

391. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the Surface Transportation Act of 1971; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

392. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, Mr. ROYBAL introduced a bill (H.R. 14988) to authorize grants to the Degana-widah-Quetzalcoatl University; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

228. By the SPEAKER: Petition of staff members of various Members of Congress and its committees, relative to the war in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

229. Also, petition of Robert H. Simmons, Washington, D.C., relative to establishment of a National Historical Museum Park, as proposed in H.R. 10311; to the Committee on House Administration.

230. Also, petition of Helen M. Grover, Baltimore, Md., relative to the condition of the Provident Hospital Mental Health Clinic in Baltimore; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

231. Also, petition of Sergio P. Arizala, Cataingan, Masbate, Republic of the Philippines, relative to a claim of Candido P. Mendoza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

232. Also, petition of B. W. "Swede" Davidson, San Luis Obispo, Calif., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

233. Also, petition of Albert J. Sullivan, Joliet, Ill., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

234. Also, petition of Richard Warren Bowman, Gratenford, Pa., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

235. Also, petition of James M. Williams, Minneapolis, Minn., et al., relative to impeachment proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

VOLUNTARY SUPPORT IS KEY TO ECONOMIC STABILIZATION PROGRAM

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, as phase II of the President's economic plan for our country continues to be in effect, it is with great hopes that I harbor the goals of the Cost of Living Council in developing a sound economic stabilization program.

In a recent speech by Joseph E. Mullaney, General Counsel of the Cost of Living Council, before the Printing Industries of America, Mr. Mullaney cited the compliance and enforcement aspects as being the root of success of the economic program along with the support of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I insert at this point the text of a news release on the speech made by Mr. Mullaney urging support for the Council's efforts by all parties involved:

SPEECH BY JOSEPH E. MULLANEY

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 19.—"The stabilization agencies are fully prepared and will vigorously enforce the Economic Stabilization Act and the regulations that have been issued to date," Joseph E. Mullaney, General Counsel of the Cost of Living Council said yesterday in a combined luncheon address to the Government Affairs Committee and the Wage Price Steering Committee of the Printing Industries of America at the Marriott Key Bridge Hotel in Washington, D.C.

The Printing Industries of America is the largest trade association in the graphic arts field with more than 8,000 member companies.

Mr. Mullaney gave his assessment of the effectiveness of the Administration's economic control program since its inception last August 15. He traced the purpose and results of the freeze and reported on the planning and options for Phase II, the present goals and existing structure, progress to date in compliance and enforcement, and possible future changes in the system.

Since the "future" comes fast in today's happenings, Mr. Mullaney underscored a current Council objective of real significance to printers, namely, the effort of the Council to achieve greater efficiency by relying more upon the voluntary and conscientious actions of those in the small business field to police

themselves by competition and, at the same time, strive to adhere to the policies and regulations of the Pay Board and Price Commission. Mr. Mullaney assured his audience that any future decisions, now under consideration, to exempt small businesses from the formalities of the controls system will be realistic, equitable, and helpful both to the objectives of business and Government.

The chief legal officer for the Cost of Living Council focused his remarks primarily on the compliance and enforcement aspects of the program. "If the program is to succeed, it must have the support of the American people," and, Mullaney added, "there is considerable evidence that the program has that support. We are doing our best to earn it."

"Where violations are found, we now have the machinery in place to aggressively seek out violators and to move promptly and forcefully to see that the violations are corrected."

The Cost of Living Council, a Cabinet-level agency, was created by Executive Order on August 15, 1971, to develop and recommend to the President policies and procedures to maintain economic growth without inflationary increases in prices, rents, wages and salaries. It is charged with the primary responsibility for establishing broad goals for the Nation's Economic Stabilization Program.

General Counsel Mullaney cited a few specific examples of areas now receiving close scrutiny—areas being examined to determine whether violations may exist. These are: (a) Instances of voluntary rollbacks or adjustments where there have been willful violations, where they have had a significant economic impact, and where there is a likelihood that the incident will reoccur; (b) Instances where profit margin limitations have been exceeded over the base period. In this regard, action has already been taken against some firms and, it was made clear, will be taken against all others who do not observe this requirement; (c) Instances of potential violations involving large firms failing to observe the reporting requirements. This requirement is applicable to all firms with \$50 million or more in sales and to all pay adjustments involving 1,000 or more employees; and (d) Instances involving the possibility of potential violations by retailers and wholesalers with respect to deviations from accepted customary markup practices.

After making it clear that the Government is getting tougher with willful violators of the stabilization program, with the necessary sanctions readily available for use, Mullaney, a magna cum laude graduate of both Holy Cross College and Harvard Law School concluded his remarks with the following appeal, "For those who have been harboring the thought that the Economic

Stabilization Program was a dream that would be gone in the morning, I urge them to reconsider. For those who have been making price and pay decisions without consideration of the program, I urge them to educate themselves and their companies as to the impact of the program on those decisions."

VIRGINIA'S HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAM RANKS FIRST IN THE NATION

HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to announce to the Senate that Virginia ranks first in the country in the 1972 evaluation of State highway safety programs by the Department of Transportation.

Virginia scored 1,485 out of a possible 1,600 in the ratings, according to information provided by DOT and the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety. The Commonwealth achieved a perfect score in six of the 16 national highway safety program standards.

These include periodic motor vehicle inspection; motor vehicle registration; motor cycle safety; driver education; driver licensing; codes and laws; traffic courts; alcohol in relation to highway safety; identification and surveillance of accident locations; traffic records; emergency medical services; highway design, construction and maintenance; traffic lighting and control devices; pedestrian safety; police traffic services, and debris hazard control and cleanup.

This is the second consecutive year that Virginia's highway safety program has achieved this distinction, and I wish to commend the division of highway safety in the Governor's office, and the Virginia Department of Highways for their efforts and initiatives.

Mr. President, an April 26 news release of the Department of Transportation explains the program in considerable detail. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION NEWS

Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe said today that efforts at the State and community levels—together with Federal support—have slowed the rapid increase of lives lost in traffic accidents. But the Secretary noted that no State has taken all the legislative and administrative actions needed to fully implement highway safety program standards.

He urged the Nation's Governors to step up their State's highway safety activities, particularly in the priority areas of alcohol countermeasures, driver control and Selective Traffic Enforcement Programs (STEP).

"Research indicates that a majority of traffic crashes are attributable to driver behavior and thus driver control must be made more effective and comprehensive," Secretary Volpe said. He stated that advancements in mechanical technology, learning techniques, and data processing provide the opportunity for greatly improved or innovative systems.

"When we talk of driver control programs," the Secretary said, "we do not mean to imply a punitive program. We mean better screening and examination of people entering the system, better education of drivers, improved rehabilitation, and, of course, increased police efforts to get the hazardous driver into the remediation system."

As advanced by the Department's National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, an ideal driver control system would influence driver behavior by upgrading skills, knowledge, and attitudes. Where this is not possible, drivers, or potential drivers, with critical physical and mental impairments would be screened out.

Secretary Volpe said the Department has recently announced a massive, national information-education campaign designed to generate public awareness of the continuing threat of the drunken driver.

"This high priority effort," said the Secretary, "is in response to President Nixon's directive to take all necessary steps to drastically reduce our annual toll of some 55,000 highway fatalities each year, half of which are related to excessive drinking."

The campaign will serve as a backup for the Alcohol Safety Action Programs (ASAPs) now being Federally-funded in 35 States to find ways to control drunk drivers and remove them from the highway. ASAP contracts with the NHTSA represent a total investment of \$82 million over a period of three-and-a-half years.

The STEP program is designed to evaluate the strategy and impact of traffic enforcement countermeasures applied at high accident frequency locations. Last year, the Department awarded contracts totaling \$1.5 million to three cities to develop traffic enforcement techniques to reduce fatalities, personal injuries and property damage in which traffic violations are contributing factors.

STEP contracts have been signed with Chattanooga, Tennessee; El Paso, Texas; and Sacramento, California. The result of countermeasures used in these cities will be applied to future STEP projects in other cities around the country.

The Secretary said he recently sent letters to the Nations Governors advising them he has reviewed an evaluation of each State's highway safety program.

Under the Highway Safety Act of 1966, the States are responsible for carrying out highway safety programs to implement uniform National Standards issued by the Secretary of Transportation and administered by the NHTSA and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

Along with the letters, the Secretary enclosed a chart which shows a listing of the States grouped alphabetically within the three categories of Above Average, Average and Below Average. The categories reflect how the States are implementing the national Standards.

The 16 National Highway Safety Program Standards include Periodic Motor Vehicle Inspection; Motor Vehicle Registration; Motorcycle Safety; Driver Education; Driver Licensing; Codes and Laws; Traffic Courts; Alcohol in Relation to Highway Safety; Identification and Surveillance of Accident Locations; Traffic Records; Emergency Medical Services; Highway Design, Construction, and Maintenance; Traffic Lighting and Control Devices; Pedestrian Safety; Police Traffic Services; and Debris Hazard Control and Cleanup.

ABOUT STRIKES

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, O. B. Augustson, publisher of the West Central Daily Tribune at Willmar, in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District is a longtime liberal, a real liberal, I might add.

He was raised in a mining town in the days when the labor union movement was in its infancy, when it was badly needed in that industry. He has been in the forefront of the liberal thinkers of Minnesota and has been a strong supporter of the labor union movement.

With that background, I think a recent editorial "About Strikes" by Mr. Augustson should be of special interest to my colleagues and the many others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, with your permission, I insert that fine editorial in the RECORD:

ABOUT STRIKES

George Meany, head of the giant AFL-CIO labor organization made some headlines when he appeared recently before a U.S. Senate labor committee. He was commenting about the matter of strikes.

We have read thru his views as expressed at that hearing. And one can surely agree with much of what he said and even express surprise at some of his views as somewhat unexpected. Perhaps Meany at his age has lived a long time, times have changed, labor and capital relations have changed, causes for strikes perhaps also have changed.

We would like to comment on some of the points he has made and the writer himself has lived a long time and observed much.

Meany said that he does not believe in strikes and doesn't believe they mean what they did years ago. One would agree. The writer was brot up when strikes were imperative. During the days called days of dark capitalism when strikes had to be done for workers to survive. Those were strikes for plain bread. In contrast with today—strikes are for more cake.

Meany said that there should be other alternatives to walkouts and surely better ways should be sought. We agree. Strikes are brute force, they belong to the old past and could be called antiquated and uncivilized in our time of a far better society. By no stretch of imagination can it be said that the causes for strikes today can be compared to the poverty out of which strikes were born in the yesterdays. We know something of this from a mining town.

But the labor chief sort of qualifies his strike stand. He would allow strikes tying up 40% of an industry. Well in this new age of unprecedented dependency the havoc raised would still be there and you could just as well tie up the whole business for the damage and inconvenience imposed. Rather a lame back door proposal. Not full

sock in the jaw, but half—but this might be enuf for a knockout.

Meany gives another reason for his belief of strikes as a weapon in capital and labor disputes. He says that the strike benefits and strike funds are not enuf to sustain the strikers under our present high standard of living. This is reverse comment. Surmise that if those funds were adequate, strike would be okeh. So he watered down his original principle and compromises it.

The labor chief has given some nod to binding arbitration—also called compulsory arbitration. Now he is getting somewhere. The elimination of the strike completely and the decision made by a mediation board of neutral judges and that decision would be final and binding on both parties in the argument.

But Meany concludes by stating that he would continue his fight for the right to strike. Question. That workers have the right to tie up an organization owned by other people just as if they owned it themselves, deprive the public of services furnished by that organization and create distress thru-out a nation or a community. That is asking a whale of a lot of power. To quit work is a right of course. That can be done by anyone. But then the stricken company should have free will to hire other people to do work required and without any molestation—no threats, no violence. In our days of law and order and one would hope a lot of plain horse sense, one would contend that disputes should be settled, not with clubs any kind but like in all civil cases let them be brought into court and settle the arguments in a civilized manner—and like grownups, not a bunch of kids. Especially when in our day when the grievances hardly justify the use of force and sometimes even violence.

This has been a lengthy treatise but the subject is a major one. We have many giants in the field of capital and labor and they have to learn to live and share together and thru the most peaceful means.

A VOTE FOR POSTERITY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the recent election in West Virginia made it clear that when the issues are clearly before the people, the environment remains as an important, if not overriding, fact of political life. This point was clearly made by the Christian Science Monitor in an editorial in its May 13, 1972, issue under the heading "A Vote for Posterity" and I insert the text of the editorial at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A VOTE FOR POSTERITY

Out of the rugged hills of West Virginia has come a political portent that should serve as warning to those last-ditch resisters who still think of environmental control as a will-o'-the-wisp pursuit of little ladies in tennis shoes. This new sign of the environmental times is the smashing victory in the Tuesday primary elections of candidates who staked their political lives on abolishing strip-mining, which has scarred thousands of square miles of West Virginia's weeded mountains.

Considering the economic importance of coal in that state—which produces 85 percent of U.S. coal output—and the fact that the antistripping forces had no real statewide organization, the odds would have seemed heavily against the industry's opponents. Not so.

Secretary of State John D. Rockefeller IV, the Democratic maverick of one of America's wealthiest and most solidly Republican families, swept up the nomination for governor with a 71 percent vote. Mr. Rockefeller has pledged to "abolish strip mining completely and forever" in West Virginia. In its place he would encourage deep-mining of coal, which not only causes less environmental damage, but supplies more jobs.

Other antistrip candidates' showings were as impressive or even more so than Mr. Rockefeller's. One such is Rep. Ken Hechler, who has led the fight against strip-mining on a national level in Congress. Considered an underdog in the West Virginia primary, Mr. Hechler swept up the nomination over the opposition of the United Mine Workers Union. He seeks a return to Washington to finish his work as author of a bill that would abolish surface mining nationally.

Conversely, state Sen. Tracy Hylton, a powerful strip mine operator, suffered an upset defeat at the hands of youthful Warren McGram, member of the state House of Delegates, and an opponent of strip-mining.

It is sad to think that a once-beautiful state had to be mutilated to the degree that West Virginia has been, in the greedy rush for quick profits by shortsighted men, before the public would rise in concert to stop it. But the lesson should be a valuable one for all of the United States. Environmental protection has been proven a potent political issue. The democratic process has been once again vindicated as a powerful, if often slow, means of popular redress.

We applaud the courage of those candidates who stood up against the economic odds. And that of the citizens who cast their ballots on the right side.

PRESIDENT EXTENDS A SIGNIFICANT TAX BENEFIT TO FARMERS

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note that President Nixon recently extended a significant tax benefit to farmers across our Nation. I refer to the President's action April 11 in providing the investment tax credit for many types of foreign-produced farm equipment ordered by farmers while the import surcharge was in effect last year.

As we know, foreign-produced items ordered during the import surcharge period last August 16 through December 19 did not qualify for the tax credit unless the President waived this limitation. Mr. Nixon has decided that it is in the interest of our country's farmers—and in the general public interest—to grant the credit on duty-free farm equipment.

Because of the President's action, America's farmers will now be given the tax credit on many foreign-produced items which they normally buy and which they usually order at the time of year when the import surcharge was in effect. The list of affected items is lengthy, but included such vitally needed equipment as tractors, planting and seeding equipment, harvesting machinery, and various types of sprayers. The investment credit will reduce the original cost of these and other important items and will help our farms to remain modern and competitive with those of other nations.

All farmers who are eligible should obtain a 1040X form from their local internal revenue office. This form is used to amend a 1971 tax return.

I congratulate President Nixon on his decision. Not only is it in keeping with our commitment to the principle of free trade among nations, but it will also provide substantial benefits to our many millions of farm families.

WHY AMERICA GROWS WEAKER

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the extent of acceptance of the manifestly unsound contention that peace can come through retreat in the face of attack continues to amaze many Americans. Most thoughtful people want peace. The question is how best to attain it?

In this world it is by staying strong, not by running out on your obligations, our friends, or the need to maintain a sufficiently capable military and naval presence to discourage aggression.

This month's Armed Forces Journal in an interesting editorial quite properly expresses concern over our rapidly eroding defense capabilities.

DISSENT IS FINE—BUT HERE WE

GO AGAIN

(By Gerald Gidwitz)

(NOTE.—Gerald Gidwitz is chairman of Helene Curtis Industries and Continental Materials Corporation. He has no defense contracts—although some military exchanges may sell shampoo made by his firm. A Journal subscriber and former stockholder, he is neither dove nor hawk: As he put it once, "The quality of American politics would improve immeasurably if a few more candidates worked as hard persuading the North Vietnamese to let American POWs out of prison as they are working to get themselves in office.")

Whatever happened to that old American indignation? What's happening to this country?

The Viet Cong weren't winning on the battlefield in South Vietnam, so the North Vietnamese went all out.¹ As we're pulling our troops and materiel out, North Vietnam sent its in. On three major fronts, the Communists have hit South Vietnam with everything they've got.

As President Nixon took steps to blunt this massive invasion, the Communists who can't win on the battlefield are trying to win on the home front—our home front.

Three years ago, America's so-called "peace groups" and politicians who blamed us, not North Vietnam, for the war in Southeast Asia pressured President Johnson to stop the bombing in North Vietnam in return for a useless promise to negotiate. The Communists, it's clear now, lost their shirts in the Tet offensive that precipitated President Johnson's decision. But they won the biggest battle of the war: not on the battlefield, on the American home front.

The Paris meetings have degenerated into

¹ On March 31st, so many NVA troops poured through the DMZ that today 80-percent or more of regular Army forces are fighting beyond its own borders. North Vietnam has 13 regular divisions; two "Viet Cong" divisions are manned predominately by NVA troops: twelve of these are now outside of North Vietnam.

nothing more than a propaganda forum giving the North Vietnamese easy access to our news media while they again follow the policy that preceded Dien Bien Phu—building up power for the kill. When President Nixon's policy of training the South Vietnamese to handle their own defense looked like it might work (as it has in Korea), the Russians—with some help from the Chinese—stepped up their aid program to North Vietnam to a monumental extent.

The NVA fighting in South Vietnam today is being done with tanks, artillery, missiles, and mortars on a scale that some European powers would be hard pressed to duplicate. With equipment made in Russia, not North Vietnam.²

But even all that hardware shipped in to Halphong hasn't let the VC and NVA win on the battlefield. So the Communists have started anew a chorus to win the decisive battle—on our home front.

They are getting a lot of help: from some of our most popular radio and TV commentators; from some of the nation's best-read newspapers; from some opportunistic politicians running for the Presidency by aiming their rhetoric at the so-called "liberal" vote; and from 144 House Democrats who voted on 20 April to criticize our President, not North Vietnam's, for "a dangerous escalation" of the war. The right of dissent is one of America's greatest strengths; but those who exercise it bear an equal responsibility to inform, not just inflame. There are two sides to every issue: it's one thing to be indignant over the bombing in North Vietnam; it's another not to voice equal indignation over the North Vietnamese invasion or North Vietnam's treatment of our POWs.

Ironically, North Vietnam is getting some unwitting help from the Administration itself. A courageous President is catching holy hell from Congress and the press for trying to blunt an invasion—because his communication "experts" won't let the Americans see the Pentagon photo's that show our bombing is accurate and is directed at military targets (not "orphanages, hospitals, or North Vietnamese homes"). Our photos that show there are still one helluva lot of those targets to take out—if the South Vietnamese nation isn't going to fall under the treads of Russian-built tanks or die in cities incinerated by callously-aimed Russian-built rockets and long-range mortars.

Much more hinges on the outcome in Vietnam than Vietnam. Our credibility as an ally in Thailand, Japan, the Philippines, and even Europe is at stake.

In 1954 we encouraged the Hungarians to revolt—and didn't lift a finger to help them. In 1961 we abandoned the Cuban brigade on the beach at the Bay of Pigs. In 1962 we "won" the Cuban missile crisis—just barely—and let the Russians take home nuclear missiles targeted on our cities, so they could be retargeted on our European allies. We said we'd never permit Castro to export Communism to Latin America—but he's doing it. We let the Russians build the Berlin wall. We watched our friends be overthrown in Libya—and got ourselves thrown out. An American general damned near got hung for putting U.S. forces in Germany on full field alert when Russian forces headed west and suffocated Czechoslovakia. We pressured Israel to pull back to less defensible positions on her own borders, held up the Phantom jets she needed to counter the air force Russia sent to Cairo, and then hedged for weeks over who violated what while Egypt poured arms into the buffer zone. We undermined an old ally, Nationalist China: all we have to show for it so far—two Panda Bears in the National Zoo. Our foreign service specialists debated the wisdom of Presidential orders while India creamed Pakistan.

² By some intelligence estimates, five hundred Soviet-made tanks spearheaded the new offensives in South Vietnam.

We've let our military strength deteriorate vis-a-vis Russia's to the point where we look like a second-rate power with an obsolete, shrinking Navy; a disappearing Merchant Marine; an Air Force which has to retire obsolescent planes (or see them shot down by Soviet-made guns and missiles) faster than we are building them; and an Army that takes almost as many casualties in the Congressional budget arena as it did on the battlefield in Vietnam.

Not only do our enemies get the message, but our allies will too. Around the world, diplomats are troubled by an interpretation of U.S. foreign policy that suggests:

"The Communists help their friends just enough to win; we help ours just enough to lose."

And we even have Senators running for President on that platform.

CONSUMER SUICIDE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in much of the current discussion about consumer "advocates" and consumer "rights," we tend to forget that the best consumer safeguard is not a new law or Government agency but free enterprise itself.

Under our capitalist system, the consumer votes with his dollars for the kinds of products he wishes to purchase. The jury of American business is not a court of law or a legislative chamber but the millions of free citizens who judge its products and services as they choose between them.

Unfortunately, many businessmen have failed to respond to those who urge increasing governmental intervention into the economy. Writing in the May 1972 issue of the *New Guard*, Robert Bearce points out that—

There is no reason for industry to apologize for profit. No reason to grovel before humanitarian zealots because it has not created utopia by 1972 nor rid man of his basic human nature. The guilt complex of the entrepreneur today is the seed of surrender by default. To the extent that industry and business allow socialistic slander and falsehood to go without hard-hitting rebuttal, to that extent it will be easier to clamp bureaucratic stagnation upon the free market.

In this sense, the real threat to the rights of the consumer is not the businessman but the so-called consumer "advocate" who would stifle economic freedom in order to "protect" those whose freedom is eliminated.

I wish to share Mr. Bearce's article, "Consumer Suicide: A Consumer's Best Friend Is Not Ralph Nader," with my colleagues and insert it in the *Record* at this time:

CONSUMER SUICIDE—A CONSUMER'S BEST FRIEND IS NOT RALPH NADER

(By Robert Bearce)

Writing in 1850, at a time when the French Legislative Assembly was being seduced by socialistic rhetoric and legislative cure-alls, Frederic Bastiat both admonished his contemporaries and prophesied for the future:

"It must be admitted that the tendency of the human race toward liberty is largely

thwarted, especially in France. This is greatly due to a fatal desire—learned from the teachings of antiquity—that our writers on public affairs have in common. They desire to set themselves above mankind in order to arrange, organize, and regulate it according to their fancy. While society is struggling toward liberty, these famous men who put themselves at its head are filled with the spirit of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. They think only of subjecting mankind to the philanthropic tyranny of their own social inventions."¹

Just as immutable truths are eternal, so is there a continuous thrust to falsehood. The myths of socialism preached in Bastiat's day have been refurbished and ballyhooed before us anew. Since socialism is parasitical—succeeding in practice only as long as it can soak up previously accumulated wealth—it finds acceptance from the masses just to the extent that it can infiltrate and manipulate some cause or problem currently attracting the populace's attention.

That "cause" today is consumerism. Bastiat would have labeled it "philanthropic tyranny," although we are assured by the modern custodians of society that it has a virtuous obligation to "protect the consumer." Bastiat would have reported that such benevolent intention in behalf of humanity were simply a devious cloak employed by those who "set themselves above mankind in order to arrange, organize, and regulate it according to their fancy."

Consumerism in 1972 promises to be a fertile field for legions of socialistic-minded politicians, "intellectuals," professors, journalists, et al. The statist-collectivist mob has muscled its way into the free market, curling its paternalistic arms around the supposedly defenseless consumer. Naturally, if the consumer requires protection, there must be some culprit... some oppressor. Free enterprise—more specifically industry and business—is that monstrous exploiter. Phosphates, DDT, and mercury—all are sinister poisons brewed up by the twentieth century's version of the Robber Barons for the subjugation of the "common man."

The exploitation theory has antecedents before Marx. Our present pollution-consumerism hysteria is typical demagoguery used by human manipulators throughout history. When capitalism and the free market were liberating man from material deprivation during the early and mid-1800s, the proponents of the regimented society mounted an energetic offensive against freedom. The magnified and imagined sins of the Industrial Revolution were paraded before the world with pious infallibility. The anticapitalistic saga as related by collectivist journalism made bloodcurdling reading but it was a bit divorced from reality.

CAPITALISM EQUALS PROGRESS

The fruits of free trade, capital accumulation, free market exchange, mass production, and laissez-faire economics as set forward by men like Jefferson, Adam Smith, and Bastiat steadily out-distanced collectivist tirades. It was apparent to all except the doctrinaire authoritarian that capitalism was responsible for technological progress, a higher standard of living for more people, and economic stability... all accomplished in an atmosphere of freedom. Socialism and government intervention, by contrast, still deprived people of the necessities of life, starved them, subjugated them to misery and degradation... all at the expense of freedom.

Thus defeated in their propaganda onslaught against the Industrial Revolution and free enterprise, the champions of socialism had to muster forces for a new offensive. Obviously, the free market fed folks while

socialistic masterplanning starved others. The obvious, though, is lost in agile intellectual juggling by the collectivist mentality. That capitalism and freedom were the key to progress was swept hastily under the mat. Capitalism's new crime against mankind was that it duped the helpless consumer with innumerable choices, massive deceit, and personal freedom which the consumer could not intelligently handle in behalf of his own welfare.

The latter part of our twentieth century has witnessed an anti-industry, "pro" consumer binge that delights in sleuthing out the human imperfections and fallibilities reflected in the free market... exaggerating these... and offering them as absolute justification for state control. Automobiles, toys, and packaged foods are not viewed as the blessings of capitalistic affluence but rather as threats to life and limb.

This is the mind intoxication with its own supposed infallibility. In its hands, consumer protection becomes just one more demagogic and legislative weapon for restructuring society consistent with its visions of man-introduced millennium. Many sincere, honest people in the United States have justified complaints against certain products, business practices, and false claims by industry. Such individuals—and they are housewives, vice-presidents of corporations, "ghetto" residents, and bank executives—are the bonafide consumers, not the personally-anointed, third party interventionists who have twisted consumerism into an anti-free enterprise bludgeon.

CONSUMER HAS POWER

The consumer has the right and the responsibility to make himself felt, both through vocal indignation and pocketbook abstention. When he does, he can exert tremendous power—power more effective than all of the commissions, laws, and legislative programs coerced through Congress by the socialistic bandwagon. If the consumer is allowed to remain free, to be accountable and responsible, he will ultimately choose between what he thinks is a wise purchase or an unwise buy. Through personal trial and error, the worthless product or cheap purchase is cast aside. A new product or shop is patronized. Either the company will provide an improved product or it suffers bankruptcy.

Government, too, has its justified presence in the consumerism debate. Fraud, malice, violence—all are means by which the free market is corrupted by men who view freedom as a one-way affair or as the means to the "get-rich-quick" throne. Government has the duty to prosecute the abuser of freedom. The consumer activist, though, makes government the ultimate object of his affection since through its "legalized" use of force, all manner of legislative remedies are concocted in behalf of the consumer.

A contaminated can of tuna is discovered. This insidious mishap is followed by journalistic tirades decrying the malpractices of capitalism (not just the particular company involved but the free market itself!). Politicians and anxious consumer pow-wows take up the chant. When the tear gas of emotionalism and sloganeer drifts away, a new law is on the books while the citizenry is more suspicious than ever that business is either plotting against the consumer or degenerating into unpardonable inefficiency. Multitudes are willing to abandon individual accountability, responsibility, and free choice for the worship of a host of new mini-gods—the FDA, FTC, Office of Consumer Affairs, etc., etc.

This crusading spirit in behalf of "consumer protection" is infectious, prompting numerous citizens groups to raise the "protection" standard. The New York Times News Service reports that an energetic group known as Action for Children's Television recently petitioned the Federal Trade Com-

¹ *The Law* by Frederic Bastiat, page 51-52. Translated by Dean Russell and published by the Foundation for Economic Education, Irvington-on-Hudson, New York. (1968)

mission to eliminate all toy advertising from children's t.v. programs.² ACT has also waved the banner against vitamin, drug, and food advertisements directed at the kiddies.

One wonders just who will inherit the financial burden of children's t.v. programming if advertising is banned. The present sponsors . . . the toy manufacturers? Hardly. Ah, but perhaps someone will propose the only real solution—government sponsorship and subsidy. At the taxpayer's expense, of course! The lobbyists from ACT complain that toy advertising fools the children viewers; that is, the young cannot see through the sophisticated commercials. Since the children don't usually have the money to buy the toys advertised, the tots are manipulated into coercing their weak-kneed parents into purchasing the product.

STRANGE VISIONS

A nasty state of affairs. Duped children strongarming their folks down to the local toy shop. ACT's conception of the typical child-parental relationship appears to be that of spineless adults being whipped into submission by victimized youngsters.

Well-intentioned as the protectionist spirit may be, it both denies human dignity and plays into the hands of the statist. The individual is stripped of his human endowments; he is "protected" into the stagnated existence of a delicate plant that must be constantly nourished, watered, and pruned for its own good. The individual is warned that he might save his life in an automobile accident if he will use a seat belt. Such an admonition fails to bring about the required response, so government legislates the wisdom of seat belts. At the consumer's expense. Six out of ten consumers will remain unenlightened, so wizards of protection design a unique "Auto-Safe" interlock safety belt that prevents the ignition of an automobile motor until the device is first properly buckled around the driver.

Ingenious perhaps, but at what price must the individual be protected from the consequences of his inherent right to exercise individual freedom and choose for himself?

Two disheartening responses are reflected by the current consumerism craze. Most obvious is the eagerness of the consumer to surrender his sovereign role in the market place and freely subjugate himself to the cancerous inroads of paternalism. The consumer activist looks benevolently down upon the American housewife, automobile buyer, and shopper as some sort of village half-wit, the victim of "free enterprise exploitation." Regrettably, many Americans are falling for this hokum. We have side-stepped the broader implication of Ben Franklin's admonition: "Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

The second discouraging response to "consumerism" is private enterprise's muted lethargy when it is confronted by the consumer activist. Some businessmen are undoubtedly confused and unprepared to defend themselves against the subtle techniques of the proponent of regimentation. Other men in industry, though, have actually succumbed to a bad case of bootlicking as they kneel before the champions of state intervention. Deep groans of repentance are heard as atonement is sought through vows that business and industry will knuckle under to fulfill their roles of "social consciousness and responsibility."

MARKET ESSENTIAL FOR ALL

Business does not have to appear before the supreme court of socialistic judiciary.

² The New York Times News Service, published by *The Houston Chronicle*, Vol. 71 #64, Thursday, December 16, 1971.

Free enterprise is already on trial . . . every day of its life. Its jury in the United States is the millions of free, competent citizens who judge its products and services. Many companies can't cut the mustard. They don't pass judgment in the eyes and pocketbooks of the consumer. Their fate is extinction—at the hands of the free consumer making his choice for himself and not by the benevolent hand of the regimental bureaucrat.

There is no reason for industry to apologize for profit. No reason to grovel before humanitarian zealots because it has not created utopia by 1972 nor rid man of his basic human nature. The guilt complex of the entrepreneur today is the seed of surrender by default. To the extent that industry and business allow socialistic slander and falsehood to go without hard-hitting rebuttal, to that extent it will be easier to clamp bureaucratic stagnation upon the free market.

Final note should be made here that those breeds of pro-freedom elements known as capitalists, conservatives, and libertarians are often accused by the supposedly "enlightened" of gazing with fond eyes back upon the "horse and buggy" days. The conservative, so we are to assume, is enamored with the simplicity and blessings once enjoyed by his rugged, individualistic forefathers. Yet, it will be noted from Bastiat's sage observation that the enemy of freedom was spreading his nonsense in the 17th and 18th centuries. Those "famous men" he mentioned, who thought "only of subjecting mankind to the philanthropic tyranny of their own social inventions," were not only men with the spirit of the 17th and 18th century, they are the same men with the "progressive" spirit today. Men who wish to regulate and manipulate.

SOCIALIST REACTIONARIES

Thus we see the social reformer today hungering for bygone days when life was simple. No polluted rivers. Clean, untainted air. No burdensome choices at the supermarket . . . just cornbread and squash. No deceit on the part of shoe manufacturers. Everyone trods barefoot. These are exaggerations, of course, but they do point to a visionary mentality. Polluted rivers become an unpardonable sin against mankind because romantic eyes dream of days when Indians paddled their canoes and fished for perch in crystal clear rivers.

Too many individuals, though, who are obsessed with "protecting the consumer" fail to place life in the twentieth century in perspective. Those nasty factories now hugging the river banks represent more than ooze draining into the perch's habitat and smoke belching into the atmosphere; they represent a standard of living that allows a man and his family to live in security, dignity and a measure of affluence.

Americans—yes, even conservatives, would like to see all lakes and streams in a pure, clean state, but is that deprivation too high a price for the life we enjoy contrasted to the human degradation of past ages or the drab, oppressive life of socialist states? The authoritarian regimes of the world also have their polluted streams, their tainted tuna, their product defects—that is, those socialized countries where enough industry exists to make consumer products a problem.

Again, the threat of consumerism is not the legitimate complaints voiced by the consumer, nor the necessary governmental prosecution to protect free men working and choosing freely in a free society. The vice lies within its manipulation by the collectivist-minded . . . business's failure to counter-attack . . . and the individual consumer's willingness to surrender individual freedom for paternal regimentation.

IRISH REPUBLIC OFFICIAL OFFERS HOPE FOR UNITY

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Minister Consul General of Ireland in New York, Mr. Kevin Rush, addressed the Greenwich, Conn. Division of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and he had some hopeful words about what, to date, has been the discouraging situation in Northern Ireland.

The Greenwich Time covered Mr. Rush's address and I would like to share that account with my colleagues at this time:

IRISH REPUBLIC OFFICIAL OFFERS HOPE FOR UNITY

"This is an important time for Ireland, a difficult time for Ireland, an historic time for Ireland," according to Kevin Rush, Minister Consul General of Ireland in New York.

Mr. Rush was the featured speaker yesterday at the annual Communion Breakfast of the Greenwich Society, Ancient Order of Hibernians, held at the Penthouse Restaurant. The year 1972, he said, will mark the beginning of a unified Ireland which will be a part of a united Europe.

The road will be a hard one, he said. As an analogy he traced the history of the United States. Two hundred years ago there was a religious war in this country he said. Protestants in Virginia were fighting Catholics in Maryland.

Although he did not mention future fighting in Ireland, Mr. Rush pointed out the United States had endured its Civil War before the states finally "got together." There still are problems facing the United States, he said.

So far as the present situation in Ireland is concerned, Mr. Rush said Americans get a distorted picture of what is going on.

"Don't believe all you see in the papers," he told the 160 members present. "That is not the whole story. It is mostly headlines, sensations compressed into a few words."

Similarly, he said, the Irish do not get a true picture of life in America from newspapers in their country.

The differences are on the verge of being settled Mr. Rush said in his brief talk. Already forces are at work building a new Ireland "but it will take time," he emphasized. "All great achievements take time."

"The year 1972 marks the beginnings of Ireland's entry into a united Europe," Mr. Rush said.

"Have faith in the people of Ireland and their elected leaders," he said. "They have to go forward with confidence, dedication and belief."

John White served as toastmaster at the breakfast where greetings were extended by Michael Conlon, president of the Greenwich Hibernian Assn., and First Selectman William B. Lewis. Awards were presented to three students, Barbara Brennan and Walter Jura of St. Mary High School, and Margaret Bolter of Catholic Middle School.

Co-chairmen of the breakfast were George Pitney and Miss Mary Treanor. Present also was Mrs. Edith Duff, Connecticut president of the Ladies Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians.

TWO MATTERS OF CONCERN TO MORE THAN JUST THE JEWISH PEOPLE

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, just yesterday I was pleased to be able to participate in a very moving tribute to the State of Israel. I am referring to the New England salute to Israel parade which was such a great success and attracted so many thousands in downtown Boston yesterday. Gratifying as it was to pay tribute with so many of my good friends, especially the chairman of the parade, the Honorable Sumner Kaplan, to the great State of Israel, it is well to remember that there is another area of considerable concern to the Jewish people which has nothing to do with the Middle East but rather with the plight of the Jews in Soviet Russia today. It is my earnest hope that this will be one of the prime topics of discussion when and if the President visits Russia later this month. The treatment of members of the Jewish faith in Russia today goes beyond ethnic and religious boundaries and has captured the genuine concern and triggered a real revulsion among members of all faiths in all corners of the globe. Whether it comes as an example of ecumenical spirit or just down-to-earth human decency, the following article from the recent edition of the Boston Globe points out the widespread concern of people of many faiths for Soviet Jewry. I feel particularly proud of this effort, because for many years St. Angela Church in Mattapan was my parish and its members are well known to me. Monsignor McManus has long been a pillar of strength in the Mattapan-Dorchester community.

The article follows:

CATHOLIC PARISH PETITIONS NIXON FOR SOVIET JEWS

Parishioners of St. Angela's Church in Mattapan have signed petitions asking President Nixon to raise the issue of the mistreatment of Soviet Jewry during his visit to Moscow.

The petitions have been enclosed in a joint letter to the President by Rt. Rev. Paul J. McManus of St. Angela's Church and Simon Scheff, chairman of the New England regional board of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Msgr. McManus, who reported that many of his parishioners had signed the petitions, expressed the hope that other parishes in metropolitan Boston would also participate in the petition effort.

Scheff praised the humanitarian concern shown by the people of St. Angela's and lauded the "moral leadership role played by Msgr. McManus."

In their letter, Msgr. McManus and Scheff reaffirmed their concern over the denial of religious freedom to Soviet Jews and urged the President to make the plight of Soviet Jewry a top-priority item.

U.N. WORLD COURT COMES UNDER FIRE

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, the following is an article from the Los Angeles Times of April 15, 1972, setting forth a letter to the editor from Mr. C. C. Moseley of Beverly Hills, Calif.:

U.N. WORLD COURT COMES UNDER FIRE

(By C. C. Moseley)

The Times published a lengthy article (March 12) on "An Idle Court in an Unruly World." This article was a strong demand for the United States to accept jurisdiction of the United Nations World Court, impressively named the International Court of Justice.

The United States became a party to the United Nations statute creating the World Nations statute creating the World Court when the Senate ratified the U.N. Charter (Treaty), but we were not bound to accept the jurisdiction of the court until we made formal declaration. In November, 1945, Sen. Wayne Morse (D-Ore.) introduced a resolution giving the consent of the Senate to our accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on July 24, 1946, unanimously approved the resolution.

On the Senate floor, Sen. Tom Connally (D-Tex.) offered a six-word amendment, to wit, "as determined by the United States." This provided that the United States would not accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court "in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States as determined by the United States." This amendment was approved by a vote of 62-2 on August 2, 1946.

Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey (D-Minn.) introduced a bill in 1960 that was designed to repeal the Connally Amendment to the U.N. Charter, which protected our country from compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. It was defeated.

The World Court is made up from many countries not loyal to the United States. Without the safe protection of the Connally amendment, the World Court could decide any issue is international as far as the United States is concerned. Here are some examples, there are many more:

1—That our immigration laws are international, and immigration from all over the world should be accepted in the United States—perhaps by the millions.

2—That our export and import laws are international, which would leave our laboring people with no protection against foreign products made at slave-labor pay.

3—That integration in the United States is an international problem and therefore subject to the United Nations World Court's jurisdiction.

4—That religion is international and under the United Nations World Court's control.

5—That "free speech might imperil "national" security, and according to the U.N. Statute would be under the United Nations World Court.

The socialistic phony slogan "World Rule by World Law" is dangerous. Don't be taken in by this slick slogan which seeks to remove the Connally amendment thus causing us to lose our sovereignty and protection from compulsory jurisdiction of the United Nations World Court. This would destroy our

national independence, sovereignty and give the World Court unlimited jurisdiction over American affairs and lives—yours and mine. We have just had an example of how the United Nations performs in the recent China-Taiwan vote where the United States was spit upon with glee. Let this be a lesson—beware of the World Court!

THE BASIC ISSUE OF THE WAR

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, about 3 weeks ago the Christian Science Monitor and the Los Angeles Times printed editorials on the bombing of North Vietnam. You would think the Haiphong blockade would make earlier comment obsolete. But these two editorials seem as appropriate and pertinent today as the day they were written.

The basic issue of the war has not changed, and it does not appear that it is going to change. It is the issue of the will and the desire of the South Vietnamese people.

If the South Vietnamese people wish to preserve the government we have given them, they can do so. Their army outnumbers the opposition forces several times over. And despite all the talk about the modern weaponry the Russians have given Hanoi, the cost of this equipment would barely pay the interest on the cost of the equipment we have given the Saigon army. If they want to preserve Thieu or someone similar, the South Vietnamese have the men and the equipment to do it.

But if they do not want Thieu badly enough to fight for him, there is nothing more we can do. Loyalty and motivation cannot be procured like a howitzer or a truck. Either Thieu has earned it or he has not.

Our Vietnam effort is dying an unpleasant death; we are best advised to cut our losses and bring our troops and prisoners home. Bombing and blockading serve only to prolong the death and to increase the cost. There is no point in it.

I insert the editorial entitled "Prolonging Vietnam's Agony," from the Los Angeles Times of April 17, 1972, followed by the editorial entitled "The Renewed Bombing" from the Christian Science Monitor of April 17, 1972:

PROLONGING VIETNAM'S AGONY

The bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong by the United States is wrong. It is a commitment to a deeper involvement in the Indo-China war long after the necessity for ending the American commitment has become evident. It is an admission of the failure of the Vietnamization program without an acceptance of what that means.

We are not impressed with the rationalization of the decision. If the bombing is a response to "military necessity," then it can buy little more than time. If it is a "response to" the aggression of North Vietnam, it becomes an act of retaliation which, at

least in this war, has achieved nothing. If all this is to be blamed on Moscow, then the American nation will be hard pressed to explain its role and its leadership and its initiatives across all Indo-Chinese frontiers.

In two weeks of fighting, the South Vietnamese ground forces have been losing the battles their American advisers expected them to win. Times correspondents on the scene have told us that the South Vietnamese, despite their modern arms and larger numbers, are holding on only because of American air support. But even that air support apparently has not been enough. In the first week of fighting, it comprised close support tactical operations. In the second week of fighting, B-52 superbombers were added in a region running 30 miles into North Vietnam. As the third week of the new war begins, the B-52s have been unleashed where they never operated before, over Haiphong, North Vietnam's chief port and supply center.

It is not the first time that the United States has bombed the north. Three years of bombing there did not win the war. It did not even frustrate the Tet offensive of 1968. The bombing was halted four years ago as part of a package to get peace talks under way. Now Mr. Nixon appears convinced that the resumption will somehow not only save South Vietnam on the battlefield but also blast away the impasse in the Paris peace talks.

How strange it must have seemed to Hanoi to receive from the President, after the new fighting had begun, a bid to resume the Paris talks which he himself had suspended because he thought them nothing more than a filibuster.

The bombardment of Haiphong, destruction of its oil tanks farms and military supply depots and we know not what else, may slow or even end this offensive. It may buy time, in weeks, or months or a year. But there is no shred of evidence that it will buy a bit less dependence by South Vietnam on the United States, not a hint that it will advance that dream of American Presidents that Saigon some day can be left safely as a permanent bastion against Communism.

Mr. Nixon must be clear about this. For any ambiguity leaves the United States open to the ugly charge that American bombers are buying time because of domestic political considerations, because it just might not be convenient for some Americans to wind down the war all the way until a President is elected in November.

Pentagon promises have rarely been confirmed on the battlefield in this war. Victory has been an illusion, unobtainable for anyone, least of all for the Americans. There is only one thing for the United States to do: To get out, with its ground forces as with its bombers, B-52s over Haiphong cannot buy victory. They can only prolong the agony.

THE RENEWED BOMBING

The bombing of "oil installations and supply dumps" in the Hanoi region of North Vietnam does not add substantially to the horrors and brutalities of the war. It is not different or worse in kind than things done by both sides many times during the war. It is an obvious attempt at reprisal for a major offensive into South Vietnam by the "main" force army from the North, in the course of which thousands of civilians have been driven from their homes and many innocents killed and injured.

It is doubtful that anything like as much human misery has been caused by the resumption of this bombing in the North as by the offensive in the South.

But, having said this, it needs to be noted that the battle in the South is being fought with men, equipment and supplies which were moved into the battle zone long ago.

The battle can be expected to last at most another three or four weeks. The rains will put an end to such large scale fighting before the end of May. Hence the outcome of the battle is not going to be influenced by the material damage done by the bombing. No gun, or bullet or gallon of fuel blown up in the bombing could have reached the front-line in South Vietnam before the battle will be decided.

The only kind of influence the bombing can have on the fighting itself is in terms of its effect on the morale of the people on the two sides. In that respect it may be a plus for Hanoi. The history of bombing is often improved morale among the people bombed. Hitler's bombs toughened the fighting will of the British people. British bombs increased the output of German war factories. At the end of World War II the Allied Strategic Bombing Survey concluded that strategic, as distinct from tactical, bombing was a highly inefficient and often counterproductive method of waging war. There is no reason to doubt that this finding still holds true.

The other side of the coin is the possible value to morale in Saigon. There, the resort to this bombing may have value as a token of American recommitment to the Saigon cause. President Nixon has risked a revival of political protest at home, and further erosion of goodwill for the United States among friends and allies in Western Europe to prove his devotion to the Thieu regime.

This renewal of the bombing is not going to break the will of North Vietnam. It may even improve it. It is probably not going to change the course of the battle in the South. It may further erode the good name of the United States in those countries already critical of the American posture in Indo-China.

All of which is a very high price to pay for bolstering the confidence of the Thieu regime.

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has proclaimed the week of May 14 Small Business Week to honor the thousands of small businessmen who contribute in their daily work to the success of America's free enterprise system.

There are presently 8 million small businesses in the country and an estimated 10,000 in Alabama. An unprecedented 287,000 new companies were incorporated just last year. Nineteen out of every 20 firms are considered small business and they provide more than 35 million jobs, and contribute more than \$370 billion to the gross national product.

Opportunity is the byword for small business in America. Small, free, independent enterprise is the heritage of our past and the lifeblood of our future. It is the corridor of progress and change for Americans of every nationality and color.

And so it is very appropriate that we recognize small businesses and the small businessman through the observance of Small Business Week.

OBSERVANCE OF ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE DAY—MAY 15, 1972

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it hardly seems possible that 24 years have elapsed since that eventful day when the sovereign State of Israel came into being. It was not just the birth of another new nation. It was, rather, a fulfillment of a centuries-old dream of Jews throughout the world. The long-hoped-for, long-prayed-for, and long-worked-for dream of a Jewish homeland became a reality.

For those of us in the Congress who devoted ourselves to the task of securing the enactment of requisite legislation to establish this new nation this day is just as meaningful as it is to the hundreds of thousands of Jews who today call Israel home. We too share the great pride which the citizens of Israel and world Jewry have in the miraculous accomplishments which this fledgling nation has brought to pass in less than a generation's span of time.

There is a great similarity in the thinking and conduct of the patriots of Israel with the American patriots at the birth of our own Nation. Our forbears produced a flag and a vocal proclamation that admonished the world, "Don't tread on me." The people of Israel remembering the centuries when Jews have been forced to accept humiliation, privation, and suffering determined at long last they would not tolerate being pushed around. They have proved their determination in this respect on the bargaining tables in the Council of Nations and on the battlefields in defense of their borders and their hard-won sovereignty. They have demonstrated unlimited courage and boundless determination to attain a recognized and respected place among the great nations of the world.

Americans have given generous economic assistance to many nations of the world—large and small—new and well established. But no outpouring of our wealth has been more gratefully received or more effectively used than has our help to Israel. The transformation of desert wastes into wondrous fields and gardens of rich productivity; the development of manufacturing and trade that today makes Israel an exporter as well as an importer; and the creation of a strong and vibrant cultural system all attest to the spirit and integrity of the people of Israel to put the State and its welfare above their own personal wants and needs.

No one who has played a direct role in helping Israel from the days of its birth can fail to remember the almost insurmountable problems and the great number of political and economic crises to which this infant nation was subjected. There were, indeed, numerous times in which Israel's leadership was put to tests of extreme magnitude and complexity. These are the times when I am grateful for the support and back-

ing which the American people have given to the people of Israel and to the men and women they installed as their leaders.

Israel faces today and doubtless will face again, serious problems of protecting her hard-won attainments. To be militarily strong in her defense she needs our planes and armaments; to be economically viable she needs our continued financial and technical assistance; and to be politically strong and independent she needs our continued pledge of friendship and affection.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all want to join our fine Jewish friends and neighbors in sending our warmest congratulations to the people of Israel on this their day of independence. We congratulate them on their great achievements; we commend them for their valor and dedication to the protection of their freedom.

We thank them for their friendship and for the enrichment of our own lives to which they are making such significant contributions.

AN URGENT PLEA BY CYRUS EATON

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, since the earliest hours of our involvement in Indochina, while many people were still trying to square this war with their consciences, one man continued to remind us that the war was immoral, illegal, and unconstitutional. His voice is stronger and his tone more urgent today.

I speak, of course, Mr. Speaker, of Mr. Cyrus Eaton, America's greatest champion for world peace. If our succession of Presidents had heeded his advice, we would not have activated mines off the North Vietnamese shoreline today. About 55,000 young Americans and 2 million Asians would still be around to enjoy life. Last week, 19 more Americans would not have lost their lives.

As important, we would not be on the verge of a showdown with the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. It is even conceivable that, if someone had listened to Mr. Eaton, we might be living today in a cooperative community of the nations of the world.

It is a well-known fact of political life that President Nixon makes his moves in terms of tomorrow's history texts. His brittle disregard of human life today, he hopes, will be somehow justified in the future.

Even a super historian will not be able to redeem Richard Nixon.

Cyrus Eaton, who has always lived for the moment, is the man who, when history is written, will be proven right. He does not waste his time predicting the future; he interprets the present.

Mr. Eaton presented such an interpretation in a letter to the New York Times, printed in that journal on May 10, 1972. His letter was a plea to academi-

cians and college presidents to oppose the Southeast Asian mistake. He urged them to "help persuade our Senators and Congressmen to cut off the funds that permit the administration to pursue an utterly immoral and inhumane course in Vietnam without public sanction, and to subject the citizens of America to a crushing burden of taxation in a completely lost cause."

It is an important statement—a necessary statement. And it is one which I hope my colleagues and the members of the academic community will pay attention to.

Mr. Eaton's letter follows:

COMMENTS ON THE WAR IN VIETNAM

To the Editor:

The Ivy League Presidents have rendered a great service to higher education in their joint statement of April 19 deploring renewed American bombing of North Vietnam and its civilian population. Making this forthright declaration obviously took tremendous courage.

Conspicuous among those responsible for our international policies since World War II have been Dean Acheson, John Foster Dulles, Dean Rusk, William P. Rogers and Henry Kissinger, educated at such famous universities as Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Cornell and Oxford. The public has urgently needed the Ivy League reminder that the policies of these men are discordant with the highest intellectual and ethical standards of great institutions of learning.

From the outset, French and British military leaders, familiar at first hand with Asian campaigning, have pointed out that the United States could not possibly win in Vietnam and that if America persisted in pushing the war there far enough, it would find the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic forgetting their differences and combining in a massive undertaking to throw us out. It is also well known that President Eisenhower, with his extensive experience, flatly refused to send American troops into Southeast Asia, even though he was constantly being pushed by some members of his Cabinet to get into the war in a massive way.

The Ivy League statement deserves to be read by every administrator, faculty member and trustee of every college in America. If, in their own self-interest, all university and college presidents would speak up in the same vein, it would also help persuade our Senators and Congressmen to cut off the funds that permit the Administration to pursue an utterly immoral and inhumane course in Vietnam without public sanction, and to subject the citizens of America to a crushing burden of taxation in a completely lost cause.

CYRUS S. EATON.

CLEVELAND, May 2, 1972.

NATIONAL PLUMBING INDUSTRY WEEK

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors is the largest and oldest trade association in the construction industry. The association will celebrate April 15 through 22, 1973, as National Plumbing Industry Week.

In celebration of National Plumbing

Industry Week, the association will lead its total industry of 2 million men and women in special activities to focus attention on the vital role that plumbing, heating, cooling, and piping play in the health, comfort, and convenience of our citizens in homes and other buildings.

Plumbing and piping contractors are the original ecologists. They have engaged in this field for nearly a century. They have taken the lead in the development and application of today's newer and more sophisticated measures to insure environmental control and preservation.

The products and services of this industry also play a vital part in our Nation's economic strength, industrial productivity, national defense, space exploration, transportation, food processing, and mineral development—in fact, everything that depends for its existence on the movement of air, gas, water, and other liquids through pipes, valves, fittings, and fixtures.

The officers, directors, and members of the National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors represent every city and State of our great Nation. They are engaged in their own businesses in the finest traditions of private enterprise. Without their products and services, civilization as we know it today would not be possible.

The association's officers are Roland E. Carlson, president, of Rockford, Ill.; Robert K. Wark, first vice president, of Houston, Tex.; Samuel Bloom, second vice president, of Miami, Fla.; John Giolitto, secretary, of Rockford, Ill.; Joseph Rich, treasurer, of Atlantic City, N.J.; and Lawrence Mutter, executive director, of Washington, D.C. Chairman of National Plumbing Industry Week is Robert K. Wark, the association's president-elect.

Mr. Wark, by the way, is an outstanding citizen of Houston and a good friend and civic leader. He will begin serving as president of the National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors in July.

Its 15-man board of directors includes Paul LaMott of Haverhill, N.H.; Leon Novak of Brooklyn, N.Y.; William Robertshaw of West Orange, N.J.; Harry Hutchinson, Jr., of Philadelphia, Pa.; Harold Cothran, Sr. of Altavista, Va.; W. Wesley Styers of Gastonia, N.C.; Howell Switzer of New Orleans, La.; Donald Priest of Garden City, Mich.; George Connelly of Chicago, Ill.; Cecil Self of Dallas, Tex.; Joyce Anderson of Kearney, Nebr.; J. B. Haverly of Britton, S. Dak.; Merle Johns of Billings, Mont.; John Armer of Phoenix, Ariz., and Merlin Geddes of Arcadia, Calif.

In recognition of the outstanding service rendered to our Nation by the National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors and the total plumbing, heating, cooling, and piping industry of 2 million men and women who are engaged in contracting, manufacturing, marketing, distribution, and installation of the industry's products, I would like to call upon my fellow Members to lend their

support to a resolution which I have introduced today calling on the President to declare the week of April 15 through April 22, 1973, as National Plumbing Industry Week.

DEDICATION EXERCISES FOR THE BIG SPRING FISHERY HATCHERY

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, late last month I had the opportunity of attending the dedicatory exercises for the Big Spring Fishery Hatchery, which is located in my 19th Congressional District in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Spencer H. Smith, Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, made the principal remarks at this dedication. It was particularly fitting that Mr. Smith should make these remarks, because he has had vast experience in the field of wildlife resources, both in the laboratory and the field. His present governmental position promises to provide dynamic leadership in the advancement of fish and wildlife services.

Frank E. Masland, Jr., a member of the Pennsylvania Fish Commission, an outstanding citizen of Carlisle, Pa., was also on hand for these dedication exercises. He addressed those in attendance. Mr. Masland has been an ardent conservationist over a span of many years, striving tirelessly to assure that the bounty of natural resources that is ours today will be available for America's citizens of tomorrow. Mr. Masland knows conservation because he has lived it.

Because both Mr. Smith's and Mr. Masland's remarks carry meaningful messages and touch on some highly significant conservation aspects, I introduce these remarks to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

REMARKS OF SPENCER H. SMITH

In these days of mass production, from Chryslers to chickens and from photos to phosphates, it's a real social question about the needs and values of items mass-produced around the world. Machines turn widgets out in enormous quantities, requiring an equally enormous selling effort to get us to buy them.

But I think we can all agree that there's no turn-on campaign needed to sell fish and fishing, even though we are moving into mass production of these, too. In economic terms, we have a seller's market . . . a growing surge of buyers. I tend to think of our piscatorial products in esthetic terms rather than commercial, but let's not play down economic considerations.

For sport fishing is a multibillion dollar business in this country, with more than 33 million U.S. citizens identified as fishermen in the 1970 census sampling of our population. Those anglers spent nearly \$5 billion that year pursuing our finny friends. And even if we take away the money spent on saltwater angling, we find the freshwater fishermen spent three billion, 750 million dollars. As an ironic side angle: of this huge expenditure, only about \$100 million went for licenses across the Nation. The rest, about 97 percent of all money spent for angling, went for bait, rods, reels, travel, lodging, guides, boats, ac-

cess costs and other items connected with goin' fishin'.

According to the 1970 survey, there were 8 million more anglers in the U.S. that year than there were in 1965. Further, it appears that it cost considerably more to float a fly or loop a lure than it did in 1965, not only because there were so many more people practicing the gentle art, but also because that practitioner had to travel further and stay out longer. It appears likely that expanding metropolises is devouring the close-in fishing, by building around the water and by polluting it, so we have to travel further, stay longer, spend more even if inflation weren't adding to the total.

So it isn't out of line to suggest that sport fishing is a highly important factor in our financial structure, a larger industry—to misuse the word a bit—than many that are written about in the *Wall Street Journal* . . . and the *Journal* reporters also write about sport fishing.

But more important, in my view, is the need of people, the value of fishing to the individual soul and body. For in this society of dramatic changes and uncertain stresses, tension is a heart-and-gut problem to every human being living in these United States.

Among other values, fishing provides a lesson in humility. The busy man or woman, centered on a desk and office and profession, who can somehow sandwich an angling afternoon in the busy schedule, learns something: The world keeps on turning. Somehow, humanity has gone on eating, sleeping, fighting and loving even though our executive hero wasn't providing his or her important input.

Apart from either economics or humility, there is simple joy in one's own self. Admittedly, the Gentle Art has something in common with golf; we only remember the good shots and forget the frustrations. But fishing has to do with the Four Ages of Mankind: child, youth, middle-age or senior citizen can compete without struggle, gain satisfaction and ecstasy, and above all have the memory that is a solace in the dark hours of those long nights we all experience.

I remember when my son, at about five years of age, caught his first fish . . . a scrubby little thing, perhaps, but the hair stood on the back of his neck and when that mite of scaled wiggle was on our stringer there was a grin on his face—and the grin stayed there all that day.

This spring, 24 years later, I took my son on his first trip for striped bass; when he caught his first one, it was far from scrubby—but the hair stood on his neck again, and I saw that smile come back from a quarter-century of time.

A year ago I fished in Texas with my 80-year-old father. That is, he was 80 as he stooped over his rod—but when the fish struck, those years sloughed off. He was young again. And at such times I am young again.

Let me reluctantly leave the emotional aspects of sunlight, water, rod and fish to say that despite the masculine example I have just used, angling is not a manly sport but a human pleasure. More than one woman in ten in this country went fishing during 1970, which explains why angler is more descriptive than fisherman.

But we are here today to dedicate a hatchery, not to let me run a seminar in fishing philosophy. And this is quite a hatchery: the newest and technologically most sophisticated plant for trout propagation I have ever reviewed in an adult lifehood of aquatic biology.

But Big Spring Hatchery is more than scientific method for high-density fish propagation. It will produce nearly a quarter-million pounds of rainbows and brook trout each year, to permit the stocking of 750,000 catchable size fishes annually; it is certainly sanitary, designed to prevent pollution, and it will utilize all the newer techniques for

breeding fish of fighting quality and superior health. Mechanically, this is a marvelous hatchery. But it is something more; it is another proof that we do not live by bread alone—not by piscatorial specimens alone, either.

For if it is not more, why did the citizens of Pennsylvania vote to finance it . . . vote not as fishermen but as citizens? If the only value is to flycasters, why should taxpayers foot the bill? How many of you at this dedication are interested only in statistics of output of per-pound cost?

Of course, any hatchery has to do with put-and-take fishing, even if we don't like to admit it, and even if there's a long-time gap between the putting and the taking.

But Ralph Abele, as Executive Director of the Pennsylvania Fish Commission, has inherited a tradition of intelligent fisheries management in a heavily populated State. My own Bureau has been of some help here, with our Lamar National Fish Hatchery part of a carefully worked out plan of stocking and harvesting. I wish we could be more help by producing more fishes at Lamar, but it's good to know we have done what we can in a cooperative program among colleagues.

Fishing lends itself to metropolitanism, because a lot of people can fish on 10 acres of water in a season, so long as that water is clean. How many can hunt on 10 acres of land?

So while us old purists dream of wild streams and courting trout, we must also recognize that wildness is receding and distance is expensive. But with hatcheries like this, with sound management and imaginative operations, a great deal of angling still can be provided in heavily populated areas. I recall that your Commission has done some interesting experimentation with inner-city fishing, even.

So Big Spring Hatchery will pay a major role in bringing angling to many people, where natural reproduction simply would not provide enough fishing. I further applaud your plan to protect native wild brook trout in a 3,300-foot stretch of this stream. Closed stretches of stream, no-kill angling, barbless hooks . . . these factors that some of us used to dismiss as fun and games . . . are coming to look more important to fishing recreation as our base of wild land steadily diminishes.

Pennsylvania had 812,000 licensed fishermen last fiscal year, along with many thousands of unlicensed youngsters, though you have few large impoundments, little frontage on Lake Erie—and some water pollution problems that would stagger an intellectual carp. Yet your Commission has served these anglers well, and kept the name of Pennsylvania in the top rank of fisheries management. And you seem to have taken the non-fishing citizenry along with you, else the Land and Water Conservation Fund would not have put its money into such a hatchery.

So the Fish and Wildlife Service offers official congratulations to all the citizens of Pennsylvania.

And I offer personal congratulations to Ralph Abele, his staff and everyone at this dedication of Big Spring Hatchery . . . not just for developing a new hatchery or new methods of stocking nor even on pollution solutions, but mostly for your stress on that great balm for social stress called the Gentle Art of Angling.

REMARKS OF FRANK E. MASLAND, JR.

Thank you, Mr. Smith, for a message which fits this occasion so well. We are pleased to know that the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife shares our concern in providing the rewards of fishing to an increasing number of Americans who more and more feel the need for relaxation—for getting away from the jungles of concrete and steel, from the noise pollution of telephone bells, traffic

roar, rock and roll music, the hum of machines and the clicking of computers to seek a few hours or days of peace and quietness along our trout streams—to admire in gentle solitude the majesty of a sunrise and sunset across a lake.

We have long noted that your Bureau of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has much in common with those of us connected with the Pennsylvania Fish Commission. Through the years we have felt and experienced a kinship that is unique in Federal-State relationships. Since 1962, these common interests have been formally joined in an agreement known here in Pennsylvania as the Cooperative State-Federal Trout Stocking Program. Your employees at the Lamar National Fish Hatchery in Clinton County have worked shoulder to shoulder with our fish culturists, biologists and waterways patrolmen to provide a sport fishery in Pennsylvania based on equal partnership, friendship and cooperation. Your biologists have made a great contribution to our knowledge of the scientific facts so necessary to protect and manage an important natural resource. Likewise, our division of fisheries has shared an equal role in the research we must have if we are to intelligently plan for the future.

To you, personally, we express deep appreciation for taking time from our busy schedule to be here today. I understand that within a few days, appropriate ceremonies will take place in Washington in connection with your confirmation as bureau director. On behalf of my fellow commissioners, our executive director and his staff, and all of our employees, I wish you every success and continued accomplishment in what I know is a complex and challenging job.

For one moment, to emulate Texas and Alaska, may I brag a bit. Pennsylvania, the number one industrial State, still retains 62% of our land in forests. Two out of three acres are forested—we have over 100,000 acres more of forest land than any northeast State including Maine. We have over 900 trout streams. Truly, we have proven worthy of our name—Pennsylvania.

I think it may be said that we of the Pennsylvania Fish Commission do not entertain the opinion that we exist solely for the purpose of creating means for producing fish.

We do not preserve a forest solely for the sake of the trees, nor coyotes and hawks to control the rodent nor the spectacular ungulate to preserve the species. We seek to preserve the forest that there, in God's cathedral, the jaded spirit of man may be re-created and find new life and purpose. Enlightened selfishness requires that we conserve our natural resources, the habitat and its native inhabitants that the world around him will so serve man that he may continually move toward the realization of his ultimate potential.

There is no substitute in a boy's life for the father who goes into the field with his son and a dog and a gun or with him wades a trout stream on a frosty morning.

There is no experience more certain to cause youth to turn to nature when in need of re-creation than the memory of a camp beside a lake and the smell of breakfast bacon. Its a smell that won't rub out.

I think we believe, those of us on the commission and our dedicated staff and field men, that what we are really trying to do is not just to raise fish but to provide an opportunity for a better way of life—and I'm sure this is equally so of the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife.

Thank you, sir, for your presence here today. Return often. Bring your rod and may the trout be rising, whether they be the product of our hatcheries or the native brook of big spring.

WINDOWS ON DAY CARE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a good deal of criticism, legitimized by the message accompanying the President's veto of the bill providing child development programs, has been directed against the whole concept of community care for children.

Mary Hart, in the Minneapolis Tribune describes a recent survey by the National Council of Jewish Women. A book, "Windows on Day Care," by Mary Dublin Keyserling reports the results of this survey of 77 cities. One of the centers cited in the book is the North Star Day Care Center in my district. The Hart story follows:

SURVEY MAKES SUGGESTIONS FOR DAY-CARE CENTERS

(By Mary Hart)

Custodial care—that's what a majority of children under 6, whose mothers work, are getting.

This care can be in the child's own home, a day-care home or a center that is understaffed or has underpaid directors and helpers.

Stimulation and education are lacking for many of the 6 million children of working mothers. About a third of these children are from families in poverty or close to the poverty line. If their mothers didn't work, the families would be on welfare.

These are a few of the facts uncovered by a survey done by members of the National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW) in 77 cities in this country.

Members of the council visited day-care centers, day-care homes and talked to mothers in all walks of life. The surveyors came up with many ideas and recommendations, which were compiled into a book (released last week) by Mary Dublin Keyserling, "Windows on Day Care."

Perhaps the most startling recommendation from the national group is that federal appropriations of at least \$2 billion are needed to expand and improve child care by 1973.

(A bill for \$2.2 billion was vetoed by President Nixon in December.)

Other recommendations included:

Comprehensive developmental child day-care services should be available to all families who wish their children to benefit from them.

Day care should be provided without charge for children in low income families, with fees scaled to income for others. Economically disadvantaged children should have priority.

Survey participants found that far too many children of working mothers were grossly neglected latch-key children on their own.

The survey also showed that most parents who want quality care for children are not eligible for care that is subsidized, and they cannot afford unsubsidized quality care.

"Developmental day-care services are expensive. They cost as much as \$2,000 to \$3,000 a year a child. Few families can afford this," wrote Mrs. Keyserling.

A few mothers interviewed received free care for children, while fees for others ranged from \$2 to \$100 a week, with their weekly outlays averaging \$15.

The council recommended that Head Start programs should be continued and expanded.

Also that day care should not be regarded as a "welfare" service.

"It is needed by families at all income levels. All publicly assisted day-care programs should be integrated racially, ethnically and with respect to socio-economic groupings," the council suggested. "State and local matching funding requirements should be reduced to 10 percent and waived as necessary."

Many members of NCJW are involved in helping start centers in their own communities.

One cited in the book is the North Star Day Care Center at 1110 22nd Ave. N. in the Bethlehem Lutheran Church. The Minneapolis section of the NCJW has provided funds and other support to the center, which, the book points out, is unique, because Jews and Indians worked together to develop a service to Indians, blacks and white children with a multi-racial staff and board.

Many other organizations are involved in the center. This year the center has expanded its services to extend day care for 16 kindergarten children at Hall School. The school contributes the facilities, but the staff is from the North Star Center.

CONGRESSMAN WYDLER URGES NATIONAL UNITY FOR LASTING PEACE

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, shortly after President Nixon announced his intention to interdict massive supplies of war materials being used for massive invasion of South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, the editorial department of Newsday, a leading U.S. paper, asked me to present a statement for use in connection with the President's action. I thanked them for the opportunity of making a direct and straightforward statement on the President's action.

The reaction of the American people will probably determine not only the way the war in Southeast Asia ends but the hopes of the world for a generation of peace.

The following is the article written by me and printed in Newsday in their Viewpoints section, Friday, May 12, 1972:

In time of national crisis, the American people have always rallied to support the President of the United States. I urge everyone to do that now.

The interdiction of supply lines in North Vietnam will protect the U.S. forces remaining in South Vietnam and require the invading armies of North Vietnam to deescalate the massive blitzkrieg-type attacks they have been launching in the three neighboring countries of South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

The mining of North Vietnam harbors is a step that can bring about real negotiations for a cease-fire in Vietnam and a return of our prisoners of war. That is what the President seeks and what our nation has a right to expect.

The one danger in such a move is a confrontation with the Soviet Union. The manner in which the harbor mining was announced minimizes such a danger, but it is still real. Every effort should be made to avoid such a military confrontation.

A political confrontation is also possible. This would be a loss of the May 22 trip of the President to the Soviet Union. If it is called off, the United States, the Soviet Union and the world would lose a real chance to make progress toward peace. But if that trip is to mean anything, it will have to be based on more than an exchange of hopeful words. There must be a respect for the interests of each part. If such a situation does not exist, it would be better to wait until it does.

Personally, I am heartened by the recent interest shown by the United Nations. I wish such interest had started with the massive invasion by North Vietnam, but I also believe we should seek help this organization can provide to get real negotiations started toward an honorable and peaceful solution.

Finally, I believe the entire situation is the storm before the calm. North Vietnam apparently attacked to get territory in South Vietnam and while U.S. forces were still present and American interests involved. It appears they wanted to improve their bargaining position. Our own steps appear to be directed at obtaining real negotiations. The President's latest proposal is for a withdrawal of all U.S. forces within four months of a cease-fire and a return of our prisoners of war.

There is, in my judgment, no political advantage to anyone to be found in this national crisis. But voices are being raised. They cry that the President should take stronger action. Other voices are crying out to impeach the President. Some are seeking partisan advantage. But the issue is not whether the President was right or wrong, but whether our nation will succeed or fail.

The President bears the responsibility for his actions and decisions and is answerable to the people in a few months for the results. Those who rush to condemn him make his position and that of our nation weaker and increase the risks of challenge from the Soviet Union—and a confrontation between us.

This is a time for our great nation to remain calm and to pull together. In that way we will increase the chances for a lasting peace.

THE DANGERS OF PRICE CONTROL

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the problem of inflation is one which concerns all Americans and it is the goal of all Americans to stem the tide of increasing wages and prices.

Where many differ is with regard to the method of achieving the desired result of a sound economy, one in which the dollar is able to purchase the traditional dollar's worth of value.

There are some who argue that the best way to stop inflation is, in effect, to ignore its causes, which include deficit spending by Government and an increase in the money supply, also by Government, acting through the Federal Reserve Board. While ignoring the causes, such spokesmen would treat the symptoms; namely, the increases in wages and prices. They would, in effect, outlaw such increases through compulsory controls enforced by Government.

Discussing the dangers of price controls, Economist Henry Hazlitt writes that—

The first thing to be said about wage and price fixing is that it is harmful at any time and under any conditions. It is a giant step toward a dictated, regimented, and authoritarian economy. It makes impossible arrangements that both sides are willing to agree to. It sets aside contracts that have already been made in good faith.

The question which is often asked today is whether or not the administration's policy of wage and price controls is "fair" and "equitable." To such a question, Economist Hazlitt responds this way:

There is no right way of doing it. There is no right way of doing a wrong thing . . . Instead of talking of "fair" profits, and "fair" wages, we ought to be talking about functional wages, functional prices, and functional profits. Prices have work to do. What they do in effect is to give the necessary signals to production. They direct production into the things that are most wanted . . . Price-fixing destroys the signals on which this ever-changing balance depends.

In order to achieve its goal of lower prices, the Government should be pursuing a policy far different from the policy of compulsory wage and price controls upon which we have embarked. It should, declares Mr. Hazlitt, encourage producers, and not place them in a strait jacket. He points out:

Price fixing does exactly the opposite . . . We've seen that the Pay Board gave the coal miners a 16.8 per cent increase for the first year; then when the first coal company asked for an increase in price, the Price Commission allowed it only a 4 per cent increase in price to meet that 16 per cent increase in wages . . . With this kind of whipsaw there will be a terrific squeeze on profits. The result will be to discourage investment and therefore to increase unemployment. That certainly wasn't the original object of the price control act.

Mr. Hazlitt's article appears in the May 1972, issue of *Imprimis*, the journal of the Center for Constructive Alternatives at Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Mich. I wish to share it with my colleagues, and insert it in the *Record* at this time:

THE DANGERS OF PRICE CONTROLS

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The first thing to be said about wage and price fixing is that it is harmful at any time and under any conditions. It is a giant step toward a dictated, regimented, and authoritarian economy. It makes impossible arrangements that both sides are willing to agree to. It sets aside contracts that have already been made in good faith. If an employer wishes to give a man a raise in pay, and the man deserves it, he is nonetheless forbidden to do it under the new regulations. This is a grave abridgment of individual liberty.

Price fixing and wage fixing do harm even if there is no inflation. In a free economy prices are constantly changing. They are changing to reflect changes in supply and demand, in costs, and in a hundred other conditions. Some prices are going up, other prices are going down. If an effort is made to freeze these prices and wages and costs exactly where they are, it immediately disturbs the relationship of prices and comparative profit margins which decides what things will be made and what quantities they will be made in. It upsets the process by which the free market decides how thousands of different commodities and services are to be made in the proportions in which people want them.

Of course, if we are in a period of inflation, price fixing does immensely more harm.

And it is never a cure for inflation. What causes inflation is an increase in the supply of money and credit. This is always brought on, directly or indirectly, by governmental policy—especially by governmental deficits which lead to an increase in the supply of money and credit.

In the last 42 years there has been a deficit in the federal budget for 33 years. In 1971—that is, the fiscal year that ended June 30 of this year, there was a deficit of \$23 billion. This was second only to a deficit of \$25 billion in 1968; apart from that, it was the highest peace-time deficit in our history. We are facing in the present fiscal year an estimated deficit of \$28 billion.

Now these deficits over the years have been financed by the issuance of paper money. At the end of 1939 demand bank deposits and currency in the hands of the public totalled \$36 billion; today that figure is \$227 billion. That is an increase of 530 per cent, in other words, a six-fold expansion of money. And this is the sole cause of the rise in prices over that same period of 195 per cent. American consumer prices have tripled in the last 32 years. What we have today is price fixing with monetary inflation. This must lead to shortages and to a profit squeeze. And it will tend to distort and to reduce production.

Sometimes people talk as if it would be possible to have universal price fixing. That is to say, the government would fix every wage, every price, every cost. This is absolutely impossible. While nobody knows how many separate prices and separate wages there are, there are good reasons for thinking that there cannot be fewer than about 10 million.

If you try to fix 10 million prices, what you are trying to fix is something in the order of 50 trillion cross-relationships of prices. This is something that no government is capable of determining—not to speak of policing. If they could police it, they would have to impose rationing and allocation of individual goods in order to keep prices where they were if they kept increasing the money supply. And even then, the whole project would be impossible for the simple reason that the government cannot control prices of imports. These are out of their control. And they would not know how to pass these increases in import prices through the economy without creating disruptions and distortions.

Now on August 15, 1971 the President did announce what purported to be a complete freeze of both wages and prices. But this freeze was purely rhetorical. There was not even an attempt to police it. In fact, nobody can police the actions and decisions of millions of employers and sellers and of 80 million workers.

It is not difficult to fix prices, or to pretend to fix prices, for a period of 90 days. But the trouble with fixing prices for a period of only 90 days is that if you continue to increase the money supply—and if all the other factors are what they were—then at the end of that period prices will jump to where they would have been anyway. So when the administration recognized this, in order to avoid the criticism that the whole 90 days price fixing was useless and pointless it had to extend the wage-and-price fixing. So we are now in Phase Two.

Nobody knows when Phase Two will end. And for a very good reason. When we get toward the end, there will again be fears: "As soon as we stop this price fixing, prices will jump, won't they?" So there's a self-perpetuating gimmick in so-called temporary price fixing. Once you hold prices down by edict, you have to keep holding them down in order to prove that you are doing some good.

If, on the other hand, the money supply were kept down, prices would not tend to rise and the price fixing would not be at all necessary. I'd like to say here, of course, that I'm simplifying somewhat in talking about the

effects of changes in the money supply. There is usually a lag between increases in the supply of money and increases in prices. This may range from 6 months to a year. But everything depends on the special conditions that exist. Just let's keep in mind that it's changes in the money supply that determine changes in the level of prices.

Phase One ostensibly froze every price and wage just where it was. Phase Two is supposed to be looser and more flexible. It is supposed to allow for and prevent hardships to individual producers. Therefore, it turned things over to a board, or a group of boards, so they could use their discretion. But discretion in the hands of bureaucrats is a very dangerous thing. The members of these three boards for price fixing and wage fixing are not even officials of the American government. They are ostensibly private citizens. Now to have private citizens telling everybody what they can charge and what they can pay raises legal and constitutional questions of a very grave nature.

The administration has set up three separate boards. One is a Cost of Living Council, which is supposed to preside over the whole arrangement. Then there is a Pay Board which is supposed to take care of wages and salaries. And a Price Commission that is supposed to fix prices. What is the relationship between these three bodies? It's been purposely kept quite vague.

The Price Commission is composed ostensibly only of members of the public. The Cost of Living Council is composed ostensibly only of members of the public. The Pay Board is a tripartite group of fifteen persons, five supposedly representing labor, five employers, and five public. Now union labor constitutes only one quarter of the labor in this country, yet every one of the five members of the Pay Board is a union leader. This is a little lopsided. And then Mr. Meany made it quite clear early on that the unions would feel free to pay no attention to any ruling that wasn't in their favor. That isn't going to help.

Then the Pay Board can fix wages and the Price Commission can fix prices. But when the Pay Board fixes wages, it pays no attention to prices because they aren't within its jurisdiction. Prices are in the jurisdiction of the Price Commission. But costs have already been set by the Pay Board. So if the Price Commission doesn't follow along submissively and endorse all the decisions of the Pay Board by allowing these increased costs to pass through, or if it tries not to let them pass through, then it is going to create great disruptions in the economy.

As a result of having two bodies governing wages and prices respectively, we have two formulas: one formula governing wages and another formula governing prices. Wages are to be allowed to go up 5.5 per cent, but prices are to be allowed to go up only 2.5 per cent.

Let's look at this 2.5 per cent for a moment. It's a completely arbitrary figure taken out of the air. If we want to control prices, why not just control prices—fix them just where they are? What is the point of allowing an increase of 2.5 per cent? If we fear it would do harm not to allow price increases of 2.5 per cent, why doesn't it do harm to allow increases of only 2.5 per cent?

But why is the wage increase figure set at three percentage points above the price figure? Why is the allowable wage rise set at 5.5 per cent, and the allowable price rise at only 2.5 per cent?

The rationale for this has grown up over the years. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has long been making estimates of the "man-hour productivity" in the country. These estimates have shown an average increase of about 3.2 per cent a year over the period since World War II. The Bureau now estimates that for the 1970's this increase in productivity will average 3 per cent a year.

This man-hour productivity, or production per man-hour, is not only a dubious average,

but an average of an average. For example, it's an average of the average of man-hour-productivity rises over a series of years. But this includes one year in which the rise was calculated to average 4.6 per cent and another year in which it didn't rise at all. Then again, this figure lumps together thirty-two different industries—or rather it lumps all industries together; but if you break this down into thirty-two industries, you find a very wide disparity from industry to industry. For example, the estimated increase in man-hour-productivity in footwear has averaged only 1 per cent a year; but in petroleum pipelines, it has averaged 10 per cent a year. Of course, if you break this figure down further to show differences between individual firms, the discrepancy is far wider still.

And whatever validity the overall 3.2 per cent man-hour-productivity figure may once have had, it doesn't exist any longer. From 1965 to 1970, the Bureau of Labor Statistics' own figures show that the average increase in man hour productivity was only 1.8 per cent. In 1970, it was less than 1 per cent. And a recent study published by the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis points out that the increase from 1965 to 1970 was only seven-tenths of 1 per cent for all private business. The author of that made his calculations on a slightly different basis than does the Bureau of Labor Statistics. But this shows how tricky and undependable all these statistics are. Yet this 3 per cent "annual increase" figure has been kept. It is constantly repeated in newspaper editorials. It has become a sanctified figure in Washington. It is an article of faith that labor productivity goes up 3 per cent a year regardless of what happens.

There are two main myths about this so-called man-hour-productivity. One is that it is labor productivity; the other is that it occurs automatically. We would get a much better idea of what we were talking about, if instead of speaking of man-hour-productivity we talked of man-machine-hour-productivity or labor-capital-productivity. This increase in productivity doesn't occur because workers work 3 per cent harder every year or 3 per cent better every year. It increases only because capital investment is increasing. It is this capital investment that increases the productivity. If a man, for example, can mow a half an acre of lawn in an hour with a hand mower, and his employer then gets him a power mower and he can now mow an acre in an hour; and then if his employer gets him a still bigger power mower and he can now mow two acres in an hour, then productivity has gone up four-fold. Suppose he then came around and asked for a four-fold increase in pay per hour? Well, first of all, the employer who bought the machine, if he had known in advance that his employee was going to demand this, wouldn't have bought the machine in the first place.

This is what is overlooked. New investment goes on in industry, increasing man-hour-productivity, first only if there has been enough profit in the past to yield the added capital to make that investment, and second, only if the outlook for future profits, for future return on new investment, remains sufficiently attractive. But if labor gets the whole gain from every increase in productivity, and nothing is left for capital, then investment will stop, and productivity increases will stop. This is a point which seems to have been overlooked.

But I don't know why I should be spending so much time examining these formulas for an allowable 5.5 per cent increase per year for labor and 2.5 per cent for prices, because no sooner were these formulas framed than they were violated. The Pay Board announced this 5.5 per cent figure on November 8. On November 19, only 11 days later, it ratified a wage increase in the coal industry that came to 16.8 per cent in the first year. This is more

than triple what it said it would allow. Then on December 9, it awarded the railway signal men a 46 per cent increase over forty two months. That's at an annual rate of 13 per cent over a period of 3.5 years. Such flagrant examples are numerous.

Now let's turn to prices. American Motors was granted a 2.5 per cent increase in its prices. General Motors was granted a 2.5 per cent increase in prices. Then Ford Motors was granted a 2.9 per cent increase in prices. And then Chrysler was granted a 4.5 per cent increase in prices. What has become of equality of treatment for all? And what is achieved by this kind of hocus-pocus? After Chrysler was permitted a 4.5 per cent increase, it turned around and said, "We are only going to increase prices 3 per cent." Why? Because competition compelled them to limit their price increase to that figure.

Of course, it's competition that holds down prices—not government ukase. And it's competition that we should continue to depend on. Competition exists in this country for at least nine-tenths of the commodities and services that we daily use. And that competition is no keener anywhere than in the automobile industry. Rival cars will sell within a dollar of each other in the same district. The automobile companies produce altogether about 380 different models—the American automobile companies alone, not counting foreign imports. That sounds like a big figure, but if you stop to think that there are about ten different types of Chevrolets, ten different types of Pontiacs, and so on, even within the General Motors Company, you can see how that gets to a very high total. Each one of these companies has to price its cars low enough to meet the competition and to maximize its own sales. Nobody is compelled to buy one make of car rather than another. Nobody is even compelled to buy a new car rather than a second-hand car. Most of us can postpone the purchase of a new car indefinitely. But this is the kind of situation that business daily faces. And this is the kind of competition that constantly keeps down prices to a minimum in relation to the general economic situation.

What the government ought to be doing to get prices low is to free and encourage the producers—not to put them in a strait jacket. But price fixing does exactly the opposite. And it's doing exactly the opposite now. We've seen that the Pay Board gave the coal miners a 16.8 per cent increase for the first year; then when the first coal mine company asked for an increase in price, the Price Commission allowed it only a 4 per cent increase in price to meet that 16 per cent increase in wages. On the Commission's own estimate, this would at best allow the coal companies to pass through about 60 per cent of the cost of the increased wage. With this kind of whipsaw there will be a terrific squeeze on profits. The result will be to discourage investment and therefore to increase unemployment. That certainly wasn't the original object of the price control act.

Price—and wage—fixing is always harmful. There is no right way of doing it. There is no right way of doing a wrong thing. There is no fair way doing something that oughtn't be done at all. We can't even define a fair price or a fair profit or a fair wage apart from the market, apart from the state of supply and demand. Instead of talking of "fair" prices, "fair" profits, and "fair" wages, we ought to be talking about functional wages, functional prices, and functional profits. Prices have work to do. What they do in effect is to give the necessary signals to production. They direct production into the things that are most wanted socially, to provide a balance among the thousands of different commodities and services in the proportions that the consumers want them.

Price fixing destroys the signals on which this ever-changing balance depends. It always does harm. And it is never a cure for

inflation. Not only is price fixing never a cure for inflation, but in the long run it prolongs and increases inflation. Quack cures divert attention from real causes and real cures. The real cause of the price rises of the inflation that we have had over the last 30 years, and that has intensified in recent years, has been the increase in the supply of money resulting from the enormous deficits that we have been piling up steadily. Yet today, when the attention of Congress, of the Administration, and of the press, is focused on whether price fixing is working well or not, we are building up the greatest deficit in our peace-time history. We are also building up an increasing money supply and intensifying the problem. False remedies drive out real remedies.

I'd like to say a final word about the morality of all this. I prefer not to make my own judgment but to quote one of the price controllers themselves. This was said by Mr. Earl D. Rhode, who is executive secretary of the Cost of Living Council. "The citizen's role in this program is to rat on his neighbor if his neighbor violated the controls." I leave the moral judgment of that to each of you.

CENTER FOR CONSTRUCTIVE ALTERNATIVES

Many people around the country are following our efforts at The Center for Constructive Alternatives with great interest, asking a variety of questions.

To meet this need we have prepared a little booklet which answers in concise detail the variety of questions posed these past months by our friends.

Who will be the scholars participating? How much will it cost? What will be the effects and benefits? Can others besides Hillsdale College students attend your programs? The inquiries go on.

Outlining our programs, commenting on our financial development, discussing our future intentions, this little booklet shares with you most explicitly the design and direction of The CCA.

To receive a complimentary copy of Questions, just check the square on the enclosed return envelope asking for more information.

FOR ABOLITION OF DINNER INTRODUCTIONS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the following is a suggestion I think many in public life will find worthwhile:

FOR ABOLITION OF DINNER INTRODUCTIONS

There should be a law enacted to abolish at all dinner meetings the time-wasting introductions of various categories of purported dignitaries who are not on the program. These introductions waste precious time.

Having suffered through this barbaric ritual for about 60 years, I am calling for an immediate bloodless revolution to forever banish this senseless custom. Many people with whom I have discussed this subject, including so-called dignitaries, agree with me that public figures gain nothing from these introductions.

About ten years ago, the Cook County Bar Association took the lead in this direction. It sponsored a dinner in honor of Judge James B. Parsons, just before he was inducted as a Judge of the Federal Court for the Northern District of Illinois. There were at least 1,000 people in attendance, and about 50 people seated at the head table. The Chairman of the dinner, the late beloved All American, "Duke" Slater, announced that the program listed the name of each person

seated at the head table, and that the list numbered them from left to right. At his request, they all stood simultaneously and received a round of applause.

In contrast to this rewarding experience, I attended a small dinner meeting recently with approximately 75 people in attendance. About 70 people were introduced as public figures. I and four other diners were not introduced. One of the strange things about these introductions at this meeting was that everybody present knew each other. However, you can imagine the traumatic effect that the failure to introduce our little group of five had on us. I particularly was chagrined because in addition to my long tenure at the Bar, I have an outstanding reputation as a notary public for at least 56 years.

These remarks were made by a distinguished member of the Illinois bar.

HOMEMAKER OF TOMORROW AWARD

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1972

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we live in difficult times, full of frightening headlines about our young people. We are told too often only about those who create problems or turmoil, and we too often forget the contributions being made by the great majority of the young. I would like to take a few minutes to share with my colleagues and the wide readership of the RECORD a bit of happy news concerning one of my constituents, Miss Christine Varney of Walpole, Mass. I insert the following article from the Boston Globe in the hope that it will help to remind all of us of the very best that America has to offer, and of the bright promise of tomorrow. The article, by Dorothy Crandall of the Globe staff, follows:

HOMEMAKER OF TOMORROW LOOKS OUTSIDE KITCHEN

In competition with 650,000 high school seniors, Christine Varney of Walpole has been named 1972 Betty Crocker All-American Homemaker of Tomorrow. "My mother is a very good cook," said the blue-eyed 17-year-old. "I do other things."

Here is a scholarship award offered to top students who regard homemaking as the most challenging of roles. Asked to define it formally, Chris Varley said, "Caught between the need for a stable family unit and her own desire to achieve recognition, the modern homemaker must make peace with herself and use her knowledge to bridge the gap between home and world."

Christine is valedictorian of her class at Walpole High School, a National Merit Scholarship Finalist, an editor of the school newspaper and her class yearbook. She plays the flute in the school band and the organ at church. A concerned teen, she joined classmates in a short course taught by experts who prepared them to handle the town's hot line. At the FACE switchboard she listens . . . then suggests sources of help.

Chris Varney's serious personal interest is science. She has completed the courses offered at high school and now works on special projects. Biochemistry and an M.D. degree hold peak interest for her. "I've been accepted at Brown University," she enthused, "for their intensive medical science program. That's three years . . . then four

at medical school. Brown was the school I wanted—what luck!"

Her father, Harold H. C. Varney, is principal of the Old Post Road Elementary School in Walpole. The Varneys have three other children: Earl, 16, Ross, 14, and Beth, 8.

This is a music-loving family. When Chris' flute came up missing during the football season, Ross taught her in two weeks to play his saxophone. "Sounded squeaky," she recalled, "but with all that noise, who heard? Before the next game the Walpole police found my flute—in perfect condition."

Currently Chris is teaching Beth the piano so that one day "she will play the church organ—as Ross does now."

The Betty Crocker award included a \$5,000 scholarship and a trip to Washington, D.C. "Most fun was meeting the 50 other finalists," she remembered. "One girl was a translator for her father in Corsica, another climbs western mountains and one is a professional designer of fashions for teens. Most exciting was the girl who lives in a commune and lectured on non-violence at Duke University."

Mrs. Varney said that her daughter often uses music to relax. "After telling us about her Washington trip, she went upstairs and played her flute. Some calm music we all enjoyed."

Her understanding family is what Chris really likes to talk about. "My parents encourage us to go ahead and try things."

TWO TRILLION TON-MILES OF FREIGHT

HON. CHARLES THONE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, National Transportation Week, May 14 to 20, pays tribute to the systems that move more than 2 trillion ton-miles of goods in the United States annually.

We salute our rail system which carries 735 billion ton-miles of freight, the pipelines that move 431 billion ton-miles of essentials; the highway system and the carriers on it which haul 412 billion ton-miles of freight; the inland waterways and Great Lakes craft which transport 305 billion ton-miles of goods, and the fast growing air transport which moves 3.4 billion ton-miles of products.

In observing this week, our first goal should be to work for transportation by free, competitive enterprise and against nationalization. We must have the type of legislation and regulation that will encourage investor-owned enterprise and movement of goods at the lowest possible prices.

A second goal of National Transportation Week should be efforts to encourage intelligent young people to prepare themselves for careers in transportation. Through the National Council of Physical Distribution Management, many companies are offering summer intern jobs for college students majoring in transportation. Efforts of this kind should be encouraged.

Two trillion ton-miles of goods are a lot to move each year, and before long our needs will double. We had better give thought to how we will provide for that growth.

COMMENTS ON THE TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of commentaries on the Trans-Alaska pipeline which I believe merit careful attention at this time. The first is a letter from the Honorable Thomas J. Anderson, chairman of the Committee on Conservation and Recreation, Legislature of the State of Michigan, to the President urging exquisite care in moving forward on this perilous project. The second is an excellent article appearing in the Washington, D.C. Star of Friday, May 5, 1972, under the headline "Expert Favors Canada Route for Oil," by the very able Roberta Hornig, staff writer for the Star. The next item is an excellent full page article appearing in the Washington Post by Mr. C. Robert Zelnick entitled "The Darkness at the End of the Pipeline."

The last is a superb article entitled "The Alaska Pipeline Reading Lesson" published by the Wilderness Society, Washington, D.C.

Certainly Americans concerned with the quality of their environment, wise use of natural resources, protection of fish and wildlife and most efficient expenditure of money to provide fuel and energy for the Nation will be interested in these excellent articles.

They also should be given full consideration by the administration.

The articles follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
April 26, 1972.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a legislator directly involved in the day-to-day business of making environmental decisions, as you in your office are called upon to do, I am greatly concerned that inadequate opportunity has been afforded the American public for expression on the proposed Prudhoe Bay to Valdez oil pipeline in Alaska. I fear the impending decision may be to proceed before the public's questions and concerns have all been heard or fully acknowledged.

I have learned with dismay that the environmental impact statement put forth for the proposed project is voluminous, not indexed, and available only in extremely limited quantities, thus having the effect of precluding public study and analysis.

I would most respectfully urge that the weight of your office be exerted in specifying a delay of ninety days for public review of the 3,500 pages of the impact statement, followed by appropriate hearings or sessions at which the alternatives to advancing the project can be aired and weighed publicly.

I can not emphasize too strongly that the "wastes" of northern Alaska are of concern to millions of Americans who know of them only through the printed word or the photograph. These "waste" areas are irreplaceable and a decision to proceed with the pipeline must come only after it is clear that the condition of the natural resources will not be diminished by such a decision.

A wrong decision, Sir, can not be cor-

rected once the scars of "progress" have been implanted.

Very respectfully,

THOMAS J. ANDERSON,
State Representative.

[From the Washington Star, May 5, 1972]

EXPERT FAVORS CANADA ROUTE FOR OIL
(By Roberta Hornig)

A former government energy expert says that transporting North Slope oil through Canada rather than across Alaska "is not only environmentally superior and economically more attractive but . . . would materially strengthen our national security."

S. David Freeman, who headed the energy policy staff of the President's Office of Science and Technology until he resigned last September, came out squarely for the Canadian pipeline route in a letter to Interior Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton this week, and urged the cabinet officer to do the same.

While at the White House, Freeman had worked on Nixon's energy message to Congress last July. He had been originally appointed by President Johnson.

Morton is currently contemplating whether to grant a permit opening the way for a controversial trans-Alaska pipeline to carry oil from the state's rich oil fields in the Arctic north to the ice-free port of Valdez in the southern part of the state.

The oil then would be shipped to the continental United States in tankers.

In his letter, Freeman pointed to recent oil finds by Canada in its Arctic north—discoveries that are believed to equal the Alaskan reserves.

"It is . . . of prime importance to our national security that we encourage the exploration and development of the rich petroleum resources in Canada, as well as those in the United States, and thus lessen our reliance on less secure imports from the Middle East," Freeman said.

He added that building a pipeline "land bridge" from Alaska down the MacKenzie River Valley "would be the strongest possible measure to further exploration and development of secure North American petroleum."

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

Freeman's letter is in the nature of comments on the Interior Department's environmental impact statement and its accompanying economic analysis of the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline.

The impact statement agreed with environmentalists' arguments that the proposed Alaska route would pass through intense earthquake belts and that oil spills would be inevitable during tanker transport to the U.S. West Coast.

The accompanying economic analysis, however, brought up the question of "national security" and seemed to favor the Alaskan pipeline over any alternative route.

FALSE NOTION

Downgrading the argument that the Alaska route is necessary for "national security" purposes, Freeman said that that route would fail to provide the incentive and means for developing the Canadian oil and bringing it to U.S. markets.

"It would only tap the Alaskan oil and direct it toward the West Coast market, which is not large enough to consume all of it," he said.

Further, he added, "the most vulnerable areas to short energy supplies are the East and the Midwest, which would better be served through a Canada routing."

"The notion that we can't afford to wait for the completion of the Canadian energy corridor is . . . a false notion that is detrimental to obtaining a secure source of energy for the United States in the 1980's," Freeman argued.

Earlier this week, 12 members of the Senate asked Morton to endorse a Canadian routing.

THE DARKNESS AT THE END OF THE PIPELINE
(By C. Robert Zelnick)

Among those who care about such things, the conviction runs deep that the battle over the trans-Alaska pipeline has become the Interior Department's Vietnam. Ill-conceived from its inception, fraudulently purveyed, divisive in its political repercussions and disastrous in its consequences, the project has little to recommend itself other than the enormous quantity of resources already poured into its accomplishment.

Yet Interior continues to see light at the end of the pipeline. That it will issue the right-of-way needed by the Alyeska Pipeline Company—a consortium of seven oil industry giants—to cross federal lands in Alaska seems a foregone conclusion. On March 20, the day his department released its massive "final" impact statement—which conceded every significant ecological objection ever voiced against the 789-mile Prudhoe Bay-to-Valdez route, Interior Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton promised a decision "within about 45 days." Eight days later, after meeting with Morton, Peter Flanigan and other administration officials to express his country's desire "for the construction of a Mackenzie Valley pipeline," Donald S. MacDonald, Canada's Minister of Energy, Mines, and Resources, told reporters at a Washington news conference: ". . . I had the impression that, with so much effort and study invested in the trans-Alaska pipeline, that it rather looks as though they would be giving that priority in their consideration."

Actually, as Morton conceded in an appearance on the "Today" show the morning after Interior released its report, his department could not have decided anything with finality within 45 days. Since April, 1971, Interior has been blocked by an injunction issued by the federal district court in Washington from issuing the permit. Two weeks advance notice is required, during which time Judge George L. Hart Jr. will have to satisfy himself that Interior has complied with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. The act requires a complete statement of the consequences of any agency action "significantly affecting the quality of the human environment," plus a thorough examination of alternative courses.

Hart, a model of judicial self-restraint, is expected to rule for Interior. The Wilderness Society, Friends of the Earth, and the Environmental Defense Fund—the three environmental group plaintiffs—would then probably appeal to the more assertive U.S. Court of Appeals, with the loser, in all likelihood, taking the case to the Supreme Court. The ultimate result is almost certain to be a landmark decision in environmental—or, for that matter, administrative—law.

THE CHOICES

The nub of the social issue involved is not whether Alaskan oil should be brought to market. Rather, the choice is between an 1,800-mile overland route, 1,500 miles of which would traverse Canada's Mackenzie Valley, and a shorter land route from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez, with the oil then moving via tankers to ports on the U.S. West Coast. The nub of the legal issue is whether Interior has considered the Canadian alternative to the degree necessary to satisfy the environment law, and whether, regardless of Interior's diligence, the evidence favoring the Canadian route is not so overwhelming as to make any right-of-way grant through Alaska a clear abuse of administrative discretion.

Environmentalists are convinced that the Mackenzie Valley route is superior, in part because it involves a single pipeline corridor rather than two, and that should Morton

decide otherwise, they can beat him in court. They maintain that abundant support for their position can be found in Interior's own impact statement of March 20. The stakes are high. The pipeline project would be the largest undertaking in the history of private enterprise. The oil industry claims to have invested almost \$100 million to date in studying the Alaskan terrain and in procuring pipe and construction materials. That figure, even if exaggerated, is a mere pittance compared to the profits they expect to reap from the venture.

The known oil field in the Prudhoe Bay area—three giant pools running inland from a 40-mile stretch along the Beaufort Sea and covering an area the size of Massachusetts—exceeds 10 billion barrels. This, however, is only a fraction of what the industry eventually hopes to find. Forty billion barrels is a more realistic estimate. In September, 1969, an assortment of producers paid Alaska more than \$900 million for the privilege of looking for more North Slope oil. A barrel of oil sells for \$3.25 on the West Coast, more in the Midwest and East.

NO "GOOD" WAY

Despite years of study and volumes of "stipulations" designed to protect the environment, there remains no "good" way of running 2 million barrels of oil a day through 48 inches of pipe at a temperature of 145 degrees Fahrenheit over and under a vast stretch of Arctic wilderness. You have to begin by building gravel service roads and air strips large enough to accommodate the big Hercules aircraft. You must find more gravel for 12 camp sites and 6 pumping stations, each 50 acres; this means gouging about 50 million cubic feet of gravel out of riverbeds and off the tops of hillsides along the way. Stream siltation and land erosion are the inevitable results. Some 350 streams would be crossed by the route. Many are spawning grounds for salmon and grayling. Oil spills can be a problem there. They can be even more of a problem if the oil gets carried out of the Beaufort Sea and trapped under the ice. Then the oil becomes a permanent part of the marine ecology.

If you decide to bury the pipe all the way, its heat melts the permafrost, causing slides and differential settlement, eroding the support for the structure and eventually causing a break. When you are forced to build part of it on stilts, you erect a barrier that blocks caribou and other migrating animals and subjects the line to greater risks of surface damage. When you dig a ditch to catch expected oil spills, the ditch becomes a moat, entrapping other animals.

Your service road extends civilization where it has never reached before. The construction activity, the planes landing and taking off and the helicopters hovering overhead frighten bear and caribou, rare birds and sheep. When these move to other areas, they die or cause other animals to die. The ecological balance in the Arctic is fragile. In the winter, the caribou uses almost all its energy just staying alive. A single timberwolf can exhaust and kill the stoutest buck in the herd. So can a bulldozer.

What we get in return for the partial destruction of our nation's largest wilderness area is more oil, a lot of natural gas, the corresponding need to spend fewer U.S. dollars buying foreign sources of energy, and, arguably, a mild, temporary improvement in our national defense posture. This latter case has been stated so often and with such apparent conviction by both the Interior Department and the oil industry that one wonders how we would have survived had not the Prudhoe Bay field been discovered in 1968. Statistical projections provide a clue.

THE EARTHQUAKE PROBLEM

By 1980, the United States is expected to be using about 22 million barrels of oil daily and producing some 10.4 million barrels, ex-

cluding what is to be drawn from the North Slope. Part of our expected deficit can be made up by importing an estimated 4 million barrels a day from nations in the Western Hemisphere. The rest will have to come from Indonesia and the Middle East.

Alaska's 2 million barrels daily could reduce this dependency somewhat for about five years. After that, our demand is expected to so outstrip domestic production that North Slope oil will be of little strategic value. In the case of a minor outbreak in the Middle East, say between 1980 and 1985, the benefit is obvious. But if the problem were big and with Russia, an exposed pipeline can offer small comfort to our military strategists. Prudhoe Bay is only 600 miles from Siberia.

While conservationists—at least those involved in the pipeline battle—accept the reality that 10 billion to 40 billion barrels of oil are going to find their way to market, they believe that even if oil was the only resource involved and even if big tankers weren't needed for the remainder of the Alaskan route, the Canadian route, while longer, is preferable. For one thing, the Alaskan area involved is renowned for its extreme seismic activity. In the past 70 years, some 23 major earthquakes have clobbered the terrain over and under which the Alaskan pipeline would go; any one of the quakes could have caused a catastrophic break in the pipe. Valdez itself, where a 900-acre, 510,000-barrel-capacity "tank farm" is planned, is a "new" city, about four miles northwest of its predecessor. The "old" Valdez was substantially washed into the sea as tidal waves of up to 170 feet rolled ashore following the great Alaskan earthquake of 1964.

The route through Canada poses no comparable seismic problems. It has fewer miles of unstable soil and more existing roads, even railroads. From Edmonton, the proposed Canadian terminus, existing pipelines now extend both to the Midwest (Chicago) and the West Coast (Seattle). Certainly less environmental damage is involved in expanding existing facilities or building parallel facilities than in constructing new ones.

THE GAS LINE

The relative merits of one land route versus another, however, are matters about which a court is unlikely to substitute its judgment for that of an administrative agency with admitted expertise in the field. But what about two land routes versus one land route? Environmentalists claim that this is the fatal legal weakness in Interior's position. Buried, almost lost in the department's six-volume statement, and totally lacking from its consideration of alternatives to the Alaska route, is the acknowledgement that "at some time during the operation of the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline, it would become necessary to transport to market the natural gas that would be produced with the Prudhoe oil."

Indeed it would. In fact, it is estimated that 26 trillion cubic feet of gas are under the Prudhoe Bay fields waiting to be developed with the oil. Moreover, Interior says, "route selection and construction procedures would be similar to those for an oil pipeline but with some simplifications resulting from reduced pipe weight and lower operating temperatures."

Yet logistics militate against the likelihood of a trans-Alaska gas pipeline. The gas would have to be liquefied at Valdez prior to shipment. Interior estimates that operational costs of a liquefaction plant would run to half a billion dollars a year. Additionally, there are only about a dozen liquefied natural gas tankers operating in the world, while some 20 to 40 would have to be built to handle the Valdez traffic alone. Thus, Interior concludes, "A gas pipeline across Alaska appears to be a remote possibility because of the problems involved in shipment from the southern terminus; a gas pipeline through

Canada to the Midwest seems to be much more feasible."

Of the various Canadian possibilities, Interior leans toward the Mackenzie Valley, noting, "The Mackenzie River is a valuable artery for use in the construction of a trans-Canada gas pipeline. Good all-weather roads and some railway mileage also exist, and existing winter trails would be valuable at the right time of year." So much does Interior favor the Canadian route when it comes to natural gas—where neither oil industry prestige nor money is on the line—that in March Secretary Morton set aside a 300-mile corridor on federal lands in northern Alaska along the route the natural gas would travel from Prudhoe Bay to Fort McPherson atop the Mackenzie Valley.

If Interior is a bit circumspect about confessing that, in effect, it plans to grant two rights-of-way instead of one, it is far less bashful in assessing the environmental impact of 41 oil-laden tankers as they steam between Valdez and West Coast ports. Here, in fact, the report takes on a quality of terrifying candor, much like Yukio Mishima standing on the balcony, coldly describing the act of harikari he is about to perform.

The sea journey poses exceptional hazards, particularly for the crews of oil tankers. Port Valdez is a 3-mile-wide, steep-walled glaciated fjord that extends east-west about 14 miles. It narrows to less than a mile before dumping out into the Valdez Arm section of the 2,500-square-mile Prince William Sound. The coastline is rocky and treacherous, not entirely free of icebergs and blasted by frequent gale-force winds. A special pilot must guide each vessel through the narrow neck of the port.

The area, moreover, is one of extreme seismic activity. Prince William Sound was the epicenter of the 1964 Alaskan earthquake during which, as Interior notes, 74 lives were lost mainly as a result of submarine landslides, sudden large-scale tectonic displacements, destructive waves, and, to a lesser extent, vibration of structures."

From Prince William Sound the tankers would run into the Gulf of Alaska and down the foggy northern Pacific coast. "During the cool months," Interior says, the Gulf has the highest frequency of extratropical cyclones in the Northern Hemisphere." From October through February, it is rocked by waves of 12 feet or better about 20 per cent of the time. Moreover, the 1964 Alaskan earthquake was but one of a large number of earthquakes of moderate and high intensity that have occurred in or near the Gulf of Alaska, and there is no geologic basis to assume that other equally devastating earthquakes will not occur in the near future."

REHABILITATING BIRDS

Plans call for about 10 per cent of the tankers to pass through the narrow Strait of Juan de Fuca—where again navigational hazards will require the assistance of a pilot—and into the 40 miles of beautiful waterway known as Puget Sound, a recreational haven for 2 million Americans and Canadians. The remaining vessels would head for San Francisco, Los Angeles and points further south.

Again, seismic dangers will be extreme. Interior recalls that "on April 13, 1949, an earthquake with an intensity of 7.1 on the Richter scale and an epicenter between Olympia and Tacoma resulted in approximately \$25 million damage to the Puget Sound area. More recently, on April 29, 1965, an earthquake of slightly less intensity (6.5) with an epicenter between Seattle and Tacoma caused an estimated \$12.5 million damage to the Seattle area. These are the two largest of the numerous earthquakes and have occurred in this region during the last hundred years; the level of seismic activity has increased substantially during the last few decades."

Interior estimates that if the performance

of the oil tankers on the Valdez run was no better than the worldwide average, we can anticipate spills averaging 384 barrels a day, or about 140,000 barrels a year. Better vessels may reduce these numbers somewhat, but the damage per spill would likely exceed the world-wide average since "large spills in the area would be more difficult to contain, clean up and restore because of the distances from sources of ships and cleanup gear and the generally limited manpower in the region."

Interior details the impact all this filth would like have on the huge salmon runs of the Northern Pacific, and how it would probably impede, and perhaps wipe out, fishing in the Port Valdez-Prince William Sound area, where the coastal waters are today as pristine as any on earth. On a cheerier note, while chronicling the devastating effect on oil spill might have on the many rare migratory bird species that inhabit Alaska-Canadian coastal areas during certain months, Interior records for posterity Alyeska's pledge to "rehabilitate" those birds belonging to endangered species. The term seems peculiarly appropriate. In this forgiving society we "rehabilitate" drunkards, junkies, whores and others who have gone astray. Clearly the murrelets, loons, grebes, albatrosses, gulls, terns, ducks, geese and shore birds who fall victim to the oil industry's determination to bring its goods to market along the route it deems best are out of step with the natural order of things and gravely in need of "rehabilitation." Unfortunately, only about one in seven of the poor creatures doused in the San Francisco Harbor spill a year ago lived long enough to profit from the experience.

SHOCKING OMISSIONS

If the six volumes of Interior's report dealing with the environmental impact of the combination overland-tanker route contain some shocking revelations, the three-volume economic analysis shocks by what it fails to disclose. Simply stated, a careful reading of Interior's economic analysis provides no clue as to why Alaskan crude should go to the West Coast in the first place, certainly none justifying an iota of increased environmental risk.

The West Coast is second only to the Southwest in the production of petroleum. It will not need any Alaskan crude for the next few years, will not be able to absorb 2 million barrels a day from the North Slope until well into the 1980s, and, if as expected, Alaskan production increases to 5 million barrels a day, the West Coast will not be able to absorb the surplus during the life of the pipeline.

Thus, even ignoring the greater hazard of the tanker route from Valdez, it is nonsense to say, as Secretary Morton did on his March 21 "Today" show appearance, that "if the pipeline went through Canada, and if it ended up in the middle of the country, you would then have to bring oil into the West Coast by tanker. So the same amount of oil would be arriving by tanker."

The West Coast simply does not need as much oil as Alyeska wants to provide. And, if it did, the obvious source would be the Southwest or Canada, a fact Canadian minister Macdonald has been pressing upon his Washington counterparts without apparent success. On April 19, for example, Macdonald was questioned in the Ottawa House of Commons by David Anderson, a Vancouver MP active in the battle against Alaskan tanker traffic, as to whether Canada was willing to supply the United States with enough oil to compensate for the anticipated additional two years it would take to complete the trans-Canada route. Macdonald's reply:

"Both in my discussions with Secretary Morton and other officials of the United States administration in Washington and recently with Secretary Rogers last week, I made it perfectly clear that Canada was prepared to supply additional quantities of oil to

the United States not only for a two-year period, but a longer period, and that this would be facilitated by their lifting their quota system."

Would Alyeska, assuming a right-of-way is granted for the trans-Alaska pipeline, then be stuck with a \$2 billion to \$4 billion Edsel, given the bearish West Coast market for Alaskan crude? A few energy economists believe so and have privately expressed surprise that the oil industry has been able to maintain so united a front on the issue while both the East and Midwest hunger for additional crude oil. More probably, Arco and British Petroleum, the two companies with the biggest positions in the pipeline, would be able to trade their excess crude to Japan in exchange for Japanese rights to Middle East oil, rights purchased long in advance. The Middle East crude oil could then be sold at a good profit on the East Coast, bailing the two companies out of their predicament but making an utter shambles of any national defense arguments for trans-Alaska route.

WINNING IN THE COURTS?

There is a reasonable chance that the environmentalists will ultimately prevail in the courts. Perhaps they will persuade the courts that Interior's failure to consider adjacent oil and gas pipelines rendered its statement procedurally inadequate. Perhaps they will win an even more significant point by forcing Interior to abide by the results of its own research, thus introducing important substantive requirements, as well as procedural ones, into the environment law.

Interior, meanwhile, hopes that its "final" impact statement on the trans-Alaska pipeline will at last get the environmental monkey off its back. From the outset it seems to have regarded the environment statute as an unwelcome encumbrance to a predetermined course.

Two years ago the department attempted to grant the oil consortium a right-of-way to build a service road adjacent to the pipeline, arguing, incredibly, that the road and the pipeline were unrelated. Its impact statement on 361 miles of gravel carved into the middle of Alaska's wilderness totaled four pages, and became the subject of the court injunction still in effect.

Interior's second attempt at compliance with the environmental law was a bit more sophisticated, but not much. Its multi-volume "draft" impact statement, produced in January, 1971, during the interregnum between the Hickel and Morton secretaryships, was basically a collection of data and arguments compiled by Alyeska itself. In that report, the department found it unnecessary either to consider the impact of tanker traffic from Port Valdez to the West Coast or to assess the feasibility of a trans-Canada pipeline route. Even today, Secretary Morton can be heard arguing from time to time that consideration of the Canadian alternative is superfluous because "no application for a Canadian route is pending." Since the 1965 *Scenic Hudson* case, however, federal courts have held that an administrative agency charged with protecting the environment has a duty to consider alternatives not placed before it by the parties. It cannot only "sit as an umpire blandly calling balls and strikes," the court found. In any event, Interior's 1971 statement was sufficiently derelict so that even the Corps of Engineers, in its formal comment, warned that the department had failed "fully to comply with the letter and spirit of the Environmental Policy Act."

SCARCE STATEMENT

The Justice Department, fighting the pipeline case for Interior in court, has also shown a greater zest for adversaria than guardianship of the public domain. Last summer, more than a year after the first lawsuit was filed, Justice tried unsuccessfully to remove the case from the District of Columbia to

the friendlier confines of the U.S. District Court in Anchorage, Alaska. This past April, when MP Anderson and several Canadian residents of the Puget Sound area sought to intervene in the case, Justice opposed the motion.

Now we have Interior's third attempt at compliance with the environmental act. Legally, the department hopes that by confessing the devastating results of its proposed action, it can achieve what it failed to get by denying those results in its two earlier efforts. Politically, it appears anxious to present the public with a *fait accompli*. In the weeks since March 20, only seven copies of the impact statement have been made available to the public without cost in six cities across the entire "lower 48" states. For others, the volumes cost \$42.50 a set. Faced with a demand for public hearings, Under Secretary William Pecora claimed that "a public hearing would be a circus" and would "interfere with a more thoughtful and rationale analysis of this complex document."

"Clearly the department has not tried to encourage hearings or informed debate," complained the Christian Science Monitor on May 2, in what might pass as the editorial understatement of the year. The Monitor went on to wonder "how much 'thoughtful and rational analysis' the Interior Department has itself given to the study." Before too long the federal courts may themselves be wondering the same thing.

THE ALASKA PIPELINE READING LESSON

Done any reading lately? Well, hold your spectacles. Because the Interior Department has just given you the reading assignment of your life.

You have until May 4 to:

Lay your hands on a copy of the nine-volume environmental impact statement on the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline. (Only 600 were printed.)

Read its 3,550 pages.

Render a "thoughtful, substantial comment." (See above.)

This is what the Interior Department considers public involvement in the decision-making process.

We hope you will be able to read the statement and render comments, but you should know the following:

1. There are exactly seven copies available for public inspection in the "lower 48" states. They can be seen during office hours in certain government agencies in Washington, D.C., Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland and Seattle.

2. Sets can be purchased through the mail, but they cost \$42.50, and delivery time is unknown.

3. The statement is not well organized or indexed, and finding what you're looking for may require days of tedious searching.

4. Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton has said he may issue a pipeline permit on or after May 4.

Is it any wonder that conservationists are asking for more time and for public hearings to evaluate this "complex report"?

WHOSE GOVERNMENT IS THIS?

No doubt the seven oil companies which own the Alyeska Pipeline Service Co. are anxious to go ahead and impatient with what they view as delays. But we believe it's time they learned that the government of the United States isn't some third-level subsidiary which they can order around. And the public lands of the United States are not their private domain.

Two years ago they were shocked and outraged that conservationists could force the government to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act. Last year they were offended by the adverse public reaction to the first, abortive environmental impact statement, which had been submitted to

them for editing before it was released to the public.

And now, though the new impact statement reveals strong reasons for building the pipeline through Canada rather than south to the Alaskan port of Valdez, they are anxiously awaiting a permit to go ahead with their original plans, using the pipe and equipment already placed presumptuously along the proposed route.

As a person concerned about the environment, you ought to blow the whistle on this whole charade of sanctifying previously arrived-at conclusions. Why should the American people be frozen out of this critical environmental decision? Why, as we asked in an earlier alert, must "the public be damned"?

Note the words of Under Secretary Pecora, above: a public hearing would be a "circus." And note, too, the implication: hearings involving the public are not particularly thoughtful or rational.

WHY PUBLIC HEARINGS ARE NEEDED

Actually, the impact statement itself is one of the best arguments for public hearings. One of the strongest impressions one gets reading through it is of the number of unsolved problems which still exist—problems that the statement openly recognizes and for which it has no answers. These problems relate to untried and untested engineering methods, incomplete environmental research, deficient land-use control and planning, and other matters of critical importance.

Many important aspects of the proposed Prudhoe Bay-to-Valdez pipeline are described for the first time in the statement. Without hearings, the many interested scientists not involved in government or oil company research will have no meaningful opportunity to comment on this new material. Or, if they do, their communications can be safely filed away and ignored.

Here are some other reasons why public hearings are needed:

Gas transportation systems

The department says "it seems clear that a single gas line will be built through Canada to the United States markets." (Economic Analysis, Vol. I, p. C-22.) It says such a transportation system is an "essential" element (Vol. I, p. 50) of any oil pipeline system and states that "less environmental cost would result from a single [gas and oil] transport corridor than from two separate corridors" (Vol. I, p. 273). But no effort has been made to evaluate these savings in environmental cost, and on March 20 a department spokesman said, "We are completing such an analysis from the economic point of view only." Further impact analysis is limited (Vol. I, p. 176) because the "absence of any firm gas transportation proposal by the owner companies limits the amount of descriptive information available." (Vol. I, p. 74.) Apparently Interior didn't even ask the oil companies for information on Canadian pipeline plans—despite the intensive studies going on in Canada.

Congressman Les Aspin of Wisconsin points out why the Interior Department hasn't received an application for an Alaska-Canada pipeline. "The same oil companies which dominate the Alyeska (trans-Alaska pipeline) consortium also dominate the Mackenzie Valley Pipe Line Co., and they are hardly likely to submit an application in competition with themselves." However, it's important to note that as recently as March 29 the Canadian government reiterated its long-standing interest in having the oil pipeline go through Canada rather than having tankers carrying oil from Valdez past and through Canadian coastal waters to the west coast of the United States.

Alternative oil pipeline through Canada

Acknowledging that potential gas pipeline routes through Canada are also attractive oil pipeline routes, the report notes that the Canadian routes avoid the maximum earthquake threats, eliminate impacts and hazards to west coast marine areas, and have no greater terrestrial impact in many significant respects in spite of their greater overland lengths. (Vol. 5, p. 238.)

The report states that an oil pipeline through the Mackenzie Valley of Canada would be "an equally efficient [economic] alternative to the trans-Alaska route (Economic Analysis, Vol. I, p. 1) but also admits it did not consider the additional economies of building an oil pipeline through the same corridor as the gas line. (Economic Analysis, Vol. I, p. C-23.) Obviously, with such economies considered, the Mackenzie alternative would not be "equally" but "more" efficient. This gross error must not be allowed to stand!

Marine transportation systems

Volume 3 (449 pages) contains extensive descriptive material on the marine environment and tanker transport of oil between Alaska and west coast ports. The evaluation of oil tanker traffic indicates unavoidable adverse effects from chronic oil pollution in port areas, from intentional ballast treatment discharge at Port Valdez, and from accidental discharge by collision or by negligence. Estimates of accidental discharge are as high as 140,000 barrels a year, but "the impacts of oil upon the various biological systems cannot be predicted in a quantitative manner." (Vol. 4, p. 196.)

Elsewhere the report (Vol. 4, p. 608) says an "irreversible commitment of some marine biotic resources would occur in Valdez Arm as a result of chronic oil pollution." But the actual area or extent can't be predicted. Even so, "permanent and far-reaching effects upon certain forms of plankton would occur," causing a "general decrease in primary productivity which would in turn affect other organisms of the ecosystem, such as salmon, herring, razor clams, murex, auklets and other species of birds, fish and shellfish."

But all this was known before the statement was written. Is this the kind of solid, substantial and detailed information on which decision-makers can render a sober and objective judgment? With no more than this to go on, how could they know we would gain more than we lost by proceeding with the pipeline-tanker transportation system?

Pipeline breaks and contingency plans

The statement acknowledges that a "no-spill performance" would be "unlikely." (Vol. I, Summary.) It goes on to say that even under emergency shutdown procedures as much as 64,000 barrels (2.6 million gallons) of oil could escape from a pipeline break (Vol. I, p. 23); and that "minor leaks are practically undetectable" (Vol. 4, p. 11). A "minor leak" turns out to be anything less than 750 barrels (31,500 gallons) a day (Vol. 4, p. 135). In spite of this, the effectiveness of surveillance, monitoring and cleanup procedures has not been fully discussed.

What effect would a pipeline break have on the environment and ecology? Throughout the report there is an unwillingness to quantify the damage. But occasionally one stumbles on a shocker like this: "For example, a significant spill into the upper Gulkana River during the peak of the salmon run would likely cause fishery damages of catastrophic proportions." (Vol. 4, p. 135.) And this is only part of the story, for as one can find in Volume 3, page 311, the Gulkana flows into the Copper River, which supports one of the greatest birdlife concentrations on earth. (Here lies one of the more irritating aspects of the impact statement; you have to search through the mas-

sive text and piece together many of its implications—one of the reasons public hearings are so necessary.)

Despite all these dire implications, the recently announced Interior Department engineering stipulations fail to require Alyeska to submit its contingency plans to the government before the construction permit is granted!

The alternative of deferral

Much of this voluminous statement consists of advocacy rather than a careful weighing of alternatives open to the U.S. government. Excluding Volume 6 (comments and attachments) and the three-volume economic and security statement, some 1,850 pages—77 percent of the first five volumes—are devoted to the environmental impact of granting the permit. Fewer than five pages—two-tenths of one percent—deal with the alternative of deferring the project. (Vol. I, p. 258; Vol. 5, p. 1 and pp. 8-10.)

Yet the paragraphs devoted to deferral note these advantages: (a) an opportunity for studies of "innovative pipeline technology," (b) "operation of a pilot plant for ballast treatment," (c) "installation and operation of a large-scale hot oil pipeline experiment" in relation to permafrost terrain, (d) "pipeline leak detection research," (e) "more exact definition of the gas transportation system that would be proposed," and (f) more definitive studies of marine and arctic ecosystems.

ENVIRONMENTAL DANGERS CONFIRMED

Until the Interior Department released this statement it was still possible for pipeline advocates to say that conservationists were "extreme," "far out" and "fright-peeders" when they warned of damage that could be inflicted by the trans-Alaska pipeline. But no longer. Here is what the Interior Department itself has to say about these environmental dangers:

"It is almost a certainty that one or more large earthquakes will occur in the vicinity of the southern two-thirds of the pipeline. (Vol. I, p. 97.)

"Construction scars would be visible for the life of the project and for years after the pipeline had been removed." (Vol. I, p. 211.) These scars would occur at 12 pumping stations, seven airstrips, 26 permanent steel towers for microwave transmission, the main haul road and numerous access roads to the 234 gravel sites and 54 quarries; and 12 construction camps, as well as the pipeline itself. Excluding the Prudhoe Bay field, these would occupy an estimated 40,000 acres (Vol. 4, p. 257) and require nearly 70 million cubic yards of gravel. (Vol. 4, p. 68.)

In spite of oil industry claims to the contrary, including newspaper and television ads, experiments on revegetating the tundra that will be torn up by pipeline construction have not worked. (Vol. 4, pp. 102-3.)

A year ago conservationists were ridiculed for suggesting that buried pipe carrying hot oil would melt the permafrost, causing the pipe to collapse. Belatedly, Alyeska now plans to elevate 354 miles (44 percent) of the 789-mile pipeline (Vol. 4, p. 16)—compared to its original plan for only 40 miles (5 percent) of elevated pipe. But there is still no definite determination of how many miles of pipe will be buried. And there is an additional, unsolved problem: Wherever protective vegetation is destroyed on the tundra, the underlying permafrost will thaw bringing drainage and erosion problems for years to come—at supports, construction pads, ditching, roads, buildings, etc.

As wildlife authorities have been saying all along, the report acknowledges that caribou and other animals will die needlessly from loss of habitat, the spilling of toxic substances on forage, and disruption of migration patterns. (Vols. 4, pp. 152, 171, 154-5.)

The report further acknowledges the pos-

sibility of catastrophic salmon losses (Vol. 4, pp. 135-36); the likelihood of "pronounced reductions" of grizzly bear populations (Vol. 4, p. 534); the certainty of "considerable" siltation of three rivers noted for their fish resources (Vol. 4, p. 527); the threat of "both locally and internationally significant losses to water-related birds due to oil" (Vol. 4, p. 538); the possibility of increased mortality rates among young moose, mountain sheep and caribou because of aircraft disturbance (Vol. 4, p. 149); the threat of "illegal and wanton shooting of peregrine falcons and the robbing of the young for falconry" arising from access to habitat (Vol. 1, p. 204); and the killing of indeterminate numbers of sea otters and fur seals, which are sensitive to even small amounts of oil. (Vol. 1, pp. 207-8.)

NATIONAL SECURITY AND OIL ECONOMICS

The final three volumes of the report deal with "An Analysis of the Economic and Security Aspects of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline," Congressman Aspin, a former member of the staff of the Council of Economic Advisers, has called the study "pseudo-economics, a sham and a hoax."

As noted above, the economic study fails to take into account the most obvious economy of all: constructing the gas line and oil line in the same corridor instead of separate corridors.

In addition, we note the following:

National security

The contention is made that the United States can't afford to be dependent on oil from the Middle East. Yet the report admits that North Slope oil (2 million barrels a day) would supply only 9 percent of our projected oil needs in 1980 (22 million barrels per day, according to Economic Analysis Vol. I, p. B-1). Depending on the amount which Canada and South America might be able to supply by that time, we would still need 5 to 6 million barrels a day from the Middle East. (Vol. I, p. B-12.)

Last year conservationists were ridiculed by the president of Alyeska and officials of the Interior Department when they suggested that some of the Prudhoe Bay oil, allegedly needed for "national security," would end up in Japan. Now we find in the Economic Analysis an admission that some of the Alaskan oil would indeed go to Japan and that British Petroleum (which owns about 50 percent of the Prudhoe Bay reserves) has signed on agreement with Japanese oil companies for marketing Prudhoe Bay crude oil in Japan. What is more, the Interior Department, having professed interest in the "national security" need for Prudhoe Bay oil, has not deigned even to ask British Petroleum how much North Slope oil it has already committed to Japan. (Economic Analysis, Vol. I, p. F-20.)

Can they really have it both ways? Surely the public should have a right to comment on these glaring inconsistencies.

Profitability

North Slope oil is low-cost oil. If delivered to the West Coast by tanker, it would reduce prices theoretically by 70 cents per barrel, saving consumers about \$800 million per year. If delivered to Chicago by pipeline, prices could be reduced 40 cents per barrel, with similar savings to consumers. That's what the economic study says (Vol. I, pp. H-3, H-6).

But there's one catch to that argument. As the report itself points out, "Mechanisms of the oil import quota system would keep supply and demand in balance at current price, so that prices would not fall and there would be no consumer saving."

Who, then, gets the benefit? The fog of figures is hard to analyze, but the answer is not. If the trans-Alaska route is approved, the profit will go to the oil companies (Vol. I, p. H-5).

WHO FAVORS PUBLIC HEARINGS

For all its weight and girth, the impact statement fails to give deserved emphasis to the tremendous wilderness and wildlife values of Alaska and the menace to these values posed by the unprecedented pipeline project. For this and other reasons most of this country's major conservation organizations have joined in calling on the President to schedule public hearings on the pipeline impact statement. These organizations include: Boy Scouts of America, Citizens' Committee for Natural Resources, Defenders of Wildlife, Environmental Action, Environmental Defense Fund, Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, Friends of the Earth, Izaak Walton League of America, John Muir Institute for Environmental Studies, National Audubon Society, North American Wildlife Foundation, National Parks and Conservation Association, National Rifle Association, Sierra Club, Sport Fishing Institute, The Conservation Foundation, The Wilderness Society, The Wildlife Society, Trout Unlimited, Wildlife Management Institute and Zero Population Growth.

Similarly, 82 members of the U.S. House of Representatives have joined in signing a letter to the President calling on him to hold pipeline hearings before a decision is reached. And on the other side of the Capitol 23 Senators have made the same request.

Finally, the three plaintiffs in *Wilderness Society et al vs. Morton*—the Alaska pipeline lawsuit—wired the President on March 20 renewing their request for public hearings. Besides The Wilderness Society, the plaintiffs are Environmental Defense Fund, Inc. and Friends of the Earth.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

In spite of this imposing array of conservationists, Congress members and private citizens, the Nixon Administration appears determined to bow to the demands of the oil industry and issue the pipeline permit. Your help is needed, and it's needed now.

Unless this decision is reversed and hearings are held, Secretary Morton could ask the federal court on or after May 4 to lift the pipeline injunction and allow him to grant a permit to Alyeska.

We urge you to act today. Send a letter—or a telegram—to the President asking for 90 days to review the statement followed by full public hearings to bring the knowledge and wisdom of the American people into this important decision-making process. Write or wire: President Richard M. Nixon, The White House, Washington, D.C. 20500.

But don't stop there. Send information copies to your congressman and senators. Enlist your friends, neighbors, local clubs and organizations. And inform your local news media—including editorial writers—what you're doing. If you can use more copies of this flyer, ask for them. Get started today!

MRS. THELMA MILLIFF

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the imminent retirement of Mrs. Thelma Milliff from the Martinez Unified School District in my congressional district after 45 years of outstanding and devoted service.

Mrs. Milliff has served the students of the Martinez Unified School District and the Martinez community with devotion, unselfishness, personal sacrifice, and

love. Her contribution to each child under her care can never be measured other than through their accomplishments throughout their lives, as a result of her superior methods of instruction and personal involvements which can only be termed a "labor of love." She exemplifies a teacher in the truest sense of the word.

I join with Mrs. Milliff's many, many friends and students on the occasion of her retirement dinner on June 7 in extending to her my sincere best wishes for a truly deserving happy and rewarding retirement for many years to come.

RUNAWAY YOUNGSTERS ARE TRYING TO TELL US SOMETHING

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, runaway youngsters are a national problem—a tragedy—that, according to the April 24, 1972, U.S. News & World Report, will not recede with the receding of the youth revolt of recent years.

According to an article from the March 26, 1972, Washington Sunday Star:

Today's youngster who flees his warm bed, his stereo and his three square meals a day is less likely to be striving for adulthood than giving an anguished cry for help.

"The Bridge" in Minneapolis offers help to runaway youths. A March 27 Minneapolis Star article describes this innovative facility. I am pleased that citizens of Minneapolis are working on this problem. The goal of "bridging the gap separating runaway children and their parents" gives the Minneapolis program its name. And this gap is at the heart of these individual tragedies.

The three articles which follow describe in detail the problem. We must work to find solutions to it:

RUNAWAYS OFTEN FIND NEW HOPE AT THE BRIDGE

(By Joe Blade)

"How can you live with hate" asked the 15-year-old girl. "With people just yelling at you all the time?"

She couldn't, so she ran away. Through part-time jobs she paid for her half of an apartment shared with a girl friend in the same suburb where her parents live.

After three months she found out how much she missed school. And that "when you can do anything you want, there isn't anything you want to do."

So she called a policeman she knew and he recommended she try The Bridge, where help is offered to runaway youths.

"You can lean on people here," she told a reporter several days after moving into the old frame house at 608 20th Av. S. "You grab them and they'll really talk to you."

Eventually they ask how much the runaway is responsible for his or her problems. And then, the girl said, she had to face the fact that she bore at least half the blame.

Perhaps not in her case. The Bridge could not even get her parents to show up for a conference. Another home is being sought for her.

The Bridge was started by Sister Rita Steinhagen, a free spirit in the West Bank

community who saw a desperate need for a runaway facility while she was running the Free Store on Cedar Av.

A long-vacant house and remodeling money were donated by Cedar Riverside Associates, Inc., which is developing the area.

The name was chosen to symbolize the goal of bridging the gap separating runaway children and their parents.

The first two functions of the house are easy to provide: shelter and a cooling-off period.

The next step is "a lot of serious talking, opening up and listening on our part to create an atmosphere where they can talk, where they know they won't be punished for what they say," says Greg Anderson, the associate director.

A 24-hour period is allowed for notifying parents. "Sometimes it's too threatening right away," Anderson says.

If a runaway won't call his parents, he can't stay.

"The initial agreement is that The Bridge is for straightening out your own problem, and we're here to help you," Anderson declares. If a youth won't confront his parents and face his problem, the facility can't help him.

Not many refuse to contact their parents, although on one day last week five left The Bridge for just that reason.

Parents are asked to come in to thrash problems out with their child and workers at the house.

From there, help may go in any direction needed. Sometimes counseling is enough. Sometimes other agencies must be called in. Perhaps a trusted person may be found in the child's home community.

Occasionally there is nothing to do but find another home for the child.

Much of the talk is throwing out possible alternatives that a runaway—or his parents—may not have considered. And suggesting some serious thought about what they really want to do.

The Bridge's eight full-time employees include three nuns from the Order of St. Joseph. There also are about 30 volunteers, many of them students at the University of Minnesota.

The average stay of a runaway is one to three days. There are nine beds on the second floor and some convertible couches downstairs. The youngsters help prepare meals.

Does The Bridge do its job? A sampling of opinions among the 581 youths served in the 13 months after its opening Dec. 1, 1970, was taken by the research department of the Community Health and Welfare Council.

Of the youths contacted, 86 percent rated The Bridge "good" or "excellent" and two-thirds felt they had been helped with their problems.

More of the parents felt they had been helped, but somewhat fewer approved as strongly of the institution. Anderson finds this understandable, because the youngsters stay, but parents travel there to confront difficult problems.

One parent responded to the survey by saying: Don't publish The Bridge's existence, so as to not attract youth."

When the underlying problem was found to be with the parents, it usually was improved, the survey discovered. When the children were the cause, problems remained the same or worse, according to responses.

The most important single precipitating cause for runaways is alcoholism or drug dependency in the family, says Sister Marlene Barghini, director of The Bridge.

About 60 percent of the children seen at The Bridge are from chemically dependent families, says Anderson.

Lack of ability to communicate on a "feeling level" is another major problem, he adds.

Sister Marlene feels this stems from the tradition that American men should not

show their feelings. That can play havoc within families, she said.

The Bridge is now independent; in its first year it was associated with St. Joseph's Home for Children in south Minneapolis.

Workers at The Bridge felt they should use a less clinical approach, while St. Joseph's was unhappy about having responsibility without control over operations. So an amicable separation was worked out.

Relations are good with most local social agencies, but there is hostility at one important institution: the Minneapolis Police Department.

Suburban police work effectively with The Bridge, bringing in children and establishing contacts within the community. Although cooperation from Minneapolis juvenile officers is even more important, says Sister Marlene, only a few individuals will work with The Bridge.

The future of the organization is distinctly unsettled. There are continuing problems with that old devil, money. The Bridge is chronically short of funds—employees went unpaid for six months at one point.

A \$28,597 grant for a year's operation is being sought in federal anticrime funds. The current budget is much less, said Sister Marlene.

U.S. Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Ind., is sponsoring a Runaway Youth Act in Congress to appropriate \$10.5 million a year for institutions like The Bridge.

If The Bridge weren't available, where would runaway kids go for help? A third responding to the survey said they didn't know; another quarter said "stay on the streets."

The research committee concluded that The Bridge not only was needed but was "an important link" among services in the community.

"The main thrust of The Bridge," said Sister Marlene, "is to cause reconciliation through family crisis. Most people won't do anything until there's a crisis."

"And running away is a crisis that affects everyone in the family."

THE RUNAWAYS

(By Michael Satchell)

She was spotted recently, thumb in the air, on a Northern Virginia beltway entrance ramp, alone, scared, vulnerable, looking all of 13 years old, hitching a ride from her private nightmare to trouble she never dreamed of.

A heavy truck with out-of-state tags shuddered to a halt and the passenger door flew open. She hesitated, flung a quick backward glance toward a nearby subdivision where she probably lived, tossed up her small knapsack and climbed into the cab to join two strangers.

The men sat her between them, the truck roared off in a spatter of gravel, and Little Miss Runaway was free at last.

"If she was lucky, very lucky, she might have gotten out of the truck unharmed," Larry Jones, a juvenile investigator remarked. "But it's doubtful. She was probably used and abused and then kicked out. That's a rotten experience for a young kid, but it happens to runaways all the time."

A Senate subcommittee investigating the runaway problem was told recently that as many as a million youngsters under 18 left home last year and the number is expected to increase. Last year, about 10,000 boys and girls from the Washington area fled their homes.

The FBI reports that runaway arrests are up 60 percent in the last four years and the age range is dropping. Six years ago it was 16 and 17 years old who were fleeing. A recent survey in New York City indicated that nearly half of that city's total runaways were between 11 and 14, a trend noted by Washington authorities.

Perhaps half of the runaways, most of them first-timers, are back in their own beds

within a couple of days, picked up by police or returning voluntarily after a brief, unhappy fling away from the parental fold. Usually, they are none the worse for their experience.

It is different story with the others who swell the ranks of the vast, numberless, drifting army of rootless youngsters, the street people who clog the nation's Georgetown, Greenwich Villages and Sunset Strips and the throngs who head like lemmings for the Florida beaches and the California freeways where—they believe—it's really at.

A tiny proportion manage to become permanently swallowed up in the street subculture and remain hidden until reaching 18 or a point where their parents no longer want them.

But the majority eventually get picked up, often for committing crimes, and are sent back home or to a juvenile institution, only to return again and again to the streets because their family problems invariably remain unsolved.

Running away is in itself an illegal act but what concerns authorities most is that in order to survive a youngster is forced to commit crimes, usually stealing or dealing in dope.

They also are extremely vulnerable to older persons who prey on them—rapists, rip-off artists, the assorted flotsam of the street subculture who themselves survive at the expense of their younger "brothers and sisters."

"Most runaways are young, inexperienced suburban kids who run away to major urban areas," Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Ind., noted recently. "These children look for companionship, friendship, and approval from the people they meet. Instead they often become the easy victims of street gangs, drug pushers and hardened criminals."

"Without adequate shelter and food they are prey to a whole range of medical ills from upper respiratory infection to venereal disease."

Said Vic Wertz, a juvenile investigator: "From the moment a kid leaves home he or she faces trouble. If it's a girl she's gonna get picked up and sexually molested. Boys have that problem too. We are certain there are perverts who cruise around looking for young kids hitching a ride."

"If a girl wants a place to sleep, she's got to pay for it and usually with her body. It's inevitable—and it's just as safe a bet a kid is gonna get into drugs if he isn't into them before he leaves home."

Even at Runaway House near Dupont Circle, where kids can find a welcome and a bed, such problems are inescapable.

"Some little bitch stole my clothes, my makeup, even my toothbrush," snarled a pretty 13-year-old who is staying in the house. "If I find out who it was I'll rip her off so bad she'll never forget it."

Most of Washington's runaways are from the suburbs, and after spending a night or two at a neighborhood friend's house, they usually head for Georgetown . . . where dope is easy to come by and the crash pads—places to sleep—are usually mattress-full.

After a few weeks, some of the youngsters become adept at hustling for their needs. A group of 13 and 14-year-olds, at Runaway House explained how they live.

"On a good day, I can make \$5 an hour panhandling," said a very pretty 13-year-old from Vienna who called herself "Billy."

"I put on my oldest clothes, go barefoot, and look very downcast. I ask the tourists if they can spare a few pennies so I can get something to eat. It works just about every time."

Ed, charming, rascally 13-year-old with a 20-year-old's experience who has run away from his Takoma Park home more times than he can remember, said he steals to survive.

"It's easy," he laughed. "I rip off food and cigarettes from supermarkets. I only got

caught once and that was in Newport News when I took 13 packs of cigarettes. I gave the guy a fake name and took off. No problem."

Runaway House, a graffiti-festooned three-story building, is the only privately operated refuge in the area dealing exclusively with runaways. In its nearly four-year existence, it has provided temporary shelter for about 3,000 youngsters. But on any given day in Washington there are scores of runaways combing Georgetown looking for a place to sleep, or a bite of food to scrounge, and it sometimes gets tough.

"We've had kids come here who have emptied garbage cans and slept in them," recalled Kurt, one of five Runaway House counselors. "Some kids sleep in telephone booths. And often they go hungry."

Running away has always been a part of America's folklore since Huck Finn and Tom Sawyer floated down the Mississippi, but today's youngster who flees his warm bed, his stereo and his three square meals a day is less likely to be striving for adulthood than giving an anguished cry for help.

The reasons for leaving, noted Ken McLaughlin, a Fairfax County juvenile court supervisor, range from such petty things as getting a bad grade in school and being afraid to go home to deep-rooted conflicts that may take skilled counseling and a long period of readjustment on both sides.

"Some kids make elaborate preparations"—almost like somebody wanting to commit suicide—"and they are constantly throwing out hints," McLaughlin said. "They tell their friends they are going to run, knowing it will get back to their parents. What they are doing is telling their parents: 'Hey, please change or I'm gonna split.'"

Still others simply decide on the spur of the moment to leave and with nothing but the clothes they are wearing, head for the nearest highway.

A typical example is 14-year-old Debbie, who said she left her Falls Church home a week ago Wednesday. She is staying at Runaway House in the District and, she said, she has not yet called her parents who probably have no idea where she is.

"I skipped school that day and went to a party in Vienna," she related. "I was supposed to get a ride home but I couldn't get one so I stayed with a friend in Arlington. Then I decided I'd be better off by myself so I headed for the District and came here."

"I don't want my parents to know where I am—even though they're worried about me. As far as I'm concerned they're just a couple of people who fed me. They didn't like my friends or what I did."

Children from middle and upper-class families run away with greater frequency than the children of poor parents, authorities note.

"You don't hear much about it when some senator's son runs away but it happens a lot," chided Marlene Ross, a psychologist and a leader of the drive to start a runaway house in McLean. "They don't report it to the police."

Said a county juvenile worker: "There is a thing 'lieutenant colonel' syndrome in Northern Virginia. They always are busy trying to make full 'colonel' and they never have time for their kids. It seems like every week we get a call that some lieutenant colonel's kid is missing."

In recent years there has been an increasing trend for girls to run away and today they outnumber the boys who have spurned their homes. Juvenile officials say girls are under greater pressure to conform to higher moral standards than boys.

Today there are few private agencies to aid runaways, and there is a growing trend of thought to move the problem out of the criminal justice system entirely.

The police tend to regard private operations such as Runaway House as a nuisance, run by do-gooders with little experience in han-

dling kids. The volunteers in turn say the police see runaways as little more than juvenile delinquents rather than troubled children, and act accordingly by arresting them.

The police feel runaway houses encourage kids to leave home. The runaway houses say they are answering the needs of desperate youngsters.

The answer may be a Congressional bill introduced by Sen. Bayh that asks for \$10 million over the next three years to construct and operate temporary housing and counseling services for runaways. The bill would strengthen interstate co-operation or runaways and would promote research into the problem as well as provide housing for the youngsters and ways of getting them back to their families quickly.

It is a jarring experience to chat with the residents of Runaway House, not so much to hear their tales of family woe, but to hear them assess their own situations and talk about their life-styles that at the tenderest of ages revolve around little more than acid, alcohol and "being free."

But their outward bravado of making it alone on the streets without help from their parents is betrayed by the pain they express only among themselves, or in their crude scrawls of graffiti on the walls of their bedrooms.

"Loneliness is a kid living with two adults," reads one message. "I love the world and everything in it but my mother," reads another. "Caution: Parents may be hazardous to your health."

But most telling of all, perhaps, was the statement by a pretty young girl who says she has been through it all as a runaway—drugs, sex, attempted rape, shoplifting, the lot.

"Being 13 years old is such a bummer," she groaned. "How I wish I was 14."

RUNAWAY CHILDREN—A PROBLEM FOR MORE AND MORE CITIES

The flight of unhappy youngsters from U.S. homes shows no signs of diminishing. It's striking at a wider range of parents, raising big questions about the future of the family.

Each week more than 10,000 American children run away from homes, schools and institutions. What's more—Developing among U.S. youth experts is the unsettling thought that runaway youngsters are going to be a national problem for years to come.

No longer do specialists in juvenile troubles put much stock in the theory that the runaway tide will recede once the youth revolt of recent years wanes. Today, campus and off-campus violence is slackening—but adolescents continue to decamp at a rate exceeding half a million a year.

GETTING INTO TROUBLE

As in the past, violent death still befalls some. Others are arrested for prostitution, drug peddling and theft—though nothing has come along recently to match the murderous exploits of runaways who joined the "family" of Charles Manson in the late 1960s.

Some changes in the runaway pattern are being noted.

Girls appear to be moving into the foreground of the homeless young. More runaways seem to end up in smaller cities closer to home rather than faraway "glamour" cities.

Many still head for a freewheeling commune or "crash pad." But some, now wary, may take refuge with friends' families nearby, or seek out one of the "runaway houses" being set up in a number of metropolitan areas.

New York City is one of several urban areas reporting slight declines in the number of youngsters who leave home. Others, such as Nashville, Tenn., show increases.

Chicago officials say that the average age of runaways has declined to about 14.

San Francisco and other cities report that

minority and working-class youngsters are joining a runaway flow once consisting mainly of disenchanted offspring of the middle class. In Boston, homeless children sleep all night in automat restaurants. In San Diego's warmer climate, they sleep on beaches.

WASHINGTON'S PROGRAM

Several dozen havens—public and private have been set up in the Washington, D.C., area to look after the 10,000 or so runaways to be found there at any given time.

One of the largest enterprises, "Runaway House" and its two foster-care homes off Dupont Circle, looked after 464 girls and 556 boys last year with funds supplied by government, business and industry and private individuals.

Talk to some of America's transient children and you hear the old and familiar reasons that have impelled untold generations of Huckleberry Finns to skip out—school problems, a longing for adventure, quarrels with parents, and neglect or brutality in the home.

Today's "youth culture," however, is adding new dimensions to the old problem of runaways.

Through hearsay, and occasionally by television and youth-oriented publications, the young have been led to believe—as a San Francisco youth worker puts it—that "running away is a socially acceptable thing." Many also seem to think that the big city overflows with Eden-like communes offering instant fellowship and protection.

Contributing even more emphatically to the runaway phenomenon, say many youth experts, is a state of disarray in the traditional American family.

The family unit has become so geared to upward—and outward—mobility, critics say, that it is increasingly unable to provide for the emotional needs of youngsters or to bridge a "culture gap" between generations that is widening.

Often juvenile values become warped—as in the case of a suburban boy who ran away to nearby Washington, D.C., when his parents refused to buy him a \$400 stereo set.

Some sociologists and psychologists say the problem of runaway children is likely to be in the foreground of national attention for some time to come. Introduced in Congress this year was legislation to provide 30 million dollars over the next three years to help communities establish and maintain "runaway houses" across the nation.

Statistically, the problem is measured by Congressmen and local authorities in these terms:

Conservative estimates are that about 600,000 minors ran away from home in 1970—double the number of seven years earlier. Currently, the experts say, the situation shows little, if any, change.

Most runaways are aged 13 to 17, but some are 10 or 11. Today, about as many girls as boys are running away.

Of those runaways arrested, about 40 percent are under 15. More girls than boys are arrested.

To get a close-up of the children and what is being done about them, "U.S. News & World Report" correspondents in major cities visited shelters and talked with law-enforcement officials. Their reports follow:

SAN FRANCISCO.—Five years ago, in this city's Haight-Ashbury section, a massive inflow of flower children from all parts of the U.S. alerted Americans to the new scope of the problem of runaways.

Today, Haight-Ashbury is a desolate hangout of addicts and derelicts—and the runaways are congregating downtown, along or near Market Street.

Police pickups of runaways now are about half of what they were in 1968. Where do the youngsters come from? Of those who head for Huckleberry House, a runaway shelter near Golden Gate Park, about half are from

the Bay area. Codirector Brian Slattery of Huckleberry House says:

"Kids are going to the nearest metropolitan area, rather than heading for particular cities. And they try to stay in parts of cities where they won't be noticed."

At this shelter, parents are always called, but the youngsters are not required to go home. Still, a surprising proportion—probably 75 per cent—do so.

"Most kids have enough love for their parents that they want to work it out and go home—and some of the most abused kids are the most insistent on working things out at home," Mr. Slattery adds.

The average runaway lasts about three days in the city before going broke, which is interpreted to suggest that the act of running away is not intended to be permanent.

About half come from broken homes, but homes with both parents present also have troubles, Mr. Slattery comments:

"In the depression, kids left because they were starving. Now it's because Dad is working two jobs, and the extra \$800 a month isn't worth it."

He described some youngsters as actually "throwaways," whose parents don't want them and won't accept collect calls from them. In such cases, the remedy may be to place the adolescent in a foster home if he or she is a Californian. Some who are badly damaged by their experiences may be placed in a "group home."

Huckleberry House started out with a largely white clientele. Now about one third of those receiving its help are from minority groups.

Across San Francisco Bay, in Berkeley, police say runaways have increased without letup for the past 10 or 12 years. At one runaway center in 1971, just over half of those youngsters coming for emergency help and counseling decided to go home. Reports Eugene Horn, director of the Berkeley Runaway Center:

"Compared to six months ago, many more of the kids we're seeing are from working classes. This means that the faddism of running away is about over. Kids who are running away now have more serious difficulties to run from. It's harder to get them back into their families than before."

Still, one Berkeley police official complains: "Some who normally would abandon the idea of running away as impractical now might do it. Someone will take care of them. All they have to do is say, 'Hi! I'm a runaway!'"

"Generally, there is a fad thing going on—to hitchhike around the country, to be on your own, and to heck with the older generation. If it suddenly became extremely popular to honor your father and mother, the runaway situation would probably change."

LOS ANGELES.—Fewer runaways seem to be coming to Los Angeles than in the years when the Sunset Strip was a magnet for wandering youths from all over the U.S. and for some from Europe.

Over all, runaways reported to the County of Los Angeles sheriff's department came to 1,792 in the first 11 months of 1971, compared with 4,525 in the 12 months of 1968.

"Many times we are able to determine that the home life of a runaway is extremely bad," says one juvenile officer.

He cited this example: Police recently picked up a young girl and boy wandering about aimless. The boy was mentally retarded, and his 15-year-old sister brought him to the city mainly to get away from a home where the mother was usually absent and the father—an alcoholic on welfare—sold their food stamps to buy liquor.

In San Diego County, the inflow of runaways continues at a steady pace—at about 2,400 youngsters annually. Most are around 16 or 17, though some are only 12. The coun-

ty director of juvenile services, Howard Toone, reports that about half of the runaways are from broken homes.

Every effort is made to keep runaways out of court, and officials work closely with private agencies, including The Bridge, a runaway shelter. It is funded mainly by the county, and on any given day offers refuge to about a dozen youngsters, who get counseling and emergency board and room after telephoning their parents. The house manager, Walter Atkin, says:

"We try to get the parents in and talk to them privately, and then with the child. In most cases, the kid will go home."

GETTING AT THE PROBLEM

"Crashers," just looking for a bed aren't accepted, and youths must be willing to accept counseling, medical attention and psychological or psychiatric care if needed. Most are from the immediate area, and only 10 per cent are from out of State.

More girls than boys are accepted. One girl on her sixth trip away from home said she first left four years ago at the age of 11.

"I never get my way at home," she said. "I can't discuss a thing with my father, especially if I'm right. I can get along with my mother for about two hours and then we start fighting."

Tenth-grade dropout, she is awaiting placement in a foster home, rather than return to own home. "The law says you have to have a 'mommy' and a 'daddy' and have them make all your decisions until you are 18," she said. "I have 2½ centuries to go—it's going to be a countdown."

More thoughtfully she added:

"I was really spoiled by my mother. She should have said 'No' to me when I was small. Now she's trying to correct the mistake and says 'No' to everything, but it's too late."

CHICAGO.—In slums as well as in affluent suburbs, runaways are becoming a major source of worry to parents and the law.

Chicago's department of human resources has begun what may be the first runaway program in the nation for "ghetto" children, following up every runaway case reported to the police in eight high-crime communities.

Usually the runaway from a slum home is trying to escape strict parental rules, avoid harsh punishment or flee harassment from gangs. Ratio of girls to boy runaways is 3 to 2. Runaways of both sexes tend to remain with friends, and quickly become a police problem. Officials estimate that runaways account for 22 per cent of all youth crimes in the city's near South Side.

COURT FOR REPEATERS

More than the white runaway, the black youngster from a "ghetto" is likely to turn up in juvenile court if he runs away more than once. Sometimes the judge may feel the child has run away from an unfit home, and he will arrange for a foster or temporary home. But about 80 percent of the time, the youth is returned home for whatever counseling or psychiatric follow-up the court may provide.

Parents are required to come with their child to at least one group-counseling session. Welfare, legal and medical help is obtained for those who need it. Encouragingly, many families return voluntarily for several weeks of counseling—and runaway and juvenile crime rates appear to be going down in areas where the program is operating fully.

While "ghetto" parents usually report a runaway immediately, affluent parents are likely to try to hide the fact.

Even so, known runaways in suburban Evanston went up in 1970 by 50 per cent over 1969. Last year, they rose by 90 per cent. But the suburban runaway, it seems, is likely not to go very far, and to stay with friends.

Richard Hangren, a faculty member at New Trier East High School on Chicago's North Shore, says:

"We saw more running to other cities three

years ago. It seems these kids just need a cooling-off period of a night or a few days."

Why do such youngsters leave? From Lt. David Kelly of the Evanston police department:

"It becomes a form of blackmail that the kid uses on the parent. Maybe the parent won't let the kid stay out as late as he wants, so he runs away. Some of these parents have taken threats from their kids from the time they were small. They ought to call the kids' bluff and not give in."

DETROIT.—Runaway numbers in Detroit and Wayne County have gone up three or four times in the past five years, says Juvenile Court Judge James Lincoln. And, he adds, it is now the girls who are more likely to run away. Why?

"Parents will reject girls where they will forgive their sons."

Some runaway girls find their way to East Lansing, the home of Michigan State University, and to The Listening Ear, a runaway shelter. Says Mrs. Martin, a former social worker and now a volunteer worker at the shelter:

"They're getting younger every year. They used to drop out of college. Now they drop out of high school."

One example: Last autumn, 10 boys quit East Lansing High School and went to California in a van. They returned not long ago and are back in their classes.

At Ann Arbor, home of the University of Michigan, runaways find shelter in Ozone House. A 17-year-old girl calling herself "Vampire" told how she took off a few months ago—"splitting" from the hospital where she had been committed by her parents in suburban Detroit to be treated for a drug overdose.

"I got involved with drugs in high school," she said. "Everybody's taking them. My parents should have watched me closer. Sure, I was hiding the stuff from them, but there are signs—if you know what to look for."

Even before the overdose incident, she had quit school and hitchhiked to Michigan cities. At present she supports herself by baby-sitting in exchange for a room, but spends much time at the runaway shelter.

Her future? She replies:

"I know hitchhiking is unsafe, but my luck's been good. I'll keep hitchhiking until something bizarre happens. I have no plans for an education. I just want to get out and enjoy."

ATLANTA.—Runaways are on the rise in Atlanta and Fulton County. In 1969, the juvenile court reported 512 runaway cases. The figure rose to 106 in 1970 and 1,075 in 1971—more than double the 1969 figure.

Most transient youths noted by public and private agencies are middle and upper-middle-class white girls fleeing home problems. Generally they were 14 to 17 years old, with 15 year olds probably the largest single group.

At The Bridge, a runaway shelter, most of those getting aid make contact with parents in three or four days—then go home. Reports Brother Greg Santos, a bearded Catholic priest and cofounder of the house:

"About 98 per cent of the kids who come here end up with something agreeable to them and their parents."

In a random check of 46 runaways who returned home, it was found some months later that all were still at home.

Atlanta's runaway shelters get some criticism because they do not initiate calls to parents or police. Larry McCoy, director of Truck Stop Boys' Lodge and a Methodist minister, explains:

"The first night we tell the runaway that we are not going to call the cops or his parents or make him call. We let him make up his own mind, and it usually works."

In Atlanta, as elsewhere, broken homes figure strongly in the runaway picture. Juvenile Court Judge Thomas Dillon told of a

13-year-old boy who filed a complaint of his own with the court, claiming that he was a deprived child and that his stepmother "brutalized" him. The judge adds:

"The father then came and filed a complaint that the child was a runaway and wouldn't obey. We found in this particular case the child had no business being at home. The woman was not even his stepmother but was only living there. We found him a foster home."

HOUSTON.—In 1971, the Houston police picked up 5,652 runaways, of whom 3,287 were girls, compared with 5,525 pickups—among them 3,079 girls—in 1970. Juvenile officer Joe Navarro observes:

"It used to be that more boys than girls ran away from home. Now the trend is toward more girls."

It is possible, he concedes, that girls may be reported missing more quickly than boys. "Many parents feel that a 16-year-old boy can pretty well take care of himself, but they realize a girl is more likely to come to harm."

Houston officials see two types of runaways.

One, they say, is "pushed out" by parents and is a child who is unwanted, or is trying to escape an intolerable situation such as alcoholic or brutal parents. The other type is described as a child in rebellion against his parents, in his school or his way of life.

BROKEN HOMES A FACTOR

In the second type, a breakdown of communication between parent and child is held to be common. In either type of runaway, most come from broken homes—and a high percentage are mentally or emotionally disturbed.

Fairly typical of the thousands of runaways on Houston streets is the pretty, 14-year-old stepdaughter of a well-to-do Houston manufacturer, who has left home for the second time. When interviewed, she had been away on her second trip for about three days.

"I had everything at home—my own room in a nice home, just everything I wanted," she relates. "My mother is upset about my running away, but for my stepfather, it's just another thing he has to worry about."

During her first absence from home, she lived with a 19-year-old electrician whom she met at a service station and agreed to live with after a few minutes' conversation.

"I think I love him," she says. "But who knows what love is?"

She has experimented with amphetamines and barbiturates, but has avoided heroin. Why did she run away? "I couldn't face my problem, I need help." What is her problem? "I don't know. I just know I have one."

NEW YORK CITY.—Last year, the names of 8,466 juveniles aged 10 to 16 were filed with the Missing Persons Bureau, a drop of about 150 from the previous year. Notable, however, was this: While the number of missing boys fell off sharply, this decline was nearly matched by an increase in the number of missing girls—5,193 last year compared with 4,875 in 1970.

Police involvement—not always for criminal acts—declined substantially among New York City's runaways, from 1,932 in 1970 to 1,630 last year. And some youth workers say that perhaps 90 to 95 per cent of youngsters "crashing" in Big Town manage to emerge without lasting damage.

Still, murders and suicides occasionally turn up among runaways. Some time ago, eight adults were accused of raping and torturing four runaway girls and forcing them to join a prostitution ring. Recently, "The Village Voice" published a long account of a "white-slave ring" that was recruiting runaway girls for prostitution.

The Rev. Fred Eckhardt, pastor of St. John's Lutheran Church in Greenwich Village, explains:

"Most of these kids have been brought up in fairly nice homes. They think they're run-

ning away to a place where nobody tells anybody else what to do, and everybody shares, and life is just a round of 'rapping,' with maybe a little panhandling or work thrown in.

"What they find is that girls have to earn their keep in crash pads by engaging in sexual relations or even becoming prostitutes. Sometimes the same thing happens to boys. New arrivals learn that to be accepted they have to experiment with drugs, even heroin. They have to give whatever they have to the boss of the pad, and provide money by whatever means they can—begging, stealing, drug-peddling or prostitution."

A CHANCE TO SEE

To combat the rosy picture of runaway life, St. Johns is staging "Operation Eye Opener"—tours of New York City's Bohemian haunts, jails, courtrooms and drug-rehabilitation centers for sponsored groups of out-of-town youngsters. Last year 43 such groups, numbering 1,600 adolescents, got a glimpse of what really is in store for runaways. Says Mr. Eckhardt: "Their naivete quickly gives way to astonishment."

This church also is putting its own youths and others in the Village to work on behalf of parents in search of their missing children. In the rectory is a giant bulletin board literally covered with letters, many accompanied by photographs, appealing for help in finding a child. Several bear the seal of "found." A few are canceled as the result of the youngster's death.

Parents are encouraged to help in the search. Police fear that this sometimes spurs the runaway to run even farther away, but Mr. Eckhardt dissents:

"I've found parents generally constructive and eager for their youngsters' return, though they may vacillate between love and anger. Many kids are willing to go home once they see the parent cares enough to look for them."

As some child specialists see it, America's runaway problem flows out of larger woes afflicting the U.S. family.

Statistics skim the surface of what is happening:

In 1960, there was only 1 divorce for every 4 marriages in the nation—but the number grew by 1970 to 1 in every 3.

Illegitimate birth rates for unmarried women aged 14 to 44 increased 26 per cent between 1955 and 1968.

Among married or formerly married women with children under 18, about 42 per cent now are in the U.S. labor force—and 7.4 per cent of all American husbands hold two jobs.

So often do Americans move that about one fifth of the U.S. population today is not living where it did a year ago.

FAMILY TIES LOOSENED

Trouble grows as families become smaller. Not only are birth rates at a 30-year low but since World War I a steady attrition of the "extended family" has removed grandparents, uncles, aunts and cousins from the immediate circle in which the "nuclear family" of parents and children often lived.

These peripheral relatives, in effect, often backstopped parents in bringing up children—providing additional affection and behavioral models, and a sense of family solidarity.

Today, however, the "nuclear family" stands almost alone, stripped down for mobility in pursuit of economic security and status, even to the extent of moving across the continent to accept a new job or a promotion.

That situation, in the background of many runaways, is found to produce serious friction between parents and child.

On one hand, psychologists say, children often feel themselves separated from parental love by the external pressures of "getting ahead." Alternatively, there is rebellion

against parents who try to bridge the gulf by showering "warm" concern on the child.

Recently the noted psychologist and educator, Dr. Bruno Bettelheim of the University of Chicago, observed:

"It is a terrible burden to be loved too much. Parents are so anxious their kids won't make it that the kids purposely don't—just to get back at them. If parents would have a little less 'warmth' and more respect for the independence of their children, they would do a lot better."

TV AND THE CHILD

This "alienation" process, some authorities say, is intensified in early childhood by television-watching, described in one report to the American Academy of Pediatrics as occupying 64 per cent of the average toddler's waking time. Result, in the view of many psychologists, is to hamper the development of social skills and ability to communicate with parents and other children.

Out of all this come the youngsters who run away because of a sense of failure, others who want to see if their parents are really interested in them, and still others who take off simply because of a "cultural gap" of historic proportions between many children and their parents in a time of onrushing change.

Raised is this question: Can the American family survive the troubles implicit in the continuing tide of runaways?

Some doubts are raised by such critics as Betty Friedan of the "women's liberation" movement, and a British psychiatrist, David Cooper, whose book, "The Death of the Family," heralds the replacement of the "nuclear family" by communal groupings.

Even so, most authorities say the American family is likely to survive the runaway problem and other symptoms of its disarray. Dr. Paul Reiss, Fordham University sociologist and vice president for academic affairs, notes:

"Recent studies suggest a growing interest of Americans in regaining contact with relatives. We may also see a moderation in success goals, so that parents may be willing to give up some material rewards—a promotion, for instance—in order to remain near stable friends and relatives."

"I don't see a return to the old 'extended family' but I do see new forms of personal relationships developing outside the nuclear family."

Similarly Dr. E. James Lieberman, a Washington, D.C., psychiatrist and family specialist, sees future hope in the tendency of young people to marry, free of pressures and more sensibly, at later ages. The quest for a higher "quality of life" in marriage and home, he says, may ease some of the disruptive factors at work in recent times.

At the moment, however, the strains on the American family and its relationships, continue to take their toll on parents and children—and neither law-enforcement officials nor scholars see a quick end to the runaway problem. In the words of Houston's Juvenile Court Judge Wallace H. Miller:

"Until the nuclear family is re-established or re-oriented, the problem of runaways will continue to grow."

THE BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is good to know that many in Government who have a feeling of appreciation and understanding of American history are

keenly aware of our opportunity to reflect on and evaluate the record of the United States since its birth nearly 200 years ago. As I have indicated earlier, Congress wisely established a Bicentennial Commission to aid and abet this program but, unfortunately it has not yet developed the kind of leadership that either comprehends its opportunity or understands its reason and, therefore, very little constructive leadership has come out of the Commission except some good suggestions that have come from a committee headed by Mr. James Bittle. Therefore, it is fortunate that there are those in Government who are responding already to the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, one of these institutions in Government is the Library of Congress. It has called on its talents and its capabilities to plan, to raise funds, and to promote a symposium.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday and Saturday, May 5 and 6, 1972, over 500 scholars and professional and amateur historians and archivists from across the United States attended a symposium at the Library of Congress on the theme, "The Development of a Revolutionary Mentality." This symposium, which was under the direction of the assistant Librarian of Congress, Mrs. Elizabeth E. Hamer, was the first in a series of five such meetings to be held at the Library of Congress in anticipation of the 200th anniversary of American independence. The entire series was made possible by a grant from the Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation, established in 1948 by the late Mr. Cafritz, a Washington realtor and philanthropist. Its enthusiastic reception by so distinguished an audience reflects the interest of the American people in our national heritage, and I hope it will provide new inspiration to the many State and local organizations that are seeking ways to participate in the forthcoming bicentennial celebration.

The symposium was opened by L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, who, following a welcoming remark to the audience and the participants, outlined the Library's Bicentennial programs. Then, after a spirited introductory address by the symposium chairman, Richard B. Morris, Gouverneur Morris, professor of history at Columbia University in New York, Dr. Henry Steele Commager, one of the world's foremost historians and holder of 17 honorary degrees from colleges and universities in Great Britain and the United States, addressed the audience on the subject, "America and the Enlightenment." Professor Commager's principal thesis was that:

The Enlightenment, which many scholars consider synonymous with humanitarianism, tolerance, freedom of religion, and a commitment to the freedom of the mind, was realized in the New World. The Old World imagined, invented, formulated, and agitated Enlightenment, but it was chiefly in America that Enlightenment was absorbed and institutionalized.

Intellectually, eighteenth-century America was very much part of the European Enlightenment. Almost everywhere in America the philosophies embraced a common body of ideas, subscribed to a common body of laws, shared a common faith. Americans accepted the Newtonian world governed by laws of

nature and nature's God. They accepted, too, the principle of the sovereignty of Reason, and the axiom that Reason could penetrate to and master the laws of Nature and of God. Faith in Nature and in Reason was one of the common denominators of Europe's Enlightenment despots too, but there it was never fully realized. When the spectacle of liberalism began to be translated from philosophy to politics, European rulers conveniently forgot most of their liberal principles. But not in America.

Americans had no kings, not after they had toppled George III anyway. No kings, no aristocracy, no church in the Old World sense of the term, no bishops, no Inquisition, no army, no navy, no colonies, no peasantry, no proletariat. But they had philosophers in plenty. Every town had its Solon, its Cato; . . . In America, and in America alone, the people had deliberately made their philosophers kings: Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison in the presidential chair, a Bowdoin, a Jay, a Trumbull, a Franklin, a Clinton, a Pinckney, a Livingston in the gubernatorial.

After a luncheon break, the sessions resumed with Prof. Caroline Robbins' address on Revolutionaries and Republicans in the Old World Before 1776. Dr. Robbins, professor emeritus of Bryn Mawr College said:

The Declaration of Independence was not a republican document. During the 16th and 17th centuries, Catholic and Protestant alike justified rebellion against rulers who failed to protect them against disorder at home and invaders from abroad. The early Dutch, Swiss, French, Italians, Germans, and English all demonstrated that there was no obligation on the part of the people to bear the exorbitances of a monarch when it degenerated into tyranny. In such cases, the rebellion of a whole nation cannot be called rebellion but a necessary part of freedom. As one writer put it, to resist the abuse of government is to assist government.

Professor Robbins held that the lessons of history were not overlooked by America's Founding Fathers. Having given the ancient republics careful scrutiny, James Madison noted that:

The United Provinces allowed no particle of the supreme authority to derive from the people. Venice contained a small group of hereditary nobles exercising absolute power. Poland's aristocracy had scarcely any virtue. Only the Commons in England's polity was in any way republican.

But Madison thought that the name republic might legitimately be applied to a government holding its powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the people. Only in republics is the general good the constant concern of its magistrates. Thus in America a new meaning was given to the term republic.

Commenting on Professor Robbins' paper was J. H. Plumb, professor of modern English history at Christ's College, Cambridge. Professor Plumb praised Dr. Robbins for her excellent scholarship, noting chiefly that she had failed to include historians of the period, such as Edward Gibbon.

After Professor Plumb's remarks, Dr. Richard Bushman, professor of history at Boston University, delivered a paper on "Corruption and Power in Provincial America." Professor Bushman explained that prior to 1750 corruption in the sense of manipulating the legislature through patronage and influence was rarely mentioned in Massachusetts. The great ques-

tion which agitated England throughout the eighteenth century never emerged in Massachusetts before 1750. It was the corruption of selfishness—official avarice—which preoccupied the colonial assembly. It was a much simpler corruption unrelated to the intricacies of the balanced constitution and amounted to nothing more than the ancient fear of a ruler's greed, the belief that men in power use their offices to enrich themselves at the expense of the people.

The archetypal Governor in the colonists' mind seemed to be the man of broken fortune, or of new wealth, or an aspiring and ambitious man, the very sort thought most capable of jobbing and spoilation. The Governors were especially suspect because they were not of the native elite, but were aliens and had interests apart from the inhabitants of the Colony. The distrust of these men who went to America both "to rule a colony and seek their fortune at one and the same time," compelled the assemblies to defend and enlarge their privileges. And because the legislatures were less easily corrupted, less was said in America about influence.

After 1750, however, a larger pattern began to emerge as the colonists were drawn into imperial affairs. He said:

Under the tutelage of English radicals, a growing number of colonial politicians came to see . . . [that] the ministry at home had much deeper and more malevolent designs on their liberty and in pursuit of their object had devised methods for over-reaching the restraints on their power which Parliament imposed. As experience with Parliament made that idea a reality for Americans, the word corruption attained the fullness of meaning in colonial politics it had long had among English radicals. It grew to include corruption of the legislature through patronage and electoral influence and thus to threaten the entire destruction of the constitution.

In a sense the American Revolution was the extension of a conflict over legislative corruption waged in England. But in another sense the Revolution never outgrew its origins in provincial politics with provincial emphasis on corruption as sheer greed. . . . John Adams said that a "whole government of our choice, managed by persons whom we love, reverse, and can confide in has charms in it for which men will fight."

The colonists fought, "not just to escape the dominion of an oppressive ministry and a corrupted Parliament but to create a government of men they could trust, men whose interests mingled with their own and whose lust was checked by frequent elections. Under that government they could at least rid themselves of the avaricious royal appointees who, in the minds of the colonists, had been the bane of provincial politics."

Commenting on Dr. Bushman's paper was Edmund S. Morgan, Sterling professor of history at Yale University. Professor Morgan found Bushman's definition of corruption too doctrinaire, and he cited examples of governors whose behavior did not fit the pattern described above. He did, however, concede that, at least in part, the argument was valid. On that point the session ended, and in the evening many visitors and dignitaries attended a reception in the Library's Great Hall.

The Beginnings of American Republic-

canism, 1765-76, was the subject of a paper delivered at the Saturday morning session of the symposium by Pauline Maier, assistant professor of history at the University of Massachusetts. Professor Maier traced the change from the early 1760's, when Americans were attached to the British Crown, to 1770 when, after he had rejected a series of petitions for redress, newspapers first compared the King to Nero. In 1773, readers of the Massachusetts Spy were told by A Republican that:

Kings have been a curse to this and every other country where they have gained a footing. From the very beginning disillusionment with George III was coupled with a rejection of monarchy as an institution.

"For a time the British constitution had seemed the consummate achievement of political engineering," Professor Maier stated, "but in the course of the Anglo-American conflict it proved instead 'imperfect, subject to convulsions, and incapable of producing what it seems to promise.' It no longer seemed a well-poised arrangement of King, Lords, and Commons, but instead 'a kind of fortuitous consolda[ti]on of Powers now in Opposition to the true Interest of the people.'"

Was the republican alternative any better? Opponents of republics claimed that this form of government was prone to instability and unwieldiness. The provincial assemblies provided no model for republican experiments "for they acted as part of a political system conceived as a provincial model of the British constitution, in which the governor took the place of the King, the assembly of the Commons, and the council, however imperfectly, of the House of Lords. A more exact precedent for the republican governments established from the mid-1770's lay in the association formed to regularize colonial resistance to British 'oppression.'"

While they were extra legal, temporary, and outside the regular institutions of government, these associations based their authority on popular consent, and were "designed specifically to contain what was always considered the major danger of republican institutions—popular anarchy. Here they were remarkably successful. The rash of popular violence that spread throughout the Colonies in the fall of 1765 was never repeated. Republicanism, once considered utopian, had assumed practicality. It alone—American experience suggested—could provide the freedom, peace, and security that all men sought from government."

Prof. Jack P. Greene of the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore in commenting on Professor Maier's argument explained that:

Americans chose Republicanism chiefly because of their appreciation of British traditions and institutions and the lack of a viable alternative.

The final paper to be read at the symposium was Mary Beth Norton's *The Loyalist Critique of Republicanism*. Miss Norton, assistant professor of history at Cornell University, saw the Tory-Whig struggle in the American Revolution as a contest between different varieties of Whigs. She argued that:

The loyalists participated in the regular course of American development in the eight-

eenth century and that they were, not monolithic conservatives or unthinking supporters of monarchical prerogatives, but "Whigs par excellence."

It was the American revolutionaries who, in the imperial world, were the aberrations. Their peculiar brand of thought came largely from a "singular, unorthodox branch of Whig ideology." They had changed and adapted the Whig philosophy to fit their particular circumstances, so much that it had little credence among most Englishmen. The loyalists, on the other hand, were neither unthinking tools of the British ministry nor rigid conservatives who resisted all change within the empire. To the contrary, prominent loyalists like Thomas Bradbury Chandler, Jonathan Boucher, William Smith, and Joseph Galloway, fully recognized the necessity of a readjustment in the relationship of the Colonies with the mother country. They differed from their fellow Americans only in the means of redress against real political grievances.

After examining their opponents' ideas, loyalists Samuel Seabury and Peter Oliver hit upon the answer: The radicals were not Whigs at all, they were republicans.

The eloquent commentary on Professor Norton's paper, delivered by Esmond Wright, Director for U.S. Studies at the University of London, was a fitting note on which to end the symposium.

STATEHOOD FOR THE STATE OF ISRAEL

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, 24 years ago, May 15, 1948, David Ben Gurion read the proclamation of statehood for the State of Israel. The event crowned the efforts of a group of dedicated people who had been working for the revival of the ancient Jewish State for many years, and ended a 2,000 year hiatus during which time there was no state or homeland for the Jews. The birth of the new state was the fulfillment of prophecy, the realization of a dream, the fruit of toil and labor, the reward of persistence, and a hope for the future for the thousands then waiting in the ghettos and refugee camps of the Middle East and Europe.

Independence for Israel did not mean security or freedom. Hostile neighbors used the occasion of the proclamation of statehood as their declaration of war. Invading armies swept into Israel with the intention of destroying the farms and homes of 50 years labor, and with the conviction that they could kill the Jews who had returned to their homeland. Neither the Arab soldiers nor their fanatical masters expected the Jews to defend their land; but the defense of Israel, begun in 1948 and still continuing today, is one of the inspiring stories of modern history. With little training, few weapons, scanty equipment, hasty or-

ganization, but with an unfathomed wealth of determination and courage, the defenders of the State of Israel were able to repel the invaders and secure for the State of Israel and for the Israeli people a place among the family of nations.

In the past 24 years, the mettle of the Israelis has been tested many times and is still being challenged today. At the threat of economic strangulation and in the face of another invasion of their land, the Israelis, in 6 short days in 1967, stopped the most recent of the attacks against their sovereignty. In the 5 years since the cease-fire of June 1967, the Israelis have been waiting at the peace table, waiting in vain for their adversaries to agree to end once and for all time, this war that drains away so many resources which could be used for the betterment of the whole region. But just as Israel has been persistent in its determination to live, it is persistent in its determination to live in peace. Israel wants peace, and Israel shall have peace.

The years have not all been spent in warfare. During those times of relative quiet, the Israelis have been building and planting, raising cities where before only the sand blew, constructing factories in the forgotten corners of their land, ordering neat rows of fruit trees across empty yards of chaos. I have been to Israel and have marveled at its progress. I have seen the drained swamps of Hulah, now resplendent with gardens. I have walked among the vineyards and the orchards standing in the debris of centuries of neglect. Such experiences restore in a person his faith in the dedication of his fellow man to the rewards of hard work and to enduring dream within us all to be masters of our own ships of destiny.

In every field of human endeavor, in every institution of civilized man, the Israelis have demonstrated to the world the inherent truth of one dictum: that nothing is impossible. In Israel, the free will of men and women dedicated to a cause that is just and in which they all firmly believe is on display for the world to see. Israel goods and products fill the markets of the world. Works of Israel artists grace the galleries and museums of every major capital. Israeli teachers pass on to the young and old alike, of countries in Latin America, Africa, and the Far East, the skills with which they were able to restore their own country. Israel democracy is a model upon which the emerging nations of the world build their own national governments. And Israel is an inspiration to all peoples who are threatened by extinction or domination at the hands of international thieves who would steal their freedom and subvert their wills to slavery.

But if Israel's progress and achievements are fitting subjects of praise, so are Israel's problems fitting subjects for consternation. There is still a military threat on the Israel horizon, which each day grows through the sinister largess and malevolent intent of the Soviet Union. The arms are still flowing into the Arab arsenals, and the Arab armies continue their training and preparations for a battle they claim is inevitable. In recent

years, the world has watched while Soviet fighting personnel have moved into Egypt to assume positions next to their Arab clients. For the Israelis and for the free world, the question is:

Will the Soviet troops in Egypt be involved in another shooting war, should one erupt? On Israel's other borders, the Arab armies also wait and rearm. Israel has not asked foreign soldiers to fight its battles, it has not requested an American army. All that Israel wants is the chance to acquire those weapons which are necessary for the defense of their land.

Israel is paying dearly for its defense through the costly weapons it acquires and through the loss of manpower demanded by the constant vigilance along the cease-fire lines which is a burden on the Israeli economy. There are other costs involved in the defense of Israel: the lost hours away from schools and universities, the hours of waiting to find out if your son or daughter will return from patrol, the material devoted to constructing bunkers and defenses when the same material could be used for homes or hospitals. But these costs are willingly borne, because the Israelis know that the peace for which they wait and pray will bring more benefits to Israel, the Arabs, to the Middle East, and to the world.

In Israel, this 24th anniversary, like the anniversaries before it, is a time for praise of accomplishments, a time for prayers for peace, and a time for watchful waiting along frontiers abounding with hostile enemies. It is a time to hope that this anniversary will be the last one spent in a posture of defense. It is a time for planning for future building and growth. It is a time for all Jews—whether in Philadelphia or on the floor of this Chamber, Jews living in Moscow or Buenos Aires, Jews in America and around the world, to remember our heritage and be thankful that our people are, at last, home. It is a time for free men and women, in these United States and around the world, to recommit ourselves to the promise of democracy. It is a time to recall those who, less fortunate than ourselves, remain behind the walls of intolerance in the Soviet Union and elsewhere. And it is a time to look to tomorrow, when new challenges, not of warfare, but of peace, will present themselves to us and inspire us, as they did the founders of the State of Israel, to new heights of accomplishment—to do the impossible.

TELEPHONE PRIVACY—XXII

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently reintroduced the telephone privacy bill with 49 cosponsors.

This bill would give individuals the right to indicate to the telephone company if they do not wish to be commercially solicited over the telephone. Commercial firms wanting to solicit business over the phone would then be required to obtain from the phone company a list of customers who opted for the commercial

prohibition. The FCC would also be given the option of requiring the phone company, instead of supplying a list, to put an asterisk by the names of those individuals in the phone book who have chosen to invoke the commercial solicitation ban.

Those not covered by the legislation would be charities and other nonprofit groups, political candidates or organizations, and opinion polltakers. Also not covered would be debt collection agencies or any other individual or companies with whom the individual has an existing contract or debt.

As I noted in a statement on March 9, I have received an enormous amount of correspondence on this legislation from all over the country. Today, I am placing a 20th sampling of these letters into the Record, since they describe far more vividly than I possibly could the need for this legislation.

These letters follow—the names have been omitted:

SCOTIA, N.Y.,
April 27, 1972.

HON. LES ASPIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I just heard that you have introduced a bill to eliminate solicitors' calls to home phones.

My husband and I have written our representative and asked him to support this bill.

Thank you for trying to get such a wonderful bill passed!

Very truly yours,

MEMPHIS, TENN.,
May 8, 1972.

DEAR SIR: I heartily support your efforts to end unwanted telephone solicitation. Perhaps if this bill passes, I'll no longer be awakened at 8 a.m. or intercepted at the dinner table to hear about "the bargain of the year."

I'll be writing my own congressman about this, too.

Sincerely,

WALNUT CREEK, CALIF.,
April 24, 1972.

HON. LES ASPIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was delighted to hear that you have authored a bill against telephone soliciting. I have seriously considered getting an unlisted phone number for this very reason. I have a "No Peddlers" sign at my front door to prevent my being bothered by salesmen. For a long time I have felt that phone soliciting is a real invasion of privacy and that there should be some way other than having an unlisted phone number to insure against a constant irritating barrage of unwanted phone solicitations. I feel sure that the average citizen will welcome with great enthusiasm a bill such as yours. Good luck!

I would appreciate being kept advised of the progress of your bill.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

VIRGINIA CITIZENS CONSUMER
COUNCIL, INC.,
Alexandria, Va., May 10, 1972.

Congressman LES ASPIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPIN: The Virginia Citizens Consumer Council, representing some 150,000 Virginia consumers through in-

dividual and organizational memberships, would like to go on the record in support of your Telephone Privacy Act.

From the mail that our complaint committee receives and the comments when representatives of our speakers bureau get when they go out to talk to community groups, telephone solicitors are considered an annoyance that many many consumers would very much like eliminated from their daily lives.

What has been most upsetting to the people we heard from is that there seems to be no way to stop the solicitations from coming. We have many cases on file of consumers who have first politely and then less courteously asked to be removed from the list callers use. To the utter frustration of these consumers, the calls nonetheless keep coming. In many cases, meals are interrupted, baths or complex tasks are interrupted, and worse, people are awakened from their sleep or called out of a sick bed to take what turns out only to be an unwanted commercial solicitation . . . and then are unable to guarantee they won't be bothered again by the same company.

In our state, land developers seems to be the worst offenders, calling long distance from Florida as well as from nearby locations. Photo studios and subscriptions agencies seem to be the next most annoying callers, and, again, don't seem to want to take complaining consumers off their lists. To make matters worse, many people tell us they have reluctantly gone to the inconvenience and expense of having an unlisted number so they can avoid these calls only to discover that sequence dialing finds them anyway.

We agree with you that the right of privacy should be given precedence over the alleged need for phone solicitation and certainly hope the Congress will act swiftly on the Telephone Privacy Act.

Sincerely,

BROOKFIELD, CONN.,
May 3, 1972.

DEAR SIR: I am a homemaker who is terribly harassed by frequent interruptions from commercial and charitable organizations who use the telephone as an instrument of advertising.

I strongly urge you to continue working for the Telephone Privacy Bill.

Very truly yours,

EL PASO, TEX.,
May 9, 1972.

HON. LES ASPIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on the Telephone Privacy Act (H.R. 14097). I have wanted such a bill for many years.

Sincerely,

CURRENT POLICY AGAINST COMMUNIST INVADERS SHOULD BE SUPPORTED BY ALL WHO VALUE AMERICAN LIVES

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, while it appears some Americans, probably prompted by a variety of motives, oppose any American interference with the massive Communist invasion of South Vietnam, evidence is overwhelming that most

Americans support whatever actions are necessary to protect American lives.

Our President, drawing upon the best military advice that is available, decided that mines should be planted in shipping channels of enemy ports. The mines have been installed. That action is not now a debatable issue. It is a reality, already consummated. The mining operation, and the stepped-up interdiction of other Communist supply lines, is designed to save American lives and disrupt the enemy's infamous invasion. Regardless of one's views about the war or the strategy employed, the decision having been made, it becomes the duty of all responsible Americans to solidly support this action.

The significance of the present situation was well described in the concluding paragraph of a May 9 editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, which stated:

The point is this and only this: For better or worse, the President has taken what he himself has described as "a decisive action." The die is cast, the Rubicon is crossed. If he fails, not only he but each of us will be the loser; if he wins, all of us benefit. Under such circumstances, the place of this newspaper is behind the President of the United States. And we believe that on that firm ground we will find ourselves in the company of the great mass of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from a speech I made on May 6 to the Reserve Officers Association at its State convention in San Antonio. My remarks were made prior to the President's announcement regarding the mining of Haiphong harbor. The address follows:

REMARKS BY HON. O. C. FISHER

Now, let me refer for a moment to the situation in Vietnam, a subject about which you are, of course, well informed. As you know, the illegal invasion across the DMZ was an act of such raw aggression that it caused even Senator Fulbright to quit calling it a civil war over there.

It would seem important that the public understand that the problems caused by the Communist invasion has nothing to do with whether we should or should not send people to Vietnam. The one and only issue we are now dealing with is whether our bombers and naval craft—which are there—should or should not interfere with the enemy supply lines and provide protection in that way for American lives, and also by such means to help prevent a Communist takeover of South Vietnam. Some think we should protect American lives and American interests; others do not.

PROTESTERS OPPOSE U.S. INTERFERENCE WITH ENEMY DRIVE

War protests have recently taken on a new dimension. Recent outbursts have not been directed at the draft. Nor are they directed against being required to do military service in Vietnam. While a bit hazy, their chief complaint seems to be against the presence of our air force and naval units in Southeast Asia, and their use against enemy supply lines—without which lines the invasion could not succeed.

While some protests may be in good faith, one becomes very suspicious about motives when we see demonstrators proudly waving enemy flags.

These people I have described appear totally unconcerned about the safety of many thousands of Americans who are in the process of being withdrawn. Just why they are

opposed to protecting them is difficult for me to understand.

MADAME MINH'S U.S. FOLLOWERS

This line of denouncement of interference with Communist supply lines has been voiced by certain Presidential candidates, by a few befuddled Senators; by some House members; by Jane Fonda and Dr. Spock. In addition, I should add Gus Hall and Mme. Minh—who has acted as Hanoi's chief non-negotiator at the Negotiation table in Paris. The Madam, incidentally, by telephone hookup from Paris 2 weeks ago spoke to 30,000 of her loyal minions who assembled under an enemy flag in Kezar Stadium in San Francisco.

She told her faithful California followers to demand that President Nixon stop interfering with their precious supply lines, to set a day-certain, and install a Communist as President of South Vietnam. That was the effect of the orders of Hanoi's butcher woman whose invading legions are now on a wild rampage of wholesale slaughter and destruction in South Vietnam.

Let all Americans understand what these protests amount to. They say "Stop the bombing." When they say that they protest any U.S. interference with the supply lines which support the invasion and which obviously endanger the lives of 65,000 Americans. When they say "Stop the Bombing" they are, wittingly or unwittingly, echoing the orders of Madame Minh.

This protest is not a protest against the war or against our presence in Vietnam. Our presence is already there, and it is being rapidly reduced. Therefore, the only possible validity that can be attributed to these demands must be a revulsion against any interference with enemy supply lines—because that is what it is all about. It is one thing to protest the war. But it is quite a different thing to protest interference with a brutal invasion and the protection of American lives which are endangered.

THREE MILLION IN SOUTH MARKED FOR SLAUGHTER

It is one thing to oppose the war, which is anyone's privilege, but quite another thing to denounce opposition to an invasion which, should it succeed, would involve several million human lives in South Vietnam, large numbers of whom would undoubtedly be slaughtered—should the Communist invaders overrun the South.

Let us examine that awful prospect for a moment. Clark Clifford, when he was Secretary of Defense, said that should South Vietnam fall to the enemy, the worst bloodbath in the history of the human race would ensue.

Many have not forgotten that after Hue was occupied by the Communist invaders briefly a few years ago 5700 bodies—men, women and little children—were dug up from shallow graves, all brutally murdered by the North Vietnamese.

Col. Tran Van Doc, a North Vietnamese officer who defected after 24 years in the Communist movement, estimated a slaughter of 3 million if the Communists take over.

Another defector from the North, Col. Le Xuan Chuyen, who had been in the Communist movement 21 years and who should know whereof he speaks, disclosed that 5 million South Vietnamese are on the Communists' "blood debt" list. He said the plan is to kill 10 to 15 percent of them, imprison about 50 percent, and subject to balance to "thought reform."

Many other very knowledgeable people confirm this gruesome prospect of mass butchery. Now, I know some Americans insist it is none of our business. They insist that even though the lives of 65,000 Americans are endangered, and even though timely interference with the enemy's supply lines helps protect those lives and at the same time

helps to prevent the big takeover, they still demand that our bombers be completely grounded and our naval guns be silenced.

FIRM U.S. POLICY ENHANCES HOPE FOR POW'S

Another aspect of this tragic development is the plight of prisoners of war. Those who criticize the U.S. for interfering with the invasion of the South don't like to talk about POWs. When pressed on the subject they brush it off by saying once we surrender or totally withdraw all manpower and any future military supplies, the Communists will knock themselves out rushing all prisoners home. Who do they think they are kidding? How stupid can people be anyhow? Don't they know that last year President Nixon, in secret talks by Dr. Kissinger, offered the enemy total withdrawal, a day-certain, resignation of President Thieu, a free election in the South, and massive economic aid, for a cease-fire and a peaceful settlement? But this overly-generous offer—probably the most generous peace offer in history—was spurned and repudiated.

The simple fact is that the only language the enemy understands is force. Once those Communist warmongers are made to know they are in for severe punishment and that they are not going to be allowed to win that war in Washington, only then can we hope for meaningful negotiations, and some relief for prisoners. As the matter now stands, the devastation that can be wrought by B-52's and other bombers and by sea power, constitute the only meaningful advantage and bargaining power we have left in the process to bring the war to an end and expedite the release of POWs.

The enemy is risking everything on this one last big drive. Twelve of their 13 divisions are now south of the DMZ. All their eggs are in one basket. If they are thrown back, experts believe they will never again be able to recoup, reorganize, and again pose a major threat.

The military situation in Vietnam is obviously serious indeed. The President has said too many lives, including Americans, are involved to allow the invaders to succeed in this major thrust. He has said appropriate steps will be taken to prevent it. We can only speculate on what he has in mind, what force he will apply, should necessity require it. We do know that Haiphong, where 80% of all war supplies are received, is extremely vulnerable—either from aerial attack, harbor blockade or floating mines. We do know that the irrigation dikes of the Red River delta are extremely crucial and very vulnerable. And we know there are other vital targets that have heretofore hardly been touched. Whatever is done deserves solid, united American support.

ENEMY RELIES ON HELP INSIDE UNITED STATES

I have belabored this subject, but I think it is something that should be talked about and the public enabled to better understand the implications. The enemy does not disguise the fact that major reliance is placed on disunity among Americans, to assist them in their infamous plans to slaughter civilians and achieve a military victory.

It is time for all thoughtful Americans to assess the situation realistically. And it is high time for presidential candidates, whose pronouncements are heard loud and clear in Hanoi, to wake up to their responsibilities as Americans and as candidates for that high office.

It follows that in this time of grave peril, when we are playing for keeps—with so much involved on the outcome of this one invasion, that all Americans close ranks, lay aside their own views about the war, whatever they may be, and give solid support to our Commander-in-Chief. He is the only one we have, and he operates under the majesty of the American flag—your flag and my flag.

WHOSE CIVIL LIBERTIES?

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the American Civil Liberties Union appears to have become affected by the company it keeps. Over the past few years the ACLU has defended many a hypocrite in the name of civil liberties. In most cases, these individuals have demonstrated little or no regard for civil liberties. For example, when the President is shouted down with obscenities, whose freedom of speech should be defended? When "peace" demonstrators destroy another man's property, whose rights have been violated? The hypocrisy which runs through these acts performed in the name of "civil rights" is rampant.

Thanks to the company it keeps, the ACLU has lost a proper perspective on its own values. Those who burn, loot, destroy, and shout obscenities have not had their civil rights violated. One whose hands are full of dirt from the acts of violence and disruption can hardly claim he is coming into court with clean hands.

I am enclosing an editorial from the Knoxville News-Sentinel of May 6, 1972. This comment unveils the most recent chapter of the ACLU's passion for defending the "civil rights" of those who are bent on civil riot:

IN THE NAME OF "LIBERTY" 8

In Washington, D.C., the American Civil Liberties Union has filed a lawsuit to intimidate the police.

The ACLU, which used to earnestly live up to its name, is demanding "compensatory damages" in behalf of the thousands of "peace" demonstrators who a year ago wrecked automobiles, smashed windows, set fires, blocked traffic and generally raised hob in the capital city.

The ACLU lawyers also are asking court injunctions against future arrests for these offenses.

The "damages" would be paid, of course, by the taxpayers, who also were stuck for a couple of million dollars in extra police costs as a result of this disorder.

All this is being proposed in the name of civil liberty.

There have been some recent examples of similar exercises in "civil liberties."

At the University of Pennsylvania, an administration building was seized and confidential files stolen from the offices of university officials. Cornell University had to get a court order to remove a gang of "peace" demonstrators from a library. Even the Pay Board in Washington was invaded by a band of "May Day" protesters.

The leader of one of these riot-prone outfits, also involved in the Washington disorder last year, boldly proclaims that "our strategy is mass action in the street."

The point of the ACLU lawsuits is that all this comes under the head of constitutional rights. But nothing is said about the constitutional rights of Government, university and civilian merchants to carry on their business, or the right of people to get to work, or the right to be secure from property damage or burglary, or the right to be safe from rocks, bottles and other missiles thrown by hoodlums.

When anarchy can be defended in the name of constitutional liberty, we have come a long way from the concepts of the Founding Fathers.

APOLLO SAGA

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Friday morning, April 28, 1972, edition of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram does much to sum up not only our national space program, but also the achievements of Apollo 16 and other lunar missions. During the Apollo 16 return from the moon Astronaut Young quoted René Descartes, the 17th century French philosopher:

There is nothing so removed from us to be beyond our reach, or so hidden that we cannot discover it.

It is my hope that we will not forget these profound words. As we approach the last lunar mission on the part of the United States, Apollo 17, we would do well to heed the words brought to us by John Young. I commend this editorial to my colleagues and the general public:

APOLLO SAGA ADDS WEIGHT TO RENÉ DESCARTES' WORDS

With the return to earth of Apollo 16 Thursday, the amazing saga of man's flights to the moon now moves toward a big milestone. In December Apollo 17 is scheduled to make the final manned visit to the surface of the moon in the Apollo series.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has no further plans for manned lunar missions beyond the one in December. And unless the Russians come up with a similar project, all the new knowledge of the moon in the immediate future will be gained through electronic communications and visual study, two processes which have been inculcated advanced by the work on the moon performed by American astronauts since the day in July 1969 when Neil Armstrong first set foot on the dusty surface.

The world of science has found on the moon through the efforts of 26 American astronauts who have flown there in the Apollo series evidence and information that will affect or transform many areas of scientific thought into the indefinite future.

Before Apollo, science could only guess what a visit to the moon would disclose that would be meaningful to a geologist, astronomer, bacteriologist, zoologist, physicist, biologist, and so on down the long list. The Apollo flights have answered hundreds of questions for all of them and, thanks to radio and television, for all of us, too.

Situated as we are right in the middle of the saga, we tend to overlook much of its obvious significance. We watch the blast-offs, the moonwalks and splashdowns and leave the analysis to present and future historians.

Even so, occasionally somebody in the program says something that helps us all get a better perspective on its nearly incredible scope and accomplishments.

On his way back to earth this week, astronaut John Young did that with a quotation from René Descartes, 17th Century French philosopher and mathematician for whom Apollo 16's landing site on the moon was named.

"There is nothing so removed from us to be beyond our reach, or so hidden that we cannot discover it," said Descartes.

"That's the story of our mission so far," Young said, and he could have been speaking of the entire U.S. space program, which in a few years has reached to fantastic lengths and discovered a vast multitude of things that were hidden.

MAYOR RICHARD J. DALEY CELEBRATES HIS 70TH BIRTHDAY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today is the 70th birthday of the distinguished mayor of Chicago, Hon. Richard J. Daley.

I am delighted to join his many thousands of friends in extending my congratulations to him, to his devoted wife, and to his children on the occasion of his birthday.

I had the honor of serving as director of labor in the cabinet of Gov. Adlai Stevenson at the same time that Richard Daley served in the cabinet as director of finance.

Over the years I have seen this remarkable man serve with ability and dedication the people of our city and our State. He has made a tremendous contribution both to the city of Chicago and to the cause of better municipal government during his service as mayor of Chicago over the last 17 years.

All of his fellow mayors acclaim him as the best mayor in the United States, and Chicago as the best-run city in the United States. Other mayors are constantly seeking his advice and counsel toward the solution of their own municipal problems. The people of Chicago hold him in the highest of esteem, having returned him to office for five terms. He has thus served longer than any other person as mayor of Chicago.

Mrs. Annunzio joins me in extending to him our sincerest congratulations and best wishes for many more years of service to the people of our city, State, and Nation.

Two articles about Mayor Daley follow—one written by Edward Schreiber of the Chicago Tribune and the other written by Harry Golden, Jr., of the Chicago Sun-Times:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 14, 1972]

DALEY AT 70 TELLS HOW TO FEEL LIKE
40, STAY CHAMP

(By Harry Golden, Jr.)

Approaching his 70th birthday Monday, Mayor Daley confided he lifts weights, pedals a bicycle exerciser and punches the big bag in the basement of his home.

The master politician and builder of public works and mayor of Chicago for 6,233 days come Monday bantered with regular City Hall reporters in his office and said:

"I feel just as well as if I were approaching 40."

Accounting for this, Daley said, "The Lord has been good to me, and I must be doing something that I like to do."

"I have no vindictiveness with anyone. I am thankful to the Lord each day that I wake up and it is such a nice day. And I am thankful to my parents—and to a lot of other people."

HE'LL CUT A CAKE

Daley will shake hands with his department heads and leaders of the clergy, government, labor and business in his fifth-floor City Hall offices Monday morning. He will cut a cake.

Everyone will sing, "Happy birthday, dear May-or." And, if past years are any indication, he will choke up a bit and speak of his late parents, Michael and Lillian, and his wife, Eleanor, and their four sons and three daughters.

Then it will be back to his desk and the public business.

On week days, the mayor is in his office at 8:30 a.m. Evening appearances often keep him away from home in his native Bridgeport till late at night.

Daley sets the pace as he hastens down hotel corridors to banquet tables, or from City Hall across Randolph to the Sherman House and his offices as chairman of the Cook County Democratic Central Committee, or to the escalator that will take him to the Civic Center and a session of the Public Building Commission—one of scores of agencies he heads, or effectively names the heads of.

The pace is neither brisk nor swift, but downright speedy.

CARRIES ATTACHÉ CASE HOME

Far taller and years-younger associates in government seem to have to break into a half trot to keep up with the rotund figure in the blue suit.

A reporter asked if he tries to relax on those weekends when no meeting is scheduled.

Daley grinned. He reached under his desk and heaved up an enormous attaché case.

"My wife is going to burn this," Daley said. "I have been carrying that home all my life. That isn't a good habit."

Daley said exercise is the foundation of his apparent health and continuing zest.

"Exercise is one of the things that everyone must take," he said. "The human body will disintegrate if you don't use it."

"The former commissioner of health, the great doctor, Herman Bundesen, on the first day I was in here (April 20, 1955), said, 'Do you do a lot of exercise?'"

"I said that, well, I did a lot of sports, but lately I wasn't exercising too much. He said, 'Every morning, get on the bicycle and ride it.'"

A reporter recalled that Daley played football and baseball with his sons when they were younger.

"Now I play it with the grandchildren," he said. He reached into a desk drawer and pulled out a box of baseballs, all autographed by the players of his cherished Chicago White Sox.

"These are the balls for the kids (grandchildren)," he beamed. He couldn't restrain himself from adding irrelevantly that the White Sox have a great team this year.

Prior to recent years' intense concern over security, Daley often walked from home to City Hall on pleasant days.

He's now a do-it-at-home exerciser. What kind of exercise?

"Bag punching. Bicycle riding. Jumping the rope. Weight lifting."

Weight lifting?

"Sure," said Daley. "Anyone who doesn't do that better not get out of bed."

Did he really have a body bag in the basement?

"Boxing gloves, too," Daley said. "Want to come over some morning?"

Daley considers diet, too, a key to vigor.

He's fond of grapefruit and honey in the morning. On his birthday, he speculated, Mrs. Daley will probably prepare "a boiled dinner" (corned beef and cabbage, potatoes and carrots). Or she may have ribs, or roast beef.

"Mrs. Daley is a very fine cook," he declared, "and I haven't anything to say about it."

The mayor is a nonsmoker and a moderate beer drinker.

Daley characterized his health as "excellent." But he hastened to note that several of his friends, some of them famous, made such pronouncements shortly before expiring.

Daley leaned back confidently and asserted, "If the Lord wants you, He will call you. I am ready to see Him if He wants me."

The mayor was asked if he plans to run for a sixth four-year term in 1975, as predicted by several political associates.

"I'll tell you when the time comes," he said.

He turned again to sports. He plans, through the Mayor's Youth Foundation and the Chicago Park District, to reactivate and expand a "baseball school" for boys aged 8 to 14, in a program similar to that which was once guided by baseball great Rogers Hornsby.

Daley said players of the White Sox and Cubs will lead the training.

"We hope to have two leagues," he said, "one on the North Side and one on the South Side." He added proudly, "This will be hard ball."

In his own youth, Daley played second base and catcher with the Hamburgs, a club organized by his ward's Democratic organization.

But his favorite sport was football, because of the rough "body contact," he said.

Wasn't his favorite sport really politics? "Football," Daley said, "is something like politics."

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 15, 1972]

HAILS EXERCISE—DALEY TO TURN VIGOROUS 70
(By Edward Schreiber)

Well, here it is already, a year later than it was last May 14, and, like everybody else, Mayor Daley is a year older.

A year older? Well, not quite. Actually, his birthday is tomorrow. Today is Mother's Day at the Daley household, as it is everywhere. Tomorrow it is his day, when he will be 70.

Unlike many who get to that age, Mayor Richard J. Daley is quite jolly about the idea. Eleanor will cook up a boiled dinner and he'll eat at home, which is where he likes to eat. There will be no leftovers tomorrow, you can bet on that.

WALKS LAST MILE

The mayor will reach the City Hall about 8:30 a.m., debouching from his chauffeur-driven car and walking the last mile or so, as is his custom if the weather cooperates.

"Exercise, you know, is responsible for my good health," the mayor said a few days ago when reporters, anticipating his birthday, began asking him the customary inane questions that come along every year about this time.

Exercise?

"Oh, my goodness yes, exercise," said the mayor. "Dr. Bundesen told me my first day in the mayor's office, back in 1955, that exercise was just great. That is responsible for my good health."

SHOULD SEE BASEMENT

One reporter says that the greatest exercise he has ever known the mayor to indulge in—except for walking that mile to City Hall, of course—was to walk into the steam room at the Lake Shore Club.

"You should be in my basement—jumping rope, punching the bag, lifting weights, and an Exer-cycle, too. Anyone who doesn't do this had better not get out of bed," said the mayor.

KURMAN'S CRUSADE

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend to my colleagues the following article written by Barbara J. Katz in the May 13 issue of the National Observer. The story concerns the health and safety problems at summer camps throughout this country and one man's effort to make them better. With over 8 million children going off to summer

camps this year, this is an important and very timely article:

KURMAN'S CRUSADE—HE CAMPAIGNS FOR SAFER SUMMER CAMPS

(By Barbara J. Katz)

Until the summer of 1965 Mitch Kurman was "just an ordinary guy. All I was interested in was enjoying my family, tending to my furniture business, and getting away on week ends and doing a little fishing," he recalls.

But all that changed that summer, a summer Mitch Kurman says he will never forget. His only son, David, 15, died in a boating accident on a camping trip sponsored by an upstate New York YMCA. David drowned when his canoe overturned in the Penobscot River in Maine while negotiating white-water rapids that a forest ranger had warned the boys' camp counselor against tackling.

ONE CRUSADER, SEVEN LAWS

Since that time, Kurman has led a one-man crusade for improved camp safety. He has devoted thousands of hours to lobbying congressmen and state legislators, testifying in congressional hearings, writing articles, delivering speeches, and crisscrossing the country to personally investigate dozens of reported camp activities.

The fruits of his efforts to date include at least six state laws and one Federal law. A comprehensive bill on youth-camp safety—the main focus of Kurman's crusade—has passed the Senate but lost out to a weaker House version that a Senate-House conference committee approved last week.

When they sent their son off from their Westport, Conn., home that summer of 1965, Mitch and Betty Kurman, like other parents, simply assumed the camp they had selected was safe. They were unaware that, unlike other facilities for children, camps in most states are under little or no obligation to meet specific standards of health and safety.

DANGER IN WATER, CARS

According to the American Camping Association (ACA), the largest nonprofit camping organization in the country, 24 states require no license or set no standards for operating a camp. Only 21 states inspect camp facilities, and only 4 of these evaluate safety factors. Forty-six states have no requirements for counselors or other camp personnel.

Summer youth camps are a big and growing business. There are 10,500 overnight, day, and travel camps nationally. Only about one-third are ACA-certified as meeting minimum health and safety standards. In 10 years the number of campers has increased 40 per cent, to nearly 8,000,000, the ACA says. Camp experts say it is likely that accidents causing serious injury or death are increasing correspondingly.

The leading causes of camp fatalities are drownings and automobile accidents. Approximately 40 children are known to drown at camps each year. But the true number is probably higher, because camp drownings are not reported separately from other drownings. The same is true of automobile accidents, which apparently kill about half as many campers as drownings do.

Nor are firm figures available on the full range of camp accidents, both serious and minor. But the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) estimates that 250,000 injuries requiring medical attention or restriction of activities for one day or more occur in youth camps each year. Reporting of camp accidents is mostly a matter of the camp reporting to the parents that Johnny bruised his knee or broke his arm.

The only camp-safety survey of note took place in 1929. That nationwide study, commissioned by a group of youth leaders and camping enthusiasts, concluded that 65 per cent of all camp accidents could be prevented by better supervision or higher standards of camp maintenance and administration. The

study said only one-fourth of accidents at camps could be attributed to the camper's negligence, and half of these could be prevented with more rigorous supervision by counselors.

Despite those findings, little has been done in the intervening 43 years to legislate health-and-safety standards for camps. Many children, of course, attend safe, well-run camps where supervision is firm and accident prevention is taken seriously. But camp experts say others attend camps whose counselors have little knowledge of dangerous waters or woods and whose safety equipment is in short supply.

"There is a great deal of negligence in this field," says Ernest Schmidt, executive director of the ACA. "Why, you can send your child to a camp in some states and the state won't even know if the water in the camp is safe to drink."

DEATH FROM MISJUDGMENTS

In one incident at Fremont, Calif., four years ago, 4 children and a counselor died and 58 others were injured when the flatbed truck they were riding on overturned on an expressway. No regulation prohibited the camp from using an open tractor-trailer on a high-speed expressway.

A few years ago seven boys died on a mountain-climbing expedition in the Canadian Rockies sponsored by an Eastern camp. At 8,600 feet up an 11,000-foot mountain, their leader quit because of altitude sickness and instructed the boys to continue without him. At 9,000 feet an avalanche swept them to their deaths. No regulation stipulated that persons leading such groups be adequately trained in mountain climbing.

In the accident that claimed the life of crusader Mitch Kurman's son, the counselor leading the canoe trip had previously had a narrow escape on a river he had been warned against traversing. Kurman sued the camp, charging that the counselors were inexperienced, had no life jackets on board, and had no ropes or snubbing poles to guide the canoes away from rocks. He won a \$30,000 out-of-court settlement.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION SOUGHT

Kurman has brought incidents such as these to the attention of a number of state legislatures and members of Congress. He believes these accounts were instrumental in convincing Connecticut legislators to pass a camp-safety law and persuading legislators in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Maine, Connecticut, and New York to pass laws requiring that boats carry at least one life preserver per passenger. Kurman also helped initiate the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, which sets basic standards for boat construction, equipment, and operation.

Lately Kurman has been campaigning for a Federal law that would require all youth camps to meet health and safety standards. Congress has mulled several such bills since 1966, when Kurman convinced his home-state senator, Democrat Abraham Ribicoff, of the need for such legislation. Ribicoff's bill was followed by a series of bills on the House side, introduced by Congressmen Dominick Daniels of New Jersey, Ben Rosenthal and Peter Peyser of New York, and others. After three sets of congressional hearings, no bill has yet been approved.

WEAKER BILL GETS NO

Last week a House-Senate conference committee finally endorsed a camp-safety bill, but it won't please those who advocate Federal standards: It calls for further study rather than action. Introduced by Rep. J. J. Pickle, Democrat of Texas, it would provide for a \$300,000 HEW investigation of youth-camp safety.

The bill is attached to the controversial higher-education bill, which is bogged down while the committee wrangles over differing busing amendments. Aides say it may be

weeks before the bill is ready to go back to the House and Senate for voting.

The committee rejected a stronger camp-safety bill introduced in the Senate by Ribicoff. It would have required the HEW Secretary to establish minimum camp-safety standards. States wouldn't have been required to adopt them, but sizable Federal grants would have encouraged them to do so.

Kurman and other advocates of strong Federal action were backing an even stronger bill. Introduced by Representative Daniels and Peyser, it would have instructed the HEW Secretary to set standards within a year and required the states to comply with them.

ACA leaders insist that enough is known to enact Federal standards now. Dr. John Kirk, a past ACA president and current national board member, says that, "We have a pretty good idea of what's happening in the camps."

"We don't need a study to tell us that kids are being hurt at many camps by a lack of standards," he says. "What we need are minimum safety standards promulgated by the Federal Government and enforced by the states. If by this we can save youngsters' lives and prevent serious accidents, I'm all for it."

RULES FOR PARENTS

With summer approaching, however, no law passed by Congress could affect camps this year. Camp-safety advocates therefore say that parents still seeking a safe camp for their youngsters should get the answers to these questions:

What are the qualifications of the camp director and counselors? Are they experienced and trained in their specialties?

What is the ratio of counselors to campers? The ACA recommends one counselor for every 10 campers over age 8, with more for children under 8.

Does the camp take safety precautions around water and near shooting and archery ranges?

Do the buildings and grounds appear safe?

Does the camp have adequate medical facilities, and does it require medical examinations and records for all campers?

Are sanitation rules followed, and does the kitchen appear clean?

Does the camp make its accident record available? If not, why not?

Safety-conscious camp experts realize that it may never be possible to avoid all camp accidents. But they add that parents who make certain that their child's camp is up to par on health and safety will increase the likelihood that summer camp will be a youngster's great adventure, not a family's great tragedy.

HOW MANY MORE, MR. PRESIDENT?

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, last week the Associated Press reported from Saigon that since the North Vietnamese offensive started on March 30, a total of 70 more American planes have been lost in the fighting. In these losses, 64 Americans have been killed, 18 wounded, and 62 more Americans are missing in action.

This is not the way, Mr. Speaker, to end American involvement in Vietnam and to bring home our prisoners of war and the missing in action.

How many more POW's and MIA's

will our massive bombings of North and South Vietnam produce, Mr. Speaker?

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE ARTICLE WRITTEN BY ASSOCIATE PROF. WILLIAM A. STANMEYER "THE CASE FOR A BETTER BAR EXAMINATION"

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call an article by Associate Professor William A. Stanmeyer of Georgetown University Law Center to the attention of my colleagues. In that article, which appeared in the May issue of the American Bar Association Journal, Professor Stanmeyer suggests, not the elimination of the use of bar examinations for the screening of prospective lawyers as advocated by Judge Edward Bell, but the continuation and improvement of that screening procedure.

Judge Bell, in his earlier article, suggested that completion of an accredited law school should entitle a person to practice law; that the law school with its intimate association with the student over a 3-year period was in a better position to observe professional achievement; and that bar examinations have been and are currently being used as devices to prevent certain applicants, mainly blacks, from practicing law.

Professor Stanmeyer answers the arguments of Judge Bell pointing out that the intimate association between law schools and students, in most courses, occurs by examination at the end of the course; that with the burgeoning law school enrollments, up over 80 percent over the last decade, such schools will be less well equipped or qualified to take on the additional responsibility; and that the charge of racial discrimination, even if true, can be corrected by the elimination of racist examiners.

Professor Stanmeyer points out that every competitive profession has "its moments of truth" and that bar examinations, in addition to the completion of minimum academic requirements, offers a second line of defense against incompetents in the legal profession. Automatic licensing, as suggested by Judge Bell, would only harm the profession and those clients such untested attorneys would serve.

I commend this article not only to other Members of the House of Representatives but also to anyone who is interested in the legal profession and request that the article be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

THE CASE FOR A BETTER BAR EXAMINATION (By William A. Stanmeyer)

"Christianity has not been tried and found wanting; it has been found hard and therefore not tried."—G. K. CHESTERTON

Whatever the merits of Chesterton's aphorism as an apology for Christianity, Judge Edward F. Bell's recent *Journal* article (December issue, page 1215) asserting bar examination uselessness proved, at most, a para-

phrase of the Chestertonian dictum: bar examinations have not been tried and found wanting; but composing and administering a good examination has been found hard and, therefore (in some states), not really tried.

With all deference to Judge Bell, I must enter a vigorous dissent from the view that we should junk the bar examination. The automatic licensing of the graduates of all law schools, no matter their low averages, no matter the quality of the school—its shifting thing in an era of academic upheaval—can only harm the legal professional and the clients untested lawyers will serve.

The Bell position has three main thrusts: first, bar examinations don't work; second, they are racist; third, law schools are better equipped to make the final judgment on the candidate anyway.

DOES THE BAR EXAMINATION "WORK"?

Judge Bell says "the Michigan bar examination is designed to test only one thing, knowledge of Michigan law. I would never concede that as serving a useful purpose." Such a remark is disturbing; for one may presume that the majority of those taking the Michigan bar do intend to practice in Michigan, where, one would think, they will hold themselves out of the public as having some knowledge of Michigan law. Although, as Judge Bell urges, it may be better to attempt to test "an applicant's achievement or his aptitude"—prescinding from the subtle question, how achievement and knowledge differ—in this era of consumer protection it should not be unfair to protect the clients, who expect the licensed attorney to have demonstrated a minimum acquaintance with the law about which he will give advice.

Of course, the answer is to design a bar examination that does test achievement and aptitude, as well as measure knowledge of local law. In the meantime, the state examination motivates the student of a "national law school" to direct some attention to a given state's law before he starts advising clients there. One would think this is "a" useful purpose.

In the second column of his article, Judge Bell hints he thinks so, too; he refines his attack by saying that the bar examination is scarcely the apt means to achieve this purpose. First, he says, a practicing lawyer is not as qualified as an academician to correct the examination. This is possible, although no proof is offered; and many schools have practicing lawyers teaching as lecturers or adjuncts. The answer is: get more academics as correctors.

Second, he criticizes the lack of bar examiner contact with the student. The point has some merit. The addition of an oral examination argument or interview would make theoretical sense. Sadly, the logistics render this impossible, unless the examination were given monthly to randomly chosen smaller groups, and the number of examiners was greatly increased. But it is not entirely accurate to suggest that there is a high degree of examiner-examinee intimacy in the law schools themselves. They are bulging at the seams with students who in many schools are anonymous both during the semester and when being examined.

Third, Judge Bell makes the "one-bad-day-blows-it-all" complaint. Again, the point has some merit, although in contrasting three years in law school with a three-day bar examination Judge Bell has shifted the comparanda: the "performance" in law school in most courses, except seminars, occurs on exams. So we are comparing about twenty examination days to three. And one might just as well argue the same of the school. Why, after spending a diligent semester, should a student get no course credit because of some fortuity such as a sleepless night? The response must be that at some fixed point or other the apprentice must assemble all his skills and apply them in a controlled con-

text to a problem he asserts he is able to handle, so that his abilities may be evaluated. Doing a good job here (by, we are agreed, fair and objective standards of measurement) is the definition of "all the successful work . . . in three years of law school", not frequent presence in class.

EVERY COMPETITIVE PROFESSION HAS ITS MOMENT OF TRUTH

Every competitive profession has its final moment of truth—the day, chosen by circumstance or one's adversary as often as by one's own convenience, when the competitor must perform. No good purpose is served by insulating neophyte lawyers from this harsh fact of life.

However, often there are equitable reasons why one failed to perform up to his abilities. Sickness, emotional pressures, mistake of time or place are some common excuses. Although lawyers must learn to control their emotions and minimize their mistakes, it is unfair to the neophyte to allow no excuse for poor performance and to require, as is usually the case, a six-month wait for a second try at the examination. For the student who flunks the first attempt, additional exam periods should be offered at monthly intervals so that he can try again as soon as he judges himself able. The numbers would not be great and the logistics easily managed.

Fourth, Judge Bell believes that, "At best, the [bar] examination is a test of one's memory." It is, in part. But so are the very law school examinations Judge Bell extolls. Yet both examinations can be, and I would venture to say usually are, much more: a test of ability to analyze and marshal facts, reason logically, argue cogently and write clearly. Judge Bell overstates the memory dimension of the bar examination; such fields as commercial paper and taxation, being code courses, may stress memory. But examinations in common law courses and such a crucial field as constitutional law need not, should not and probably do not. If an examiner constructs a test that is "just a question of how many facts one could cram in [to his mind] . . . and then put down on paper", he is a terrible examiner. Once again we are reminded of Chesterton's dictum about hard tasks not really being tried.

Fifth, a cogent objection is the "twenty-minute time limit on the answer." Again the point is overstated, because a three-hour period spread among nine or ten questions does admit a good deal more flexibility than a fixed amount allowed indiscriminately for each question. But once more the main reply is that it need not be this way. Every examination must have some time limit, yet it would not be too hard to give the students an extra hour for their ten questions. And perhaps more examiners should remind students of law professors' experience. Student writing is often in inverse proportion to student thinking.

Finally, since bar examinations fail to weed out all the grossly incompetent lawyers, we are urged to let the marketplace decide, by a kind of social *laissez faire*. Skipping the question of protecting the public (with apologies to Ralph Nader), it is curious that the presence of incompetents among us should be adduced as evidence that we should license everyone who graduates from every law school. For these incompetents fooled their teachers, evaded the school examination screening and are living proof that the schools, with all their supposed intimacy with the students, are just as fallible as the bar examination. But it should be clear that two lines of defense against incompetents are better than one.

MUST THE EXAMINATION BE RACIALLY BIASED?

Let us start from common ground. There are not enough black lawyers, but this de-

ficiency has been the result of a congeries of factors, some irrelevant to our issue; for example, the poor quality of public school education offered most ghetto residents. Inner city schools, generally, simply do not drill students adequately in requisite verbal skills, and thus, with the use of the usual testing mechanism, the selection of law school applicants may well be imbalanced in favor of middle-class students.

Let us acknowledge that the deficiency has been due, at times, to discriminatory intent, a *prima facie* case for which Judge Bell makes out in his discussion of the Pennsylvania practice. This particular does not prove the universal. It is a *non sequitur* to contend that because three or four states invidiously discriminate, all states should discontinue examining.

Even if all bar examiners were racists which is doubtful, this fact only would prove that we should drop those examiners, not the examination. The examination process is, or can be made, ethically neutral, an improvement that should not be difficult given the "one shot" nature of the test and the ease of alternative identification procedures such as numbers assigned by computer.

If the American Bar Association can preserve the anonymity of essay contest entrants and city newspapers the anonymity of crime-suspect tipsters, devising workable methods of anonymous examination should not be beyond human ingenuity. We might experiment with a system in which examinees randomly draw from a box a gummed label marked in three sections with the same number, affix one number to their paper, keep the duplicate original and mail the triplicate original to an escrowee who by order of court will not even open the envelopes until after scores are published next to each number. Many variations easily can be devised.

The incidence of blacks failing bar examinations at a higher rate than whites must be because of (a) pure chance, (b) deliberate examiner intent, (c) a "culturally biased" exam, or (d) deficiency in writing and legal skills.

CULTURAL DEPRIVATION MIGHT CAUSE BLACKS TO FLUNK

A "culturally biased" examination is one which premises high scores, usually, on verbal skills generally associated with white, middle- or upper-class academic experiences, and these skills and experiences are, arguably, irrelevant to the measurement of a student's basic legal abilities. Such a bar examination would likely flunk out a higher percentage of blacks than whites, even though the former might be "really" just as knowledgeable or apt as the latter; and they would show it if we had a different testing mechanism. Some persons have felt this stricture should be directed against the law school admission test.

Judge Bell offers solid evidence that (a) is not the main reason; and he offers a good deal of evidence that in some states (b) is the (only?) reason. He does not really address himself to (c) and (d). This omission is unfortunate, because hyperemphasis on the alleged racism of bar examiners may distract from a deeper question: is an essay examination that puts a premium on a certain style of thought and composition unfair to examinees who have had relatively little or no cultural support for these skills in their formative years?

This inquiry is at the core of the problem, not the "absence of black bar examiners" *vel non*, a reproach tossed in by Judge Bell. Indeed, on reflection one can only be shocked that anyone seriously could suggest improving the examination by changing the color of the examiners. How would multiplying the black examiners even tenfold enable more black examinees to pass? Either the former know the latter's identity and give

them special treatment, a practice Judge Bell rightly condemns, or the examiners would not know examinee identity, and the color of either group would not matter.

"FLEXIBLE STANDARDS" LEAD TO PURSUIT OF BLACKS

Judge Bell asks how it is that blacks who passed all their law school courses still could flunk the examination. His insufficient answer is that the examiners are racists. There are, however, other possibilities that deserve exploration. Besides the cultural deprivation syndrome—which, I repeat, has nothing to do with race save insofar as poor people, usually minorities, are victims of it—there are the new "flexible standards" in many law schools.¹ Awakening in the 1960s to their exclusion of blacks, many conscience-stricken schools moved rapidly to redress the imbalance by an almost frenzied pursuit of black applicants. Although an energetic "minority recruitment" policy is an excellent idea, it is an unfortunate fact that disproportionately fewer blacks attend college. And those who do are, because of their higher frequency poverty background, often at disadvantage in college as they were in high school. The upshot was that there were not as many qualified blacks as the law schools wanted.

The law schools had two choices: cut back on minority admissions or cut down the standards for admission. Most chose the second course, thus shifting the moment of truth—"sink or swim"—from the application stage to the law school examination stage. Then, insufficiently prepared (a deficiency partly the law school's fault), a high proportion of blacks flunked out. For example, a few years ago a major northeastern law school admitted thirty "minority group people", and upwards of twenty-seven failed the first year.² One may assume, although there is no proof, that some of these failures were the contrivance of biased professors. That this assumption is not a complete explanation, however, may be argued from the twin facts that most major urban law school faculties are overwhelmingly liberal on civil rights questions, and that many faculties and individual teachers repeatedly agonize over how to keep a marginal minority student in.

To redeem themselves and repay the students for time and tuition, the schools hastened to institute tutorial and remedial programs. Simultaneously the decision evolved in many schools to discount examination performance as much as possible and even to construe the examination as such an imprecise tool as to be meaningless. "Flexible admission standards" have sometimes evolved into flexible grading standards. The normative question whether this is good or bad is beside the point, which is the descriptive observation that it is so.

It may be that flexible admission standards plus flexible grading result on occasion in the graduation of students only marginally equipped to deal with the bar examination. If so, we may have to open Pandora's box and discuss both legal education standards and the problem of what I have called the "culturally biased" examination. Surely one can contend that social policy warrants law school adjustments and bar examination changes. But social policy, not to mention plain reasonableness, also mandates more discussion before we simply blame the examiners.

SHOULD LAW SCHOOLS BE THE SOLE JUDGE?

Since someone must decide who is fit to practice law, unless we are to license all college graduates, Judge Bell wants it to be the law schools. That most of the mechanisms the schools would use are little better than the bar examination has already been

suggested. At this point we should go a step further and dare to speak of a situation of which the practicing legal profession is only dimly aware.

Legal education is changing rapidly, but not all the changes are for the good. The problem is not to throw the baby out with the bath water.

Some of the good changes, in my judgment, are the increased incidence of "clinical" courses; the new willingness to accommodate legitimate student desires; the expanding elective offerings which give students more choice in the last two years; the poverty-related courses at last bringing some legal services to the poor; the thrust of minority recruitment efforts.

Some of the harmful changes, in my judgment, include: dismantling the grading system in many schools, so that now a student's transcript is senseless, a quality prospective employers often assume is the student's; lack of adequate faculty supervision in some clinical courses; smorgasbord electives that are more sociology or politics than law; a cavalier treatment of examinations that leads to severe ethical problems for many students; faculty reluctance to ask anything of students that might be difficult (such as class attendance, timely submission of papers or taking examinations without books and notes).

It goes without saying that all these faults do not appear in every school. Nor is there unanimity that all these developments, as I have asserted, are "harmful". But the changes are occurring and bear on our question.

Concretely, if a school employs a "pass/fail" grading system or some equivalent, wherein *de facto* 98 per cent pass, does it adequately screen its students, or automatically dump them, after three years, onto the public? The same question may be asked if professors insist on expressing their discontent with the grading system by giving high grades to everyone, regardless of merit.

If a school promotes a "social policy" approach to law to the exclusion of other concerns, has it graduated lawyers or political theorists?

If professorial policy is to make academic life as easy as possible for law students, how does this prepare young lawyers to deal with judges and opponents not similarly inclined?

These questions and others suggested here-in should be sufficient to raise some doubts about law schools' current prowess in deciding who should be lawyers. At the core of my concern is the conviction that law schools today are further than ever from applying a uniform measuring standard of either professorial expectation or student performance. Educational philosophy, like cultural norms, is quite balkanized. The bar examination provides a valuable counterweight to the centrifugal forces pressing academia in all directions. One can well fear that by casting out the bar examination not only will we not exercise the *Zeitgeist*, but will actually open the door to seven worse demons.

THE EXAMINATION HAS MERITS

To prepare for a single, three-day test, students are forced to "put it all together". It has been three years for day-school students, longer for those in night school, since they took contracts, torts, property and procedure. They have forgotten a lot, and appellate decisions have changed much state law. It makes good sense to require a professional both to "see the big picture" and to be up to date. Few will review all their courses with an eye to recent decisions and course interrelation save to prepare for a required exam.

It would be ironic if lawyers, some of whom liken themselves to physicians or Ph.D.s, could someday achieve the title "Doctor" without the challenge of either pre-med and internship or, as with the Ph.D., the "com-

prehensive", oral final or research dissertation. Public confidence in the legal profession is not very high; how will it be increased by dropping the profession's only "comprehensive" examination and by licensing everyone who manages to pile up, over three to five years, about eighty credit hours?

Nowadays perhaps a third or a fourth of those credits in many schools may be gained in esoteric courses such as women's lib law and ecology law. These offerings can have merit; if the professor develops solid content and requires intellectual rigor, they are a curriculum improvement. But the bar examination deals with the more traditional subjects, with which it is reasonable to expect a licensed attorney to demonstrate an acquaintance, not only in his first year of law school, but also in his first year entering practice. Thus the bar examination protects a certain core of learning, the existence of which channels the schools' approach to law and helps school and student alike restrain their restless eagerness for exotica.

Drop the bar exam and the last barrier to a faddist "relevance" is gone. The result is likely to be a proliferation of *ad hoc* social-concern courses, only some of which are meritorious. Whether there's a Gresham's Law in curricula, I do not know; that ice cream is more tasty than meat and potatoes is certain. The need to pass a bar examination motivates students to balance their intellectual diet. Both for the student and the public this is a useful purpose.

In a permissive age, many students climb the academic ladder with an ease that deceives them about the harder realities beyond the womblike comforts of academia. As undergraduate uncertainties and malaise spread into law schools, the curricula, teacher attitudes and student expectations from the college years enter as well. The campus mood is suspicious of competition, and some young professors make fun of such "bourgeois virtues" as hard work and self-discipline. Yet the legal profession demands just that—competitive, even combative, work. Although the bar examination is imperfect, it does demand laborious preparation and is a far more realistic training than most law school tests.

Finally, with more students from State A attending law schools in State B, without a bar examination State A has no evidence at all that bar applicants know the slightest iota about its laws, particular rules or law reform efforts. It would have only the reputation of a law school in another jurisdiction. Moreover, as the review of applicants by character and fitness committees is usually a *pro forma* appendage to the examination process, it is likely that abolition of the examination will entail a concomitant abolition of any character and fitness inquiry. Many who view the inquiry as useless ritual would welcome such a development. But we should not back into it without deliberation. There is a "legal federalism" as well as a political one. The states may well ponder abdicating what slight influence they now have over the legal and ethical qualities of members of their Bars and the yielding of it to law schools sometimes half a continent away.

Judge Bell's attack on the examination system in principle and in practice and my defense of the principle both stem from sincere concern for the profession and for minority groups long excluded therefrom. I join his condemnation of racial injustices and anachronistic practices, but we can separate both from the testing system. The task may be hard, but if we fail to try, it will be ourselves, not the principle of examinations, who are found wanting.

FOOTNOTES

¹ To judge from the already celebrated trial court case of *DeFunis v. Odegaard*, Superior Court, County of King, State of Washington, Case No. 741727 (September 22, 1971), many minority representatives who test inferior are

nonetheless admitted to law schools. In this case the trial court held that Mr. DeFuniis, who had an excellent college record and high law school admission test scores, but who was denied law school admission while minority applicants with lower scores were accepted, was denied equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment. However this case is resolved on appeal, it is common knowledge that minority admissions policies have become flexible.

³See also 1 Balsa Reports Newsletter 9 (September 1971): "From our underground news sources it appears that Wayne State [law school] is having a lot of problems. It appears that the Wayne State administration is systematically flunking out brothers in large numbers. For example, last year, out of 23 Black law students or thereof [sic], 15 or so brothers flunked out. However, due to some aggressive actions on the part of the brothers, most of them were readmitted. This year, it seems that Wayne State is doing the same thing. Perhaps what is happening at Wayne State is indicative of what is happening at other schools. We are watching Wayne State."

THE PEOPLE OF LOCKPORT, N.Y., IN FAVOR OF ADMINISTRATION'S LATEST MOVES IN VIETNAM

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I wish to include in the Record, a copy of a letter I have received from Leonard Bauguess, Jr., program director of WUSJ radio in Lockport, N.Y. in my district. During a recent radio talk show, Mr. Bauguess informs me that of 134 respondents to the question, "Do you support President Nixon's announced action—to end the Vietnam conflict with honor?"; 108 persons responded in favor with only 26 opposed. As a result of this poll, Mr. Bauguess wrote the President to inform him of the results. The contents of that letter follow:

MAY 10, 1972.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with great satisfaction for your efforts in our behalf, and renewed pride in the office of the Presidency that I write this day.

As a member of the much assailed media it is an extreme pleasure to respond to your plea for public support today. In a straw poll, taken live via telephone over radio station WUSJ between 9:15 and 10:00 AM this date the response was as follows:

In support of the President's address May 8, 1972, 108.

In negative response to the President's address May 8, 1972, 26.

Total call's received in 34 minutes, 134.
We asked the question: Do you support President Nixon's announced action last night to end the Vietnam conflict with honor? We are pleased to be able to share our small poll from a small segment of Americans in Western New York. Our phones were jammed during the polling period, and with certainty many more would like to have been included.

The people of our area reflect my own sentiment. We want all of our servicemen, including the prisoners held by the Hanoi regime home. We are confident your course

of action will make that dream a reality for all Americans.

Our prayers go with you and thank you for acting strongly in our behalf.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD L. BAUGUESS, Jr.

AN UPDATE ON INFLATION

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the Congress and the Nation is still very much preoccupied with the battle against inflation. I am sure that my colleagues in the House will find the enclosed article from the Wall Street Journal helpful in assessing our current standing and our immediate prospects for the future:

CURBING INFLATION: ANALYSTS CLAIM EFFORTS TO SLOW RISE IN PRICES ACHIEVE LIMITED SUCCESS

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

How fares the battle against inflation? Worse than most planners in the Nixon administration care to admit. But not as badly as many critics of Mr. Nixon's economic management contend.

As the administration's wage-price control effort nears the nine-month mark, this is the picture that emerges from private economists who keep a close tab not only on bare price statistics but on more fundamental developments that ultimately can affect price tags. Almost no one now believes that the overall rate of inflation can be brought down to the administration's original goal of between 2% and 3% annually by the end of 1972. Rather, many analysts look for a year-end rate of roughly 4%, or a shade less. At the same time, however, almost no one anticipates a return anytime soon to the disastrously rapid rates of price increase—exceeding 8% in some months—that occurred in 1969 and 1970.

Ironically, this view that the effort to curb inflation will be neither resoundingly successful nor a total failure attaches little importance to the administration's much-publicized control program. Private analysts generally feel that the regulator bureaucracy, at the most, can exert only a marginal influence on the long-run course of prices. Some economists liken the control effort to squeezing a balloon; you can reduce the size of one part of a balloon by squeezing on it, but in the process other parts will inevitably expand.

THE POSTFREEZE BALLOON

The confusing, even bizarre behavior of some price indexes in recent months—sharp increases one month, almost no change the next—is attributed largely to the wage-price program. Wages and prices were held down artificially during last year's "freeze" period, analysts say, and therefore were bound to balloon in the early postfreeze months. But the longer-range impact, it's claimed, will be negligible.

Don Conlan, chief economist of Dean Witter & Co., estimates, for example, that wholesale prices are about where they would have been without any control program. Projecting trends evident before the imposition of controls on Aug. 15, the economist reckons that the wholesale price index in March would have stood at 117.5% of the 1967 average. The actual March level, after a big jump in February and a very small increase in March, was 117.4%.

Mr. Conlan's conclusion: "All that grief and confusion for one-tenth of a percentage point improvement over free markets!"

While analysts tend to minimize the importance of the administration's control program, they do attach considerable significance to other factors, some of which are the indirect result of Mr. Nixon's economic policies. Foremost among such factors is the slack condition of the economy. An unusual amount of slack—in both machine-power and manpower—still exists even though the recovery is about a year-and-a-half old. And it's generally agreed that this slack derives largely from the Nixon administration's efforts in 1969 to slow the economic pace. In fact, a full-fledged recession occurred between the fall of 1969 and late 1970.

EVIDENCE OF ELBOWROOM

This economic slack can be gauged in various ways. About 25% of the nation's production capacity is currently idle, an extraordinarily large percentage for so long after the start of a business recovery. Close to 6% of the labor force is jobless, again a remarkably high figure. Economists estimate that the so-called gap between actual and potential gross national product has been running at an annual rate of about \$50 billion. In early 1969, in contrast, actual GNP exceeded the nation's estimated economic capacity by more than \$4 billion, indicating a severe overstraining of economic resources.

Such slack will permit business to expand briskly for many months without any danger of 1969-style inflation, many economists predict.

Some analysts contend, moreover, that any reduction in economic slack in coming months would actually serve to reduce inflationary pressure. A reduction in the amount of idle plant capacity, for instance, would tend to speed up the hourly output of factory workers. Any productivity speed-up, in turn, would tend to reduce unit labor costs, which in recent years have been a prime element in the inflation problem.

Robert H. Parks, chief economist of Eastman Dillon, Union Securities & Co., is among analysts who believe that "surprisingly" large productivity increases will show up as the business expansion progresses. These increases should bring "a slowing of unit labor costs in the year ahead," he predicts, adding that "the worst of inflation is over." In the first quarter, productivity among workers in private businesses rose at an annual rate of 2.1%, after seasonal adjustment. Most analysts anticipate sharper increases as the year goes on.

A LIGHT LABOR CALENDAR

Happenstance should also serve to hold down labor costs in coming months, some analysts say. Fortunately for Washington's inflation-fighters, relatively few major labor contracts come up for negotiation this year. Major labor contracts covering about 2.8 million workers either expire or contain wage reopening provisions. This is an unusually small number of workers, down from nearly five million in 1970 and again in 1971.

Another factor that may limit labor costs, some economists claim, is that workers' earnings at long last are climbing in "real" terms. In dollars and cents, weekly paychecks have climbed without interruption for many years. But because of rising prices and taxes, the actual purchasing power of the average paycheck remained approximately flat from 1935 through late last year. Since then, however, "real" pay has begun to increase briskly, finally rising well above 1965 levels.

If these gains in purchasing power continue, labor's pay demands will gradually slacken, some analysts claim. "It's when you see that your pay isn't keeping pace with prices and taxes that you pound hardest on the bargaining table," remarks an economist at Chase Manhattan Bank.

HON. GEORGE WALLACE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, my wife and family join with the people of my district in offering our prayers for George Wallace and extend our sympathy to his wife, his bereaved family and his people of Alabama. But now in our time of national sorrow, we must not forget to face the simple fact of life—things do not just happen; they are caused. Something provoked the deplorable shooting of Governor Wallace.

Amidst the tumult and the shouting resulting from the tragic shooting of the Governor of Alabama, a candidate for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency of the United States, here within the shadow of our Nation's Capitol, there is one evident truth—the role of the Nation's news media in inflaming people, possibly even to the point of an attempt at political assassination.

Consider the inflammatory effect of a recent lead editorial in the largest newspaper of our Nation's Capital, a paper which has wide distribution in the area of Maryland where Governor Wallace was wounded.

I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, May 12, 1972]
THE PRIMARIES: AND THEN THERE WERE THREE

A lot has happened since we last looked in on the Democratic primaries in the wake of Senator Muskie's defeats in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. Subsequent contests have been held in Ohio, Indiana, Tennessee, North Carolina, West Virginia, Alabama and Nebraska. Senator Muskie and Senator Jackson have both more or less withdrawn from the race. And all three principal survivors of the ordeal—Senators Humphrey and McGovern and Governor Wallace—have demonstrated special strengths along the way, each having acquired considerable delegate support or at least the prospect of it.

What has thus begun to emerge from the mists of confusion is one possible scenario for Miami Beach. Still broad in its outlines and vague in its detail, it is the possibility that Governor Wallace will come to the Democratic National Convention in roughly the same position he sought to achieve in the electoral college in 1968—namely, as a potential kingmaker, a man controlling a bloc of votes sufficient to break a deadlock between two candidates, neither of whom could get the nomination without his assistance. To be sure, any number of circumstances could intervene between now and then to render this prospect unlikely: one of the other two candidates could achieve so commanding a lead as to ensure that the necessary support would come over from quarters not identified with Governor Wallace; the sizable number of uncommitted delegates now expected at the convention could be pruned loose or conceivably even mobilized by some fourth force (Southern governors come to mind, despite Terry Sanford's dismal showing in North Carolina the other day) so that the winner would not necessarily be beholden to Governor Wallace; the Governor himself might do badly from here on out, thus reducing his chances to conduct a presidential

auction. Even so, it seems to us that given the configuration of delegate strength at this point, the scenario is at least worth considering, as is the larger matter of Governor Wallace's role in the party proceedings as a whole.

Assume, then, a Humphrey-McGovern deadlock and a potential swing bloc of several hundred Wallace delegates, all of whom have been freely and properly selected under the Party's new reform procedures. Assume, too, that Governor Wallace is in a mood and a position to have a go at his swingman role. Two questions then arise—and they are questions that have been hovering, troublesome and unanswered, over the fight for the nomination ever since Governor Wallace began to display his considerable strength. One is: how are the Democrats, a huge proportion of whom regard the Governor as a renegade, a racist and a pariah, to deal with Mr. Wallace and his supporters? The other is: what does the Governor really want, what—to put it crudely—might be his terms?

As they used to say on those now-defunct quiz shows, we will try to answer the second part first—largely because, hard as it is, it is the easier question. Our suspicion is that Governor Wallace, improbable as it may seem to some, wants exactly what he has said he wants: an audible voice and a visible presence in national Democratic Party affairs, a demonstrable influence on the Party's platform and a demonstrable hand in the selection of its ticket. In many respects, this is the most difficult prize he could seek to extract from the Democrats. Unlike some squalid charge-account arrangement concerning subsequent patronage and perks, it really matters. And unlike some grandiose demand for a reversal of position on great national issues to which the Party has been and continues to be committed—questions of race, for example—it is within the power of the Party to give. Moreover, to the extent that Governor Wallace may enjoy a position of strength at the convention as a direct result of popular sentiment democratically expressed, his claim to recognition and participation and influence on behalf of his constituents grows. The operative image in all this—one which the imagination continues to resist and eject from focus—is that of the nominee, George McGovern or Hubert Humphrey or some other, standing there with George Corley Wallace's arm draped around his shoulder, while the band plays "Happy Days Are Here Again."

If you believe, as we do, that this kind of recognition, along with some conspicuous impact on the convention's decisions, is Governor Wallace's immediate aim, and if you also believe, as we do, that he personally embodies a collection of prejudices, small-bore hatreds and jagged perspectives on the world that should be repudiated rather than honored, then you will recognize the dilemma posed by his presence in Miami. How should the Democratic Party respond to his claim?

This is the truly hard question, although a couple of easy, negative answers spring to mind. For one thing, it is both stupid and outrageous, in our view, that Party officials here and there are already talking about violating their own state election laws and the Party's new rules to minimize the representation of Governor Wallace on state delegations and the prerogatives of his delegates once there. If the Party reforms are to mean anything, if their credibility is to be sustained, then Governor Wallace must receive everything to which he is legally entitled and so must his accredited delegates. Politically, we suspect, as well as morally, this is the only wise course: the fight against him must be honorable and must be seen to be honorable.

A second negative injunction has to do with not categorically imputing to Governor Wallace's delegates or his supporters among

the electorate those characteristics that have made the Governor himself so thoroughly unacceptable as a major influence on a great political party. Senator McGovern wisely and cannily made the distinction after the Florida primary when, unlike Senator Muskie who excoriated the Wallace voters, he made a point of crediting their discontents and inviting them to support a candidate who meant to deal with those discontents honorably and effectively. These two evident imperatives concerning attitudes toward and treatment of the Wallace contingent flow from the simple imperatives of a democratically organized nominating process. It is not really within the power of other candidates or Party hierarchs to confer legitimacy on Governor Wallace or to deprive him of it: the legitimacy of his claim will be a direct product of the size of the vote he is able to amass between now and Miami.

None of this suggests to us that the fight against Governor Wallace should be gingerly or half-hearted. On the contrary, according him his democratic due seems to us to carry with it the simultaneous obligation to wage an all-out battle against his success. In this connection, incidentally, we do not think it a bit too early for people to inspect the implications of glossing over enormous differences in political position with the newly fashionable term, "populism." At some point, and sooner than later, one would hope, the candidates—and especially Senator McGovern—would set about defining more clearly some of the distinctions between Governor Wallace's appeal and promise and their own. He is, in some respects, getting a free ride from the other candidates, and there is some prospect that the magnitude of his Miami strength will have been enhanced by some of their actions.

Governor Wallace needs to be defined. His constituents need to be persuaded away. Conceivably the Democrats will profit from a demonstrably open and combative and democratically ordered convention in which the Wallace forces have been seen to have had a fair shake. But the only way in which that image of the finale, with Governor Wallace on the platform, makes any sense to us is as the picture of a man who has been fairly denied his policy aims, who has come to terms with the better purposes of his party—and not the other way around.

THE PROBLEM OF VIETNAM

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today during the quorum call I was absent because I had an appointment with Mr. John Irwin, Under Secretary of State, to discuss with him some of the problems in foreign affairs and especially the problem of Vietnam. Mr. Speaker, I came away believing that there was genuine concern in the State Department about Vietnam and I believe there is some comfort in those who are open minded and willing to consider other options and propositions that may be offered by this administration's leadership and comforting to know that they are willing to listen to Members of Congress who have deep convictions about Vietnam that may be in variance with the administration's present position.

MCGOVERN'S OWN EDITORIAL

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the Democratic candidates for the Presidency, Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, has done much better in the primaries than many political pundits had predicted. The Senator's press secretary has said that MCGOVERN has received many votes in the primaries from "conservatives" under the mistaken impression that MCGOVERN is really conservative.

An editorial appearing in today's edition of the Peoria Journal Star explodes that myth by quoting from a letter which the Senator sent to every member of the ADA soliciting funds.

I insert the text of the editorial to be placed in the RECORD at this point:

MCGOVERN'S OWN EDITORIAL

The Americans for Democratic Action endorsed the candidacy of George McGovern a few weeks ago, and Senator McGovern promptly sent a letter to every ADA member soliciting funds.

In it, he outlined his program.

For two pages he attacked the Vietnam war and "Vietnam thinking" which is one position he has that has long been familiar. Then, he briefly outlined his overall "program," which has been somewhat obscure.

Frank Mankelwitz, McGovern's own press representative, has said that McGovern has received many votes in the primaries from "conservatives" under the mistaken impression that McGovern is really "conservative." That impression somehow emerges because of McGovern's somewhat ponderous appearance and delivery, apparently.

In his letter to ADA, Senator McGovern clearly outlined his views. He wrote:

"In place of the madness of Vietnam thinking, I have proposed a rational reordering of our national priorities and redistribution of our national resources.

"I have shown that building a 'Zero Base' Defense budget, starting at zero and budgeting only what is realistically needed, would cost no more than \$54.8 billion instead of the approximately \$80 billion the Nixon administration wants.

"I have spelled out how we could increase our federal tax revenue by \$28 billion by plugging the tax loopholes of wealthy individuals and large corporations.

"As a nation, we have the resources to feed the hungry, care for the sick, give work to the jobless, provide decent housing for the homeless, clean up our air and water, educate all of our children properly. We are simply misusing our strength.

"I sensed a yearning on the part of the American people for a great sea change which no one in national leadership was articulating.

"I felt too that an effort to provide new leadership would have a priceless advantage: the untiring, unselfish dedication of hundreds of thousands of political idealists like yourself.

"A.D.A. was founded when the spirit of the New Deal appeared to be faltering, and the old coalition put together by Franklin Roosevelt was losing much of its forward momentum. Throughout the 1950's, you kept the flame of liberal idealism burning bright despite the suffocating complacency of the Eisenhower years.

"Now it is time to set new goals and build a new coalition. This new coalition can join together...

"... peace advocates heartsick over Vietnam and our bloated defense budget

"... women rightfully demanding full equality with men

"... small farmers being driven off the land by giant agribusiness.

"... Idealistic young people fighting for a better future

"... Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Indians and other minorities

"... blue-collar workers squeezed by cold-war inflation and taxes

"... environmentalists and zero-population-growth advocates fighting to save our planet before it's too late

"... consumer advocates demanding quality, honesty, and value

"... civil libertarians alarmed over unconstitutional crushing of crime and dissent

"... educators concerned over the austerity budgets of most of our schools

"... enlightened business and professional people who want a healthier, happier country.

"Successfully building this coalition within the Democratic party may be our only hope of heading off the Third Party and Fourth Party walk-outs threatened by militants of the right and left... won't you join this historic effort?

"And please hurry. Funds are urgently needed..."

Sincerely Yours,

GEORGE MCGOVERN.

The program portion of Senator McGovern's solicitation letter has been reproduced here, as written in his own words, as the best way to bring citizens more clarity about him stated in the most favorable way the senator chose for himself... and not on this occasion to put forward our opinion, but to put forward essential facts that, somehow, we feel in this campaign have not really become available otherwise.

In a very real sense, this has been Sen. McGovern's own best effort at an "editorial" on his own behalf.

It's here because you're entitled to it.

C. L. DANCEY.

VEYSEY PRAISES ISRAELI SPIRIT ON 24TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, 24 years ago Sunday the Jewish people proclaimed the independent sovereign Republic of Israel—their first nation-state in over 20 centuries.

During these past 24 years the Jewish people have wrought a miracle, carving their nation from bedrock, a desert, and malarial swamps. Twice they have had to temporarily set aside the tools of construction to take up arms and batter back the onslaughts of hostile neighbors numbering 10 times their population. What a tribute to courage, determination, and vigor.

As if that were not enough, Israel has encouraged other small nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America—not only by example, but by substantive action with programs of technical assistance, on-the-job training courses, and the loan of experts and instructors.

This tremendous release of energies and the accomplishments of the Jewish people these past 24 years should remind us of our heritage, and that free

men can stir the imaginations of the rest of mankind only so long as they remain free and are willing to bear the burdens of freedom.

ARTHUR BURNS OUTLINES THE ESSENTIALS OF INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Arthur F. Burns, laid out a thoughtful catalog of the elements he considers vital in a reformed monetary system in a speech May 12 before the 1972 International Banking Conference in Montreal. The text of his remarks follows:

SOME ESSENTIALS OF INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM

(By Arthur F. Burns)

On August 15 of last year, in the face of an unsatisfactory economic situation, the President of the United States acted decisively to alter the nation's economic course. The new policies, especially the decision to suspend convertibility of the dollar into gold or other reserve assets, were bound to have far-reaching consequences for international monetary arrangements. New choices were forced on all countries.

The next four months gave all of us a glimpse of one possible evolution of the international economy. Since exchange rates were no longer tied to the old par values, they were able to float—a prescription that many economists had favored. However, last fall's floating rates did not conform to the model usually sketched in academic writings. Most countries were reluctant to allow their exchange rates to move in response to market forces. Instead, restrictions on financial transactions proliferated, special measures with regard to trade emerged here and there, new twists crept into the pattern of exchange rates, serious business uncertainty about governmental policies developed, fears of a recession in world economic activity grew, and signs of political friction among friendly nations multiplied.

Fortunately, this dangerous trend toward competitive and even antagonistic national economic policies was halted by the Smithsonian Agreement. Despite recent developments in Vietnam, which may cause some uneasiness in financial markets for a time, the Smithsonian realignment of currencies is, in my judgment, solidly based. It was worked out with care by practical and well-informed men, and I am confident that the central banks and governments of all the major countries will continue to give it strong support.

Developments in the American economy since last December have been encouraging. Aggregate activity in the United States has begun to show signs of vigorous resurgence. Price increases have moderated, and our rate of inflation has recently been below that of most other industrial countries. Moreover, the budget deficit of the Federal Government will be much smaller this fiscal year than seemed likely three or four months ago. These developments have strengthened the confidence with which businessmen and consumers assess the economic outlook. International confidence in turn is being bolstered by the passage of the Fair Value Modification Act, by the convergence of short-

term interest rates in the United States and abroad, and by some promising signs of improvement in the international financial accounts of the United States.

With the Smithsonian Agreement and other indications of progress behind us, it is necessary now to move ahead and plan for the longer future. The Smithsonian meeting was pre-eminently concerned with realigning exchange rates. It did not attempt to deal with structural weaknesses in the old international monetary system. Yet they must eventually be remedied if we are to build a new and stronger international economic order.

We all have to ponder this basic question: Given the constraints of past history, what evolution of the monetary system is desirable and at the same time practically attainable? For my part, I should like to take advantage of this gathering to consider some of the elements that one might reasonably expect to find in a reformed monetary system.

First of all, a reformed system will need to be characterized by a further strengthening of international consultation and cooperation among governments. Our national economies are linked by a complex web of international transactions. Problems and policies in one country inevitably affect other countries. This simple fact of interdependence gives rise to constraints on national policies. In a smoothly functioning system, no country can ignore the implications of its own actions for other countries or fail to cooperate in discussing and resolving problems of mutual concern. The task of statesmanship is to tap the great reservoir of international goodwill that now exists and to make sure that it remains undiminished in the future.

Sound domestic policies are a second requirement of a better world economic order. A well constructed international monetary system should, it is true, be capable of absorbing the strains caused by occasional financial mismanagement in this or that country—such as are likely to follow from chronic budget deficits or from abnormally large and persistent additions to the money supply. But I doubt if any international monetary system can long survive if the major industrial countries fail to follow sound financial practices. In view of the huge size of the American economy, I recognize that the economic policies of the United States will remain an especially important influence on the operation of any international monetary system.

Third, in the calculable future any international monetary system will have to respect the need for substantial autonomy of domestic economic policies. A reformed monetary system cannot be one that encourages national authorities to sacrifice either the objective of high employment or the objective of price stability in order to achieve balance-of-payments equilibrium. More specifically, no country experiencing an external deficit should have to accept sizable increases in unemployment in order to reduce its deficit. Nor should a surplus country have to moderate its surplus by accepting high rates of inflation. Domestic policies of this type are poorly suited to the political mood of our times, and it would serve no good purpose to assume otherwise.

I come now to a fourth element that should characterize a reformed monetary system. If I am right in thinking that the world needs realistic and reasonably stable exchange rates, rather than rigid exchange rates, ways must be found to ensure that payments imbalances will be adjusted more smoothly and promptly than under the old Bretton Woods arrangements.

The issues here are many and complex. There was a consensus at the Smithsonian meeting that wider margins around parities can help to correct payments imbalances, and

should prove especially helpful in moderating short-term capital movements—thereby giving monetary authorities somewhat more scope to pursue different interest-rate policies. Our experience has not yet been extensive enough to permit a confident appraisal of this innovation. It is clear, however, that no matter how much the present wider margins may contribute to facilitating the adjustment of exchange rates to changing conditions, the wider margins by themselves will prove inadequate for that purpose.

We may all hope that at least the major countries will pursue sound, noninflationary policies in the future. We should nevertheless recognize that national lapses from economic virtue will continue to occur. In such circumstances, changes in parities—however regrettable—may well become a practical necessity. Moreover, even if every nation succeeded in achieving noninflationary growth, structural changes in consumption or production will often lead to shifts in national competitive positions over time. Such shifts will also modify the pattern of exchange rates that is appropriate for maintaining balance-of-payments equilibrium.

In my judgment, therefore, more prompt adjustments of parities will be needed in a reformed monetary system. Rules of international conduct will have to be devised which, while recognizing rights of sovereignty, establish definite guidelines and consultative machinery for determining when parities need to be changed. This subject is likely to become one of the central issues, and also one of the most difficult, in the forthcoming negotiations.

Let me turn to a fifth element that should characterize a reformed monetary system. A major weakness of the old system was its failure to treat in a symmetrical manner the responsibilities of surplus and deficit countries for balance-of-payments adjustment. With deficits equated to sin and surpluses to virtue, moral as well as financial pressures were very much greater on deficit countries to reduce their deficits than on surplus countries to reduce surpluses. In actual practice, however, responsibility for payments imbalances can seldom be assigned unambiguously to individual countries. And in any event, the adjustment process will work more efficiently if surplus countries participate actively in it. In my view, all countries have an obligation to eliminate payments imbalances, and the rules of international conduct to which I referred earlier will therefore need to define acceptable behavior and provide for international monitoring of both surplus and deficit countries.

Sixth, granted improvements in the promptness with which payments imbalances are adjusted, reserve assets and official borrowing will still be needed to finance in an orderly manner the imbalances that continue to arise. Looking to the long future, it will therefore be important to develop plans so that world reserves and official credit arrangements exist in an appropriate form and can be adjusted to appropriate levels.

This brings me to the seventh feature of a reformed international monetary system. It is sometimes argued that, as a part of reform, gold should be demonetized. As a practical matter, it seems doubtful to me that there is any broad support for eliminating the monetary role of gold in the near future. To many people, gold remains a great symbol of safety and security, and these attitudes about gold are not likely to change quickly. Nevertheless, I would expect the monetary role of gold to continue to diminish in the years ahead, while the role of special drawing rights increases.

The considerations which motivated the International Monetary Fund to establish the SDR facility in 1969 should remain valid in a reformed system. However, revisions in the detailed arrangements governing the creation, allocation, and use of SDRs will prob-

ably be needed. In the future, as the SDRs assume increasing importance, they may ultimately become the major international reserve asset.

Next, as my eighth point, let me comment briefly on the future role of the dollar as a reserve currency. It has often been said that the United States had a privileged position in the old monetary system because it could settle payments deficits by adding to its liabilities instead of drawing down its reserve assets. Many also argue that this asymmetry should be excluded in a reformed system. There thus seems to be significant sentiment in favor of diminishing, or even phasing out, the role of the dollar as a reserve currency. One conceivable way of accomplishing the objective would be to place restraints on the further accumulation of dollars in official reserves. If no further accumulation at all were allowed, the United States would be required to finance any deficit in its balance of payments entirely with reserve assets.

I am not persuaded by this line of reasoning, for I see advantages both to the United States and to other countries from the use of the dollar as a reserve currency. But I recognize that there are some burdens or disadvantages as well. And in any event, this is an important issue on which national views may well diverge in the early stages of the forthcoming negotiations.

I come now to a ninth point concerning a new monetary system, namely, the issue of "convertibility" of the dollar. It seems unlikely to me that the nations of the world, taken as a whole and over the long run, will accept a system in which convertibility of the dollar into international reserve assets—SDRs and gold—is entirely absent. If we want to build a strengthened monetary system along one-world lines, as I certainly do, this issue will have to be resolved. I therefore anticipate, as part of a total package of long-term reforms, that some form of dollar convertibility can be re-established in the future.

I must note, however, that this issue of convertibility has received excessive emphasis in recent discussions. Convertibility is important, but no more so than the other issues on which I have touched. It is misleading, and may even prove mischievous, to stress one particular aspect of reform to the exclusion of others. Constructive negotiations will be possible only if there is a general disposition to treat the whole range of issues in balanced fashion.

We need to guard against compartmentalizing concern with any one of the issues, if only because the various elements of a new monetary system are bound to be interrelated. There is a particularly important interdependence, for example, between improvements in the exchange-rate regime and restoration of some form of convertibility of the dollar into gold or other reserve assets. Without some assurance that exchange rates of both deficit and surplus countries will be altered over time so as to prevent international transactions from moving into serious imbalance, I would deem it impractical to attempt to restore convertibility of the dollar.

My tenth and last point involves the linkage between monetary and trading arrangements. We cannot afford to overlook the fact that trade practices are a major factor in determining the balance-of-payments position of individual nations. There is now a strong feeling in the United States that restrictive commercial policies of some countries have affected adversely the markets of American business firms. In my judgment, therefore, the chances of success of the forthcoming monetary conversations will be greatly enhanced if parallel conversations get under way on trade problems, and if those conversations take realistic account of the current and prospective foreign trade position of the United States.

In the course of my remarks this morning I have touched on some of the more essential conditions and problems of international monetary reform. Let me conclude by restating the elements I would expect to find in a new monetary system that met the test of both practicality and viability:

First, a significant further strengthening of the processes of international consultation and cooperation;

Second, responsible domestic policies in all the major industrial countries;

Third, a substantial degree of autonomy for domestic policies, so that no country would feel compelled to sacrifice high employment or price stability in order to achieve balance-of-payments equilibrium;

Fourth, more prompt adjustments of payments imbalances, to be facilitated by definite guidelines and consultative machinery for determining when parties need to be changed;

Fifth, a symmetrical division of responsibilities among surplus and deficit countries for initiating and implementing adjustments of payments imbalances;

Sixth, systematic long-range plans for the evolution of world reserves and official credit arrangements;

Seventh, a continued but diminishing role for gold as a reserve asset, with a corresponding increase in the importance of SDRs;

Eighth, a better international consensus than exists at present about the proper role of reserve currencies in the new system;

Ninth, re-establishment of some form of dollar convertibility in the future;

And finally, tenth, a significant lessening of restrictive trading practices as the result of negotiations complementing the negotiations on monetary reform.

I firmly believe that a new and stronger international monetary system can and must be built. Indeed, I feel it is an urgent necessity to start the rebuilding process quite promptly. It is not pleasant to contemplate the kind of world that may evolve if cooperative efforts to rebuild the monetary system are long postponed. We might then find the world economy divided into restrictive and inward-looking blocs, with rules of international conduct concerning exchange rates and monetary reserves altogether absent.

As we learned last fall, a world of financial manipulations, economic restrictions, and political frictions bears no promise for the future. It is the responsibility of financial leaders to make sure that such a world will never come to pass.

NEWS-MEDIA BIAS?

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, some years ago I did a survey of Congress on ethics of the media. The following news item is relevant to recent accusations of bias:

NEWS-MEDIA BIAS?

NEW YORK.—An article in the Columbia Journalism Review says that although Vice-President Spiro T. Agnew has convinced many people that the news media have a liberal bias, the nation's newspapers are overwhelmingly Republican and conservative.

"The irony is that Agnew in one sense is right—the newspapers of this country are out of step with the electorate—but they are massively out of step in the direction opposite to that which Nixon-Agnew claim," said the article by Ben Bagdikian, an assistant managing editor of the Washington Post and a commentator on the media.

CXVIII—1096—Part 14

Of papers that endorsed a presidential candidate in 1960, 78 percent endorsed President Nixon, Mr. Bagdikian said. In 1968, Mr. Nixon had 80 percent.

"And though Nixon people like to castigate the big-city press in contrast to the 'real American' papers in the smaller cities, in huge metropolises like Los Angeles, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and Philadelphia all the major papers were for Nixon," the article states.

NATIONWIDE SOLIDARITY DAY FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, 1972, the citizens of the State of California joined with Americans all over the country in urging the President to take up with the Soviet leaders the persistent and flagrant violations of the rights and freedoms of groups within the U.S.S.R., especially those rights of the Soviet Jewish population. This day, Nationwide Solidarity Day for Soviet Jewry, also served as a reminder to the American people of the precious nature of religious liberty.

The record of persecutions, committals to asylums for the insane and arbitrary drafting of individuals whose only crime is a desire to worship in their own way or to leave a country deserves a place on the agenda with the leaders of the U.S.S.R. Since one of the motivating forces for the President's trip is to create bridges of understanding with the Soviet world, it would be a most appropriate and opportune moment to express this Nation's concern in the matter.

I would like to introduce for the Record as part of my remarks the Assembly Joint Resolution No. 26, adopted in my State to celebrate this day.

I am hopeful that the President will heed this resolution as well as the voices which have risen from all over the Congress urging that discussions be entered into on this issue.

The resolution follows:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION No. 26—RELATIVE TO SOLIDARITY DAY

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AJR 26, Waxman. Soviet Jewry.

Urges the citizens of California to take part in Nationwide Solidarity Day for Soviet Jewry and urges the President of the United States to take up the issue of grievances of Soviet Jews with the leaders of the U.S.S.R.

Whereas, President Richard M. Nixon plans to visit Russia on a mission that seeks to create a greater bridge of understanding between the two great powers of the United States and Russia; and

Whereas, Such bridges of understanding will help to promote the cause of world peace; and

Whereas, The Members of the Assembly believe that this mission provides an opportunity for the President to take up the issue of grievances of Soviet Jews as well as other oppressed people under Soviet control on a humanitarian basis; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California urges the citizens of this great state to join in the Nationwide Solidarity Day for Soviet

Jewry, which takes place on Sunday, April 30, as a means of informing our President that the citizens of this great nation feel strongly about the issue of human rights and freedoms as exemplified in the dilemma of Soviet Jews as well as other oppressed people under Soviet rule; and that we convey to our President by this means the importance of his taking up this matter on the agenda with the leaders of the U.S.S.R.; and be it further.

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit a copy of this resolution to President Richard M. Nixon.

DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, anyone who studies the complex problem of drug abuse quickly comes to appreciate the limited contribution that can be made by laws and law enforcement. We have a problem here dealing with human behavior, with the exercise of free will, with the desire to experiment, and often the rejection of convention standards. Many young drug takers have a sense of belonging to a culture of their own, one that is opposed to the world they see outside. There are various volunteer bodies and social workers who are trying to make it easier to come to terms with this heartbreaking problem which has faced the courts, the police, probation officers, teachers, doctors and young people themselves over the past decade. But the problem is getting worse—much worse.

A recent study has shown that six percent of the nation's high school youth have used heroin at least once.

What is more frightening is that these figures represent the heroin use pattern of our youth between the ages of 12 and 18, the future of our country. The figures drop off sharply in the over-18 group, where only 1 percent have tried heroin.

This means that 1.5 million Americans between the ages of 12 and 18 years of age, and 700,000 over 18, have tried heroin.

For all the millions and millions of dollars spent this past year on controlling the smuggling of heroin, and on drug treatment centers, the problem seems to be getting worse.

At present the jurisdiction for these drug programs for both rehabilitation and anti-smuggling operations falls under 13 agencies. There is little cooperation and incredible duplication of efforts which occur. There is no central location for anything—several agencies are involved with the criminal aspect of control—several different agencies have rehabilitation programs—several isolated commissions are doing research which the President ignores—and many of these agencies merely provide pamphlets on the dangers of drug abuse. And the problem worsens.

The following figures represent the total Federal dollars spent on drug control and related programs:

[In millions]

1969	-----	\$77.1
1970	-----	112.4
1971	-----	217.5
1972	-----	474.5
1973	-----	594.2

The cost-benefit ratio on these figures is nonexistent. The more money we spend, the worse the problem to get. Many of the programs are showing progress—but the emphasis has been to disarm the bomb after the explosion.

A "full-scale" educational effort must be undertaken in this country within the school systems to show our young people the psychological and physical destruction that "hard drugs" inflict.

The greater Cleveland area has 33 percent of all the addicts in the State of Ohio. These are not only the inner city poor but many are young people from the suburbs of Cleveland, that are being "tragically snagged" in the heroin trap. At this time there is no required course curriculum in our high schools that provide information and films on this crucial social problem. Of the \$475 million that will be spent in antidrug programs in 1972, a very small sum will be spent on education—the heart of the problem.

It is my hope that the administration will take whatever steps are necessary to implement such an educational campaign. Imprisonment is no way to deal with our young people's drug problems—verbal abuse provides no solution—we must react with education and reason.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article from the May 5 issue of Life magazine.

RICHIE

(By Thomas Thompson)

This is the story of a terrible thing that happened between one decent man and the son he loved. It took place on a Sunday afternoon in a fine lemon-colored house on a maple-lined street hard in the middle of the American dream. The woman who was wife to the man and mother to the son could only stand by as an agonized witness.

Seventeen years ago, on June 6, 1954, their first child, a son, was born to George Edward Diener and his wife, the former Carol Ring. They had been childhood sweethearts in Brooklyn on a row of houses which Carol remembers as "like the ones you see at the beginning of *All in the Family*." When people would ask later how they met, George Diener would grin. "I was lazy," he would always say. "I fell for the girl next door."

During their five-year courtship, Carol finished high school and became a receptionist on Wall Street. But George dropped out and joined the merchant marines at 16, hoping to catch a piece of the tail end of World War II. He sailed the seas for seven years before Carol suggested—firmly—that if he wanted her to marry him, he would have to settle down and stay at home.

Carol was petite and red-haired and willful, like her Scotch and English ancestors. She was proud of her family history and paid a genealogist to trace her line back to a 16th-century Norman knight. George countered by tracing his line, which went back, he said, only as far as a saloon in Ridgewood, N.J. about 1916. Carol also joined the DAR and hung the membership certificate on the living room wall. Efficient and good with money, she paid the bills and kept up the cramped apartment they took in Queens.

George Diener was a muscular, compact fellow with thick and dark wavy hair. If you saw him in a bar, you would notice the U.S. flag tattoo on his strong arm, affixed there

by a drunken tattooist in the Bowery when George was only 15. He had a Jimmy Cagney air about him. You would guess he had been a scrapper as a kid, maybe a welterweight boxer. He always seemed uneasy at rest. In conversations his eyes would dart about a room, his hands chopping the air. He was never one to sit at home on Sunday and watch the games. "I only like things that I can do," he would say. Much more to his liking was a hike in the woods or a day of target practice at an indoor pistol range. He was a good enough marksman to be rated expert.

They named their first son George, after his father, but to distinguish between the two, the child quickly became known by his middle name, Richard. Soon he was Richie. He was a fine son, with a lusty cry and bright red hair. George Diener adored him.

When Richie was 2, George's new job as salesman for a food company required him to travel each day the far reaches of Long Island, from Huntington to Orient Point, stopping in on hundreds of grocery stores and restaurants, persuading them to stock his brands of coffees, teas and spices. He longed to move his wife and son from the congestion of a city apartment out into the land. How could a man who had seen the sun turn the white cliffs of Dover gold at dawn, how could a man who had traded a cartoon of cigarettes to an Eskimo for six huge lobsters in Greenland raise his own boy on the anonymous floor of an apartment house?

There was no literature in George Diener's life, no poetry, not even great ambition. Like most men, he was willing to settle for ordinary dreams: a woman, some money, a house with land that is owned, trees, work that does not paralyze the mind, recognition. And, above all, sons. A son is the mirror image, the blank piece of paper before our inkblots soil it, the continuation of life. There is joy in a daughter, but there is power in a son.

George and Carol chose East Meadow in the heart of Nassau County, Long Island, once a place of potato farms but after World War II the definitive example of exploding suburbia. To the young couple who had grown up in Brooklyn, there was a delicious feel of newness about East Meadow. The houses were new and painted warm pastels, the people young and industrious and—like the Dieners—politically conservative. Policemen and firemen from the city were buying and moving in, and aircraft workers, and union men who took off their hard hats and turned to pruning rose bushes. East Meadow was 98% white. The sea was near, near enough to catch a breeze in summer. There seemed to be a boat in every other driveway. And everybody agreed the schools were excellent.

They lived for five years in the first house, and when a second son, Russell, appeared, it was time to move to a larger one. George had always wanted a basement to store his tools and do his home carpentry. On Longfellow Avenue, they found just the house, with a spacious wooded backyard and room for a pool.

Carol remembers that Richie was never happy in the new house. "There was only one other little boy on the block, and he moved away, and there were only girls around then." Richie was chubby and hated it when the girls called him "Fatty." He took refuge, found friends, in animals. Carol had had a Boston terrier named Boots who died when Richie was very small. He loved the dog so much that she bought another one for him, which he also named Boots. There followed a skunk, a rabbit, a crow, hamsters, gerbils, fish, alligators, a coati, even a boa constrictor that grew to five feet and suddenly vanished within the house. It was never found.

George encouraged his son's interest in animals. The father had always preached reverence for any form of life. "George

wouldn't even let me step on a spider," said Carol. "He said spiders did more important work than people, and when I found one in the house I'd get Richie to pick it up and take it outside." When Richie wanted books on animals, his father bought them by the dozens. Richie became almost expert in animal diseases and he personally doctored all of his pets. The squirrels in his backyard would spring onto the new redwood deck and wait for their friend to feed them peanuts by hand when he got home from school.

Even when he lost his childhood fat and grew into a well-built lad of 5' 2", 145 pounds, with strong legs and a muscled chest, Richie had no interest in sports. George encouraged him to try wrestling, Carol suggested football and baseball. "But he always refused," his mother said. "He was so insecure. He told me that if he ever got on a team and made a mistake that caused his side to lose, he wouldn't be able to stand it."

Nevertheless, for the first 15 years of his life, Richie was a satisfying, average boy, very much a part of George's ordered life. The father recognized Richie's insecurity—but what 15-year-old is secure, anyway? He accepted his son's preference for animals over human friends, tolerated his periods of moodiness, his silence, his middling grades, his occasional breaking of midnight curfew on Saturdays. None of these particularly alarmed his parents: they seemed the classic problems of any adolescent.

When the first real trouble appeared in the summer of 1970, it was therefore as startling as a crack of lightning on a clear night. Twice Richie had been away to summer camp, but on this, his third session, Carol received a long-distance telephone call. Richie had become disruptive and belligerent with the counselors. And he had been caught smoking marijuana. Could his father come immediately and get him?

On the long drive back from the Adirondacks, George questioned his son. Richie said it was only "the first, maybe the second time" he had ever tried grass. "All the kids were doing it," he said. "Some brought it up, and others found it growing wild in the woods." He promised never to use it again.

The next year, when Richie was a junior in high school, his grades tumbled. He took the nature books and animal pictures that used to decorate his room and put them in his closet. "This is what my son used to be," his father said one day to a visitor, pointing to the forgotten books. "And this is what he is now." His arm swept the room in bewilderment.

Richie had transformed his room into a lair of the counterculture. Ticket stubs from rock concerts were pinned to the window ledge. Black light cast an eerie glow on replicas of rock stars. A game called "Feds n' Heads" was pinned to the wall. When Richie lay in bed, he could look directly ahead at several bizarre and frightening drawings, grotesque demons, creatures with bulging eyes, hair tossed by electrical storms, hands of reptiles. One such creature sat in a bathtub of blood, holding a dagger.

Richie had discovered a tiny space, some six feet long, behind a panel at the back of his closet. He put a cheap mattress in it and took to lying there to escape his parents' calls. George found the secret place in May 1971 and decided to dismantle it. He came across a small cube of something brown wrapped in aluminum foil, neatly hidden behind a picture. "What is this?" he demanded of his son. Richie answered that it was hashish he was keeping for a friend. Then he said it was only mud that somebody was passing off as hashish. Whatever, George threw it out.

Not long after, Carol found a sandwich bag full of marijuana in Richie's room and threw that out too. This time the boy freely admitted that it was his. Moreover he was furious at his mother for what she had done.

Carol tried to discuss the matter with him calmly. If he opposed her cigarette smoking, why did he smoke marijuana?

"Because the other kids do," he would say, or "Because I want to, that's why," or, shyly, almost a mumble, "Because it helps me talk to girls." Carol found a book in his room, *How to Talk to Girls*. Richie was undeniably shy. His longtime friend Sue Bernstein, whom he had dated since he was 14, said it took Richie three years to get up the courage to kiss her goodnight.

When Richie turned 16, the changes came faster. Carol and George learned that he had become a heavy user of marijuana and hash—and more, though they would not discover this for some time. He began staying out until 2 a.m. on weekends, two hours past his curfew. He told his parents never to enter his room, and if they did, there would be a yelling row. He rarely joined them for dinner. "I'm just not hungry," he would say, but Carol could see the haunting red eyes and hear his tongue tripping over the words, new profane words, that rushed out of the boy who had been so quiet so long.

Richie now had friends, disturbing ones. He began running with an East Meadow boy who was on probation for using marijuana and who was suspected of dealing in heroin. Ironically, Carol learned, Richie had met the boy on a Methodist Church retreat. For a time, Richie had been active in church, and he had been confirmed when he was 15. The new friend, whom we will call Eddie, tried to interest Richie in heroin. Apparently he refused. "Richie said he wasn't going to stick any needle in his body. No way," said one of the friends.

George discovered that he now could not talk to Richie without yelling at him, and the boy yelled back. When George ordered him not to see Eddie, and to be home at a certain hour, and to stop using foul language, Richie disobeyed every order. Finally George took his son to Family Court and charged him with being incorrigible. "I don't want him to have a police record, but he's only 16 and all the proceedings are secret," he told Carol. After the session in court, Richie suddenly changed. He found a summer job at Burger King and began saving money to buy a car. George Diener informed the court of his son's improvement and the case was dismissed.

Last October, a severe case of bronchitis developed into pneumonia and Richie stayed home from school for three weeks. He fell behind. He failed every subject the first quarter. Carol was upset because on his Scholastic Aptitude Tests for college he had scored well. When Richie returned to class in November, Carol received a call from the assistant principal. Richie was ill. Could she come and pick him up?

When Carol arrived at the assistant principal's office, Richie "was very talkative, his eyes were red and heavy. He was abusive," she told George that night. "He cursed me and everybody else." Carol talked privately that morning with the nurse. "Richie told me he took some pills on the school bus, but he insisted they were pills the doctor gave him for pneumonia," the nurse said. But her voice was skeptical.

"Do you think it was something else?" Carol asked.

The nurse nodded.

The "something else" was Seconal. The kids called them "downs" or "goofers" or "reds." With all the horror stories about heroin and speed, somehow Seconal has not received much attention. It is a powerful barbiturate, a mental depressant used as a sleeping pill. Tens of millions are manufactured every year in America. Marilyn Monroe died from an overdose of them. So have countless others. In the late 1960s, the kids discovered that Seconals produced a quick and curious feeling, an hour of dreamy lethargy.

"If you become dependent upon Seconals,"

explains one New York doctor, "you actually need the drug to function, just as an alcoholic needs a drink first thing in the morning. Without Seconal, a dependent person becomes nervous, jittery, agitated. Withdrawal from Seconal is more severe than withdrawal from heroin." Because Seconal is a depressant which interferes with nervous transmissions from the central nervous system, it can so affect the brain's functions that one can become hostile and aggressive.

The market for Seconal thrives, particularly in high schools. A Nassau County narcotics officer said that the dangerous pills can be bought in the corridors or bathrooms or lunchrooms of "any school in this district, including parochial ones." They sell for prices ranging from 25 cents each to three for a dollar. "The kids like them because they are cheap, clean—no needles—and plentiful," said the New York doctor. "They don't think they are addictive. But God, are they ever. They don't think they are dangerous. I wish word could get around that at least six Long Island kids have died in the past year from Seconal abuse."

Last autumn, Richie began using Seconal heavily. He told one girl that he had a bottle of 100 pills, that he was tempted to sell them, but he thought he would keep them for his own use. "Why don't you stop doing drugs?" said the girl. "I can," answered Richie. "Anytime I want. I just don't want to stop right now."

No one could say for certain why Richie became so deeply involved with drugs. One "perhaps" was his being thrown into a massive high school with 3,000 students and wanting desperately to be accepted. When a shy, socially insecure youngster discovers that drug use will admit him to at least one circle, however pathetic that circle may be, the temptation can be great.

There were other signs that Richie was pleading, in his way, for status and friendships. He became an expert on rock music, not the standard Fillmore East pop groups, but obscure ones which Richie would "discover" and tell his friends about. He fretted constantly about his appearance. He took at least two showers a day and his clothes had to be clean and freshly pressed. Detesting his tight, curly red hair, Richie spent hours in front of the mirror attacking it. Finally he went to a barber and had it straightened. "Now it looks like a Brillo soap pad," he said in despair. He announced he was going to grow an Afro, which did not please his father.

His childhood nickname of "Fatty" was replaced by the time he was 17 with a new one, "The Kid." He hated this name so much that he once bloodied a friend's nose for calling him that. But when the fight was over, he invited his friend to come by his house anytime and listen to music. He told all his friends that. "Whenever the light in my room is on, that means come on in," he said. "I really mean it."

There were many signs that Richie was not totally comfortable in the drug world. He very carefully divided his friends into "straights" and "heads" and he never mingled the two. One of the straights, a boy who did not use drugs or even smoke pot, described this period of Richie's life: "We all knew Richie was doing drugs—a really heavy pill scene—but he'd never bring anything with him when he went out with us. He wouldn't take the chance of getting us busted along with him. I think he respected our way of life."

Once last summer Richie had arrived at Jones Beach with a group of "heads." A hundred yards away were two couples who were "straights." Richie waved at the couples, then started walking toward them. But midway he stopped. He glanced back at his "head" friends, then looked forward toward the others. Finally he sat down on a dune mid-distance between them, not able to commit to either side.

By Christmas last, the rupture between George and his son became complete. They passed each other silently in the house. Occasionally anger would flash and they raged at one another. But George had decided that he could no longer deal with Richie. Perhaps Carol could achieve something. As long as she talked to the boy quietly, gently, he would listen. And promise. And go out and break his promise.

Late at night, George and Carol would lie in bed and search their lives for reasons. Carol assured her husband that it was not his fault. He had tried in his brusque, do-as-I-say way to interest Richie in scuba diving or in becoming a marine biologist. "What did I do wrong?" George would say, not content with his wife's murmurings. "What did I do wrong?" He had built up the walls of his life so that he knew exactly who he was, what he believed and where he belonged. That his son had no ambition, that his son lay in his room listening to loud music with confusing lyrics, that his son had covered his boyish face with a scraggly red beard and long shaggy red sideburns and was letting his hair grow in the direction of a windstorm was more than he could understand.

George was growing more and more politically conservative. He groused often about welfare abuses, a "no-win" policy in Vietnam, and how "liberal" to me is a dirty word. It was not difficult for him to affix part of the blame for Richie's troubles on these villains. "It's this permissive liberalism," he told Carol. "The kids do just what they want because they know the courts won't punish them." Indeed, there had recently been a large narcotics raid on a house in the neighborhood which involved several arrests. But, George raged, "the pushers were back on the streets the next day." Carol agreed. She also felt Richie's school was partly to blame. "He had three free periods to do just what he wants," she said. "He can leave the campus or buy drugs or go into the bathroom and smoke pot. The teachers are afraid to go to the bathroom because they know what's going on in there."

On Christmas Eve, Richie was in his room and Carol went to call him. The house was full of relatives and it was time to open gifts. She opened his door and the smoke of marijuana assaulted her. "Put that out immediately," she said. "Everybody is waiting for you so we can open the presents." Richie shook his head. He would not join the family celebration. "I think he was so possessed of guilt," Carol told George later, "that he couldn't bear to face all those people who loved him. He couldn't let them see him stoned."

George Diener's ordinary dreams were being menaced in other areas. The taxes on his house had originally been \$300 a year. Now, in less than seven years, they had quadrupled. Even though George and Carol together earned \$15,000 a year, there was rarely enough money for an evening out. Carol liked good restaurants, but the best George could normally do was hamburgers at McDonald's. Crime seemed to be encircling him. The house across the street was robbed, then one behind him, finally his own—in broad daylight. Because he worked part-time as a night security guard, George had a police permit for two pistols. One of them was taken by the afternoon burglar and the house was ransacked. Even though many of the parents in the Dieners' circle of friends knew their own children were using drugs, it was rarely discussed. Perhaps it should have been. District Attorney William Cahn publicly estimated that 75% of the youth in his county had at least experimented with marijuana and/or pills.

George worked ten hours at one job and often at another, he coached Little League baseball and was a committeeman with the Boy Scouts, but he had to come home from

labor and civic endeavor to discover his own son stoned and red-eyed and mute. "Jesus God in Heaven, what's happening to us?" he would cry.

During one of their flashes of anger which was the only way they communicated anymore, George grew so exasperated that he snapped to Richie, "All right, son, you believe in the law of the streets. You believe strong is best. Put up your dukes."

Richie looked at his father in surprise: his hands were closed into fists. Richie picked up a piece of chain to defend himself. George, perhaps remembering his own Brooklyn street days, perhaps thinking he could "slap some sense into the boy," threw a round-house punch at his son. It exploded on his cheek. For days Richie had an angry, swollen bruise on his face. Later George apologized, but Richie did not accept it.

George began to suspect that his son was not only using drugs but selling them. He told Carol that the only way to find out for sure was to tap the family telephone. If his suspicions were true, he wanted to stop the business before it grew larger. Carol was reluctant at first—"How can we spy on our own child?" she said—but George insisted. He installed the bug secretly, but Richie found out and told his friends.

One girl friend remembers those days: "I'd call up Richie and I'd start off the conversation by saying 'Hi there, Mr. Diener,' or 'Hello Tape,' and we'd talk in code so he couldn't dig anything anyway."

But before Richie discovered the tap, George heard things that staggered him. His son seemed a budding expert at the art of "ripping off." The boy's telephone conversations with friends were peppered with requests to "front me," which George learned was a plea for enough money to buy, say, a half pound of marijuana which might cost as much as \$100. Richie then broke it down into "nickels" and "dimes"—\$5 and \$10 sandwich bags—and sold it. Usually he sold an ounce that was either short-weighted or mixed with oregano.

George and Carol's younger son Russell was taking medication prescribed by a doctor, and Richie bragged on the telephone of stealing some of the pills and selling them to friends. He told one girl that his customers were "dumb kids, like only 13."

George also heard, on the tapped phone, that Richie was developing enemies who had discovered they were being cheated. "Richie told one contact that he was unable to sell a big batch of marijuana because he had ripped off so many customers that nobody trusted him anymore," George told Carol. "He says that people are out to get him, but he isn't worried because he will shoot them. Or stab them."

The police of Nassau County knew Richie was a marijuana user, but they did not know he was a large-scale dealer. "The pattern is typical," said one narcotics officer. "If a kid gets some grass, he sells it to friends at small profit and keeps his own use going. A lot of kids even give it away. It seems to be an element of social status of making and keeping friends."

One day toward the end of 1971, Richie came home stoned, his eyes red, his speech fast but slurred. George challenged him once more. "I have done everything I know to do," said the father. "I have tried to reason with you, I have forbidden you to see kids who take dope, I have asked you to stay home, I have taken you to Family Court, I have cried, I have told you I loved you, I have told you I'll do anything in my power to find you help. Your mother and I cannot talk to you anymore. So this is the way it's going to be. You're going to stay home Friday and Saturday nights if I have to lock you in your room."

Richie made a counterproposition. "I promise to stop doing drugs," he said slowly, "I really do promise . . . if, if you'll let me

go out with the kids on weekends and drink beer."

George answered quickly. "As much as I want you to stop taking drugs, I can't bargain with you. You're only 17, and I can't give you permission to go out and drink."

Richie began to yell. He shouted, as children so often do, "You don't love me! You don't understand me!"

"Of course we love you," Carol put in softly.

"You never even wanted me," Richie raged. "The only reason I'm here is that you two were fooling around one night. I didn't ask to be born."

George blew up. He hit his son in the mouth and blood gushed out. Richie took the blood from his mouth and flung it against the wall of the living room. While George watched the blood trickle down, Richie rushed out into the night.

Once again, George Diener took his son to Family Court, and this time Richie endured two sessions with a psychological counselor. After the second meeting, the counselor told Carol that he was going on a two-week vacation and when he returned, he would resume his work with Richie. "When the counselor returned," said Carol, "he called me and said he had been promoted, that another man would take over Richie's case. This new man would call me and make an appointment. I never heard from them again."

On Feb. 12, a Sunday, Richie was in a Walgreen's drugstore at the huge Roosevelt Field Shopping Center. The manager noticed him loitering near the drug counter and suspected him of shoplifting. He told Richie that he would have to stay until the police came to investigate. A punch-up occurred in which, according to the manager, Richie threw a display basket and a wooden table at him, tried to choke him with his necktie, and kicked him in the knee. The manager charged Richie with assault and a trial was set for Feb. 28. It was Richie's first arrest.

Two days later, Valentine's Day, George was working at home. The school called. Richie had been expelled for fighting and cursing at a teacher. George waited for his son to come home. He dreaded the confrontation. Richie pulled up in front of the house with a carload of friends. They noticed George's car in the driveway and hurriedly sped on. George knew that they would not come in with him as long as he was there, so he got into his car and drove away. Some time later he circled back and, sure enough, the boys were inside the house. George made a decision. He telephoned the police and asked them to raid his own son's room. "I thought that maybe if Richie was arrested, it would scare him out of it," he told Carol later.

When the police arrived and searched the room, there was no marijuana. The boys were only drinking. After the police had left, and after George had ordered the boys out, Richie began to scream at his father. George yelled back. It was the same ground they had gone over a hundred times before. Only this time Richie seized a pair of scissors (gold ones which his mother had once used to make elaborate Halloween costumes for him) and threatened to kill his father.

George checked his clenched fists and left the house. Richie called his mother at the junior high school where she worked in the cafeteria and sobbed into the telephone. "I must be crazy," he said. "I just tried to kill my father." Carol's mind raced. She figured this, at last, was Richie's cry for help. "You're not sick," she said. "You're just tired. Lie down on your bed and rest and I'll come home."

She telephoned a relative who put her in touch with a community health psychiatrist. The psychiatrist gave Richie a preliminary "screening" and told Carol that, yes, he would take the case, but that he would have to wait until the Walgreen incident was disposed of in court. Since that trial was only two weeks off, Carol felt the delay could be borne.

Toward the end of the week Richie had a conference with the principal of East Meadow High. If Richie agreed to stop using drugs and stop cutting classes he could come back on probation.

"The next week was almost miraculous," according to Carol. "Richie was a changed boy. He stayed in at night. He did his homework. He was sweet to me. He was our boy again. I think he realized this was his last chance. That Friday afternoon—I would learn later—a big shipment of drugs hit the school. Richie bought some pills. A lunch-room lady spotted him and some other kids and told them she was turning in their names to the office. Richie probably felt this was the end."

On Friday night, Feb. 25, Richie went to a Long Island bar called Ryan's which is popular with young people. In New York State, the legal drinking age is 18. Police raided Ryan's that night and checked ID cards. Richie had none. He and a few others were taken to the police station, questioned and released. This was Richie's second arrest.

On Saturday, Richie, oddly mute and peaceful, asked his mother to drive him to a girl friend's house. She agreed. Four hours later when he returned home, Carol suspected he had been smoking marijuana. But she said nothing. That night, Richie and two friends, two "straight" friends, went out and—for a few happy hours—played in the snow.

The next noon, Richie asked his mother if he could borrow the car. Carol had forbidden him use of the car but, as she remembers: "He had been acting so nice all week that I gave in. In fact, I made a bargain with him. 'If you stay this way,' I said, 'I'll give you my old car rather than trading it in on a new one as I had planned. You'll have to find a job to pay for the insurance.'" Carol watched as Richie happily left. She had always "lived with hope." She thought her lectures were getting through to him. Maybe.

Richie and a friend went to a local hamburger shop. As they left, Richie backed his mother's car into another one. There was negligible damage to both, but the other car's owner telephoned George and Carol. Assured that their son was not hurt, they waited for him to come home with an explanation. Richie had taken some Seconals. He pushed the car up to 60 mph on a quiet residential street in his neighborhood. Suddenly a tire blew out and the car bounced across the street, hit a station wagon, careened into a yard and knocked down a fence. Neither Richie nor his friend was hurt, but the car was destroyed.

George was summoned to the scene, and he told his son they would discuss the accident later. Richie went home while George stayed to discuss insurance matters with the police.

At 4 p.m. George and Carol sat down at the dining room table with Richie to talk about the accident. Carol had told George that it must be a calm meeting with no raised voices. But Richie seemed strangely remorseless. "You don't act the least bit sorry," said Carol. Finally she spoke sharply. "Don't you realize you just totaled my car? Besides that, you could have killed somebody! You could have killed yourself!"

Richie raised his head and looked through the glass patio door to the yard. "Maybe that would have been even better," he said softly.

George remained silent during the dialogue. But he was shaking his head sadly. Richie noticed this. "That's right," the boy shouted, "shake your head."

Trying to avoid another scene, George rose and left. He went to his basement shop and began working on his salesman samples, sorting out broken packages and returns.

Richie and his mother continued to talk, but the boy kept jumping up and making telephone calls. Finally Richie went into his room, flipped on a rock tape, and shut the door. Carol took her younger son to a bowl-

ing alley and returned half an hour later. Richie came out of his room and his mother gasped. He was staggering. His eyes were red slits. He slurred his words. "What in God's name have you taken?" she cried. He confessed that he had taken four Seconals.

Ignoring her, Richie made a date on the telephone with a friend for 6:30. He hung up and shouted at Carol, "And don't go down in my room when I'm gone and look for pot." "You're in no condition to go anywhere," said Carol. Richie began to walk past her. Suddenly he fell over a chair and onto the floor.

The two crashes—boy and chair—brought George racing up from the basement. Now Richie was standing up. He saw his father. "Did you tell the cops at the accident scene that I was on dope?" he cried.

George did not want to talk to the boy in this condition. He turned without speaking and started out. Richie ran after him. "Answer me! I asked you a ——— question," the boy shrieked, "and I want a ——— answer!"

Richie's face was so contorted, his body so quivering with rage that George felt he and his wife were in physical danger, the kind that could not be handled with parental authority or even with fists. This was the last scene of the long painful drama and all the emotions were out. All reason was gone.

George went to his bedroom to get his pistol. The .32 was hidden behind a night stand. Weeks before, Carol had urged George to conceal it. She had been afraid that Richie would find the gun in a heated moment and use it on them as they slept. On the taped telephone calls, George had heard his son brag of being ready to shoot or stab any dissatisfied customer who was out to get him. And more than once Richie had shouted at George, "I'll get you . . ."

George tucked the .32 into his belt. He walked down the stairs into the basement.

Richie appeared on the stairs leading to the cellar. Unsteadily he made his way down. He saw an ice pick on a work bench and picked it up. When he was 15 feet from his father, Richie raised it and cried, once more, "I want an answer! Answer me!"

George's answer was to take the gun from his belt and to point it at his first-born son. Perhaps this would frighten him. Perhaps this would send him away.

Richie threw out his arms like a crucifix. "You've got your ——— gun. Go ahead and use it." The boy walked slowly toward his father. When he was five feet away, the ice pick trembling in his hand, George cocked the .32. Richie stopped and flung out his arms once more. "Go ahead. . . . Shoot!"

Richie dropped his arms and somehow the ice pick fell to the floor. George lunged forward, grabbed his son by both shoulders, and kicked the ice pick into a corner. Carol had appeared by this time, paralyzed with fear. Richie broke loose from his father and rushed upstairs, shouting behind him. "I'm going up to get the scissors." He rushed past his mother. "Oh my God! What can we do?" Carol moaned.

"I don't know," George answered. "Maybe he won't come back down."

While they waited in the cellar, George and Carol could hear Richie rummaging in the kitchen above their heads. He pulled out a drawer too far and it crashed to the floor, utensils rattling about like hailstones on a metal roof.

Instantly the boy appeared at the head of the stairs with a steak knife in his raised hand. George pushed his wife behind him and faced his son. With each step he took down the stairs, Richie cried, "Shoot! Use your gun!"

George's finger trembled on the trigger. The frustrations of his life were suddenly telescoped. His seed had produced a son, but the son was no longer his. The son was a million miles away. The son was a child-man with a beard, with a knife, with obscenities on his lips, with drugs in his brain.

What God spared Abraham from doing to Isaac, what the makers of myth and literature could scarcely even imagine, George Diener at last did.

He fired.

The bullet tore directly into Richie's heart. He slumped backward onto the stair in a sitting position. He brought his young hands to his chest and he saw his blood. He was puzzled. He stood straight up and raised the knife again. Now its handle was soaked with the life draining from him.

Incredibly, George Diener fired again. This time the bullet went wide, screaming past his son and ripping a hole in the wall of the house that had been George's dream.

Richie sat down and toppled forward, down the stairs, onto the cement floor.

George grabbed Carol and pushed her up the stairs to the living room. He called the police and an emergency ambulance number.

He went back downstairs. Richie was quiet, he was not moving. George touched his throat. There was no pulse.

Slowly he dragged himself up the stairs.

George went to his wife and knelt beside her chair. "He's dead. I've killed our son. Can you ever forgive me?"

Then they sat and cried and waited for the police.

Several things quickly happened.

They carried out Richie's body in a canvas sack. An autopsy disclosed that his vital organs contained six times the amount of Seconal given by doctors in a therapeutic dose.

George was arrested and charged with murder, but he pleaded self-defense and the grand jury did not indict him. The police did want to know why George, an expert marksman, shot to kill, rather than to wound. "All I could think of was that if I only wounded the boy, he would come back and kill Carol and me," he answered. "There had been so many threats."

George vowed to lead a community war against drugs, in particular barbiturates.

The night before the funeral, many of Richie's friends went to the funeral home to pay their respects. George thanked most of them for coming, although he would not even speak to some he considered part of Richie's "head" crowd. In particular Eddie, who was sobbing almost hysterically. Carol was shocked to see that more than one of the young mourners came to the funeral parlor stoned.

When Richie's friends looked at him in the casket, they were stunned to see that his beard had been shaved off, his sideburns trimmed and raised, his hair neatly, forever cut. Sue Bernstein, his longtime friend, said that Richie looked "exactly the way he looked when I first met him, when he was 14, before the trouble started."

There was criticism of the barbering, but George dismissed it. "This is the way I wanted Richie to look," he said. And the father, at last, had his way.

Lately George has taken to going into Richie's room and shutting the door and stretching out on the bed. It is his way of getting through one sleepless midnight. There are others to come.

CAPT. JOHN ZEBELEAN III PRESENTED MEDAL IN VIETNAM

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, recently in the Republic of Vietnam, Capt. John P. Zebelean III of Catonsville, Md. was pre-

sented one of Vietnam's most distinguished medals, the First Technical Medal. Captain Zebelean was presented the award for his outstanding service as an adviser to the 294th Communications Squadron, Binh Thuy Base Support Group, of the Vietnamese Air Force 4th Division.

Captain Zebelean is the son of Judge and Mrs. John P. Zebelean, Jr. of 5605 Wilkens Avenue in Catonsville. I would like to congratulate Captain Zebelean on receiving this decoration from the Republic of Vietnam and to commend him for his outstanding work with the Vietnamese Air Force.

STATE DEPARTMENT PROMOTION PRACTICES

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on April 25 of this year the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held hearings on the promotions of 385 Foreign Service officers of the State Department and 175 from USIA, in what usually are pro forma sessions. However, in the above case, the committee withheld confirmation of the list based on charges made by John D. Hemenway, a former Foreign Service officer now with the Defense Department, until State Department officials could respond to the charges.

Specifically, Mr. Hemenway questioned the selection of certain persons on the basis of their language proficiency. In keeping with the legislative intent of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 "to enable the Foreign Service effectively to serve abroad the interests of the United States," State Department regulation 3 FAM 871.4a, states:

It is the Department's and USIA's objective to have each officer acquire, before reaching the senior level, at least a minimum professional level of proficiency (S-3/R-3—see section 872.2) in two foreign languages, as well as such level of proficiency in the language of each post required by the particular assignment.

Among other charges, Mr. Hemenway observed that 35 percent of the class I officers and 31 percent of the class II officers on the promotion list do not meet the very minimal standards of a single foreign language:

Now every reasonable man admits that knowledge of language is not everything. But practically all of these "senior level" officers have been with the Department of State for more than 20 years. To consider oneself a "diplomat" by profession and not to be able to command a single foreign language is, in my opinion, inexcusable. It perpetuates the image of the "Ugly American."

Another interesting aspect of the former FSO's testimony brought to light that as many as 12 to 14 files are maintained on many foreign service officers. Some of these files have been kept for some years although not expressly authorized by State Department regulations and contained material or information pertinent to an evaluation of

the performance of an officer which have not actually been placed in the official personnel folders provided for in the regulations and made available to officers.

Mr. Hemenway, in addition, cites two cases in which he charges that both professional competence and basic integrity or honesty are possibly involved.

It will be recalled that John Hemenway testified last year before the same Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the case of the nomination of Howard Mace to be ambassador to Sierra Leone, which nomination was later withdrawn. Mr. Hemenway, incidentally, is rated fluent in Russian and German, served as an infantry lieutenant in World War II, is a graduate of the Naval Academy at Annapolis and has earned bachelor's and master's degrees at Oxford as a Rhodes scholar.

I insert at this point this testimony of April 25 before the Senate Committee along with several items appearing in the press regarding his Senate appearance. The Chicago Tribune column by veteran newsman, Willard Edwards, is but the latest of a number of columns over several years on the Hemenway case.

The items follow:

STATEMENT OF JOHN D. HEMENWAY CONCERNING THE FOREIGN SERVICE PROMOTION LIST, 1972

Chairman Fulbright and members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: thank-you for the opportunity to testify this morning concerning the 1972 Foreign Service List.

In this testimony I will be specific; however, I will avoid the use of individual names by using numbers. You have before you (TAB A) a copy of the 1972 Foreign Service List as distributed by the Department of State. It contains the names of many more promoted officers than you are asked to confirm, but that is a matter to which I shall return later. Annotations on the list provided will make specific and clear all information without offense to any individual sensitivities, I think.

Ten years ago I would not have believed what I am about to document for you in the next few minutes. I have been an officer of the United States Government for twenty-five years. I was brought up to believe that few things were more sacred than service to this Republic. I appear before you today in that spirit. Many Foreign Service Officers whose names appear on this list are highly competent—I know that personally—I know them. There are an astonishing number, however, who do not meet the criteria set by regulations and law for their advancement. It may not be their fault that they are not qualified for higher positions. That is for you to judge. It is my task to bear witness to the fact that they are not qualified. My testimony is based on open sources. If the Department of State wishes to attempt a rebuttal of what I have to say with materials that are administratively controlled, I hope this Committee will insure me the right to reply.

My knowledge of personnel procedures in the Department of State has been thrust upon me, so to speak. I am not a personnel officer and never have served as one. You will recall the law—the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

In part, Section 111, "Objectives" says:

(1) "to enable the Foreign Service effectively to serve abroad the interests of the United States."

(5) "to provide that promotions leading to positions of authority and responsibility shall be on the basis of merit and to insure the selection on an impartial basis of outstanding persons for such positions."

With the law in mind, and the annotated copy of the promotion list in front of you, I wish to read to you a portion of the regulations of the Foreign Service based on that law:

3 FAM 871.4a.

"It is the Department's and USIA's objective to have each officer acquire, before reaching the senior level, at least a minimum professional level of proficiency (S-3/R-3—see section 872.2) in two foreign languages, as well as such level of proficiency in the language of each post required by the particular assignment."

The senior level of the Foreign Service is the Class I and II level, i.e., FSO-1 and FSO-2. Let us look at the record.

The list before you has been compared with the "Biographic Register", an official publication of the Department of State, revised as of June 30, 1971. The names underlined indicate those officers who, according to that register, do not meet the minimal requirement, the Department's objective, which I just read. Sixty-four per cent (64%) of the Class II officers do not meet the minimal standards; 65% of the Class I officers.

It may be that the Department's own standards are too high (these are regulatory and could be changed, if that were the case). After all, language qualification is only a tool—not an end in itself. If only one language were required (surely a minimal standard by anyone's measure, for a senior diplomat) we still find that, according to the Department of State's own statistics, taken from the Biographic Register that 35% of the Class I officers and 31% of the Class II officers being promoted to higher rank still do not meet the very minimal standards of a single foreign language (See TAB B). These officers are indicated by an asterisk on your annotated list. Moreover, standards are even worse in this respect than last year, on the 1971 list (See TAB C). And, I might add, they were fully as bad in 1968 when I also surveyed the list with this criterion.

Now every reasonable man admits that knowledge of language is not everything. But practically all of these "senior level" officers have been with the Department of State for more than 20 years. To consider oneself a "diplomat" by profession and not to be able to command a single foreign language is, in my opinion, inexcusable. It perpetuates the image of the "Ugly American."

There are, of course, other standards. I shall take these up in a moment.

Let me briefly mention sources. The "Biographic Register" is a Department of State publication, as I said. As such, personnel information contained in it should be given the same confidence one would give to any personnel information disseminated by the Department. It may be that some of the officers noted as deficient have acquired skills not identified in the "Register", i.e., that it is out of date or inaccurate in this respect. Perhaps it will be argued that "only" 15% or "only" 10% of these senior promotees are so deficient that they can not speak a single foreign language (please recall that the Department's own regulations state that the objective is two languages prior to reaching senior level, i.e., by the time an officer is FSO-3). Is this really an adequate answer for the Senate which must confirm or reject the entire list? I must add that, in my experience, in fact, the "Register" errs on the generous side. It carries men as having a working knowledge of a language who long ago forgot that language or did not, as required by regulation subject themselves to the rigors of re-examination. What I am suggesting is that the most accurate statistics available would reveal a far worse picture

when this Committee calls for the pertinent personnel records, which is its right. In any event, if the Biographic Register published by the Department of State is not accurate, then it should be put right. The American public pays for its publication and deserves to have honest and accurate information concerning the Department of State.

Then there is the matter of expunging of records—even the Biographic Register. Four of the FSO-1 promotees have been given special language training, but it is not recorded that they ever successfully passed a language test after that training. Comparison of the 1964 Register with the 1971 Register reveals that, in two of these cases, any mention of the earlier—evidently unsuccessful—language study is removed from the record. It is a record of past failure cleaned up, so to speak. I can establish that this is not a matter of economy of space in the Biographic Register. Incidentally, neither of these two men meet minimal standards, according to the data provided in the Register. Your Committee, Mr. Chairman, may wish to ask the Department for exact linguistic data on these nominees; what level of competence do they possess and what were the tested ratings given by the Foreign Service Institute. Further, why do they fail to meet the minimal standards set forth in the Department's regulations as the desired objective before reaching senior level. In the case of language training failures, you may want to know if the fact of that failure was before the promotion boards that considered these officers. In other words, were the personnel records changed or expunged as was the Register?

That brings up the larger question of the genesis of the promotion list. Who sits on promotion panels and what are their qualifications? Take the panels from Class 2 to 1—none met the language standards; two spoke no languages at all. It is demonstrable, I think, that in one important respect (for a diplomat), an objectively measurable qualification, language competence, the 1972 promotion list fails miserably to meet the Department's own standards. There are many other standards, some less capable of objective measurement: health, integrity, professional competence. Let us look at the list from a few different angles.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall that the former Director of Personnel, Mr. Howard P. Mace attempted to explain to this Committee, during his recent confirmation hearing, the complex sequence by which Promotion Boards determine promotions. According to Mr. Mace, Boards consist of objective citizens, who examine objective personnel files (presumably in accordance with the regulations) to determine—competitively and fairly—which officers are the best. Under questioning from you, Mr. Chairman, it was determined that Mr. Mace himself had a large say in who sat on these Boards. This 1972 promotion list is, so to speak, the last "Mace List" in that Mr. Mace helped determine the composition of these Boards. The process sounds orderly enough, when glibly explained; but it is not orderly, Mr. Chairman, nor is it equitable.

No doubt your Committee believes that it is examining a promotion list based on judgments as objective as possible concerning the "Efficiency Record" of eligible officers. The Foreign Service Act in Section 601(1) has defined the "Efficiency Record" of an officer as "those materials considered by the Director General to be pertinent to the preparation of an evaluation of the performance of an officer." As you know, Mr. Chairman, you and your Committee are entitled under the Act to examine these records. Specifically Section 612 authorizes this, so if you wish to do so, you can determine for yourself the accuracy of my testimony here today. However, there is a problem in that there is no such single record as the "Efficiency Record." If there is

no efficiency record, how can you then have a promotion list based on such a record?

I submit for the perusal of your Committee a document written by the Legal Advisor of the Department of State to Mr. Macomber (TAB D) entitled: "A Foreign Service Employee's Right of Access to His Personnel Records." I believe the copy is dated 8 October 1971. It is unclassified. I apologize for the poor quality of this copy, which was submitted as evidence in my own Hearing before the Department of State, which entered its third year last fall and is still continuing. The Department did not provide us with this particular copy and, so far, the Department had not been willing to provide a more legible copy even though it has been requested. Perhaps the Department might be more responsive to a request from your Committee for a copy that can be easily read. However, on page 4 of that memorandum it is plain to read:

"The recent Committee on Files found that, with respect to many Foreign Service Officers, twelve to fourteen different files are maintained."

Elsewhere in the memorandum the files are described variously to include:

The career development and counselling files (CDC).

The Director General's file.

The suitability files (SRS).

Then there is the "Official Personnel Folder" (This may be considered the "real" file!)

And the medical file, "classified" file, investigative file, administrative file, etc. etc. Evidently, in the Department of State, you can prove anything in personnel work or conceal anything, depending upon which files you choose to select for the project.

Now I wonder if this Committee has been told what file or files were used in the compilation of this promotion list? Or has the Committee been told which of these files were used to "supplement" information in the "real file", or that, in the words of official correspondence of the Department, "it is a common accepted practice for [promotion] Boards to consult officers in O and other areas of the Department?" What becomes of the much talked about sanctity of the promotion system under these conditions? I submit—merely as an illustration—one documented example (TAB E) in which the head of a promotion board made three illegal contacts to "supplement" the "file" during promotion board deliberations. None of these were recorded at the time. Only reluctantly has the Department admitted in writing that this is a "common accepted practice". How often did it happen for the 1972 list?

With no established standards of record-keeping, with wheeling and dealing in terms of illegal contacts with the members of boards, with constantly shifting standards for promotion, it is little wonder that the present Director General of the Foreign Service himself received a promotion on the basis of an *ad hoc* "one-time" exception to established and published requirements. In that case, it was said that his promotion would "constitute a single exception not constituting a precedent for the future." (See Draft memo for the files by Mr. LaRue Lutkins 10/15/68 at TAB F.)

Since established procedures and standards are not maintained, but ever shifting, it is no wonder that closer examination will reveal a few problems with this lost other than linguistic. Consider the matter of professional competence. You will recall a recent murder trial involving two foreign service employees. One man was killed and the other convicted of murder. The Executive Director of the Bureau of African Affairs at that time, whose name is found at #102 of your annotated promotion list, specifically was alerted to the problems of this post and to the possibility of this kind of serious trouble. You may know that the job of an executive

director of a Bureau is to be responsive to anticipate this kind of problem. I can provide this Committee with the name of a witness who specifically alerted #102 to the dimensions of the problems at this post but which #102 did nothing to alleviate. Is the matter even discussed in #102's personnel file—which ever of the 12-14 files is pertinent?

Consider the matter of basic integrity or honesty. At #114 is an officer against whom serious charges were made by another officer still on the roles. The charges have not been answered; in fact, the Department has refused to investigate further or to give the complainant a hearing or due process. Is the complaint or its disposition among the files viewed by the promotion boards? I note that #114, like #102 does not fully measure up to the Department's own linguistic standards.

Just how does one get on the promotion list? Well, clearly it helps to get as close to top management and administration as possible, other qualifications notwithstanding. Three such officers include #127, #143, and #151. Two of those three are without any language qualification. The third knows one language (which is less than the minimum) and at age 39 is the second youngest on the list. (With a little more time and experience, he might be fully qualified.) But all are high in the management/administrative structure. The fact that #127 attended courses in German in 1958 and Spanish in 1962 but had not yet qualified in those languages is duly noted in the 1964 register, a matter expunged by the time the 1971 register was published. However, his other training, presumably successful, at the University of Pittsburgh has not been deleted in the 1971 register.

I think the above random examples serve to make a point. There are many other broadsides that could be delivered along these same lines. So as not to take up too much of your time, I think it would be useful to shift to the fact that the Senate has received for confirmation only a portion of the current promotion list. The remainder of the list contains FSRs and FSRUs not subject to the Senate's scrutiny. If you think that the standards are low on the list I have just been discussing, the list the Senate is permitted to examine and judge, you can imagine what the standards are of those not required to pass muster.

A look at the promotion boards themselves will explain why these standards are so low. Take the members of the "B" Board which considers FSRU officers from Class 4-8 and some FSRs from Class 6-8. All three members are indicated in the Register as having no satisfactory knowledge of any languages. But it pays to serve on such a Board; one of these three is #126 on the 1972 promotion list—promoted to FSO-2. That is a quicker payoff than usual, even for the management staff in the Department of State, I might note in passing. The FSRU Boards are backed up by a panel of "specialists", themselves products of this system that one person qualified to judge has described as a "self-perpetuating Board of Directors." Thirteen (13) out of 18 are indicated with no rated language proficiency, yet six have entered the Foreign Service at the very top, FSO-1, after being in the favored and protected positions of FSRs. Four more are FSR-1, waiting in the queue, so to speak, to become instant "US diplomats." These panel members are the people who are determining the fitness of those persons promoted to FSR positions, officers who are exempted from the further scrutiny of the Senate. Later, when laterally entered, they will be placed on a special promotion list similar to the one submitted to the Senate on July 28 which included a number of FSO-3s and FSO-4s who had neither college

degrees nor language qualifications, (TAB G). No wonder our Foreign Service is called the "best paid second rate diplomatic service in the world."

By asking the Senate to confirm this list or another like it before a thorough-going reform of the system is accomplished, the Department of State management authorities have attempted to deceive. There is a large number of well-qualified officers on this list. What a pity that the honest pride in a well-earned promotion has been diminished for the others on the promotion list who have not yet met the required standards!

We all have heard of the low morale of the Foreign Service. Is it any wonder? Senior officials determining the standards and selection out of qualified officers themselves would have been dismissed had not the high standards set for the Foreign Service in regulation been set aside for them.

I regret to inform this Committee that the promotion list before you represents a further slump in standards. It should be remanded with instructions that it not be returned until all people on the list measure up to the high standard the American public has a right to expect of its Foreign Service.

Thank you for listening to my testimony today.

[From the Federal Times, May 17, 1972]

SENATE HOLDS UP STATE PROMOTIONS

(By Bill Andronikos)

WASHINGTON.—In an unprecedented move, the Senate has withheld confirmation—at least for the time being—of an entire promotion list of the State Department and U.S. Information Agency.

Affected by the move are some 385 foreign service officers and about 175 USIA officers, whose names were submitted to the Senate recently by President Nixon. Generally, the Foreign Relations Committee passes along the recommendations without hesitation.

The Senate action came on the heels of testimony before the committee by a former foreign service officer, John D. Hemenway, who has charged that the list includes names of officers lacking in language proficiency, professional competence and honesty.

Fired from his foreign service position on Jan. 17, 1969—in the final days of the Johnson administration and while Dean Rusk was secretary of state—Hemenway currently serves as a civil servant in the Department of Defense.

Among other things, he charged that, according to the State Department's own statistics which he gleaned from the department's "Biographic Register," 35 per cent of the Class I officers and 31 per cent of the Class 2 officers proposed for promotion "still do not meet the very minimal standards of a single foreign language."

Hemenway indicated he was not attacking everyone on the list, but in testimony he avoided the use of individual names, preferring to refer to various officers on the list through a numerical sequence.

Although acknowledging that "language is not everything," he said virtually all these senior level officers have been with the State Department more than 20 years—and added: "To consider oneself a diplomat by profession and not to be able to command a single foreign language is, in my opinion, inexcusable."

"It perpetuates the image of the 'Ugly American,'" Hemenway said.

He argued that the department's own regulations call for two languages prior to reaching a senior level—by the time the officer reaches Class 3.

Hemenway testified four of the FSO-1 officers on the promotion list have been given special language training—"but it is not recorded that they ever successfully passed a language test after that training."

He also challenged the validity of the pro-

motion list, questioning the types of individuals who sit on promotion panels as well as their qualifications.

He said the controversial former director of personnel, Howard P. Mace, helped to determine the composition of the panels selecting the present promotion list. Consequently, Hemenway referred to the list as the "Mace List."

Earlier this year, Mace had asked President Nixon to remove his name from consideration for nomination as ambassador to the African country of Sierra Leone. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee had shelved Mace's nomination in December following a torrent of criticism over the way he allegedly handled the State Department's selection-out of diplomats after they had been rejected for promotion by the selection board.

Hemenway charged that in addition to language weaknesses, the promotion list includes individuals who lack professional competence and basic integrity or honesty.

To get on the promotion list, he told the committee, it "clearly helps to get as close to top management and administration as possible, other qualifications notwithstanding."

In addition, he noted that the Senate received only a partial list of those scheduled for promotion. The remainder contains foreign service reserve officers (FSR's) and foreign service reserve officers with unlimited tenure (FSRU's) not subject to the Senate's scrutiny.

"If you think that the standards are low on the list I have just been discussing, the list the Senate is permitted to examine and judge, you can imagine what the standards are of those not required to pass muster," Hemenway said.

Hemenway also accused the State Department of attempting to deceive "by asking the Senate to confirm this list or another like it before a thorough-going reform of the system is accomplished."

Hemenway told the committee it was no wonder there are indications of low morale within the foreign service, when "senior officials determining the standards and selection-out of qualified officers, themselves would have been dismissed had not the high standards set for the foreign service in regulations been set aside for them."

Charging that the promotion list represents a "slump in standards," he urged the committee to remand the list "with instructions that it not be returned until all people on the list measure up to the high standard the American public has a right to expect of its foreign service."

Meanwhile, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has transmitted Hemenway's allegations to Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration William B. Macomber Jr., asking his comments before deciding on a course of action on the foreign service promotion list.

In related action, Sen. Claiborne Pell, D-R.I., himself a former foreign service officer, issued a strong protest with the Foreign Relations Committee against a promotion system change implemented by USIA Director Frank Shakespeare.

Shakespeare has deviated from traditional USIA practice (currently still being followed in the State Department's foreign service setup) by ignoring the USIA selection board's rankings for promotions and choosing those he personally feels warrant upgrading.

Pell and other critics said they fear the Shakespeare method would lead to political maneuvering for top agency jobs.

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 6, 1972]

ONE MAN'S VICTORY IN WASHINGTON

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, May 5.—To the astonishment and dismay of the State Department, 385 high-ranking foreign service officers have been temporarily blocked from promotion by

the efforts of a former colleague, fired from their ranks more than three years ago.

This feat—and in the bureaucratic world it is an exploit of stunning significance—is the latest success in the one-man crusade of John D. Hemenway against the establishment which kicked him out in the closing days of the Johnson administration.

He has proved that, against all the odds, you cannot only fight city hall but overcome it on occasion. It requires a courage beyond most men, patience and a calm determination, a willingness to endure financial sacrifice, but it can be done.

It is now conceded by the State Department hierarchy that the biggest mistake ever made by former Secretary of State Dean Rusk was to uphold Hemenway's dismissal just before he left office in January, 1969. His judgment was based on a report filed by two of Hemenway's superiors which, subsequent hearings have shown, contained false and malicious accusations. Hemenway's real crime was that he had differed with these superiors by "too aggressive" support of the American position in dealing with Communist nations as chief of section in Berlin.

The Nixon administration subsequently recognized Hemenway's talents by giving him a high position in the Defense Department. It found itself unable to return him to the State Department, which remained in charge of a holdover power structure unalterably opposed to the retention of any subordinate who had dared to exercise independent judgment.

Hemenway, at that point, decided to battle for a removal from the record of falsehoods placed against him. He forced upon the State Department the first grievance hearing in its history. The evidence accumulated at these sessions has tarnished the reputation of celebrated figures now serving in key posts abroad.

Last December, Hemenway helped stop the nomination of Howard P. Mace as ambassador to Sierra Leone. Mace, as the State Department's personnel director, gained the nickname of "the executioner" for faithfully following the orders of his superiors to destroy the careers of those who disputed top echelon policy. The Mace nomination was buried after testimony from Hemenway and other victims had outlined what they called "a sick and corrupt personnel system which had wrought havoc to the careers of dedicated officers."

Not until April 25, however, did the State Department realize fully the influence in Congress gained by Hemenway in his repeated forays.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee met that day for the customary routine approval of the annual list of 385 foreign service officers designated for promotion to higher ratings, carrying increased prestige and salaries.

But Hemenway appeared, requested and received an unprecedented hearing, and furnished a devastating analysis of the lack of qualifications of many of the career diplomats on the list.

He noted, as one example of their deficiencies, the failure of two-thirds of them to have proficiency in two foreign languages, as required by law. He added a staggering disclosure—that one-third of those at the highest level did not even have proficiency in one foreign language.

"Knowledge of language is not everything," said Hemenway, who is himself fluent in Russian and German, "but practically all of these senior level officers have been with the State Department for 20 years. To consider oneself a diplomat and not to be able to command a single foreign language is, in my opinion, inexcusable. It perpetuates the image of 'The Ugly American.'"

The committee agreed and held up action on the promotion list pending a reply to Hemenway's criticism by Deputy Undersecretary

tary of State William B. Macomber. Members voiced suspicion that the State Department's promotion system elevates amiable conformists rather than the truly competent.

[From the Sarasota Herald-Tribune, May 2, 1972]

A SCANDAL AT STATE?

If charges brought against the United States Department of State by a former employee are correct, they constitute a major indictment and one rattling-good shakeup is in order.

John B. Hemenway, chief of the Berlin section in the Foreign Service division until 1968, last week told a Senate committee hearing that the department was breaching its own rules and deceiving the Senate by submitting for confirmation to key posts men it knew were not qualified.

Mr. Hemenway is a veteran, a Naval Academy graduate and a former Rhodes Scholar at Oxford, rated fluent in Russian and German. He was dropped from the Berlin post and was the first Foreign Service officer, believe it or not, to demand a hearing (and received in 1969 the first such hearing ordained by the State Department for any reason in 15 years). The case is still being contested.

But the former Berlin chief may be presumed to have some expertise in job qualifications within the department, and he has charged that State's management bureau is loading up the Foreign Service with its own personnel who are not qualified.

As for instances, he noted that among the latest 23 Foreign Service officers promoted to Class One, the top grade, 35 percent speak no foreign language at all and 30 percent speak only one. Regulations, he said, call for them to be proficient in at least two.

He also charged that State's management bureau has been tampering with personnel files in defiance of regulations and common decency.

One State Department official has acknowledged that the latter accusation was true (although he says it has been stopped), but says the language requirements, in senior grade as in others, are merely "objectives," not minimum requirements.

Observers who have been puzzled for years over inadequacies in our Foreign Service may find a few clues here.

If it is not required for top-grade officials to have language proficiencies, only suggested, one can readily see how information gathered is of limited value—and also why some nations may be increasingly cool to us, since we give such seemingly small regard to other native speech.

As to improper access to personnel files, which has been admitted, it is only necessary to imagine oneself a State Department employee with the knowledge that this is going on, to realize the morale damage it must have been doing.

And in days like these, to have a demoralized Foreign Service is not very far from committing slow national suicide. Few contemporary Americans carry a greater burden in foreign fields for the good of the country.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, after hearing Mr. Hemenway, has asked for a full rundown from State on its promotion and personnel policies.

It doesn't seem much to ask—but perhaps a trifle late to ask it.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 30, 1972]

EX-AIDE ASSAILS FOREIGN SERVICE

WASHINGTON, April 29.—A former Foreign Service officer has shaken the State Department by publicly charging that the department has violated its own standards for promotion and has tampered with confidential personnel files.

In a hearing Tuesday before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, John B. Hemenway, who is now a civilian employee with the Defense Department, accused the State Department also of trying to deceive the Senate by submitting for confirmation to key posts the names of officers it knew to be unqualified.

After hearing the charges, the Senate committee asked the State Department for details of its promotion and personnel policies.

Mr. Hemenway, who is 45 years old, was dropped from the Foreign Service in 1968 while serving as chief of the Berlin section in the department. He served as an infantry lieutenant in World War II, was graduated from the United States Naval Academy in 1951 and, after entering the Foreign Service in 1951, earned bachelor's and master's degrees at Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar. He is rated fluent in Russian and German.

SOUGHT REINSTATEMENT

In 1969, Mr. Hemenway filed a grievance charge against the State Department seeking reinstatement. The hearing—the first ever demanded by a Foreign Service officer and the first accepted by the department in 15 years—is being contested.

Mr. Hemenway testified that among the latest list of 23 Foreign Service officers promoted to class one, the highest grade, 35 per cent speak no foreign language while 30 per cent speak only one. The regulations, he said, call for proficiency in at least two foreign languages before promotion to senior rank.

Of the 45 officers recently promoted to class two, he said, 31 per cent speak no foreign language and 33 per cent speak only one.

Mr. Hemenway charged the management bureau of the State Department with promoting its own staff members to key assignments—including promotion panels—and with tampering with personnel files in violation of regulations.

Mr. Hemenway showed the committee copies of a staff memorandum written last Oct. 1 from John A. Stevenson, State Department legal adviser, to William B. Macomber Jr., Deputy Under Secretary for Management. The Stevenson memorandum criticized widespread illegal access by promotion panels to the "12 to 14 different" files maintained on every officer and recommended that such practices be halted.

"In the Department of State," Mr. Hemenway charged, "you can prove anything in personnel work—or conceal anything—depending upon which files you choose to select for the purpose."

Mr. Hemenway also testified that growing numbers of employees of the bureau of management are being admitted to the Foreign Service without passing examinations. In several cases he said they had "neither college degrees nor language qualifications."

A State Department spokesman, who said that he had not read Mr. Hemenway's testimony, explained that language qualifications for senior officers are "objectives" rather than minimal standards. He conceded that there had been violations of regulations through unauthorized access to personnel files but said that these practices had been stopped.

THE PICTURE OF HEALTH— NATIONAL HOSPITAL WEEK

HON. CHARLES THONE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, one of every seven people in the United States will be

a hospital patient this year. This dramatic statistic points up the importance of the 52d annual observance of National Hospital Week, May 7-13, 1972.

"We want you—in the picture of health" is the slogan for the week. It has three important meanings.

Our hospitals will better serve our communities if more individuals take an interest in the Government, needs and policies of their local institutions.

The American Hospital Association and its member hospitals want individuals to become more concerned about the provisions of health insurance policies. The AHA praises and encourages the growing trend of insurance payments for medical procedures performed in physicians' offices or in hospitals on an outpatient basis. Such practices release beds that may be needed for critical illnesses and help hold down medical costs.

Finally, the phrase "We want you—in the picture of health" calls attention to the need for intelligent, motivated recruits for careers in the field of health. Health care is already the Nation's third largest industry, and new jobs are being created every day.

America has the best hospitals in the world. Citizen participation can help make them serve their communities better than ever.

NATION IS LOSER BY FAILING TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE MONEY TO STAFF AND SUPPORT WORKER SAFETY AND HEALTH LAW

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is the loser and workers themselves lose because the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 has not been properly supported by staff or money.

The Nixon budget for fiscal 1973 calls for \$97 million for both the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare responsibilities to administer the new law. This is less than \$2 per worker, since 57 million workers are covered by Public Law 91-596.

An excellent statement on the fiscal needs of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration—OSHA—and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health—NIOSH—has been prepared by the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO. I commend it to my colleagues.

There is no other law on the statute books today which more directly affects the environment and quality of life for working people than does the worker health and safety law. It is a great tragedy that Congress has failed to provide adequate staff and funds to make this law work for the good of the Nation and for the working people of this country.

The statement follows:

[From Occupational Safety and Health Reporter, Bureau of National Affairs, May 4, 1972]

UNIONS—IUD ISSUES BUDGET ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL JOB SAFETY EFFORT

The federal job safety and health budget, because it is inadequate in terms of money and people, is the nation's most extravagant expenditure, the Industrial Union Department (AFL-CIO) maintains in its analysis of the Nixon Administration's fiscal 1973 budget proposal.

The partial costs to the nation from job injuries and illnesses are \$1.7 billion in lost wages, \$9 billion in lost Gross National Product, and \$2.3 billion in workmen's compensation costs, the IUD said. The more than \$500 million spent for special compensation to black lung victims could be equaled in justifiable claims by victims of asbestosis, silicosis, and other diseases.

The job safety budget is inadequate and therefore extravagant because it is the key to plugging the cost of the 15,000 deaths, the reported 10 million injuries, and millions of uncounted job related illnesses and accidents, the IUD said.

HEALTH HAZARDS

Most complaints received by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration concern health hazards. "Labor Department officers admit that virtually every complaint to date has been legitimate and often for serious health hazards," the IUD said. "Yet months often elapse before a hygienist can conduct an investigation."

By the end of this fiscal year the Labor Department expects to have only about 40 industrial hygienists at work. "They are being asked to work without all the necessary equipment. They are enforcing only a few hundred environmental standards although thousands of toxic substances and hazardous physical agents are found in the workplace," the IUD maintained.

Last year the Administration asked for a little less than \$63 million. This year it is requesting just over \$97 million. "But the need is astronomical and, equally serious, it is not going to be spent in the most effective manner because key allocations have not been made."

Only \$27 million will be spent by OSHA on enforcement and new standards. The compliance force will about double but the most important kind of skills will not be gained in sufficient quantities. Though most of the industrial hygiene work could be done by specially trained aides, no funds are provided for this purpose, the IUD noted.

Much more environmental hazard information could be transferred to the local OSHA offices through a data transfer system, but no money has been supplied for the purpose. There are no systematically adequate links, electronic, computerized, or otherwise, with state and other federal agencies. There is not even effective face to face liaison, the IUD said.

"Recently a list of plants with probable asbestos hazards, compiled in 1969 by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was transmitted by hand to OSHA by the IUD. Six weeks later no inspections had taken place as a consequence of this information," the IUD reported.

STATE PLANS

Federal policy actually discourages effective state-federal communications. Planning funds are granted the states for information and communications systems that are incompatible among the states and with federal agencies.

The Occupational Safety and Health Act makes it mandatory for the Labor Department to monitor and assist state programs.

However, if too many states operate their own programs the Federal Government will not have enough personnel for monitoring and technical assistance. "If even a handful of states leave job safety in the hands of the Federal Government, there will not be sufficient personnel for enforcement of the standards in those states."

REVIEW COMMISSION

The Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission cannot even handle the current 6 percent rate of appeals of OSHA enforcement actions, the IUD said.

The budget calls for a \$220,000 increase for a total of \$1.28 million, even though hundreds of cases remain unsettled and management organizations are still gearing up to aid their clients in the appeals process.

NIOSH

The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health is the most tragic case, the IUD said. The effective budget increase in the \$29.5 million does not even absorb the increased cost of doing business since the last budget request. Vital programs have been eliminated and others severely cut.

The primary role of NIOSH is the supplying of safety and health knowledge through research and training. If the states take over the enforcement load, since the Federal Government has the resources and logical position to develop uniform and comprehensive standards for use by federal and State agencies, NIOSH will have greater importance than OSHA. "If the Federal Government retains its enforcement role, NIOSH will remain equal in importance to OSHA. But the budget does not reflect that fact."

NIOSH suffers from the Administration's plans to transfer it to the Commerce Department, an obvious conflict of interest situation, the IUD said. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare knows of the impending transfer and is not about to waste rationed supergrades on an agency it is going to lose.

The proposed NIOSH budget provides no funds for short term, in-house training. Grants to educational institutions will not provide for any new training programs in schools and colleges. There will be no significant increase in research. NIOSH is being hurt by the hiring freeze and decreased grade level average.

Some programs in NIOSH are particularly hard hit. The training program is trying to supply the people who can, for example, count microscopic fibers of asbestos. This need is increasing but there are no funds for the purpose.

By the Government's own calculations, 3,000 doctors are needed immediately to provide medical services generated by the Act. Only a few are being trained as specialists in job medicine. Only the Government has the ability to support fully the educational institutions. The current \$1.7 million is grossly inadequate, the IUD said.

The proposed budget provides for only about \$2 million in grants for OSHA health research, the same as last year. It is only enough to adequately fund a single university program.

The NIOSH Division of Field Studies is insufficiently staffed. "They will never be able to hire enough people to be sure that the contractors do an honest job."

SPECIAL HEALTH CARE

The critical need to care for those already afflicted with occupational diseases is not even mentioned in the NIOSH budget. Early action is necessary to save the lives of thousands already exposed to disease causing materials.

In economic terms, by anticipating the needs of these workers, hundreds of millions

of dollars can be saved by modest expenditures at this time, the IUD maintained. Possibly thousands of lives can be saved.

At least three centers exist in the eastern, central, and western states capable of quickly engaging in this program because of their trained and experienced staff. Each could absorb a \$2 million program for a total of \$6 million. They are Mount Sinai, the University of Illinois, and either the University of Southern California or the University of Washington, the IUD said. In addition to the \$6 million necessary to support three resource centers, NIOSH needs \$6 million for its responsibilities in such a program.

INFORMATION AVAILABILITY

One of the hard jobs in putting together a government program is to use the resources of other agencies. Retrieval is laborious and time consuming since there are no connections and no interaction between data banks that enable OSHA, for example, to know even what useful information may exist in the Department of Agriculture or other agencies.

"What we need is a national, coordinated information grid," the IUD said. An informal system could be operative in three or four months. A formal system will take three to five years to complete. There is absolutely no money available for this purpose, although studies financed by HEW supporting this essential effort have been completed.

"Only crisis forces coordination. The crisis is here but nothing will happen without congressional action," the IUD said.

The IUD recommended several NIOSH budget additions for fiscal 1973. These are design and pilot operation of coordinated information grid, \$1 million; field investigations, \$5 million; training program (including audiovisual), \$5 million; research grants, \$10 million; education grants, \$10 million; and special health care, \$12 million. Total requested additional funds total \$43 million.

HANOI WARLORDS WANT TO PLAY FOOTSIE WITH MEMBERS OF U.S. CONGRESS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the lives of 60,000 Americans are threatened by an invading enemy hell-bent on slaughter and destruction; when the enemy is throwing all his resources into one infamous thrust; when the Communists no longer attempt to conceal their reliance upon support from Americans in this country—they have the unmitigated gall to write personal letters to Members of Congress to solicit help and impugn the motives of our President.

This unprecedented intrusion should be treated as an open insult by every recipient, and it must be repudiated in no uncertain terms.

I include an excellent editorial which appeared in the April 17 issue of the San Diego Union. The editorial follows:

EXTRAORDINARY LETTER—REDS INVADE AMERICAN POLITICS

The extraordinary letter sent by the Viet Cong foreign minister to members of the U.S. Congress should remove any doubt that the Communists have picked 1972 for a direct invasion of the American political process just as surely as they have picked this

year for a do-or-die military sweep into South Vietnam.

Mme. Nguyen Thi Binh deserves precisely the sharp rebuke which her flagrant breach of international propriety has received from the White House. It is members of Congress themselves, however, who should rise in a body to express their indignation at this patent attempt by a foreign official to use them as tools for attaining Communist objectives in Southeast Asia.

Mme. Binh attacks President Nixon's determination to stand by South Vietnam in the face of the invasion as "an adventurous path fraught with unpredictable consequences." This might better be applied to her own venture into our politics. The consequences could well be a final awakening by leaders of both our political parties to the fact that the people most eager to keep the "Vietnam issue" alive in this American election are the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong themselves.

The Binh letter is the most bold and arrogant example so far of how the Communists are trying to influence political thinking in the United States to smooth their way for conquest in Asia. They have stepped up or scaled down the level of fighting at propitious moments to correspond with our national mood as they read it through anti-war demonstrations and the rise and fall of debate on Vietnam.

They used the offer of negotiations to gain a bombing halt in 1968, and since then have played cat-and-mouse with our delegation drawn to Paris by the lure of peace and the hint of release of our prisoners of war. Now, when they needed only to stand quietly by and await the total withdrawal of our troops, they elected to launch a full-scale invasion of South Vietnam in the hope of humiliating the Americans on the eve of our national elections.

It may be a sign of desperation that has prompted Mme. Binh to insinuate herself directly into our Congress. The North Vietnamese have poured virtually everything they have into South Vietnam, and the South Vietnamese have made them pay in blood for every inch of land that they have gained. Communists have failed in three weeks of intensive fighting even to capture the major cities that would give them an opportunity to symbolize a "victory."

North Vietnam and the Viet Cong know their only real victory would come with the total desertion of South Vietnam by the United States. They can achieve this only if controversy over our Vietnam policy is stirred and kept at a boil. Members of Congress, especially those who are candidates this year, should open their eyes to deliberate attempts from outside our country to weaken the resolve of the American people at this crucial moment in the Vietnam struggle.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?