise damaged timber or to regenerate concentrations of over-age decadent trees.

Since the Forest Service has refused to

change its policy, at the insistence of many citizens, the West Virginia Legislature, and Members of Congress, I again urge the creation of a National Forest Management Commission. Such an independent commission is needed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials on the subject, one from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 11, and one from the Washington Evening Star of April 16.

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

[From the Plain Dealer, Apr. 11, 1971]

#### PROTECTING THE NATIONAL FORESTS

The proposal of U.S. Sens. Jennings Randolph, D-W. Va., and Gale McGee, D-Wyo., for creation of a blue-ribbon commission on timber management in the national forests is a sound one. Lengthy hearings in recent days before the Senate Interior Committee's public lands subcommittee point up the need.

Two years ago The Plain Dealer first endorsed such a suggestion, saying: "A national study by an independent commission seems in order." We are pleased to see our views being advanced in Congress now.

The national forests are not wilderness areas nor national parks, yet they are the property of all the people. The law as written is clear that national forests should be managed so that timber harvests are replaced with new growth and that all uses—timbering, watershed protection, fish and wildlife preservation, grazing and recreation—should be protected.

Instead, the dominant interest of the Agriculture Department's Forest Service