

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## REJECTION BY U.N. SECRETARY GENERAL OF REINSTATEMENT OF PRESS CREDENTIALS OF NATIONALIST CHINESE CORRESPONDENTS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the new Secretary General of the United Nations, Kurt Waldheim, has turned down an appeal for reinstatement of the press credentials of two Nationalist Chinese correspondents assigned to cover the United Nations.

I believe that the decision by Mr. Waldheim's predecessor, U Thant, was unfortunate. I regret that the new Secretary General has upheld the expulsion of the correspondents from Taiwan.

It seems totally out of keeping with the spirit of the United Nations to block the coverage of its activities by reporters from any nation.

A number of newspapers have published editorials critical of the actions of U Thant and Mr. Waldheim.

I ask unanimous consent that editorials on this subject from the Philadelphia Inquirer, the Bangor Daily News, the Washington Post, the Chicago Tribune, the New York Times, the La Crosse, Wis., Tribune, and the New Brunswick, N.J., Home News be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Feb. 15, 1972]

## MR. WALDHEIM'S BLOW TO FREEDOM

United Nations Secretary General Kurt Waldheim has established a dangerous precedent, we believe, in refusing an appeal to reinstate the press credentials of two Nationalist Chinese correspondents assigned to cover the U.N.

The rationale for withdrawing the accreditation of T. C. Tang and Chen-chi Lin, who have covered the world body for many years as correspondents for the Central News Agency of Taiwan, is that they are employees of an entity that does not exist. This point is reached by the argument that CNA is an official arm of the Chiang Kai-shek regime, which in turn claims to be the government of China, despite the General Assembly's Oct. 25 vote that it be expelled and replaced by the Peking government.

"If the agency ceases to exist in fact or in law, accreditation ceases . . . With adoption of the Assembly resolution, the CNA as a national news agency ceases in law to exist for United Nations purposes," a U. N. staff legal opinion adopted by Mr. Waldheim said.

We have no taste for government news agencies, or for governments handling or influencing the reporting and dissemination of news. And we have no patience with the die-hard Irredentist fiction that the Chiang regime is the legitimate government of all China.

But the fact is that government news agencies, and total government control of the press, are the rule of life in a staggering number of the countries of the world. By

stringently applying the recognition principles of the U.N. to press accreditation, Mr. Waldheim has effectively strengthened the government-press connection, and struck a painful blow against freedom of information.

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily News, Feb. 15, 1972]

## ANOTHER STEP BACKWARD FOR RIGHTS

It is incredible that a world organization purportedly dedicated to human rights should oust reputable news reporters because they come from a certain nation. But it has happened in the United Nations.

First, the U.N. coldly ejected Nationalist China from membership, though it was a member in good standing and one of the founding nations. This was done to appease Red China, which refused to become a member unless Nationalist China was thrown out.

Next, accredited Nationalist China newsmen were told they could no longer cover U.N. activities. The order was issued by recently retired Secretary General U Thant and confirmed last week by the new secretary, Kurt Waldheim. Protests by the U.N. Correspondents Association were rejected.

Worst of all, so-called "free world" members of the U.N. have not dared to speak up for the Nationalist China newsmen. Not even the U.S., which prides itself as a champion of press freedom. All have looked the other way while the secretary general's office was showing the Nationalist China correspondents the door.

It is a shabby performance which does nothing to bolster the sagging prestige of the world peace body.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 5, 1972]

## "FREE" PRESS AT THE U.N.

At 10 a.m. last Dec. 17, aides of then-Secretary General U Thant informed T. C. Tang and Chen-chi Lin, who had represented the Central News Agency of China (Taiwan) at the United Nations for 26 and 16 years respectively, that their accreditation had been revoked and that they must turn in their passes, close their offices and depart the premises by the close of business that day. Their ouster, subsequently upheld by the new Secretary General Kurt Waldheim, was and is an outrage.

The purported fact of the matter, so asserted by the U.N. Secretariat, is that since Central News is the official press agency of Nationalist China and since the General Assembly resolution of Oct. 25 admitting Peking called for expulsion of all "representatives of Chiang Kai-shek," the agency had to go.

The actual fact of the matter, we suspect, is that the new delegation from Peking insisted on a mean and gratuitous gesture further humiliating Taiwan and that the Secretariat, not to put too fine a point on it, caved. In doing so, the Secretariat turned its back on the values of freedom of information which were supported, in this particular instance, by parties as disparate as the United States Government and the United Nations Correspondents Association, including Pravda and Tass.

We would urge Mr. Waldheim to reconsider. There is no question but that Mr. Tang and Mr. Lin are journalists who were covering a legitimate and important news activity. In deciding that one claimant rather than another deserved the single "China" seat at the United Nations, the General Assembly surely did not mean that the losing claimant should be deprived of news about the U.N. In a formal sense the two journalists may have "represented" the Nationalist government but in a real sense they represented the right of all peoples and nations to learn the news.

That is the appropriate basis, we believe, on which their accreditation should be restored.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 7, 1972]  
PRESS DISCRIMINATION AT U.N.

Secretary General Kurt Waldheim has indicated that he would look for a "pragmatic solution" permitting the reinstatement of two press representatives of Nationalist China discredited by the United Nations when Communist China was voted into the Nationalist U.N. seat in October. Waldheim's predecessor, U Thant, assented to their expulsion on the highly legalistic ground that the resolution expelling Nationalist China also called for the expulsion of the "representatives of Chiang Kai-shek," president of the Taiwan regime. Until now, Waldheim has insisted there was no alternative.

Because the correspondents represented the Central News Agency, an official government news service, it was argued that it applied to the correspondents, as well as the Nationalist diplomats representing Taiwan in the U.N. and its specialized agencies.

A committee of 17 members of the News Access Committee of Sigma Delta Chi, a journalistic fraternity, called upon Waldheim and appealed to him to reverse the decision expelling the Nationalist journalists. Spokesmen for the group argued that there should be no discrimination in access to U.N. proceedings and the principle must be maintained that "there is no connection between the accreditation of a correspondent and the nature of the government which controls the agency for which he is working."

The Nationalist correspondents, T. C. Tang and Chen-chi Lin, have also obtained support in their fight for reinstatement from the U.N. Correspondents Association and Sigma Delta Chi's Committee on Freedom of Information.

It seems to us that the U.N. secretariat engaged in a petty and pettifoggish action in discrediting the two correspondents. By reinstating them to full reporting rights, it will show a little elementary respect for the principle of freedom of the press.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 7, 1972]

## FREE PRESS AT THE U.N.

Secretary General Waldheim undoubtedly wishes that the questions raised by the arbitrary expulsion of Chinese Nationalist correspondents from the United Nations last December would fade away. In the interests of the U.N. itself and the principles of freedom of information it has embraced, however, this cannot be allowed to happen.

Retiring Secretary General Thant made the decision for expulsion rather than bucking the issue to a General Assembly headed for adjournment. An opinion of Mr. Thant's legal counsel in support of his action contained serious errors of fact, law and U.N. policy. It was perhaps understandable—but regrettable—that Mr. Waldheim, new to his job and anxious for good relations with the People's Republic of China, endorsed the decision.

The U.N. legal counsel, Constantin Stavropoulos, argued that the United Nations could not continue to accredit the Central News Agency of China because it was an official agency of a Government—the Chinese Nationalists on Taiwan—no longer recognized as a lawful entity by the U.N. But the U.N. has never accredited news organizations; it accredits only correspondents, and it had never distinguished between those working for official agencies or publications and those employed by private ones.

Mr. Stavropoulos ignored the policy laid down by Secretary General Hammarskjöld in

1956, rejecting a United States suggestion that accreditation be denied a correspondent from the official news agency of East Germany, not a U.N. member. The Hammar-skjold policy was reaffirmed twice in regard to East German newsmen. Other correspondents from agencies of governments not members of the U.N. have also been accredited.

These and other points against the Thant decision are well argued in a brief prepared by Ernest A. Gross, former United States Representative to the U.N., for the United Nations Correspondents Association. That association and kindred journalistic organizations must persist in their fight for reversal of this decision not merely to protect themselves but, far more important, in defense of the free flow of information endorsed by the U.N. General Assembly nearly a quarter of a century ago.

[From the La Crosse, (Wis.) Tribune, Jan. 21, 1972]

#### BAD OMEN AT U.N.

The new secretary general of the United Nations had a chance, right after moving in, to show that he had more gumption and impartiality than his predecessor. He blew it.

Just before leaving office, U Thant decreed that the two newsmen accredited at the U.N. from the Central News Agency of Nationalist China (Taiwan) must be expelled. Pretty obviously the order was given to please the newly seated People's Republic of China (mainland) delegation.

Now Secretary General Kurt Waldheim has confirmed the expulsion, explaining that it is because Central News is a "state-owned news agency."

Baloney, Mainland China's newsmen at the U.N. work for the state. So do the Soviet Union's Tass reporters at the U.N. and around the world, as is the case with news agencies from other Communist (and some non-Communist) countries.

Kicking out those two reporters from Taiwan was simply adding injury to the larger insult of expelling Taiwan itself, and Waldheim probably knows it.

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Home News, Feb. 15, 1972]

#### THE UNITED NATIONS AND PRESS FREEDOM

Kurt Waldheim, the United Nations' new secretary general, has made an unfortunately unwise and unsound decision in one of his first official acts. He has upheld a decision last November that the resolution of the General Assembly expelling Nationalist China from the United Nations included a withdrawal of accreditation of the journalists who work for the official news agency of Nationalist China.

Waldheim says the opinion of the U.N. legal counsel is that the discreditation of the Nationalist China newsmen was mandatory under the Assembly resolution.

It seems to us that this whole affair is an obvious threat to freedom of the press by an organization which needs to be as freely and widely reported as possible, all over the world, by all media.

#### THE SOCIAL WORKER AS ADVOCATE

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, the slogan of the Catholic Social Service of St. Paul reads, "Charity Demands Service." One outstanding example of following this

call to service is social worker Ena M. Guidarelli. I have had the great pleasure of working with her on several tough cases that involved the Federal Government. She has been of great help to me on many occasions and the good work she performs for the poverty stricken of St. Paul is well known.

In addition she has demonstrated innovative approaches to the problems of poverty. She has well documented the great uplifting impact of good housing and its potential for raising the aspiration of those caught in a seemingly endless cycle of poverty. But there have been problems—problems she spells out in the article I place in the RECORD today.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we here in the House of Representatives have attempted to attack the problems of poverty with well intentioned programs. But in our willingness to perform a worthwhile service to our country and community we have occasionally lost sight of how the programs we establish are run. I believe Ena's article is a valuable contribution to all of us who seek to solve some of the difficult problems facing our country.

The article follows:

#### THE SOCIAL WORKER AS ADVOCATE

(By Ena M. Guidarelli)

Poverty is a way of life to the poor. To the poor, poverty is a culture characterized by a helplessness without recourse for redress. The poor are lonely and isolated, sometimes hostile, sometimes apathetic. To be poor is more than material deprivation, it is an encounter with multiple social pathology.

Until federal legislation initiated anti-poverty programs in 1962, social work was oriented to social services relying on the expedients of counseling and crisis intervention. Enactment of federal legislation and the development of federally funded projects gave recognition that the poor lack opportunities to remove themselves from the entanglement of social pathology, and that the problems of the poor could be alleviated by comprehensive programs. Therefore, it is the thesis of this paper that social workers have neglected the creative development of new approaches to meet human need. In worrying about professional status, social workers are slow to accept the challenge that now, more than at any time since Mary Richmond, social workers can break away from some of their traditional modes, and to accept themselves as social workers in a truly generic sense. Opportunities to provoke existing community agencies and governmental resources to negotiate and invest in a commitment to social change are many, for, as Roosevelt said, "There are many ways of going forward, but only one way of standing still."

In September 1965 Catholic Social Service of St. Paul initiated a Parish Worker Project<sup>1</sup> in the Summit-University community<sup>2</sup> to identify met and unmet needs of three specific contiguous inner-city parishes consisting of low to upper middle class income groups of a varied ethnic background. The parish worker's involvement and effort in the dynamics of social change resulted in expansion of agency services by the development of a school social work program in Catholic schools, and a Family Life Educational Program with focus on the relationship between family life and the role of sex education. These two services were subsequently expanded to include most of the parishes in the city of St. Paul and its suburbs. However, these programs did not make the impact on the Summit-University community for which they were originally designed. The Parish

Worker Project also provided for participation in the establishment of a Neighborhood Multi-Service Center, designed to coordinate the efforts of various agencies which had been making dissimilar diagnosis and treatment in the interest of the multi-problem family.

The neighborhood center concept has been seen as a flexible approach to adapting programs to meet the special needs of a community. Social agencies in many other communities have been participating in neighborhood centers for some time, and while the results of these centers' efforts to coordinate services to the poor are not always satisfactory,<sup>3</sup> social workers do see other ways to improve and expand services and to direct their efforts more effectively.

The Neighborhood Service Center in which Catholic Social Service began participation in June 1967 was nearly overwhelmed by the enormity of the needs of the Summit-University Community. Conflict and competition for community control in the Summit-University Community as well as the inability of the co-sponsoring private and public agencies to coordinate opportunities to develop new services responsive to identified social problems foretold a demise of the Neighborhood Service Center.

It was apparent some focus of effort had to be achieved if there were to be any agency impact in the area. Therefore, after a period of four months, a statistical analysis of referrals to the Neighborhood Service Center was made by Catholic Social Service. Of the 102 referrals, 25% were made by the Relocation Officers of the St. Paul Housing and Redevelopment Authority; 42% of the referrals were not currently active with social agencies, but most had, at one time or another, received help from one or more of the St. Paul Social agencies.

Of the twenty identified presenting problems, the five highest ranked in order of frequency as follows: financial, housing, problem children, aged, and medical need. In each category, a multiplicity of problems was further identified, and without exception, inadequate, sub-standard housing was the predominant factor, with financial stresses running parallel.

In determining how Catholic Social Service could program meaningful services, additional factors were considered: the involvement of other community groups, social action programs, business firms providing job training and employment services, inner-city planning, and the usual welfare services provided from the downtown agencies. Thus, a decision was made to focus on those families who were literally lost in limbo; those too affluent to qualify for any of the traditional welfare services, yet too poor to live above the poverty level; the families living in the ghetto designated target area identified by urban renewal as "Early Land Acquisition."<sup>4</sup>

No one but the relocation officers of the Housing Authority seemed to be concerned about the plight of these families. The relocation officers had grave concern about their inability to cope with the social problems they uncovered in their relocation efforts. They also expressed concern that social workers were not aggressive in assisting low income and ghetto residents beyond providing for their immediate needs. There was a low grumble from the Prudential Life Insurance Company about the lack of community interest in taking advantage of funds the company made available for mortgages to assist ghetto residents in the rehabilitation and revitalization of their community.

Home ownership by the poor was made possible by section 221 and section 235 of the National Housing Act which provided for 100% F.H.A. commitment with no down payment required; however, \$200 was needed to cover closing costs in addition to one year's prepaid home owner's insurance on the property. Lending institutions and realtors were anxious to seek out families to grant mort-

Footnotes at end of article.

gage loans who would prove to be reliable "risks" under the government programs set up for the poor; they welcomed the agency's interest in providing social studies on a given family and in coordinating the necessary negotiations with the Housing Authority, realtor, F.H.A., and lending institutions.

For these reasons, Catholic Social Service directed its efforts in the Summit-University Community to meet the obvious needs for social agency involvement in relocation, and in doing so, to ameliorate the many unmet family needs if better housing were to have any real meaning.

*Isaac and Portia:* Good housing for Isaac, Portia, and their seven children lifted their morale, improved the health of the children, and made them eager for change: Their ghetto home, with the toilet dripping in the kitchen sink, and with rental and heating costs absorbing one half of Isaac's take home pay, was a stark reality that made a fundamental social change a pseudo-hope to them. By sharing their frustration in their inability to cope with health problems, the family was helped: A near-sighted child got eye-glasses, and was provided with private art lessons to develop his obvious talent; and a child whose legs were so bowed with rickets she couldn't stand or walk without crying was hospitalized for treatment, and was later enrolled in a pre-kindergarten for handicapped children; and a third child, who appeared to be unable to adjust to the suburban school to which he was bussed, was diagnosed and treated for impairment of visual-motor perception development. Isaac and Portia learned the techniques of money management to budget seasonal income over a twelve-month period.

*Buzzy and Quin:* Unemployment is but one facet of social pathology; under-employment is more crippling, and a pseudo-hope advancement in job status is devastating. To Buzzy and Quin, more important than moving from substandard housing was the opportunity for a social change that altered their pattern of living. Public assistance supplemented Buzzy's income as an upholsterer after completing an eighteen-month vocational school program. Quin attended night classes, and completed a course in accounting, and her subsequent employment took them off welfare. Education, jobs, and income did not remove them from the tentacles of social pathology. Hope for a better tomorrow for their family of seven was a pseudo-hope. Finally, their long-range goal of owning their own upholstery shop became a reality for Buzzy and Quin. A St. Paul bank, which provided a home mortgage loan, also provided a \$1,000 personal loan so Buzzy could buy equipment for an "at home after work upholstery business." The loan was secured by relocation allowance issued to them by urban renewal funds when they were displaced. The loan, repaid in one year from Buzzy's part-time work, gave him a double collateral: \$1,000 cash and \$1,000 in equipment. Through the efforts of the bank, Buzzy obtained a \$15,000 small business loan and is now the proprietor of his own shop. Along the way, the agency coordinated other resources: An attorney for legal advice, the Urban Coalition for a volunteer accountant to "set-up" the books, a newspaper reporter for publicity, and a congressman to "speed up" approval in the SBA offices in Washington, D.C.

*Helen:* Helen, a mother of three, was a victim of polio, alcoholism, and a broken home—she was in bad housing. Alone, she couldn't get out of her tenement with its many stairs. Helen's new home was "ramped" for her wheel chair and structurally refurbished by community volunteers. Good housing has lifted Helen's morale and generated new horizons for change. Today, she is attending business school to retrain her in secretarial skills.

There are many twists to the story of the combination of social forces to combat the toll of poverty. To give real meaning to

home ownership by ameliorating unmet needs, Catholic Social Service confronted poverty, case by case, fifteen times in less than three years, thereby discovering another opportunity for involvement in direct social change—"old-fashioned advocacy." The poor are unprotected and they do not know how to seek redress.

When they bought their house, Isaac and Portia knew the plumbing had to comply with the city code. They accepted that a fluke could happen when the water department crew forgot to turn on water and sewer at quitting time late Friday afternoon. But how does a responsible contractor explain why he forgot to re-set a toilet for three weeks? How did he forget to finish the bathroom floor? Why did he ask for payment of uncompleted work?

Buzzy and Quin had a valid earnest money contract and a 100% F.H.A. commitment. Why did the realtor refuse to submit a loan application to a specified lending institution, and, then, why did the realtor's mortgage broker later refuse to grant a mortgage loan?

Helen never dreamed that a F.H.A. appraisal would overlook serious violations of city electrical and plumbing codes—remember, she was handicapped, and this was so noted in the loan application.

These and similar challenges were met, and dealt with appropriately with the recruitment of community resources: the St. Paul Housing Authority staff, the Northwestern National Bank, Carpet Linoleum and Resilient Tile Layers Local 596, St. Paul Association of Plumbing Heating and Mechanical Contractors, along with the St. Vincent de Paul Society, a half-dozen seminarians interested in social action, and private attorneys angry about the flagrant disregard for the dignity of the humans who were paying the bill.

The abuses by unscrupulous businessmen and contractors trying to make a fast buck under the guise of helping the poor with the 235 F.H.A. program have been repeated many times over, often by the same persons, throughout the country. It has created a congressional furor. But what have social workers done about it? One social worker, one agency, one community is akin to a voice in the wilderness. Where are our community organizers, our social action groups, and our lobbyists? Can not one well-documented case of abuse prevent occurrence of another one? Is it the responsibility of the banks, the business community, and volunteers to rectify what could have been avoided, or do we need a congressional investigation to identify the perpetrators of fraud?

Where is the voice of social work that allows the squabbles of model cities and urban renewal programs to hurt the very people they were intended to help? On one occasion a Minnesota congressman wrote to the Regional Administrator, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Chicago, Illinois, regarding relocation funds for Katherine and her family as follows:

The reason I am bringing this matter to your attention is that I haven't been able to get an answer from the General Counsel's office here in Washington. I brought the problem to their attention back in February, and have received two acknowledgements since. Most recently, on March 12, Mr. David Maxwell wrote to say that the General Counsel had asked for certain facts from the regional office and a full response would be forthcoming. Since then, I have heard nothing and while the H.U.D. liaison people told me it would take forever to get a decision from the counsel, I am impatient.

The R. case constitutes a real inequity as the family has been displaced six times. In addition, Mrs. R. has never received relocation funds on the six occasions that the family has been forced to move.

If one Congressman gets impatient in re-

sponse to an appeal from one agency, what would happen if many social workers requested the 435 members of Congress to investigate the same inequity created by uneven legal interpretation of two programs designed to help one community?

Housing alone does not guarantee good social adjustment; sprucing up an old house doesn't eradicate the multiple social pathology of the ghetto.

In a recent syndicated news article entitled "No Isolation from Cancer," Sidney J. Harris describes the ghettos throughout the nation as foreign communities in a country; and that the ghetto is literally a cancer which can only spread. To quote him, "What are we doing about it? Practically nothing. Large sums are appropriated, agencies and bureaus and commissions are appointed, staffed, and funded—but somehow little of the money gets down where it is most needed. Housing starts are negligible, jobs are scarce, training is a joke, and 'law enforcement' is a blend of corruption, negligence, and repression. The social body is like a physical organism: is it impossible to have an untreated focus of infection that will not spread throughout the whole system . . ."

In summary, the combined concepts of social science casework, group work, and community organization can identify social problems, formulate and evaluate community goals. The social work triad, by grasping the needs and opportunities of the present, can develop positive advocacy and leadership to achieve human dignity for all people.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> The area covers 209 blocks and included a population of 25,000 which was 32.1% Negro (83.15% of the Negro population in St. Paul), 65.4% white, and 2.5% other (predominantly Indian). There were 4,200 residential structures, 800 of which were sub-standard and mostly renter-occupied.

<sup>2</sup> See Frank M. Lowenberg, "Social Workers and Indigenous Non-Professionals: Some Structural Dilemmas," *Social Work*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (July 1968).

<sup>3</sup> A phase of the renewal program which identified 251 sub-standard properties marked for immediate demolition, housing 399 families being urged to relocate.

<sup>4</sup> See Ena Guidarelli, "A Return to the Parish," *Catholic Charities Review*, April 1969.

#### OPPOSITION TO FORCED BUSING AND FORCED ASSIGNMENT OF CHILDREN TO SCHOOLS—RESOLUTION OF VIRGINIA FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, on April 26, the Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs at a convention in Roanoke, Va., adopted a resolution in opposition to the forced assignment of children to schools outside their own neighborhoods.

In taking this action, the federation joined with many other groups in the United States that have expressed opposition to compulsory busing of schoolchildren to achieve an artificial racial balance.

The Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs represents some 22,000 Virginia women, and I am sure its position with regard to compulsory busing reflects the

views of the overwhelming majority of the citizens of the State.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution adopted by the federation be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

**FREEDOM FROM FORCE**

Whereas, As concerned citizens, members of the Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs support quality education in public schools, and

Whereas, Quality education is enhanced by parental and student involvement in school activities, and

Whereas, We believe that the proximity of home and school encourages parental and student involvement, and

Whereas, We believe that a child should not be denied the right to attend the school in the closest proximity to his home, and

Whereas, The assignment of children to schools across political boundaries should only occur with the consent of the people within the jurisdictions involved, and

Whereas, There are before Congress joint resolutions proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the forced assignment of children to specific schools on the basis of race, creed or color; therefore,

Resolved, That the Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs endorses and supports an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the forced assignment of children to specific schools on the basis of race, creed or color; and further,

Resolved, That the Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs urges the General Federation of Women's Clubs to endorse this resolution and take action to promote a Constitutional amendment to prevent forced assignment of children to specific schools on the basis of race, creed or color.

**IMMEDIATE SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE**

**HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it has been almost a year since the House of Representatives voted a meager 5 percent increase in social security benefits as part of H.R. 1, the Social Security Amendments of 1971.

Over the past year, inflation has continued to exact its harsh toll on our Nation, particularly on our senior citizens who are forced to subsist on fixed incomes while prices spiral upward.

In the Senate, the hopes of elderly Americans for an increase in their social security benefits has become mired in the controversy and partisanship surrounding the welfare reform provisions of H.R. 1. Present indications are that the Senate may not even consider, let alone pass, H.R. 1 for months.

On March 1 of this year I cosponsored legislation to provide a 20 percent boost in social security benefits effective June 1, 1972. This legislation was initiated by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, WILBUR MILLS of Arkansas.

H.R. 13510, my bill, would provide an

increase in the minimum social security benefit from \$70.40 to \$84.50 a month. Average benefits would rise from \$133 to \$162 per month for retired workers and from \$222 to \$269 for aged couples. The maximum for couples would increase from \$324 to \$389 a month. While benefits are still far from adequate, the legislation would provide for a substantial improvement over existing rates.

Mr. Speaker, it is grossly unfair for Congress to require our retired citizens to wait any longer for a social security increase which is long overdue and much needed. We should move with dispatch to pass a 20-percent across-the-board increase in social security benefits in both the House and the Senate.

**MARINE CORPS LEAGUE HAILS PRESIDENT NIXON'S FIRM VIETNAM STAND**

**HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the news release I have received from the National Headquarters of the Marine Corps League.

In view of the pending and contemplated measures in the Congress in direct opposition to attainment of the President's objectives for peace in Vietnam, it is important that views such as these be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress at this time.

**MARINE CORPS LEAGUE HAILS PRESIDENT NIXON'S FIRM VIETNAM STAND**

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 11.—Just as the Marine Corps League voiced its total support to President Nixon two weeks ago for his firm stand on Vietnam, the famed Marine veterans organization has spoken up again in support of the President's gallant decision not to abandon the United States' responsibility and commitment to the future security and stability of the people of South Vietnam.

H. Lynn Cavin of Bowie, Maryland, National Commandant of the Marine Corps League sent a telegram to President Nixon at the White House which stated, "On behalf of the membership of the Marine Corps League, I vigorously applaud your courageous and heart-warming action to blockade North Vietnam and continue bombing enemy supply routes and installations. Your announcement of May 8th has the League's backing 100%."

The Marine Corps League is a Congressionally-chartered national veterans service organization comprised of current and former United States Marines who served, fought, and died in battles from Belleau Wood, Iwo Jima, and Inchon, Korea through the paddies, swamps, hills, and jungles of South Vietnam.

Amplifying his remarks, Cavin added: "We stand together with the President on this vital issue, and we call upon all Americans to stand with the same degree of purpose and determination." In referring to the President, Cavin stated: "Thank God we have at the helm of our Nation today a President as courageous as those who preceded him, one who is determined, despite great personal risk, that the United States will continue to live up to its commitment to its allies, to its commitment to find an end to this war, to

attain a lasting peace with honor for ourselves and with freedom and justice for our ally."

**PRIDE GOETH BEFORE THE FALL**

**HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, nearly 4 years ago this Nation elected as its President a man who pledged to end this tragic, senseless war in Indochina within 6 months. He told us held a "secret" plan for peace.

That must be the best kept secret in history, because we now appear further from peace than we did 4 years ago.

Not only has the President failed to keep that promise he made to the American people, but he has repeatedly made a mockery of it as he has widened the war to Cambodia, to Laos, and now to the harbors and waterways of North Vietnam.

The path to peace does not lie in a bombsight, along the barrel of a rifle or in a mined harbor.

Mr. Nixon, unfortunately, has shown greater concern with the prestige of his office than with the lives of millions of persons in Southeast Asia, including American fighting men held prisoners there or missing in action.

The confusing false pride for honor threatens the peace of the world. Brinkmanship, the ill-conceived policy of perching the world on the threshold of nuclear holocaust, went out with John Foster Dulles.

If Mr. Nixon were truly concerned about the honor of America he would see that his unyielding support for a dictatorial regime in Saigon—a regime which declares martial law, suspends civil liberties and censors its press—has split this Nation internally and alienated it from freedom-loving peoples around the world.

The conflict between honor and morality is the subject of a recent editorial in the Long Island Press, which points out:

Before a government can command respect abroad, it must command respect at home.

My own mail, Mr. Speaker, has been running at least 75 to 1 opposed to the President's policies in Southeast Asia. The people want peace. Not more war.

The editorial adds:

There's no morality in killing when it could have been halted—with honor—long ago. There's no morality in supporting repressive government. There's no morality in failing to hear the voices—no, the cries—of your own people.

I commend this fine piece of journalism to my colleagues and, most of all, to the President of the United States.

The editorial follows:

[From the Long Island (N.Y.) Press, May 14, 1972]

VIETNAM: HONOR VERSUS MORALITY

American mines haven't touched off explosions in Haiphong Harbor yet. But the explosion President Nixon's action has touched off at home is almost as worrisome as the

confrontation he risks with the world's other super-powers.

We hope Mr. Nixon gets away with his dangerous brinkmanship. The consequences if he doesn't are too frightening to contemplate. But even if the Soviet Union and China decide not to challenge the blockade, what has Mr. Nixon accomplished?

Adm. Elmo Zumwalt, chief of naval operations, claims that "the input of supplies . . . will be a trickle from now on. But veteran U.S. military and civilian specialists believe that, after some adjustments, Russia and China will get enough war material and food into North Vietnam by rail to make up for the supplies cut off by our mines.

Since even our most optimistic military leaders admit the blockade won't affect the North Vietnamese offensive for weeks, it appears to be an exercise in futility that will only stiffen Hanoi's bargaining position. It could even put Russia and China on better terms, to our disadvantage.

Meanwhile, at home, a divided and dispirited nation—tired of sending its young men to fight overseas and tired of fighting in its own streets and on its own campuses—cries out for a better solution than Mr. Nixon offers.

For two years, the protests had been relatively muted. After the Cambodian incursion and the Kent State tragedy, Mr. Nixon seemed to be honoring his pledge to "wind down the war." The casualty lists shrank and American men by the tens of thousands returned home.

There wasn't complete satisfaction because the demand of many for immediate and complete withdrawal was denied. But, at least there was hope that the end of our involvement—and, perhaps, the end of all the killing, of Vietnamese as well as Americans—might really be in sight.

That hope has now been dashed and the protestors are back in the streets—with a significant difference.

They are not just long-haired kids waving Viet Cong flags, the kind of protesters President Nixon ignored one Saturday in favor of a football game. They are, young and old, Democrat and Republican, black and white, students and "establishment," all fed up with war and killing. They're the president of Amherst College and his wife, the president of Smith College, the businessman and the factory worker.

They want to know why we can't get out of Vietnam now. So do we.

Mr. Nixon still maintains we have an obligation to the South Vietnamese government of Nguyen Van Thieu. This is the "democratic" government that only last week invoked martial law and explained "all kinds of liberty must be restricted."

Is Mr. Nixon's primary responsibility to a corrupt regime that suspends civil rights, censors its press to silence opposition and keeps its people under a military thumb? Or is it to the America he vowed to reunite.

The President has based many decisions on his commitment to the honor of America. How can we command respect if we don't live up to our commitments? he asks. But we fulfilled long ago our commitment to South Vietnam, if indeed there ever was one.

A nation's good name is important in its dealings with other nations. Dwight Eisenhower once spoke of "a national administration of such integrity that its honor will ensure respect abroad." Perhaps that is Mr. Nixon's guideline, but he shows a strange way of following it. Before a government can command respect abroad, it must command respect at home.

The dictionary defines integrity as "uncompromising adherence to a code of moral values." There's no morality in killing when it could have been halted—with honor—long ago. There's no morality in supporting a repressive government. There's no morality

in failing to hear the voices—no, the cries—of your own people.

There's morality in accepting reality and acting according, even if it hurts your pride.

We all value America's proud heritage. But sometimes the big kid on the block commands more honor, more respect by being humble than by flexing his muscle. This is our remaining option in Vietnam. It's time we exercised it.

INFORMATION FOR THE WORLD ABOUT NARCOTICS

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, 1972, Myles J. Ambrose, head of the Office for Drug Abuse Law Enforcement of the Department of Justice, estimated that the number of heroin addicts in the United States has grown tenfold in the last 10 years and now stands at 560,000—more than one-half million heroin addicts.

The International Narcotics Control Summary for 1971 released by the Department of State in December states that in the last 2 years the quantities and numbers of narcotics and drug seizures by the Bureau of Customs has more than doubled, seizures of hard drugs in fiscal 1971 totaled in excess of 1,200 pounds, more than had been seized in the 7 preceding years.

U.S. customs and narcotics officials are working harder than ever before to remove this scourge from America. The President has made the antidrug campaign the No. 1 priority of his law enforcement agencies. Narcotics control coordinators have been appointed in all U.S. embassies in countries affected, either as producers, or routes of illicit narcotics. U.S. Ambassadors throughout the world are discussing means of more effective narcotics control, cooperating with local officials, and stressing the importance of controlling drug trafficking.

Despite all of these efforts, drug addiction, drug-related crime, and drug-related deaths continue to rise in this country at alarming rates. The drugs picked up in the last few years are just "a drop in the bucket" according to one official source. Why? Because the sources of the illicit drugs, the poppy fields and the coca plots are growing in many parts of the world and are capable of growing in many more. Long grown by the poor farmers of the underdeveloped countries, long in use as a cash crop—sometime the only cash crop—the farmers raising poppies and coca are not aware of the problems caused by their crops in other countries. Neighbors and innocent accomplices of the drug processors and refiners are not informed of the terrible scourge afflicted on the lives of our youth by drug dealers and traffickers.

A few months ago, the Premier of Turkey very courageously promised to end the production of opium poppies after the 1972 harvest. For this action he is being very seriously criticized, and the future of his government is threatened.

In such an instance, while the United States is a major beneficiary of the Turkish Government's action, it is our duty to help his people, and in other instances, all people to understand the need for this ban of opium production.

For this reason, I have introduced an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1972 which would require the President of the United States to instruct the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and the U.S. Information Service to broadcast and exhibit information about the dread plague of heroin addiction which is causing our country so many social problems. USIA has offices and cultural centers all over the world and all of these should be used to urge support for United States and international efforts to control drug traffic. Radio Free Europe broadcasts daily to every continent and millions of people, of all walks of life, listen daily to the broadcasts. A more broader source of advertising our problem to the people involved cannot be found. And both are agencies of our Government.

Radio Free Europe, although an independent radio station, is also dependent on the United States for funding. Since much of the trafficking in drugs currently runs through Eastern Europe, this audience also cannot be overlooked.

The President is committed to solving the drug problem. We in the Congress are committed to solving the drug problem. Together we passed the Comprehensive Drug Abuse, Prevention and Control Act of 1970 and more recently established a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention in the Executive Office of the White House. Here is one more major step we can take to increase cooperation between Americans and the peoples of the world to end the scourge of drug addiction which threatens the very fiber of our society.

GEORGE T. WILSON—TOP VETERAN

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, last month the national headquarters of the Disabled American Veterans cited Sgt. Maj. George Travis Wilson as the Outstanding Veterans Service Officer in the Nation. In that same month, after winning so many battles for our veterans, George Wilson lost a battle of his own against cancer.

His loss is a deep and personal one, not only to countless veterans who relied upon and trusted his dedicated and fair judgment but also to myself and to many members of my staff who had worked with him over the years.

George Wilson knew the problems of a veteran as only another veteran can—he served in the U.S. Army during World War II and the Korean war, and received numerous service medals, the Purple Heart twice, the Army Commendation Medal twice, and the Korean Presidential Unit Citation.

He continued his career in Austin, Tex., with the Texas Military District and Reserve officers training unit. He served an 18-month remote tour in Alaska and then returned to Austin as chief administrative adviser with the rank of sergeant major until he retired April 30, 1962.

But George Wilson's dedication to the men of the U.S. Army was far from ended, and he was appointed assistant veterans county service officer of Travis County, Tex., in April 1963. In August 1970, he became the veterans county service officer for Travis County, a position he held until his illness forced him to retire.

It will be a long time before we or the veterans of Travis County recover from the shock and sorrow of his loss. But his dedication and his life will always remain a high example to all of us who knew him and to all who follow in his footsteps.

#### CRIME, UNEMPLOYMENT, VIETNAM ARE MAJOR PROBLEMS, POLL SHOWS

### HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I asked residents of the First Congressional District of Rhode Island for their views on the important issues facing Congress in 1972.

The opinions expressed by my constituents will be extremely helpful when these issues come before the House of Representatives. I am pleased that so many 18- to 29-year olds and senior citizens participated in the survey.

The results of the poll are now complete, and I am sure my friends in Rhode Island, as well as my colleagues in the House, will find these views significant.

The poll showed that Rhode Islanders feel crime, unemployment and the war in Vietnam are the most important problems facing the country. They ranked eight major issues in order of importance as follows:

- First, crime.
- Second, economy-unemployment.
- Third, Vietnam.
- Fourth, drug abuse-addiction.
- Fifth, pollution-ecology.
- Sixth, Education.
- Seventh, Race relations.
- Eighth, consumer protection.

It should be pointed out however that most of the questionnaires were returned prior to the recent increase in bombing of Vietnam as well as the President's new policy announced Monday, May 8.

Here are the results of the poll:

	Percent	
	Adults	Youth
1. Under the President's New Economic Policy, do you think prices are:		
(a) Still rising at an unacceptable level?	92.2	84.2
(b) At about the right level?	7.8	15.8

	Percent	
	Adults	Youth
2. Should Congress place private pension plans under Federal regulation to guarantee that retirees get the full benefits that have earned?		
Yes	82.8	94.9
No	17.2	5.1
3. Do you favor a program of national health insurance which would:		
(a) Provide coverage for all health care?	67.1	68.4
(b) Cover only major illnesses or long term hospital treatment?	32.9	31.6
4. Do you favor construction of additional units of senior citizens' housing?		
Yes	75.3	74.2
No	24.7	25.8
5. Are you satisfied with President Nixon's efforts to end American involvement in Vietnam?		
Yes	47.3	42.8
No	52.7	57.2
6. After our POW's have been released, should the President grant a amnesty to approximately 70,000 draft evaders, provided they complete 2 or 3 years of military or civilian Federal service?		
Yes	49.0	63.3
No	51.0	36.7
7. Do you favor the use of Federal funds for busing of school children to meet requirements of the U.S. Supreme Court?		
Yes	21.9	35.5
No	78.1	64.5
8. Courts in several States have recently ruled that local property taxes are an unfair system of financing public education. To correct this problem should:		
(a) Congress increase Federal funds for schools?	55.9	58.6
(b) States pay for public education with a new system of financing?	44.1	41.4
9. To stop the spread of drug abuse problems, do you think the major portion of Federal funds should be directed toward:		
(a) Rehabilitation of the users?	14.0	28.2
(b) Apprehension of the pusher and tougher penalties for selling dangerous drugs?	86.0	71.8
10. Would you favor a Federal law banning the sale of all non sporting Saturday-night special handguns?		
Yes	82.3	82.0
No	17.7	18.0
11. Would you be willing to pay higher taxes to end air and water pollution?		
Yes	54.1	69.7
No	45.9	30.3
12. Do you think present consumer protection laws are adequate for:		
(a) Food—No	82.2	56.1
(b) Credit—No	53.6	44.3
(c) Guarantees—No	68.0	50.2
(d) Prescription drugs—No	71.0	47.0

#### FIRE SERVICE RECOGNITION DAY

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 13, the city of Philadelphia, which I represent, observed Fire Service Recognition Day.

The celebration honored the city's fire department, which is generally regarded as the finest firefighting organization in the country.

At this time I enter into the RECORD a statement from the city about the achievements of the Philadelphia Fire Department:

#### FIRE SERVICE RECOGNITION DAY

The Philadelphia Fire Department will observe Fire Service Recognition Day on Saturday, May 13, with an open house at all its fire stations from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Fire Service Recognition Day is a national

observance being held in every city throughout the country on Saturday to focus attention on the role Fire Departments play in protecting the public's safety.

Fire Commissioner Joseph R. Rizzo extended a special invitation to all Philadelphians to visit their local fire stations, meet their firemen, examine the modern fire-fighting equipment of the Department and learn about the essential services the men provide.

Mayor Frank L. Rizzo has issued a proclamation designating Saturday as Fire Service Recognition Day in Philadelphia. Managing Director Hillel S. Levinson will present the proclamation to Fire Commissioner Rizzo during a 10 a.m. ceremony in the Mayor's Reception Room, 202 City Hill, on Thursday, May 11.

Philadelphia's Fire Department is recognized as the nation's number one fire-fighting organization. Since 1953, it has won the Grand Award of the National Fire Protection Association for the country's leading Fire Department four times and first place trophies in its major city category numerous times for its protection efforts and its outstanding record preventing building fires.

The Department has also won the coveted George Washington Medal from the Freedoms Foundation eight times for its fire safety program; the most medals any organization has ever won in this competition.

#### IMPACT OF IMPORTS ON APPAREL INDUSTRY

### HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York State congressional delegation met this afternoon with concerned workers and labor leaders in the apparel industry, who emphasized the impact of imports on the apparel industry in New York City and New York State. They urged regulation not only of the flow of imports, but also of multinational companies.

I include in the RECORD the remarks of Jacob S. Petofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, who asked:

Now please you tell me how an American worker, who has fought to bring his hourly earnings up to \$2.75 or \$3.25 an hour, can be expected to compete with Taiwan (10c an hour labor) or Hong Kong (45c an hour labor).

In addition I include a series of statistical tables which were presented very ably by Lazare Teper, director of research, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, and which demonstrates rather dramatically the increases in apparel imports which have taken place in the last 10 years.

The articles follow:

#### REMARKS OF JACOB S. POTOFSKY

We are grateful to Chairman Celler and to Representative Horton for their leadership in arranging for this opportunity for us to talk to you about the impact of imports on the apparel industry in New York City and State. It is a serious problem.

Let me first give you some figures. The apparel industry is important to New York State. Even today, after a considerable decline, we provide employment opportunities to more than 200,000 workers. Most of these jobs do not require training. Many are being filled by the disadvantaged, the poorly educated, members of minority groups.

In short, the welfare of our industry is vital to the economy of New York and to the employment situation in New York.

This is why the rising tide of imports is especially important to all of us in New York. Again, let me give you a figure; apparel imports rose by 275% in seven years, between 1964 and 1971.

During those same seven years, employment in the apparel industry declined from 290,000 to 230,000. The decline has gone on into 1972. Many plants shut down and left workers out in the cold.

Now I want to make it clear that neither the Amalgamated nor any other responsible union is against international trade. We know that as our consumption increases, imports will grow.

But it doesn't make sense to me, or to our members, that imports have to rise so sharply that they cause unemployment, job opportunities destroyed, and tremendous pressures on our working conditions.

Because not only are we losing jobs, but we feel the pressure of competition from imported suits and shirts made by 10c an hour labor in Taiwan, or 45c an hour in Hong Kong.

Now please you tell me how an American worker, who has fought to bring his hourly earnings up to \$2.75 or \$3.25 an hour, can be expected to compete with Taiwan or Hong Kong.

The plain fact is that workers can't compete with these wages and we don't intend to compete.

Let me repeat that we do not wish to cut off trade. We go further—we don't expect to roll back. We believe that legislation is necessary to regulate trade so that we can accommodate and adjust to the impact of imports—to moderate the flow to avoid disruption and unemployment.

The bi-lateral agreements signed with four Far Eastern countries by the Administration are a welcome start in this process. But they are incomplete, they are temporary, and they need the support of stronger authorizing legislation. In addition, legislation would also regulate the activities of multi-national companies, which are beginning to appear in our industry, and to reduce the export of jobs and capital.

This is why we asked for this meeting. Gentlemen, our members need your help. New York State needs your help.

We hope you will look upon our problem sympathetically.

**Apparel imports—Increase from 1961 to 1971**  
(In square yards of fabric used in their manufacture)

	Percent
All apparel	+564
Cotton apparel (subject to international agreements since 1961)	+92
Man-made fiber apparel	+5,310
Wool apparel	+126
<b>Total apparel imports as percent of domestic consumption</b>	
	Percent
1956	4
1961	6
1970	20
1971	25

EXTENT OF IMPORT PENETRATION

[As percent of domestic production]

	In 1961	In 1971
Women's and children's coats and jackets	1	40
Rainwear	6	26
Women's and children's blouses	9	51
Sweaters	5	87
Women's and children's trousers and shorts	23	52
Brassieres	15	29
Pajamas and nightwear	3	15
Women's and children's dresses	1	9

IMPORTS OF SELECTED WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S GARMENTS

	1961	1971	Percent of increase
Coats	558,000	15,672,000	+2,709
Suits	75,000	879,000	+1,072
Dresses	3,323,000	30,289,000	+711
Blouses	29,426,000	129,270,000	+339
Skirts	504,000	9,286,000	+1,742
Sweaters (for both sexes)	7,201,000	116,710,000	+1,521
Slacks and shorts	31,146,000	136,488,000	+338
Playsuits	10,988,000	20,215,000	+84
Raincoats (for both sexes)	1,337,000	4,906,000	+267
Dressing gowns and robes	476,000	3,211,000	+575
Nightwear and pajamas	4,492,000	18,245,000	+305
Underwear	1,650,000	22,941,000	+1,290
Brassieres	31,523,000	59,938,000	+90

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and ILGWU Research Department.

IMPORTS AS PERCENT OF DOMESTIC PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION—APPAREL (KNIT AND WOVEN), UNITED STATES

Year	Percent of	
	Production	Consumption
1956	3.9	3.8
1957	4.3	4.1
1958	5.5	5.3
1959	8.2	7.7
1960	8.6	8.0
1961	6.8	6.4
1962	10.2	9.3
1963	10.6	9.6
1964	11.8	10.6
1965	13.4	11.9
1966	14.2	12.5
1967	15.6	13.6
1968	17.7	15.1
1969	21.6	17.9
1970	25.2	20.3

<sup>1</sup> Preliminary estimate.

Source: ILGWU Research Department.

Net loss of potential jobs attributable to imports, apparel (knit and woven) industry, United States, 1956-70

Period:	(Job Loss (-) or Job Gain (+))
1956 to 1957	-2,900
1957 to 1958	-12,700
1958 to 1959	-35,300
1959 to 1960	-3,700
1960 to 1961	+22,000
1961 to 1962	-46,600
1962 to 1963	-5,600
1963 to 1964	-17,100
1964 to 1965	-26,000
1965 to 1966	-15,600
1966 to 1967	-17,900
1967 to 1968	-30,600
1968 to 1969	-52,500
1969 to 1970	-43,500
1956 to 1970	-288,000

Source: ILGWU Research Department.

EMPLOYMENT, PRODUCTION WORKERS—APPAREL MADE OF KNIT AND WOVEN MATERIALS, UNITED STATES, NEW YORK STATE, AND NEW YORK CITY

Year	United States	New York State	New York City
1960	1,293,500	292,900	238,800
1961	1,273,400	281,700	228,900
1962	1,321,500	282,400	229,000
1963	1,330,000	276,200	223,600
1964	1,351,400	271,000	219,300
1965	1,411,400	274,100	221,300
1966	1,456,000	273,000	219,900
1967	1,443,000	266,100	214,300
1968	1,460,100	264,600	212,500
1969	1,459,700	255,800	204,800
1970	1,419,500	233,500	186,300
1971	1,406,600	219,500	173,200

Note: Employment figures include Standard Industrial Classifications 23 and 225.

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and New York State Department of Labor (the latter information adjusted to reflect employment of production workers on the basis of benchmark information derived from the U.S. Censuses of Manufactures for 1958, 1963, and 1968).

Loss in employment of production workers apparel made of knit and woven materials, 1966 to 1971

Number of jobs:	
United States	-49,400
New York State	-53,500
New York City	-46,700
Percent of decline:	
United States	-3.4
New York State	-19.6
New York City	-21.2

PRODUCTION OF KEY ITEMS OF WOMEN'S AND MISSES' GARMENTS, 1966-71

	1966	1971	Percent change
Coats	27,700,000	25,200,000	-9
Suits	10,700,000	7,400,000	-31
Dresses	314,900,000	295,800,000	-6
Blouses	225,800,000	163,800,000	-27
Skirts	131,100,000	81,400,000	-34
Sweaters (men's and women's)	144,500,000	116,000,000	-20
Slips and petticoats	150,800,000	111,800,000	-26

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and ILGWU Research Department.

Unemployment rate among experienced apparel wage and salary workers, apparel and other finished textile products industry, United States

Year	Percent
1966	6.0
1967	6.5
1968	5.9
1969	5.9
1970	8.2
1971	9.7

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

INSURED UNEMPLOYMENT AS PERCENT OF WORK FORCE—APPAREL INDUSTRY, NEW YORK STATE AND NEW YORK CITY

Year	New York State	New York City
1966	9.7	9.9
1967	9.2	9.2
1968	7.5	7.5
1969	8.1	8.1
1970	11.3	11.2
1971	12.6	12.2

Source: New York State Department of Labor.

HEALTH HELP FOR TEENAGERS

**HON. DONALD M. FRASER**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon debate the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for fiscal 1973. I consider health care one of the top priorities in Congress.

I am deeply disappointed that the administration's budget for health programs fails to recognize the needs of our people in meeting the health crisis we are facing.

The administration proposes that vital programs be eliminated or cut drastically. Many programs that have strong congressional support are not being financed. The administration has made no effort to further innovative measures to alleviate our national health crisis.

In Minneapolis, we have a successful innovative program—the Teen Age Medical Center—which could not operate without Federal assistance. The center provides confidential, free medical services for teenagers who need help. Without the center, a vast number of teenagers would have no other recourse for the diagnoses and treatment provided.

The young people who use this center come from all walks of life and from all over the Twin Cities area. They are referred to the center by word of mouth through friends. They range in age from under 14 to 20. Almost 80 percent are aged 16 through 19.

I am submitting a 5-month report of the Teen Age Medical Center, which shows the wide range of services and illustrates that many of these youngsters come in to get medical information and education.

One clinic is mainly for pregnancy diagnosis and treats some gynecological problems. The venereal clinic is staffed by registered nurses and a male technician who take smears, cultures and give

a good VD education. The purpose of the VD clinic is to enable the physicians at the general clinic to give more definitive care.

It costs in excess of \$150,000 to run the center. This figure, however, is not all related to "direct" patient care. Included in this amount are a full time nurse/health educator, a youth coordinator and the youth employed by her and educational materials.

The report follows:

TEENAGE MEDICAL CENTER

(Clinic treated 2,890 patients for 4,876 patient visits during the 5-month period October-February)

	Number of patients	Percent of total
<b>Sex distribution:</b>		
Male.....	522	18.1
Female.....	2,368	81.9
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>2,890</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Age distribution:</b>		
14 or less.....	128	4.4
15.....	183	6.3
16.....	406	14.0
17.....	564	19.5
18 or 19.....	1,330	46.0
20 or more.....	279	9.7
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>2,890</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Patients had the same zipcode as their parents.....	1,741	60.0
<b>Marital status:</b>		
Single.....	2,811	97.3
Married.....	38	1.3
Separated.....	7	.2
Widow/divorced.....	2	.1
Not stated.....	32	1.1
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>2,890</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Occupation:</b>		
Student.....	1,866	64.6
Employed.....	574	19.9
Neither.....	185	6.4
Not stated.....	265	9.2
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>2,890</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Referral source:</b>		
Friend.....	1,466	50.7
Mass media.....	123	4.3
School.....	244	8.4
Y.E.S.....	396	13.7
Other health soc.....	220	7.6
Family.....	98	3.4
Self.....	63	2.2
Other.....	83	2.9
Not stated.....	197	6.8
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>2,890</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Race distribution:</b>		
White.....	2,335	80.8
Black.....	119	4.1
Indian.....	26	.9

	Number of patients	Percent of total
Other.....	13	0.4
Not stated.....	397	13.7
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>2,890</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Presenting complaint:</b>		
Physical examination.....	184	3.8
Counseling.....	23	.5
Possible VD.....	750	15.2
Drug problems.....	10	.2
Anemia.....	5	.1
Headache, weight loss, etc.....	82	1.7
VD recheck.....	147	3.1
Dermatological problems.....	128	2.7
Body aches.....	56	1.2
Cuts, abrasions.....	18	.4
Cold symptoms.....	222	4.6
Asthma.....	12	.2
Heart symptoms.....	10	.2
Abdominal pain.....	78	1.6
Hepatitis.....	31	.6
Pregnancy.....	607	6.2
Urinary infection.....	85	1.8
Genital infection.....	299	6.2
Menstrual problems.....	182	10.2
Abortion check.....	59	1.2
Birth control.....	1,582	32.9
IUD trouble.....	18	.4
BC recheck.....	126	2.6
BC pill trouble.....	42	.9
Obesity.....	9	.2
Ear problems.....	13	.3
Eye problems.....	14	.3
Pap smear only.....	12	.2
Laboratory work only.....	19	.4
Other.....	9	.2
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>4,813</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Diagnosis (only diagnosis listed with frequency of 0.5 percent or higher):</b>		
Venereal warts.....	122	3.0
Gonorrhea.....	157	3.8
Tonsillitis.....	106	2.6
Urinary tract infection.....	129	3.2
Trichomonas.....	114	2.8
Vaginitis.....	305	7.5
Pregnancy.....	394	9.6
Gynecological.....	182	4.3
Normal.....	1,857	45.4
Other viral infections.....	39	1.0
Pediculosis pubis.....	24	.6
Cellulitis.....	22	.5
Other dermatological.....	34	.8
Lower respiratory infection.....	22	.5
Upper respiratory infection.....	28	.7
Strep Throat.....	21	.5
Neurosis/behavior problem.....	39	1.0
Other.....	499	12.2
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>4,094</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Type of treatment given:</b>		
M.D. counseling.....	3,648	34.3
Nurse counseling.....	4,161	39.1
Social worker counseling.....	265	7.5
Injection.....	259	2.4
Prescription.....	1,533	14.4
Podophylin.....	89	.8
IUD insertion.....	67	.6
Sutures.....	2	.0
Birth control pills.....	616	5.8
IUD removal.....	3	.0
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>10,643</b>	<b>100.0</b>

DIAGNOSIS (SELECTED) VERSUS AGE

	14 or less	15	16	17	18 or 19	20 or more	Total		14 or less	15	16	17	18 or 19	20 or more	Total
Normal.....	81	118	245	369	777	131	1,721	Dermatological.....	2	1	3	5	14	3	28
Vaginitis.....	5	13	25	37	136	41	257	Trichomonas.....	3	9	17	15	43	5	92
Pregnancy.....	7	16	65	75	166	38	367	Viral infection.....	2	2	2	4	23	2	35
Gynecological.....	4	7	22	36	74	13	156	Neurosis, psych.....	4	1	3	11	8	2	29
Urinary tract infection.....	1	2	13	11	76	16	119	Upper respiratory infection.....	3	1	0	4	15	4	27
Gonorrhea.....	6	11	12	9	86	21	145	All other.....	30	21	63	73	223	482	
Venereal warts.....	2	3	4	10	46	33	98	<b>Total.....</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>670</b>	<b>1,738</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>3,648</b>
Tonsillitis.....	6	6	7	11	51	11	92								

PROJECT SANGUINE

**HON. LES ASPIN**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I have called upon President Nixon to endorse his own

White House Council on Environmental Quality's suggestion that public hearings be held in Wisconsin on Project Sanguine.

I have written the President requesting the opportunity for a free open discussion of the potential environmental effects of Project Sanguine if it is built in Wisconsin.

I am sure the President agrees with me that the people of Wisconsin have a right to know the possible environmental costs of Project Sanguine.

Earlier the Navy rejected a request by Senator GAYLORD NELSON to hold public hearings on the latest environmental impact statement. But in correspondence with me, Russell Train, the White House

chief environmentalist, has endorsed the idea. He told me in a letter April 14 that he "supported—fully" hearings on the latest environmental report. Mr. Train, however, also points out that the Department of Defense has the final authority to make such a decision.

I hope the President will support his own Council on Environmental Quality and direct Secretary Laird to hold public hearings on Project Sanguine in Wisconsin.

There are too many unanswered questions about the environmental impact and technical feasibility of Project Sanguine and I believe only a series of public hearings can clear the air.

Review of the Department of Defense own regulations—DOD directive 6050.1—reveal that hearings could easily be authorized. According to that directive any military action that would have a direct environmental impact on local population can be the subject of hearings. In addition, if members of the public have particular knowledge and expertise about the environmental impact of a project, they can be consulted in the form of public hearings. As many of my colleagues may know, many prominent scientists and environmentalists in Wisconsin have been speaking out against Project Sanguine. It would be helpful and useful to the Navy and these individuals to have an opportunity to exchange their views.

By not permitting public hearings on Project Sanguine, the Navy is actually admitting that its own hard sell public relations campaign in Wisconsin has been a total flop. Apparently the Navy is afraid to present its case to the public. Clearly the public has a right to know what Sanguine involves. It is equally clear that the Navy has an obligation to present its case to the public and exchange views with knowledgeable individuals.

I still maintain that all funding for Project Sanguine should be cut off until all the environmental and technical objections raised by Sanguine's critics have been adequately answered by the Navy. This certainly has not happened yet.

My letter to President Nixon follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., May 12, 1972.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to you in order to request public hearings on the latest environmental impact statement on Project Sanguine.

Your own Council on Environmental Quality has endorsed the idea of holding hearings. In a letter which I received April 14, Mr. Russell Train, Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, tells me that "during the two meetings (with Navy officials) the question of public hearings on the project came up. We supported this suggestion fully." Mr. Train goes on to say that he realized that a decision on public hearings rests with the Department of the Defense.

Senator Gaylord Nelson has formally requested public hearings in a recent letter to the Navy. Assistant Secretary Frosch has told Senator Nelson that hearings will not be held.

I believe Mr. Frosch's decision should be reversed and public hearings conducted. I hope you will support your own Council on Environmental Quality and direct Secretary of Defense Laird to hold public hearings on Project Sanguine in Wisconsin.

All that the Council and I are requesting

CXVIII—1110—Part 14

is an opportunity for a free, open discussion of the potential environmental effects of Project Sanguine.

There are so many unanswered questions about the environmental impact and technical feasibility of Project Sanguine that only a series of public hearings in Wisconsin can clear the air.

A Department of Defense regulation (DOD Directive 6050.1) requires public hearings on environmental impact statements when a project entails direct environmental impact on a local population and when members of the public possess special expertise and knowledge about a particular project.

Obviously Project Sanguine will affect thousands of people in Northern Wisconsin and many Wisconsin academicians and environmentalists who have carefully studied Sanguine object to the project. I believe these individuals have valuable information that should be brought to the attention of the Navy.

Clearly the Defense Department's own regulations indicate the public hearings in Wisconsin should be held.

I am sure that you agree that the people of Wisconsin have a right to know the possible environmental costs of Project Sanguine.

Therefore I hope that you will direct Secretary Laird to authorize the Navy to conduct at least three days of public hearings on Project Sanguine focusing particular attention on the most recent environmental impact statement.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,  
Member of Congress.

FRANCO DI DOMENICA, AN  
HONORED ALLY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, oftentimes Americans forget that the Second World War was fought with the aid of many nationals of the enemy nations who were instrumental in assuring the success of the allied cause.

One such civilian veteran of World War II is Franco di Domenico, an Italian who was commended for his meritorious civilian service by the War Department. I would like to read the inscription from his official commendation for outstanding performance of duty:

Francesco di Domenico, Italian civilian, for meritorious performance of service to the Army of the United States in Italy from 1 December 1943 to 25 March 1947. As Interpreter and General Clerk, Headquarters Command, Mediterranean Theater of Operations, Mr. Di Domenico performed duties in a highly efficient manner. He was responsible for the filing of all documents including the Company File System, Army Regulations, and War Department directives, as well as operating the mimeograph machine and making stencils. His whole hearted cooperation, intense loyalty, and sincere devotion to duty contributed materially to the smooth and efficient functioning of his unit and reflect great credit upon himself and the persons by whom he was employed.

With the help of men like Franco di Domenico, the United States was successful against its enemies. Perhaps what is needed in these troubled times are more men like him on our side to help bring victory to the doorstep of this Nation once again.

IN OPPOSITION TO RAISING THE  
MINIMUM WAGE TO \$2

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion, frequently becoming quite emotional, about increasing the minimum wage. Today I wish to discuss the implications of such an act in as rational a way as I can.

A national minimum wage rate was first established in the United States with the passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938. The stated purpose of the act was—and still is—to eliminate as rapidly as possible labor conditions thought to be harmful to the "health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers without substantially curtailing employment or earning power." In other words, the act intended to eliminate low wages without eliminating jobs.

Theoretically, increasing the minimum wage will help in eliminating existing low wages. But, in fact, a higher wage is not all happiness. Someone must pay for it. That someone is all too often the workers for whom the law was enacted.

Those who receive wage protection by the Federal Government are the marginal, least productive workers. They are usually the young, the inexperienced person, the unskilled, the functionally illiterate, the disadvantaged. Often they work in highly competitive, low-profit industries with high rates of turnover and instability. Employers in these lines can pay only what the worker is worth, not what may be socially desirable, and the worker typically is worth little because of his inadequate equipment and because the price structure for the goods and services of these industries typically is low.

Where the minimum wage is raised the employers of marginal workers have few options immediately open to them. They may either go out of business, lay off least productive workers or cut back on their hours of work, or substitute capital equipment for human labor. All of these alternatives cause unemployment. The highly competitive nature of most affected businesses prevents the employer from absorbing the increased payroll out of his profits or raising his prices.

Numerous before-and-after studies provide evidence that raising the minimum wage reduces employment. In the short run probably the most thorough attempt to evaluate the impact of minimum wage legislation was conducted by the New York State Department of Labor. This survey of the impact of an increased minimum wage in the retail trades found that employers affected by the increased wage rates took a variety of actions to adjust to higher costs. Weekly payroll savings were achieved by reduced hours, layoffs, and quits not replaced. Five percent of the stores affected by the wage increase reduced hiring extras. Altogether 1,000 employees lost their jobs as a result of the pay boost and another 500 who quit were not replaced.

Furthermore there is some evidence

that those who live in small towns, rural areas, and less-developed States are seriously affected by a higher minimum wage. For example, the effect of the Federal minimum wage in employment in small towns and less-developed areas was measured by Prof. Marshall Colberg in a detailed study of employment experience in Florida. He found that productive worker man-hours in low-wage Florida counties declined by 15.2 percent from the January—1956—before the adoption of a minimum wage to the April after the establishment of the minimum wage.

In the high-wage counties employment declined by 7.9 percent. Since manufacturing employment normally declined by 6 percent from January to April in Florida, the net employment decline which may be attributed to the minimum wage in low-wage counties was 9 percent. About 2 percent of the employment decline from January to April 1956 in high-wage counties, was attributed to the minimum wage. These data indicate that one can expect unemployment to increase in rural areas when the minimum wage is enacted. This, I believe, speaks directly to our situation in the counties of north-west Texas.

Even in developed areas the less skilled are hindered in their job search by a rise in the minimum wage. Teenagers have been particularly handicapped. Douglas K. Adie and Gene L. Chapin of Ohio University, using computerized techniques to measure unemployment effects, found:

Increases in the Federal minimum wage cause unemployment among teenagers; the effects tend to persist for considerable periods of time and seem to be strengthening as coverage is increased and as enforcement becomes more rigorous.

Finis Welch of the National Bureau of Economic Research and Marvin Kosters, now a senior staff economist with the Council of Economic Advisors, in a 1970 Rand Corp. study concluded:

Minimum wage legislation has apparently played an important role in increasing the cyclical sensitivity of teenage employment.

They found that as the minimum rises, "teenagers are able to obtain fewer jobs, and their jobs are less secure over the business cycle."

Other analyses have concentrated on the impact of the minimum wage on specific areas of the economy. Prof. A. F. Hinrichs found that employees in 11 low-wage plants in the seamless hosiery industry suffered a 12-percent decline in employment after the establishment of a minimum wage. William J. Shkuoti and Belton M. Fleisher found retail employment declined between 1960 and 1966 as a result of a significant portion of retailing being covered by the Federal minimum for the first time in 1961.

Mr. Speaker, more statistics and data could be cited in opposition to raising the minimum wage. Quite frankly, however, everything really boils down to one point—raising the minimum wage simply does not automatically guarantee higher wages. If we legislate in violation of the basic laws of economics, we only invite disaster. If by raising the minimum wage we merely succeed in driving up prices we have really accomplished

nothing at all. The way to raise living standards of our workers is to promote job training and education so that persons who have ambition to seek a better life for themselves and their families shall have the opportunity to acquire the skills necessary to achieve that goal.

Mr. Speaker, if the Congress enacts legislation to raise the minimum wage to \$2 per hour, we shall have only ourselves to blame for our actions which shall fan the flames of inflation and shall promote further unemployment among our people. Because of these compelling reasons, I have voted in opposition to this new minimum wage bill.

#### REPRESENTATIVE MOORHEAD SAYS WHITE HOUSE ORCHESTRATES PRESS CENSORSHIP

### HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 11, I had the pleasure of addressing the luncheon meeting of the Federal Editors Association.

I discussed with the group the progress of the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee's investigation into administration of the Freedom of Information Act and other techniques our Government employs to discourage proper dissemination of Government information.

At this time, I would like to introduce my remarks into the RECORD for the interest of my colleagues:

#### REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

It is a pleasure to have this opportunity to be with the members of the Federal Editors Association today and to discuss with you and seek your guidance on issues related to our current hearings on the Freedom of Information Act.

Today, we are witnessing a massive assault by government on our free press. It takes many subtle forms and broad dimensions. It goes far beyond sophisticated news management, calculated deception, or public relations flackery. It involves governmental censorship, intimidation, the use of naked legal power to stop the newspaper presses, grand jury harrassment, legal action against legislators and publishers, and other, less direct methods of attack.

The Vice President's meat-ax campaign against the public media was the opening barrage. Well-known radio-TV network commentators and publications such as the *Washington Post* and *New York Times* bore the brunt of the 1969-1970 Administration offensive. While this attack was going on, the President was carefully staying aloof and proclaiming his Administration's policy of "open government" to the tune of well-orchestrated televised press conferences under the direction of Maestro Herb Klein and his White House Symphony Orchestra.

Concert Master Ziegler and his East Room String Quartet provides the musical cover for the Kissinger movements to far-off corners of the globe on secret diplomatic missions. Occasional percussion is provided by the Pentagon Brass Band, which also fills in at Andrews Air Force Base if it receives adequate notice of arrivals or departures of the Presidential jet.

But 1972 is an election year and new instruments are joining the orchestra. L. Patrick Gray III, interim FBI Director, played a solo last week before an enthusiastic Orange County, California, audience. He said that American journalists "are becoming too much a part of the culture of disparagement which threatens to destroy all respect for established institutions." It's obvious Mr. Gray is convinced that dissent and debate are un-American.

Another new instrument was heard at last month's convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, held in the Shoreham Hotel Concert Hall. Deputy Assistant Attorney General Kevin Maroney bluntly warned newsmen of the threat of criminal prosecution if they dared publish "government secrets."

Meanwhile, a new version of the old favorite tune, "The Government Has a Right to Lie" was being rendered by the White House Press Office to cover another Kissinger secret trip—this time to Moscow, although billed as a trip to Camp David.

Just a few days ago, Patrick J. Buchanan, that famous Presidential speech writer, turned vocalist, performed on WETA-TV. His first solo was entitled "Atrocious and Appalling," referring to the Pulitzer Prize awards to the *New York Times* for their publication of the so-called Pentagon Papers and to columnist Jack Anderson.

He followed with a dramatic rendition of the "Anti-trust Blues," which described how network television was getting "too far from the views of Middle America" I know and warned that if it didn't mend its ways, "there would be pressure from citizens and possibly antitrust legislation."

Mr. Buchanan's final number was a network encore. He solemnly declared that if the networks "don't soon make a conscientious effort to move conservatives and people with a viewpoint of Middle America onto the network then you're going to find . . . an increasing disposition to do something about it."

But the anti-trust suit against the three TV networks involving the production of programs for "prime time," is already a reality and it being orchestrated by interim Attorney General Kleindienst between his trips to Capitol Hill to testify on the ITT anti-trust settlement.

Undoubtedly, new scores are now being written in the Nixon campaign's "tin pan alley." Conductor Murray Chotiner, long off the concert circuit, probably has a few hits left. Certainly we can expect many more old favorites, always performed in such flamboyant style by one of the stars of the show—Spiro Agnew.

The finale of the campaign review will be Richard Nixon—Superstar, who will sing a new chorus of those old 1968 hits "Bring America Together Again" and "My Secret Plan to End the War."

Now that I (hopefully) have attracted your attention by these introductory remarks, let me make it perfectly clear that I do not think our present situation is a laughing matter. It is a political situation but not a partisan political situation. Administrations of both parties have been guilty. However, today we are dealing with today's Administration.

What are some of the elements related to our present information crisis? Let me give a few examples:

*Item:* The information role of government, when not abused for propaganda purposes or for dishing out self-serving pap, is a proper, legitimate, even essential, part of broadening understanding and participation of the individual citizen in his government and the programs that benefit him and his family. Unfortunately, PR "image making" of the type described in "The Selling of the President," is too often the order of the day.

*Item:* Hearings during the past two months by our subcommittee on the administration of the Freedom of Information Act clearly reveal that public information offices (with only a few exceptions) have absolutely no input into policy decisions on whether or not to provide information to citizens who request it. Such decisions are usually made by the general counsels or other political appointees who obviously have an ax to grind to maintain secrecy in cases that might cause political embarrassment to the Administration in power. Many high-level Federal government officials are totally ignorant about the Act and its objective to advance the public's "right to know."

*Item:* Senator Sam J. Ervin, distinguished Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, which has held extensive and timely hearings on the freedom of the press recently made this observation:

"Last fall the Subcommittee heard a number of distinguished Americans express their doubts as to whether government any longer shares the faith of our Founding Fathers in the value of an unbridled, robust press free from government control and intimidation. They brought to our attention far too many instances in which government has appeared anxious to silence its critics by official sanction or the threat of official sanction. . . . The press cannot perform its function as a watchdog for the public if government views it as an enemy of the public and acts accordingly."

*Item:* Robert O. Beatty, Assistant Secretary of Public Affairs for HEW, who testified before our subcommittee recently, put his finger on another important part of the information crisis. He called attention to Section 3107 of Title 5 of the U.S. Code, which states:

"Appropriated funds may not be used to pay a publicity expert unless specifically appropriated for that purpose."

He pointed out that this archaic 1913 law, still on the books today, "has done inestimable psychological harm to professionalism in public affairs in government, and has not prevented the abuses it was supposed to prevent." Mr. Beatty went on to say that it has, at times, "driven legitimate public affairs people underground," and that "all too often competent communications professionals will not join government because the public affairs function is nothing more than an uninspired press release mill."

I congratulate Mr. Beatty for his courage in speaking up on this vital issue. I have already pledged my efforts to help eliminate this ridiculous statutory provision.

*Item:* Newhouse columnist Don Bacon recently wrote an in-depth interpretation of the White House cover-up of Dr. Kissinger's secret flight to Moscow. Quoting Mr. Bacon: "Admitted or not, the 'right to lie' attitude permeates the Administration, as it does other private and public institutions. The recent Senate Judiciary Committee investigation of ties between the Nixon government and the ITT Corporation has made liars of some of the very top people in government and business."

"Small deceptions—such as the Kissinger affair—seem unimportant in the broad context of running a government. But the opinion here is that all deception erodes public confidence and reinforces the vague feeling or mistrust in government that abounds across the nation. For reasons which may not be unrelated to all this, a large segment of America has tuned Washington and the Presidency out . . ."

*Item:* Former Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg said in testimony before our subcommittee:

"It is an understatement to say that we are witnessing an increasing confrontation between the Executive and Legislative branches in this area (of information and secrecy). We must promptly take all neces-

sary steps to prevent this confrontation from becoming a Constitutional crisis. . . . It is my ultimate conclusion that the present system, whereby the Executive branch itself determines the rules for disclosure of its own documents, is inherently inadequate to keep Congress informed."

Later in his testimony, Mr. Goldberg made another fundamental point:

"Our nation is a nation of laws and not men. In the public information area, except for Constitutional safeguards and the law which this Committee, by and large, has sponsored, we have been very much a government of men and not laws."

*Item:* Pulitzer prize winning journalist Jack Anderson told our subcommittee last week that "every government tries to control the flow of information to its people and, thereby, to manipulate public opinion." "Dictatorships," he continued, "accomplish this by seizing control of the media, by censoring the news and by jailing those who reveal what the government wants to hide. In a democracy, the methods are more sophisticated, but the intent is the same."

Anderson charged that "the Nixon Administration, like past administrations, has sought to control the news flow by classifying everything it doesn't want the people to know. But Richard Nixon has gone farther than any past President in his determination to keep the lid on the press."

*Item:* All in testimony before our subcommittee last week, Senator Mike Gravel said: "I personally feel that our democracy is under assault, assault in a very unique way and in a very evolutionary way, and unless we can turn the tide we will lose the system of government we presently enjoy. And the single item that will be responsible for this loss of government, this great experiment at self-government here in the United States, will be secrecy itself, and nothing more, nothing more complex than that, because secrecy is anathema to democracy. It is that fundamental . . ."

*Item:* Former Pentagon official William G. Florence, a 43-year expert on classification, testified before our subcommittee that more than 99 percent of the documents classified under our security classification system do not warrant the high level of security protection assigned to them.

The Subcommittee's hearings have revealed vast amounts of information that is overclassified. The massive backlog of such overclassified documents has resulted in the breakdown of the security classification system. Moreover, we have found that the secrecy stamp in the hands of government bureaucrats is often used to hide administrative blunders, waste, scandal, or political embarrassment.

We have also found that—contrary to general opinion—much information hidden from the public does not have anything to do with hydrogen bombs, weapons systems, state secrets, or other sensitive classified information that we all agree does require safeguarding to protect our national defense and foreign policy.

I am convinced that Congress must replace the security classification system under Executive Order with a statutory system that will be more workable, manageable, and more responsible to the Congress and to the Constitutional principles we have all sworn to uphold. A bill to accomplish these purposes will be introduced in the near future.

These individual items, and many more I could cite, all are indicative of the vast dimensions of the government information crisis.

In recent decades, this critical problem has been called "government secrecy," "news management," "the credibility gap," or "truth in government." Whatever label we give it, however, we all know that it is a real problem. It is a political problem, but it is not a partisan problem. It is a Constitutional

problem, but it affects newsmen, editors, publishers, and the public as a whole more than lawyers.

It is obvious to us all that free access to information about the affairs of our government is essential if we are to enjoy the fruits of a free society, where government is the servant—not the master—of the American people. But, if the basic rights of the First Amendment are breached, if the news media is denied information from government to which it is legitimately entitled, then the electorate is deprived of the facts needed to make the most intelligent decision at the ballot box and our entire political system is undermined.

The longer-range effects of widespread withholding of information by government could lead to the type of society so graphically described in George Orwell's 1984. If government information properly belonging to the American public is systematically hidden—as is too often the case—then people eventually become oblivious to the public business on which their well being depends. They develop a distrust in their government or a cynicism that results in many people just "copping out" on a broad front—refusing to register to vote or to participate in the political process; refusing to become involved in social or economic affairs of the communities in which they live; or refusing to become a full participant in the society that is the fabric of our entire governmental system. And, in the final analysis, vast numbers of Americans could thus become incapable of making valid decisions affecting their own lives or at the polls on election day, because of the public ignorance of critical events and the implications of governmental policies withheld from them by the Administration in power—and seeking to remain in power.

As the late Adlai Stevenson once said: "Those who corrupt the public mind are just as evil as those who steal from the public purse."

This is what public information and the fight to preserve the "people's right to know" is all about. A free press is the bulwark against "image makers" and political news manipulators who "corrupt the public mind" through skillfully-disguised propaganda, phony statistics, or misleading canned handouts. It is equally important as a protection against maladministration, political deals, or against those who hide mistakes under a secrecy stamp and lock them securely in 1,000-pound file cabinets.

As we all know, 1972 is a Presidential election year and candidates are roaming the country pleading with voters in State primaries for their support. Later we will endure the spectacle of two national political conventions from Miami Beach—fortunately separated by a six weeks cooling off period.

Naturally, we hear a lot these days about issues and nonissues such as school busing, tax reform, revenue sharing, the war in Vietnam, housing, education, welfare reform, and on, and on, and on. But why is it that we don't ever hear about what seems to me (and a few others like Arthur Goldberg and Mike Gravel) to be the great overriding issue that affects virtually every part of our national life and our defense and foreign policy as well? The issue of government secrecy is the best kept secret of this campaign or any other, for that matter, even though President Eisenhower's handling of the U-2 spy plane incident did become an issue in the 1960 campaign.

But certainly, truth in government makes for confidence in government, and—following this thought, it makes for a better informed citizenry and a stronger and more unified nation in these perilous days of internal division and international crisis.

I want you to help me make truth in government—confidence in government—a real issue in this campaign. The American

people must share the good news with the bad news if we are to be strong enough to compete with differing economic systems, governmental systems, and political ideologies of other nations who share this globe with us.

We must give up this idiotic notion that we can compete in the secrecy game with those who invented it. Secrecy is the blood enemy of democracy. Secrecy subverts any representative system, just as it is essential to maintain a totalitarian dictatorship.

I'm trying to do my part—as is our subcommittee—in preaching the doctrine of Freedom of Information and in fighting censorship and secrecy in government on a full-time basis.

If you can agree with anything that I have said here today, I hope that each of you in your own way will join in this fight.

Thank you.

### WELFARE WORKERS IN NEW YORK

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, Local 1180 of the Communications Workers of America in New York City is popularly known as the "Municipal Management Society." It is made up of, as the name implies, men and women who administer various municipal government programs, and it is a group of very fine, dedicated and devoted people.

The president of this local, James W. Oakes, is a neighbor and good friend of mine, and so I am familiar with the local.

Earlier in this Congress, when the House was considering H.R. 1, a problem involving the federalization of the jobs of some of the members of the local who administer social services came to my attention, and I introduced legislation to protect the collective bargaining rights of these workers, if and when they are federalized.

Recently, one of the officers of the local, Vice President Charles G. Weinstein, analyzed the collective bargaining benefits the CWA municipal management members have won, and how they compare with Federal employee benefits.

I believe this information would be of great use to the Members of Congress.

The item follows:

EMPLOYEE JOB PROTECTION UNDER AMENDMENT No. 559—H.R. 1

Welfare reform is very necessary. It is a most desirable social as well as fiscal goal. However, let us not make the mistake of throwing out the baby with the bathwater. Specifically, the provision regarding employee job protection under this pending legislation is clearly inadequate and does not properly protect the employees' job status. It substitutes a complicated federal bureaucracy, the H.E.W. Department, for state or local Departments of Social Services in the area of public assistance administration with its doubtful beneficial effects of improving such administration. We maintain that this is not a solution or panacea for what is troubling the welfare system.

Yes, we need new rules and new guidelines to cope with the ever increasing public assistance rolls. But should we not first take a good hard look at how the system is now

functioning under the relatively recently imposed new regulations of "affidavit eligibility" with its little or no casework and no meaningful field investigations to determine eligibility. Without getting too deeply involved in the philosophical and practical effects of this "new look", what are the real effects that federalization of jobs will create for the state and local employee.

Listed below is a brief analysis of the Amendment's provision on "Collective Bargaining" and a rough comparison of federal and local civil service and pension systems as it affects New York City employees:

A. Collective bargaining: Under the federal plan as outlined on Page 67 of Amendment No. 559, it speaks of an "Employee Protection Provision" and states that "fair and equitable arrangements shall be made . . . to protect the interests of all employees of any State or political subdivision thereof who presently performs such functions. Such arrangements shall include provision, *not inconsistent with law* (my emphasis), necessary to protect individual employees against a worsening of their position . . ."—and continues on Page 68 . . . "including provision to (A) preserve rights, privileges, benefits (including continuation of pension rights, credits and benefits) under collective bargaining agreements, or otherwise (my emphasis), in effect on the effective date of this Act, or such agreement . . ." and . . . "(B) Continue Collective Bargaining rights (my emphasis)

Comments: Notwithstanding the good intentions of all 21 U.S. Senators sponsoring this Amendment, an analysis will indicate that the local employees will suffer a substantial "worsening of their position" and a clear loss of their hard earned collective bargaining rights won under their union contracts negotiated by CWA and other AFL-CIO affiliates. These contracts now in full force and effect are naturally based on local civil service and pension laws, rules and regulations and might well be contrary to federal civil service and pension laws, rules and regulations. Thus the phrase "not inconsistent with law" (Page 68, Line 2) and the phrase "or otherwise" (Page 68, Line 13) might prevail. It could have the effect of gutting all the hard won benefits negotiated so tenuously over the years by various employee unions that are certified as sole collective bargaining representatives for specific titles. In other words, this Amendment could unintentionally, "or otherwise," have the effect of union busting. In the instance of Local 1180, CWA, AFL-CIO, almost 50% of its membership could be deprived of the representation of the union of its choice, and, the benefits negotiated under collective bargaining procedures with the City of New York.

B. Comparison of Federal vs Local Civil Service System (time and leave rules):

a. Work Week—NYC—35 hours (9½ months) and 30 hours (2½ months).

Federal—40 hours (12 months).

b. Holidays—NYC—All national holidays, including Lincoln's Birthday and Election Day.

Federal—Lincoln's Birthday and Election Day are work days.

c. Health & Welfare Funds—or Security Benefits Fund (Employee Administered).

NYC—Negotiated under collective bargaining. Currently an annual contribution of \$250.00 per employee. Use of benefits and fund generally determined by employee union. Typical benefits include "free" life insurance, death and dismemberment insurance, "paid" prescriptions, eyeglasses, dental work, nursing service, etc. for employee, spouse and eligible dependents. (Note: \$250.00 per employee is not subject to any income taxes)

Federal—none.

d. Vacation—NYC—27 days (maximum). Federal—26 days (maximum).

e. Formal grievance machinery—NYC—

Four step grievance procedure including outside arbitration.

Federal—?

f. Geographic Work Locations—NYC—Limited to NYC—5 boroughs.

Federal—?

g. Promotion Examinations—NYC—written examinations with promotions based on grade plus seniority.

Federal—?

h. Annual Salary Increases—NYC—Negotiated by Union—current contract is for 2 years ("average" annual increase \$700.00 to \$1200.00 per employee).

Federal—?

i. Health Insurance—NYC—No cost to employee—3 basic plans.

Federal—Employee pays about 40% of cost.

j. Job Transfer Policy—NYC—Generally protected by union contract provisions and seniority.

Federal—?

C. Comparison of Federal vs Local Pension Plan:

a. Basis of Computation—NYC—Last year of service (generally—this is year of highest earnings).

Federal—Average of three highest years.

b. Health Insurance—NYC—continues in full effect at no cost to retired employee.

Federal—retired employee continues to share cost—about 40%.

c. Cost of Living Adjustment—NYC—none.

Federal—Yes.

d. Terminal Leave included in retirement computation—NYC—additional full paid terminal time up to one year—not uncommon.

Federal—generally limited to up to 30 days of unused vacation time.

e. Social Security Coverages—NYC—FOAB in addition to City Pension and Annuity Savings.

Federal—none.

f. Low Cost Personal Loans—NYC—simple annual interest charge of 6% up to 90% of balance in employee's annuity savings account.

Federal—none.

g. Other Features in New York City Employees Retirement System—includes disability coverages, numerous retirement options, life insurance, "death gamble" protection, etc.

### DEBATE ON MINIMUM WAGE BILL

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, last week during the debate on the minimum wage bill, two items seemed to be the determining factors in the House decision to reject legislation which the committee had studied for 5 years in favor of a substitute. A ranking Republican member of my committee devised and politically designed rather a partial answer to the problems of the low waged, underpaid workers. Much was made of the so-called spiral that would be triggered by the very modest 20-cents-an-hour increase which would be given to many who have not received a pay increase for 5 long years. The realization that 7 percent of the American wage earners make \$1.60 an hour or less apparently was lost to many in this body. For some reason, they confused maximum with minimum. Eventually, the majority of Members leaned toward making the minimum wage a

maximum wage for all of the unprotected workers in America. I have considered this theory and repeat again that the proposed increase was not a step to higher minimum wages but was intended to help catch up those who have been living far below the increased cost-of-living index for the past 5 years.

While I was speaking during the debate, I clearly heard a comment from one of our Members belonging to the medical profession. The comment was "higher wages," which meant, I suppose, that these increased wages should be detrimental to the designated purposes of title III. I believe we were talking about wages going from \$1.60 to \$1.80 and \$2. While I was fighting for this inadequate pay raise for millions of unprotected workers, Leonard Woodcock, president of the United Automobile Workers was testifying before a Senate committee in support of health insurance. In response to the high wage charge made by my good friend the doctor, I thought you might be interested in the following remarks which were made by Mr. Woodcock during that hearing.

**HOSPITAL BILL \$5-A-MINUTE, UAW BOSS SAYS**

(By William Hines)

WASHINGTON.—Even in a time of skyrocketing health care costs, \$5 a minute must be something of a record.

Leonard Woodcock, president of the United Auto Workers (UAW) and a leading advocate of national health insurance, told a Senate committee yesterday about a man who spent just one day in the hospital and ran up charges of \$7,271, which is about \$303 an hour or a little over \$5 a minute.

"One of our members was admitted to a hospital (in Detroit) for surgery of the eye," Woodcock said. "Within 24 hours he required a lengthy emergency heart operation in an attempt to save his life. He died.

"The bill for one day's hospitalization and emergency surgery was \$7,271. The level of charges involved is scandalous. For example, the hospital bill of \$3,588 includes \$900 for the operating room, \$200 for the use of a heart-lung machine, lab fees of \$235, blood tests of \$717 and eight transfusion 'hook-ups' (excluding the cost of 31 pints of blood) of \$320.

"Some of the physicians charges include \$2,700 for a two-man surgical team (another bill for a second team is pending), \$500 for anesthesia and the same for a cardiac specialist consultation."

Most of the charges were covered by UAW's health insurance policy, Woodcock said, but even so the widow was left with some to pay out of her own funds.

Contrasting the situation here and in Canada, where a public health insurance program is in effect, Woodcock said that had the man been hospitalized "right across the river" from Detroit, in Windsor, Ontario, the bill would have been substantially lower" and there would have been no charges to the widow.

Asked whether the quality of care in Detroit and Windsor are comparable, Woodcock said that this question is always difficult to answer, but added:

"(A patient) would have care at comparable levels by persons of comparable training."

The person mentioned in the article who was charged \$7,271 for 24 hours care

was not a tycoon, the head of a large conglomerate or the owner of a national corporation. He was a simple worker in an American automobile plant. This ought to tell us something, but will probably leave little impression on the thinking of the Republican and southern Members who rejected the committee bill.

The primary thrust against this bill was engineered by the restaurant owners and the retail merchants, the conglomerates, and the so-called Main Street businessmen. Apparently they forget that the workers we were trying to help are the very customers who will shop on Main Street, go to the five and tens, the discount stores, and the fast food franchise restaurants. Not many Cadillacs drive up to establishments of this type.

In all probability, the overriding issue in the defeat of the committee bill was title III. This was opposed by most national corporations and conglomerates particularly, as well as by that great group of slumbering Americans who support a free trade policy for this country. The day of the vote, the Wall Street Journal published an article which undoubtedly had an adverse effect upon my ability to sell the committee bill to the Congress. It appeared under the heading, "Foreign Wages Narrow the Gap Between U.S. Wages." For the record, the following is the text of the article.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 11, 1972]  
**THE BIG GAP IN WAGES BETWEEN U.S. AND OTHERS HAS STARTED TO NARROW**

(By Ray Vicker)

After years of widening, the gap in wage rates between the United States and its major competitors is narrowing.

The change has important consequences for U.S. business. It may help American goods compete with foreign merchandise, both at home and abroad. It could give much-needed help to the U.S. dollar, which is still ailing. And it may cause some American companies to reconsider plans for expansion in Europe.

For Europe, the trend is worrisome. "Our wages aren't just rising, they are soaring," says a man at Common Market headquarters in Brussels. "This not only means American exporters are going to be more competitive in our markets; they will be more competitive in third markets, too."

The statistics are dramatic. In Italy, average total compensation in manufacturing soared to \$1.81 an hour in 1970—nearly triple the 1960 rate. The American figure advanced to \$4.20 an hour, a rise of 59% from 1960. Yet the absolute dollar gap between the Italian and American figures widened to \$2.39 in 1970 from \$2.01 in 1960. Thus, even while Italy was experiencing sharp wage inflation, it actually improved its competitive position with the United States, at least on the wage front.

Last year, the Italian figure again rose faster than the American rate. This time, however, the gap narrowed to \$2.18 an hour from \$2.39. Of course, last year's figures are affected by the world currency realignment as well as by inflation. But the main point is that wages in many foreign countries today are high enough that a big percentage gain also produces a big absolute gain, too—big enough to narrow the gap with U.S. rates.

The following figures for the average hourly total compensation of production work-

ers in manufacturing detail the wage trend for key countries. All amounts are expressed in U.S. dollars, and the 1971 figures are adjusted to reflect the currency realignment of late last year.

	1960	1970	1971
Japan.....	0.29	1.06	1.46
Italy.....	.63	1.81	2.28
Netherlands.....	.64	1.98	2.47
France.....	.80	1.67	2.01
Britain.....	.83	1.51	1.88
Belgium.....	.85	1.97	2.52
West Germany.....	.85	2.28	2.93
Sweden.....	1.21	2.96	3.38
Canada.....	2.12	3.45	3.93
United States.....	2.64	4.20	4.46

In 1960, a manufacturer could hire nine hours of labor in Japan for the cost of only one in the United States. But by last year, the U.S. hourly wage bought only three hours of work in Japan.

The figures, of course, represent a significant change in the lives of workers abroad, too. While Japan and many European countries still have considerable poverty, the skilled workers in the richer countries are prospering as never before.

Take Peter Kretzmeir, a 44-year-old milling-machine operator in Frankfurt, West Germany. He drives a Ford Capri car and earns the equivalent of \$135 a week—double the level of five years ago. Encountered at a railroad station one afternoon, he is taking a potted plant home to his wife for her birthday. Yet his real surprise for her is more than a mere plant—it's a travel voucher for a vacation in Greece for the whole family. "We can afford to celebrate tonight. I am paid well," Mr. Kretzmeir says.

But while Mr. Kretzmeir prospers, Rollei-Werke AG, the West German camera maker, is shifting two thirds of its domestic production from Braunschweig to Singapore. In addition, the company is building two more plants to handle still more production there. The company says high wages in Germany and low wages in Singapore are the main reasons it has shifted operations. Since the move, Rollei-Werke has been able to slash prices by 25%, an official says.

A man in the German operation of McKinsey & Co., the U.S. management consultants, says, "I think American companies that might have been considering a big investment program over here may be taking another look."

But Germany isn't alone. To escape sharply rising wages at home, a big British manufacturer shifts some of its production to poor Southern European nations. In Goteborg, Sweden, an economist at Goteborgs Bank says big pay settlements that can't be fully offset by price rises have "brought a strong pressure on the profitability of companies."

In Italy, Montecatini Edison announced a \$235 million loss for last year. Writeoffs accounted for a big chunk of the deficit, but rising wages also contributed heavily, the chemical maker said. In the Netherlands, the parliament is so worried about the rise in wages that there is talk of reviving the wage controls abolished last summer.

"There is no doubt that the wage gap between America and other major industrial countries is closing fast," concludes a spokesman for the 23-nation Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in Paris.

The main reason for the trend is easy to see. The OECD figures below show that the average annual percentage increase in earnings lately has been far steeper in other industrialized nations than in the United States. These rates are based on local currencies and, of course, don't reflect the realignment of exchange rates internationally:

[In percent]

	1963-69	1969-71
Japan.....	13.4	15.6
Sweden.....	8.1	9.9
France.....	8.0	10.9
Italy.....	7.1	17.3
West Germany.....	7.1	12.8
Britain.....	6.7	12.0
United States.....	4.5	6.1

Many factors cause this steep inflation abroad. Most wealthier European countries have long suffered from labor shortages that have tended to push wages up. While recent economic slowdowns have increased unemployment rates, the economic woes in Europe have been less severe than the recent American recession.

Moreover, just as wages put pressure on prices, the steep rise in European prices prompts workers to demand hefty pay hikes. In Britain, for instance, prices have been rising at a 10% annual rate. So Britain's strong and militant labor unions push for raises of more than 10%, and they often get them. In many European labor agreements, cost-of-living increases automatically prompt wage increases.

Some European countries, including Britain, have tried wage-controls. But results haven't always been encouraging, and politicians are reluctant to try these unpopular curbs.

Another big reason for the recent narrowing of the wage gap between the United States and other major countries is the currency realignment. This can be particularly significant for international companies. The December 1971 change in world currency parities automatically boosted the dollar cost of hiring workers abroad by up to nearly 17%, depending on the country involved. Such a change alone could discourage companies from establishing plants abroad to get cheap labor. Keeping the capital inside the United States would strengthen the U.S. dollar by helping the American balance of payments, the gap between all of our remittances abroad and all of our receipts from foreign countries.

The U.S. balance of payments will also benefit, of course, to the extent that the narrowing of the wage gap helps make American goods more competitive with foreign goods. In most cases, wage rises are boosting costs of foreign-made goods.

But you can't always count on it. Lionel D. Edle & Co., investment advisory subsidiary of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Inc., estimates Japanese wages will soar about 13% this year—but that productivity could rise as much as 15%. "Hence there may well be a 2% net fall in the unit labor cost of manufacturers," the company says.

You will note the difference between wages in 1960 and 1971. You will note that Japanese wages went up, but ours went up less. The difference remains almost the same both percentagewise and moneywise.

Apparently, Members of Congress close their eyes to what they see, block their ears to what they hear, and shut off their minds to thinking.

The Japanese worker works a full 40-hour week and earns only so much. When you consider the great number of American workers in plants earning \$5 an hour and more, and the number of craftsmen earning \$8 an hour and more, the number of American goods produced makes us noncompetitive even without the minimum wage.

It was said on the floor that low wage industry was the least protected. This is

true. This was why title III was put into the bill.

I want to put this into the RECORD because I am investigating the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act which are already on the book. I think we must correct a universal violation to certain sections of the act which pertain to the sale of foreign products. If I cannot convince the Congress, I will not quit, but will probably die trying. While it does not pay to become too opposed to an issue without facing the possibility of being called a fanatic, it does pay to believe that the country cannot survive on its present course. I do not intend to give up in conference. At least I will have my own vote for the bill which came from my committee.

#### REDUCING U.S. CONTRIBUTION TO THE U.N.

### HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, how long is the United States going to continue pouring money down the rathole—I am referring to the United Nations. Congressman H. R. Gross has correctly labeled the U.N. as the most useless organization ever devised by man.

The United Nations has been lavishly funded by the United States—we have been constantly reminded of our wealth and our obligations to those less fortunate. But I am wondering what our investment has bought—since the end of World War II, the United Nations has not prevented war in the Middle East, it has failed to keep Americans from dying in Korea, it has not curtailed the brutal expansionist aggression of the U.S.S.R. or of Communist China, and it has certainly done nothing for us in Vietnam. Yet we are continuously told by State Department bureaucrats that the United Nations serves the cause of world peace and that it continues to be worthy of our support and our handouts.

Perhaps the professional politicians and the State Department bureaucrats may be convinced of this, but the American people "out there"—the people derisively referred to as "average" citizens, the ones who pay the bills—these people are getting fed up with the United Nations and everything it has come to represent. The U.N., as Vice President AGNEW has correctly pointed out, is little more than a soundboard for left-wing elements. It has recently become another platform for Red Chinese propaganda. The United Nations has not kept the peace—only the overwhelming military power of the United States has done that. It is about time we face a few facts, even if the truth hurts.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD at this time an excellent editorial appearing in the January-February 1972 Texas Legion News. Bureaucrats beware—this is the voice of the people speaking:

#### IT'S TIME TO REEVALUATE U.N. POSITION

The American Legion is extremely disappointed that the majority of the United Nations voted to expel from its membership the government of Taiwan—long a friend and ally of the U.S. The vote came after the admission of Red China to the U.N., which The American Legion and the U.S. has vigorously opposed for years.

National Commander John H. Geiger said, "On behalf of the nearly four million members of The American Legion, its Auxiliary and affiliated organizations, I am compelled to express my most profound disappointment and dissatisfaction with the decision of the United Nations General Assembly yesterday (Oct. 25) to admit Communist China to the world body and to expel the Republic of China." He went on to say, "I am convinced this action by the U.N. General Assembly can only damage the reputation and effectiveness of the world organization and all its agencies."

In another statement on the U.N. the Legion leader said that, "reports from the American mission to the U.N. are that the United States has again agreed to bail out the organization financially. I am told that we made our scheduled October payment of thirteen million dollars in September so the United Nations could meet that month's payroll. Now I am told we are making our scheduled December 15 payment of \$12,000,000 in the first week of November so the U.N. can meet its November 15 payroll. Obviously, something is terribly wrong in that organization. The China vote and this hand to mouth financial situation are symptoms of a grave disorder."

What has been the first results of the Red China admission to the U.N.? The very first speech made by the head of Red China delegation contained sharp attacks on the United States—their host country. This was televised nation-wide and presumably worldwide. A few days later he again made a speech and again attacked the U.S. with all sorts of condemnations. This was televised too. Obviously our worst fears have come to pass. They have a world forum on which to rant their communist ideology and to insult and embarrass the United States at every turn. Our TV networks and news media are obligingly providing them with a TV open-window or newspaper headline into every home in America—probably the whole Western Hemisphere. Our citizens believe most of what they see and hear so Red China has what it wants—not in a peace making role in the U.N., rather membership in a body providing a world forum from which it can espouse its communist doctrine.

Commander Geiger said, "How many times must we have our noses rubbed in the dirt to convince us that our enemies, all of whom hold seats in the U.N., will not miss an opportunity to embarrass us before the family of nations? Our continuing posture as the financial patsy for this organization only increases their already obvious contempt and open hostility toward us."

Recent news from New York indicates that many U.N. missions are privately in favor of moving the U.N. out of N.Y.—perhaps to some other country because of the treatment they are exposed to in that city. This includes some Communist countries, and Russia is one of them.

Well, maybe we should accommodate those who would like to move. Maybe we should cut off our funds and that would probably take care of the whole mess without further ado. This editor, for one, is ready and willing for the U.N. to get out of my country—and now. It is time for The American Legion to urge Congress to re-evaluate its position with regards to the U.N. It is obviously ineffective as a peace keeper. Definitely, we should call for the removal of that body from our soil if nothing else.

SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT'S  
RECENT DECISION IN VIETNAM

## HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1972

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, there is a great hymn which begins this way:

Once to every man and nation  
Comes the moment to decide  
In the strife of truth with falsehood  
For the good or evil side.

I am inclined to think that every man and every nation has more than one such moment. Indeed, we face such choices daily. But some of those moments are more decisive—more crucial—by far than others. And ultimately the words of the hymn are true—ultimately, for every man and every nation, one of those moments is final and irrevocable. Often, only by hindsight do we know when that decision was made.

It seems to me that our President and, in him, our Nation has just met one of those crucial and decisive moments. And I believe we have met it with honor; that it constitutes a victory in the battle of truth with falsehood—a victory, ultimately, for good over evil, even though the choices, as is often the case, may seem only to be a choice among evils.

I speak, of course, of President Nixon's decision to mine the ports of North Vietnam and bomb roads and railways in an effort to prevent the North Vietnamese from receiving outside supplies of war material and to end the war on acceptable terms—the return of American prisoners of war, a cease-fire, the withdrawal of all American forces, and the preservation of the lives of millions of South Vietnamese noncombatants, women and children.

I fully support the President's action and pray that it will be successful. Any reservations that I have go to the concern that the President's action does not go far enough. I have waited this long to speak on the matter because I feel strongly that it is unwise to render hasty judgment on the basis of limited facts. I fully supported the President at the time he announced his decision and upon reflection I can find no fault with that initial response. Indeed, the hand-wringing and downright treasonous response of a small but vocal minority within this country only adds to my conviction that the President acted correctly in responding to North Vietnam's invasion of the South.

At this point, the most serious threat I see facing the United States comes not from any foreign power, but from domestic rabble whose chief reason for being seems to be to infect the spirit of this country from within.

This leftwing element is doing its very best to undermine the President's stance and to destroy the confidence of the American public in its elected leadership.

A group of Congressmen recently sponsored the showing of a North Vietnamese propaganda film in a congressional committee room. A U.S. Senator has referred

to this country as "The bully of the world." Another has called for a no-confidence vote against the President for his recent action, and a Congressman has demanded his impeachment. We are at war, whether we like it or not, and regardless of where any praise or blame may lie. Given that fact, I believe such activities by Members of Congress are not in the best interest of this country.

Some of our major news distributors suggest to the world that Americans do not agree with their President about the war, even though national polls have consistently shown otherwise.

One major columnist and opinion maker, in his writing on the war, recently referred to "the Americans" and "their vast air power" in a way which implies he was divorcing himself completely from the rest of us. Some members of the press have regularly delivered lengthy diatribes against our response to the recent Communist invasion of South Vietnam without one word of criticism for the invasion itself.

I will not dignify the rabid editorializing against the President's most recent action by quoting them. I do want, however, to commend the Washington Evening Star for its editorial support of the President and insert its editorial of May 9 in the Record.

As for the demonstrators and rabble, I think one need only note the antics on Tuesday in the House gallery which found a rehearsed group of agitators shouting obscenities and pro-Vietcong slogans in the U.S. Congress. This is all the evidence we need that their opposition to the war does not stem from any pacifistic or humanitarian motivation but from ideological sympathy with the Communist enemy.

They apparently do not care that "victory to the Vietcong" means death for U.S. soldiers.

I am staunchly convinced President Nixon has acted in accord with truth and honor and against that which is false and evil.

For the ultimate outcome is not freedom of political choice for South Vietnam or even the protection of South Vietnam citizens against certain slaughter. The ultimate outcome concerns the triumph of freedom over tyranny, of faith in God over atheistic materialism. The future of America, not merely as a political entity, but as a conveyor of all the values for which her people stand, is at stake in this conflict—and always has been. President Nixon has had the courage to ask the American people to face up to that fact once more, as we have done so often and heroically throughout our history.

I believe the American people will support him, all critics, demonstrators and traitors to the contrary notwithstanding. If success requires firmer action in the future, I urge the President not to waver. And I pray God that those who pursue this war for the purposes of conquest and political tyranny will come to see the folly of their ways.

The editorial follows:

## RAISING THE STAKES

President Nixon, through his action last night in ordering the mining and interdic-

tion of North Vietnam's ports, has, to put it mildly, placed a great deal at risk.

He may succeed, and we pray God that he will. For what he is trying to do is to achieve the return of the American prisoners of war, a cease-fire and "the withdrawal of all United States forces" from South Vietnam within four months. Everyone approves those ends.

But it is by no means certain that Mr. Nixon's gamble—and it can only be described as such—will succeed. In the short run, at least, it appears probable that it will not. Even if the mining of North Vietnam's ports is wholly successful, it is difficult to see how this can affect the outcome of the enemy's assaults on Hue, Kontum and An Loc. Those battles already are joined and their outcome will be determined within the next few weeks, long before supplies now on the battlefield and in the pipeline are exhausted.

The morale of the embattled South Vietnamese and that of their American and South Korean allies unquestionably will be given a fillip by the President's dramatic move. But if South Vietnam is to survive, the South Vietnamese themselves will have to hold: There is, after this, little more that Mr. Nixon can do for them.

The reaction of the Soviet Union is difficult to predict; we do not know what Dr. Kissinger said to Chairman Brezhnev nor Brezhnev to him during the former's four-day visit to Moscow last month. What is clear is that the world is at a crucial juncture comparable in recent years only to the Cuban Missile Crisis. This is a test of national wills, the uncertain outcome of which could have repercussions on a global scale.

Though his action is a strong one, it is important to recognize what the President is not doing here. This is not a Cuban-style blockade. It is not contemplated that American warships will attempt to stop Soviet or other foreign shipping on the high seas, approaching North Vietnam. The reference to interdiction "within the internal and claimed territorial waters" of that country refers to action against small boats which might be employed to ferry supplies from ships lying off-shore. Mr. Nixon already has tried hard to avoid the danger of a direct military confrontation with the Soviet Union.

Even if the Russians decide not to challenge Mr. Nixon's stern move, this month's Moscow summit clearly has been placed in jeopardy. Should the Kremlin pull the welcome mat out from under Mr. Nixon—which seems almost certain to happen—this would be no great loss to the United States. The summit was, after all, originally arranged to placate Russian apprehensions about the American overture to China and to satisfy Mr. Nixon's personal penchant for diplomatic "firsts." Nor would cancellation of the summit necessarily mean the collapse of the infinitely more important Helsinki talks on strategic arms limitations. Both nations need and want such an accord and a limited agreement, concluded without fanfare, would be possible without the Moscow trip.

Whether the Russians will react to the new Vietnam challenge with renewed pressures on other world nerve-ends such as Berlin and the Middle East is anybody's guess. While the Kremlin may decide in its own interest to avoid a confrontation in the Gulf of Tonkin, it can hardly be expected to do so either in good grace or without extracting a price elsewhere. It goes without saying that, if the Russians try to move ships through the minefields, the situation will become extremely grave.

The Chinese reaction, while it may be rhetorically sharp, is unlikely to go beyond that. Virtually none of China's aid to North Vietnam travels by sea, and communications by rail and road are not easily cut. Peking's dismay at seeing Moscow's prestige and influence markedly reduced in Hanoi would be, to say the least, slight.

The North Vietnamese may be tempted to ignore the development and press their advantage on the battlefield. But they would do well to weigh carefully the consequences. The door to negotiations remains open. They have only to bargain in good faith to obtain a settlement which could not be entirely to their disadvantage.

What clearly is not needed at this time is a frantic or angry reaction to the President's move in Congress, on the campuses or in the streets. Americans are a free people and have the right to disagree with the wisdom or efficacy of Mr. Nixon's action. Indeed, all of us will have the opportunity to pass judgment on the rightness and wrongness of that action when we go to the polls in November. But it would be contrary to the national interest in this crucial test were the support for which Mr. Nixon has asked be denied him.

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.

#### JAPANESE AMBASSADOR WRITES ON WHALING

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, last November 1, the House passed House Concurrent Resolution 387, introduced by Mr. BINGHAM, which requested the Secretary of State to call for a 10-year moratorium on whales. This followed a public hearing on this subject in July of last year by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, which I chair. I strongly favor such international measures to save whales—the world's largest creatures—from the extinction that they are now approaching at the hands of the world whaling industry.

Recently I received a written statement from Ambassador Ushiba of Japan giving the position of his government in reply to certain comments about Japanese whaling made during last July's hearing. Several months ago—December 14, 1971—I placed in the RECORD a letter from the Ambassador on this subject, and I wish to insert this statement today in order that all interested persons may be made aware of the Japanese views. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF H. E. NOBUHIKO, AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES FROM JAPAN, IN CLARIFICATION OF CERTAIN POINTS RAISED IN THE PUBLIC HEARINGS BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND MOVEMENTS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS REGARDING A MORATORIUM ON INTERNATIONAL WHALING, JULY 26, 1971

Dear Chairman Fraser:

It has been of growing concern to me that many conservation interests in the United States have concentrated much of their criticism of current practice and policy in the whaling industry, upon the practice and policy of Japan. This is indeed regrettable, since,

in virtually all such instances, their allegations are not based on complete and accurate facts. In this connection I appreciate the opportunity to emphasize the following points

1. Outstanding achievements of Japanese scientists in whale conservation.

A full-scale scientific study of whale resources was initiated by Japanese scientists at the same time as Japan resumed Antarctic pelagic whaling after World War II. The major focal points of this study were the Whales Research Institute, which Japan established in 1946, and the Far Seas Fisheries Research Laboratory, which was established in 1967. The latter institution has a special department devoted to the research of whale stocks. These two institutions have worked very closely with various universities in our country.

The contributions of Japanese scientists working at these two centers, and elsewhere in Japan, have been well-recognized throughout the world scientific community, especially as regards the enormous accumulation of scientific data and basic research which has resulted from their field work. In all, the Japanese scientific community can take credit for approximately 6,000 whale markings and for identifying the biological parameters of several species of whales.

Age identification studies by Nishiwaki, Ohsumi, Ichihara and Kasuya; taxonomic studies by Omura, Ichihara, and Nishiwaki; subpopulation studies by Fujino; studies on the environment of whaling grounds by Nemoto and Nasu; and improvements of the stock assessment methods of whales by Doi, Ohsumi and Shimadzu, are examples of the significant Japanese scientific achievements in this field, which are well known in the world academic community through publications such as, The Scientific Reports of the Whales Research Institute, the Bulletins of the Tokai Regional Fisheries Research Laboratory and the Far Seas Fisheries Research Laboratory, and various papers submitted at the meetings of the International Whaling Commission.

A special reference should be made to the efforts of Japanese scientists in the field of stock assessment. Through the efforts of these scientists, several independent, new methods of stock assessment have been developed. One of these methods makes it possible to minimize the errors which are so common in connection with the catch per unit of effort, and another makes it possible to use sighting data rather than catch data in making such assessments. Thanks to these new methods, Japanese scientists and others can now draw comprehensive conclusions regarding stock assessment.

2. Japan's sincere effort to limit the taking of whales.

Those who look with open minds at the regulatory measures of the International Whaling Commission will immediately recognize that the catch limitations based upon stock assessment provided therein are applicable only in the North Pacific Ocean and the Antarctic Ocean, i.e. in both of the areas in which the Japanese expeditions operate. Furthermore they will notice that Japan is the only whaling nation which has provided stock assessment of whales in these areas.

In fact, no whaling nation other than Japan, operating solely in areas to which these catch limitations apply, provides her own stock assessment on which the catch limitation is based.

In view of the above, it seems to me that fairminded conservationists will recognize the exceptionally outstanding record of the Japanese Government in the matter of scientific stock assessment.

3. The faithful implementation of conservation measures by the Government of Japan.

The Government of Japan has faithfully implemented the conservation measures of the International Whaling Commission.

Let me give you just a few examples:

The schedule of the International Convention for the Regulation of whaling, requires that "there shall be maintained on each factory ship at least two inspectors of whaling for the purpose of maintaining twenty-four hour inspection." In fact it has been the practice of the Japanese Government to maintain three inspectors on such ships in order to avoid even the slightest possibility of wrong doing.

In addition, at the last annual meeting of the International Whaling Commission, Japan declared her willingness, to receive international observers from a non-whaling nation.

Moreover, Japan hosted a meeting last September at which international observer schemes were negotiated concerning North Pacific pelagic operations and Antarctic pelagic operations respectively.

Finally, the bilateral U.S.-Japan agreement concerning international observer scheme for whaling operations from land stations in the North Pacific was already signed and came into force on April 26, 1972.

4. The attitude of the Japanese whaling industry toward conservation.

Some persons have alleged that the Japanese whaling industry is much more interested in the short-term destruction of whales than in the long-term conservation of them. One wonders what evidence leads these persons to adopt such a view.

In fact, the contrary is true. The Japanese whaling industry has an enormous stake in the durability of whale stocks. If the whale stocks of the world were destroyed, our whaling industry would encounter enormous economic disaster. For one thing, the industry's factory ships, whale catchers and processing facilities in Japan could not be converted to other uses. In addition, tens of thousands of employees would be jobless. It should be crystal clear, therefore, that the Japanese whaling industry has every reason to prefer the conservation of whales to the destruction of them.

5. Resource situation of whale stocks.

On this subject, let me point out first of all that, despite extremely noisy debates on the subject in the nonscientific community, the majority of scientists are in general agreement on the question of whale stock resources. In the last session of the Scientific Committee of the IWC, the only serious disagreement among the participants occurred over estimation of sustainable yield of fin whales in the Antarctic.

At one point in the hearings of the Subcommittee, Mr. E. U. Curtis Bohlen, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, gave the impression that the majority of marine scientists were of the opinion that several species of whales, not already under moratorium, were in danger of extinction. He specifically cited Dr. J. L. McHugh and Dr. Douglas Chapman, as being "the exception" among the scientists that the U.S. Department of the Interior consulted in holding that if properly controlled, the harvest of sei, sperm and fin whales, in particular, can still continue to produce a yield without being completely prohibited. However, Japanese marine conservation scientists agree with Drs. McHugh and Chapman on this question, and, in this respect, they are in line with the opinion of the international academic community as a whole.

Let me be more specific:

a. Regarding the adequacy of the catch quotas for sei and sperm whales: At the hearings, Mr. Bohlen stated, "In many cases quotas are above the level of sustained yield for a given species."

It is true that both in the Antarctic and in the North Pacific catch quotas for sei whales and sperm whales are above the level of sustained yield for these stocks. But there is nothing irregular in this situation. In point of fact the abundance of these two stocks is above the level at which the maximum

sustainable yield is attainable, i.e., the very abundance of these stocks makes it impossible to attain the maximum sustainable yield. Thus, the only possible way to achieve the optimum level of these stocks is to fix the catch quotas above the level of sustained yield.

b. The estimation of sustainable yield fin whales: Regarding the estimation of sustainable yield of Antarctic fin whales, the scientific community as a whole has, as I indicated above, failed to reach agreement. However, it should be clearly understood that scientists of the United States, Japan and Canada do take the common view that the population of the Antarctic fin whales has been gradually increasing in recent years.

c. The determination of sei and sperm whales as endangered species: In his testimony, Mr. Bohlen stated, "on the banning of the sei and sperm, we did not feel that they are in danger of extinction right now." I fully agree with this statement based upon what I have been told by Japanese scientists. However, if this is the case, Mr. Bohlen's assessment would appear to be in conflict with the finding of his Department under the Endangered Species Conservation Act of 1969, that these species are "threatened with world wide extinction".

6. Veto power within the International Whaling Commission.

At one point in the hearings it was alleged by Mr. Scott McVay of Princeton University that Japan was exercising its "veto" power to deny the adoption within the International Whaling Commission of certain measures. Since this statement is misleading, I wish to set the record straight by referring to Article III, Section 2 of the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, under which the International Whaling Commission was established. Article III, Section 2 provided for "a simple majority vote" of the Commission on all decisions before it, except in the case of amendments to the Convention, where a three-fourths majority is necessary. Obviously then, no nation possesses "veto" power over matters coming before the Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the opportunity to make the above points. I hope they will further clarify some of the issues raised at the hearings held by your highly regarded Subcommittee. In conclusion, I want to assure you that Japan takes very seriously its obligations and responsibilities in the field of whale conservation. Furthermore, we appreciate the sincerity of all of those who appeared before your Subcommittee and who submitted statements in connection with this important subject. Let me assure you that Japan fully intends to work in close cooperation with all interested parties in resolving the remaining outstanding questions in this area of our mutual concern.

Sincerely yours,  
NOBUHIKO USHIBA,  
Ambassador of Japan.

CITY'S OLDEST CEMETERY

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very interesting article recently published in the Washington Post about the condition of the Congressional Cemetery. This is only more information indicating the poor condition of this historic site and that the problem of preservation of this

burial ground should be the responsibility of and administered by the Secretary of the Interior as part of the park system of the National Capital.

[From the Washington Post, May 7, 1972]

CITY'S OLDEST CEMETERY: HISTORY OF INTERRED WITH BONES

(By Donald P. Baker)

"When we heard Mr. Hoover was coming here, we got out there ourselves and cut the grass," said Alverta Pierce, who lives in the caretaker's house at Congressional Cemetery.

Her grandson is one of the five employees of the city's oldest burial ground, a 30-acre plot in Southeast Washington, which Sen. Vance Hartke (D-Ind.) described on Thursday as "a national disgrace."

J. Edgar Hoover is the latest famous American to be buried in Congressional. The quiet, private ceremony Thursday for the FBI chief has renewed interest in the cemetery, whose 80,000 inhabitants include such disparate neighbors as a vice president, scores of senators and representatives, three Capitol architects, a handful of American Indian leaders, some Chinese residents of the District, and the District's first automobile accident victim.

Hartke introduced legislation Thursday to have the cemetery placed under control of the Interior Department. A similar bill was introduced in the House on April 12 by Rep. John P. Saylor (R-Pa.).

The cemetery is owned by Christ Church (Episcopal), Washington Parish, which acquired the land at 18th and E Streets SE just after the congregation was founded in 1794.

Yesterday brought a trickle of mourners and tourists to Congressional to pause or pose in front of the three dozen floral tributes that all but obscure the headstone of the Hoover family.

Two bicyclists, law clerk James W. Winchester and university counselor Ann Noble, walked their bikes in—a sign warns "no bicycles"—after Winchester recalled reading that Hoover was buried there.

"It's a beautiful site—and out of the way," said Miss Noble. "Maybe Congress should take it over, but then the tourists would discover it."

"You can tell it doesn't get the care that Arlington does," said Winchester, "even though it has many famous people buried here."

Leroy V. Pennell, a retired federal employee, joined the discussion and pointed out that the remains of some of the more famous names etched on the headstones aren't buried there.

"See those stones over there that say Henry Clay and John Calhoun, well neither one of them are in there," said Pennell, a frequent visitor.

He was pointing to two of 165 cenotaphs designed by the famous American architect Benjamin Henry Latrobe. They border the main entry road.

The 3-by-5 foot monuments were put in place for a few years after 1812, when the vestry of Christ Church voted to set aside 100 plots for use of congressmen and senators. (In 1820, the reservation was extended to include heads of federal departments and their families.)

It became a federally financed custom to erect the sandstone cenotaphs even if the memorialized politician's body had been removed to another location, or had never been placed there.

The practice was stopped by Sen. George Frisbie Hoar of Massachusetts, who authored a bill that directed the sergeant-at-arms of each house to have "a monument of granite (sic) erected only whenever any deceased senator or member . . . shall be actually interred in the Congressional Cemetery."

The action stopped the abuse, and practically ended the use of the cemetery by

official Washington. Since then, only three representatives have been buried there, the latest being Tilman B. Parks of Arkansas, in 1950.

Shavis Brown, 15, and Ronald Robinson, 14, cousins who both live at 435 15th St. SE, like to stroll through the cemetery, sometimes using it as a shortcut to the Anacostia River just beyond.

They paused in front of the Hoover grave yesterday, where Ronald observed that it was covered with "lotsa pretty flowers," highlighted by a red, blue, pink and green replica of the FBI shield, including a soaring yellow eagle. A streamer said it was from the FBI National Academy.

Ronald, an 85-pound boxer for the Ham A.C. at Elliott Junior High (30 wins, four losses), said he has no desire to be an FBI agent. "Not now," he said, "not with him gone."

Shavis, an offensive end and defensive linebacker for the Eastern Branch Boys Club football team, was more political: "Too many people have died because of the FBI," he said, declining to elaborate.

Four teen-aged boys with fishing poles climbed the red brick wall at 17th and G Streets, and strolled toward the river bank without pausing at the Hoover grave.

One of them wasn't even aware of the new tourist attraction, saying that the only famous person he knew of buried there was John Philip Sousa. The U.S. Marine Band plays a concert at the grave of its most famous conductor each year on the anniversary of his death, March 6.

But the Hartke-Saylor proposals say enough history remains to have the grounds become part of the national park system, as is called for by Saylor.

Among others buried at Congressional are: Civil War photographer Matthew Brady, Vice President (to James Madison) Elbridge Gerry, Choctaw Chief Push-Ma-Ta-Ha, and 21 young women who died following an explosion at the U.S. Arsenal in the District on June 17, 1864.

Hardly anyone opposes a federal takeover. Mrs. Pierce's nephew and his boss, caretaker Fritz Lehmann have repeatedly sought Federal aid.

The Rev. David Denning, rector of Christ Church, said the vestry's reaction has been "very favorable."

The church's original congregation considered itself members of the capital city's nobility—"not large but sufficiently elegant" according to one brochure—but its affluence disappeared as its members became commuters.

The church, at 620 G St. SE, and the neighborhood, have regained some of their former affluence, but a commitment to serve the neighborhood doesn't permit adding to the \$42,500 that is annually budgeted for care of the cemetery.

The vestrymen are willing to donate the land to the government, in return for a pledge to honor commitments to owners of plots, and a promise to restore it to its former grandeur, even though that will be short of the promise, envisioned in the 1800s, to become "the American Westminster Abbey."

YOUNG ARTISTS SCORE HIT AT KENNEDY CENTER

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I recently witnessed an exciting and heartwarming performance by a group of high

school musicians from all parts of the country. It was truly a musical night to remember at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. If one needed a renewal of faith in our young generation he could have found it there in great measure.

Under the batons of Morton Gould, Louis Campiglia and Paul Traver the American Youth Performs National Orchestra and Choir played and sang like professionals.

I was particularly proud of Maestro Campiglia, who comes from San Diego where he is a source of inspiration to the young musicians of my district.

This magnificent performance was an excellent example of what young people can achieve when given the opportunity to perform under seasoned leadership and in prestigious surroundings.

I compliment American Airlines for its enlightened corporate citizenship in sponsoring not only this fine concert but also the American College Theatre Festival and the American College Jazz Festival, all at the Kennedy Center.

#### YOUTH AND THE MINIMUM WAGE

### HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of attention has been given to the key youth differential provision of the Erlenborn substitute to the minimum wage bill, H.R. 7130.

It is important to remember the key issue here: Jobs. We must provide incentives to reduce the present unemployment rate among young people and dropouts. The number of unemployed teenagers stands at almost 20 percent of those seeking jobs. In the inner-city poverty areas, the rate is an astounding 28 percent. Dr. Paul Samuelson, the liberal economist, wrote about the job-reducing effects of higher minimum wages in an article in *Nation's Business*:

What good does it do a black youth to know that an employer must pay him \$1.60 or \$2.00 an hour, if the fact that he must be paid that amount is what keeps him from getting a job?

The Minnesota Area Vocational School Directors pleaded for a provision in the Fair Labor Standards Act Amendments of 1972 which would establish a special minimum wage for young people. These vocational directors clearly have no selfish motives, but they told me the youth differential is necessary if they hope to place their trainees.

An effort was made to delete the special, important provisions for youth employment from the Erlenborn substitute, and for this reason, I believe it would be helpful to review the comments of Congressman AL QUIE, ranking Republican on the House Education and Labor Committee, about this title. I include Congressman QUIE's remarks in the *RECORD* at this time:

#### REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN QUIE

Our substitute, on the other hand, eliminates most of these limitations and estab-

lishes a program for encouraging the employment of young people, which even on its face makes it apparent that it would be effective in inducing many employers to hire the young and the inexperienced which the existing law has not done and the committee bill will not do.

The substitute permits payment of 80 percent of the minimum wage, but not less than \$1.30 in agriculture and \$1.60 in all other industries, these two rates being those prescribed by the existing law. Such employment is not limited to particular industries but is permissible in all industries except in instances subject to the applicable child labor laws. Nor is it limited to full-time students doing part-time work. Any full-time student under 21 years of age and any youth—student or not—under 18 may be employed at the youth differential wage rate for either full- or part-time work. And finally no burdensome redtape is imposed on the prospective employers of these young workers. The substitute merely requires the Secretary of Labor to promulgate standards to insure that this youth differential program will not create a substantial probability of reducing the job opportunities of persons other than the young. As I have said, the substitute bill even on its face offers a powerful inducement to employers to hire young people who would otherwise be jobless.

#### KEEP TAX EXEMPTIONS ON MUNICIPAL BONDS

### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Banner in a recent editorial correctly opposed any proposal to change the exemption status of State and municipal bonds.

This tax exempt status is necessary to assure continued State and local programs of growth and progress throughout the Nation and should be continued.

Because of the great interest in this subject by my colleagues and the American people I place the editorial in the *RECORD* herewith.

The editorial follows:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, May 10, 1972]

#### KEEP EXEMPTION ON THESE BONDS

Nearly every time Congress convenes—or so it has been for many years—somebody comes up with the bright idea that Uncle Sam should eliminate the tax exemption that historically has been accorded state and municipal bonds. Just as often, strong and reasoned objection to that is lodged, and thus far the latter's better sense has prevailed.

The Banner repeatedly has challenged the proposal, pointing out the calamitous mischief such a step would visit on the problem—serious and costly at these levels; exceeded only by the problem of financing proliferating costs at the federal level.

But now, again, the suggestion is in. The 92nd Congress is no exception to the regularity of that mischief proposal. Note this report, as underscored by the *Daily Oklahoman*:

"A bill is pending in Congress which would tax any and all bonds issued not only by public schools, colleges and universities, but also hospitals, water systems, sewer systems and state, county and city bonds issued for buildings for any purpose."

When by mischief a crack is made in the dike, it is made for all. What it would mean in this case is that there would be no

exemptions, if this fiscal frivolity prevails. The absurdity of it is compounded by the fact that the change is proposed in the name of recovering money for the Federal Treasury. For it is felt by such sponsors that the Federal Treasury somehow is being shortened by the present arrangement.

The Federal Treasury is between a rock and the hard place in numerous ways and for numerous reasons; but not because—to enhance and secure a market for state and municipal bonds in the categories mentioned—these bonds are made tax exempt. If they were not exempt, these units of government would find it nearly impossible to sell bonds at a rate they could afford.

The absurdity is doubly evident considering that even as this proposal is made (again) there are those who, with logic on their side, are proposing a revenue-sharing program. By that, these same states and municipal and county units would receive a share of the federal tax moneys. They might even get a share of whatever Uncle Sam derives by altering his stance so formidably as to abolish tax exemption for them.

Tax authorities on the far-out left wing obviously are confused.

#### THE QUESTION OF SEAL HUNTING

### HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, so that both sides of the argument may be considered on the question of seal hunting, I would call to the attention of my colleagues the following article from the *Washington Post* of May 14, 1972:

MAMMAL PROTECTION ALARMS ESKIMOS, INDIANS

(By Lael Morgan)

NOME, ALASKA, May 13.—"This conference, whatever you call it, is something I don't know too much about," began Edwin Tunguk, 80, a weathered Eskimo hunter from Golovin who, like many of his people here this week had to struggle with English.

"I deeply concerned when they talk about the seals though. I know that much white man is not a fool. He got his head. Someone outside in United States wants to cut this seal hunting off. They must have seen something I haven't."

Edwin Tunguk was but one of many Eskimo and Indian hunters who laid aside their harpoons and rifles last week to travel by bush plane, dog sled and snow machine to testify before the U.S. Senate Commerce Committee on the proposed Sea Mammal Protection Act.

The legislation, which passed the House in the form of a five-year moratorium on the taking of all sea animals, would permit subsistence hunting by Alaskan natives of all but endangered species. The act would preclude trading and interstate commerce in sea mammal products.

Alaska Sen. Ted Stevens, ranking Republican on Commerce's subcommittee on oceans and atmosphere, said that while it is not customary to take local testimony when Congress is in session, many natives could not afford to travel to Washington and assessment of local impact on the legislation is needed. Alaska Sen. Mike Gravel is also participating in the hearings, which are being held in Nome, and Bethel and Juneau.

"We never waste anything. The meat we don't eat we use for trapping as bait. By carving (walrus tusks) the people buy staples, gas and fuel oil," explained Sharon Orr, a pretty Eskimo housewife representing several families who camp on Northeast cape, St. Lawrence Island.

"For generations, we have been taught to conserve because we live off the environment. If this bill passes we will have to be solely dependent on welfare. The people do not want to live on welfare. It kills their pride in themselves."

"The land claims bill has passed, but we natives have yet to see any money," said Peter Seganna, a King Islander. "Everybody thinks we're rich. We're rich in culture, which we are about to lose through you. But they estimate we'll only get \$475 with the settlement."

Robert Willard, a Tlinglet Indian representing the Alaska Commission on Human Rights, testified that the only income for 10,000 natives comes from manufacture of arts and craft items, mainly from sea mammals and byproducts. He contended that over half of all Alaskan natives receive some income from this source.

Many Alaskan villages depend on walrus, whale and seal for about 90 per cent of their diet, according to testimony.

"Just as many Caucasians can't get used to eating native food, we can't get used to eating beef and pork," Vern Kugzruk, a Nome native testified.

"We use the blubber to preserve our food because many of us do not have ice boxes," explained Emma Willoya of Greig Mission. "Our greens and a lot of our meat is put away for later use in seal oil."

And seal oil, it would appear, is as important to health in the Arctic. A sizable trading business has been established between coastal Eskimos and inlanders who trade game and furs for seal oil to supplement their winter diets.

"We have survived to this day with an abundance of sea mammals," observed Frank Degnan, Eskimo leader from Unalaklet. "Our students on return from other parts of the world where our food is not in use ask for it on arrival. Some of our Eskimos get education and need to live outside to improve their status but they still like their muktuk, seal oil . . . Some of them flippers (whale fluke) may be a little stinky, but they like it and kauk, that's a walrus hide we like to eat . . ."

"How do you spell that (Kauk)?" Sen. Stevens asked.

"We don't spell it, we eat it," Degnan replied.

The fur of the seal and skins are also essential for winter clothing. Witnesses said it's unequaled as protection in Arctic weather.

Some Eskimos struggled to find mainland parallels that might explain how limited hunting would affect them.

"It's like telling a coal miner you can only dig enough to heat your house but you can't sell any," one said.

Learning to hunt and carve are equivalent to a Masters in college," maintained Paul Tuilana, a walrus hunter with 35 years experience from King Island. "Now this bill has taken away my diploma."

The status of hunters is like that of football players. In many villages the young people look up to them and sometimes they are village leaders, reported Jerome Trigg, president of Bering Strait Native Association.

Testimony explaining the close tie between tradition and economics of the Eskimo hunt came from David Stone, a whale hunter.

"In Point Hope, our very lives revolve around the migratory cycle of the oceanic mammals," he said, reading haltingly from a speech prepared by this village council.

"There are virtually no jobs available in Point Hope. The 1970 manpower survey showed 64 per cent of the population had an average income of under \$3,000 and the cost of living is double that of Seattle. Obviously, it is virtually impossible to meet the cost of oil, rent, lights and food without any monetary supplies. Any money that we

can gain from our limited use of the sea mammal products is sorely needed."

Although it is the second largest whaling community in the state, Point Hope produced just 2,000 pounds of muktuk (edible whale skin) for sale to other Eskimo villages last season. At \$2 per pound for resale, the total return per villager was \$23.53, Stone said. "We have always hunted only for what we need. We have been wise enough not to overkill. Is it fair to destroy our cultural heritage and life style by stopping all our utilization of these mammals?"

Point Hope whalers hunt the bowhead which may be placed on the endangered list because some scientists report only 100 remain. Testimony from the Alaskan Department of Fish and Game disputed this, however. According to their men, the bowhead population is between 2,000 and 3,000 and increasing. They also estimated the sea otter population at between 50,000 and 100,000 despite harvesting of 2,460 and the Amchitka atomic test which they claim killed 1,000.

Art Davidson, Alaska representative of Friends of the Earth, pleaded for better resource management and native input in this management.

"People are part of the environment, too," Davidson said. But some of the witnesses wondered if their testimony would do any good. The only Washington representatives present besides their own senators were John Hussey and Dave Clanton, staffers for the majority and minority members of the Commerce subcommittee.

"The representatives from Washington, D.C., they don't even come in Alaska one day yet. Why not send them up to Alaska first?" wondered Benedict Snowball Jr., of Stebbins Village, who had to pay over \$300 to charter a plane for the hearing.

And if the bill passes without additional consideration for Alaskans, "All we do is watch with heartache the Russian boats taking all they want," concluded John Apangalook of Gambell, an island just a few miles off the Siberian coast.

"And one will whisper, why did the U.S. buy Alaska? I would say the one who introduced this bill needs an education in the Eskimo way of living."

#### WE STAND BEHIND A BOLD PRESIDENT

### HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's decision to mine the ports of North Vietnam will go down in history as being among his most courageous actions. The enemy's recent massive invasion of South Vietnam invited this strong response. Hanoi's blatant violation of the 1968 understanding which ended the bombing of the North and opened the Paris talks could not go unchallenged if there is to be a real hope of a negotiated settlement. Just as certainly if peace negotiations are ever to succeed it is essential that we as a Nation present a united front to the enemy. In its editorial of Tuesday, May 9, the Owosso Argus-Press expresses this need very briefly and cogently. I place it in the RECORD to give it the wide circulation that it deserves.

#### WE STAND BEHIND A BOLD PRESIDENT

Last night President Nixon displayed an amazing degree of just plain guts—nerve un-

seen in an American president since Harry Truman or perhaps John Kennedy—when he announced the blockade of North Vietnam's ports and continued bombing of facilities which would support continuance of their invasion of the south and endanger the lives of U.S. servicemen still in the war zone.

Today the various elements of the news media are chock full of analyses of the President's words, their political meaning, their intent.

And there has already been the expected spate of scattered "uprisings" on a handful of our college campuses.

We haven't truly been a "united" United States since about the mid '40s and the President knew this when he summarized his bold action simply—"We must stand together."

Among the media, the Argus-Press may be in the minority, but nonetheless, we second his motion.

Let us today stand as one.

#### FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

### HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, evidence of much good work by the Farmers Home Administration, one of the great local service agencies of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is more and more apparent in the countryside and towns of the rural United States.

My own district offers an example: the counties of Kern and Tulare in the agricultural heartland of California.

Farming and enterprises associated with it are a staff of life and a dominant community interest in our section. But success or failure in agriculture can be determined by living conditions the people find on farms and in nearby communities. Whether one's role is that of owner or worker in the ranks, farming or any other way of life is only as desirable as the rewards that flow from it.

We are concerned, therefore, about the general condition and environment of communities where the people live; about the improvement of housing for all the people, as well as production on the land and in the plants where they work; the quality and convenience of water in the kitchens as well as in the fields.

In serving on the Agriculture Committee of the House, I have been privileged to take part in the development of an exceptionally effective system through the Farmers Home Administration for supporting the self-improvement efforts of the rural community.

From county seat offices, as in our centers of Visalia and Bakersfield, the Farmers Home Administration provides a service attuned to specific problems of the rural community in financing family farm enterprise, housing and modern public services.

Rural Americans benefit not only from this agency's localized service, but from the quality of leadership provided by the present administration. Farmers Home Administrator James V. Smith came to his office from a background of farming and community leadership in his native Oklahoma, followed by service in the

Congress. He is recognized as one of the most capable and respected administrators who come before our committee, and he knows that part of America he serves.

In the towns and farm areas of our district, there is much to show for the programs developed by Administrator James V. Smith and California's FHA organization ably directed by State Director Douglas Young.

In housing, we are approaching the point where Kern and Tulare Counties will have 1,500 dwelling units resulting from the Rural Housing program of the Farmers Home Administration.

Most of these are individual houses. Mr. Smith advises me that the 1,000th individual family home loan in effect in our district under this program will be made by late spring or early summer.

This is the service in insured housing credit that enables most of our farm worker families, senior citizens, and other families of modest income to move from substandard housing into modernized, adequate, presentable family-owned homes. It is producing homes this fiscal year half again as fast as a year ago. Last year's 12-month total of about 200 homes, totaling \$21 million of Farmers Home-insured credit, was achieved in 8 months of the current fiscal year.

In addition, more than 350 units of rental housing, suitable for year-round occupancy by farmworker families, have been built at Visalia, financed through this agency for the housing authority of Tulare County. Approximately 200 additional family rental units will be added in Kern County, through projects due to be funded in the coming year for the county housing authority at Shafter, and the local housing authority of the city of Wasco.

To the same degree that the rural housing program is reducing the blight of bad housing in rural areas, the FHA community facilities program is helping to modernize water and sewer services in towns and rural settlements. Seventeen projects to build, improve or expand community water and sewage disposal systems have been developed in our two counties with \$3.3 million of FHA loan and grant assistance, plus more than \$860,000 added from local, State and other resources. Loans to be repaid by the communities account for \$3 million of the amount advanced by the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. Speaker, one of the important bills developed in the Agriculture Committee this year and recently passed by the House was the Rural Development Act of 1972, a bill to strengthen and expand these programs so ably administered by the Farmers Home Administration.

It is a major purpose of President Nixon, the Congress and the people, to equalize opportunity in America, and insure that community needs in rural areas are as well served as those of major metropolitan centers.

Progress is gaining momentum in this field. It will continue if we maintain the fine quality of service now being extended through the Farmers Home Administration.

## THE VIOLENT "PEACELOVERS"

### HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, much has been said—both pro and con—about President Nixon's decision to mine North Vietnamese ports in an effort to counter the blatant invasion of South Vietnam by North Vietnam. While I would not deny anyone their constitutional right to freedom of speech, I strongly object to the words and deeds of those who would, willingly or unwillingly, feed the propaganda machine of the Communists.

For whatever their motives, these actions have only encouraged the Communists to renew their military efforts in Southeast Asia in the misguided hope that the United States does not support its fighting men, and might even be in imminent danger of internal collapse. These so-called "peace" activists are actually hurting the President's efforts to end the Vietnamese conflict honorably, and I would like nothing better than to take part in exposing these "hate America" groups for what they really are—so that they will no longer have the opportunity of fooling some of our patriotic, well-meaning citizens.

In this respect, I would like to compliment WTVT, channel 13, for its May 11 editorial, at which time this Tampa television station made public its viewpoint on "The Violent Peacelovers." The editorial follows:

#### THE VIOLENT "PEACELOVERS"

We wonder what life would be like in a nation governed by the kind of people who demonstrate their alleged love of peace by disrupting traffic and attacking police officers. We can imagine how they would deal with protesters who got in their way if they had real power. They have pretty clearly shown their contempt for our system of government, our democratic processes and for the rest of us as individuals.

Since they aren't accustomed to the use of reason and persuasion to decide issues, we are sure most will accuse us of being against free expression just because we feel they should confine themselves to peaceful protests, especially if they want to convince others that they believe in peace as a way of life. The attitude of the hard core in these violent demonstrations is illustrated very well by their behavior in Gainesville. Law enforcement officers risked the wrath of the majority of the community's peaceful citizens by letting the demonstrators take over a public highway for several hours. The idea that this kind of concession would satisfy these people was pretty well taken care of when the protesters kept pushing until they got what they wanted, a violent confrontation. We are glad to see that they constituted a small portion of any student body, much less the general population.

We're sure thinking students and citizens don't want this very complex issue decided by violence, no matter what their views. Even legal and peaceful demonstrations will be little help in finding the right way for ourselves, our country and for mankind.

President Nixon and his predecessors of both parties are not bloodthirsty monsters because of the military actions they felt nec-

essary, any more than are the government leaders and citizens who feel justified in turning South Vietnam over to a communist dictatorship. One thing for sure, the goal of peace in Southeast Asia will not be reached simply by taking every single American out of that area, no matter how good or bad it might be for our own self-interest.

We wonder what the reaction of one of these violent protesters would be if a pro-administration demonstrator stopped his car? We've heard it said about this kind of peace-lover that his attitude is "Support peace or we'll kill you." The truth in that keeps it from being very funny. Sincere peacelovers might do more good by blockading the highways across the DMZ leading into South Vietnam.

THE FIRST SOCIAL SCIENCE FAIR,  
ST. MARY, MOTHER OF JESUS  
SCHOOL, BROOKLYN, N.Y.

### HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of attending the first social science fair at St. Mary, Mother of Jesus School in my congressional district. I was tremendously impressed with the ingenuity and understanding shown by the children. The social science fair is the kind of event which should make us proud of the next generation. I certainly am proud that this fair was conducted in my district by these wonderful children.

I know that my fellow Members of Congress are interested in the work of these children and so I am appending a description of the fair and a list of its winners:

#### FIRST SOCIAL SCIENCE FAIR

On May 6th and 7th, a Social Studies Fair was held at St. Mary, Mother of Jesus School, Brooklyn, New York. The purpose of the fair was to share with the members of the community the projects that the students had made throughout the school year. Some of the projects were made by one child and some were the result of the research and creativity of two or three children working together. The children demonstrated their resourcefulness in using toothpicks, clay, cardboard and other materials to create projects which dealt with such subjects as the manner in which the Iroquois Indians lived, the different uses of the peanut discovered by George Washington Carver, and the First Man on the Moon.

The judges of the projects were Sister Mary Balthasare, CSFN, Social Studies Coordinator for the Diocese of Brooklyn, Miss R. Simmons of P.S. 97 and Mrs. L. Morack of P.S. 128. First, second, and third prize trophies were awarded in each grade, and a certificate was awarded to each child who participated in the fair. Some of the winning projects were later displayed at the Williamsburg Savings Bank in Bensonhurst.

The judges from P.S. 97 and P.S. 128 expressed a desire to have children of their own schools view the projects. Some of the children and the teachers from these schools visited the Social Studies Fair on May 8th and 9th. Mr. M. Stonehill and Mrs. B. Marcus, the principals of P.S. 97 and P.S. 128, also visited the fair and expressed great admiration for the achievement of the children.

Invitations, written by the children of

Grades 4 to 8, were sent to local leaders. Congressman Bertram L. Podell and Assemblyman Salvatore J. Grieco accepted their invitations and attended the fair on May 7th. Upon their arrival they were cordially received by all those present at the time, including Rev. Francis X. Reilly, Pastor of St. Mary, Mother of Jesus Church and Rev. Michael DeSantis, Administrator of our school.

Mrs. Annette Caputo and Mrs. Patricia Muzil, mothers of children in our school, helped in preparing the school auditorium for the fair. It was truly community involvement that made it possible for St. Mary's to have its first Social Studies Fair and to make it a great success.

The Principal, Sister Mary Benedict, the Social Studies teachers Sister Joseph Noel, Miss Loretta All, Mrs. Sally Crowley and Mrs. Elena J. Papa were quite pleased with the response to the fair. Mrs. Papa, Social Studies Coordinator, stated, "It is my hope that the enthusiasm shown by all will continue in other endeavors at our school as it has been shown in the past. We have a great group of children!"

AWARDS

First place

Theresa Cooke.  
Rosemarie Gambetta.  
Donna Cosenza and Ann Marie Eletto.  
Kenneth Capano.  
Stephen Coccaro, Gary Luppowitz, Frank Tissellano.  
Rita Leone.

Second place

Frank Panicali and Joseph Cosenza.  
Vincent Nagler and Kevin McNamara.  
Michelle Boccia, Gabrielle Cottone, and Rose Anna Zoda.  
Joanne Porzio and Denise Sessa.  
Deborah Lombardi.

Third place

Maria Theodore.  
Corrado Coppola.  
Felicia De Rosa.  
Linda Palmeri and Phyllis Sole.  
Linda Giacchi, Susan Gill, and Camille Prandi.

Honorable mention

Frank Manno.  
Frank Montalti.  
Anthony Fasciano.  
Maria Lo Presti.

MAN BITES DOG

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, nationally syndicated columnist Ralph de Toledano and I normally are in agreement on most issues with one notable exception: nuclear power. Over the years, we flayed each other on several occasions over the necessity and safety of developing nuclear reactors to produce electricity.

In his May 5 column, Mr. de Toledano finally recognized the error of his ways and admitted he was wrong. He concluded that in the face of the growing national power crisis, nuclear power is the best available alternative for meeting our electrical demand.

And in the spirit of detente, I, too, hereby renounce all the bad things I ever said about him.

I add to the RECORD at this point Mr. de Toledano's column from the Pompano Beach, Fla., Sun-Sentinel on May 5, in which a columnist accuses a Congressman of being right:

A TRUE POWER CRISIS LOOMS

(By Ralph de Toledano)

Several years ago, in this space, I strongly belabored Rep. Craig Hosmer, (R-Cal.) for his efforts at getting America's nuclear power plants moving. It was my position then that this country could continue to employ fossil fuels for the creation of electricity, until all the bugs had been removed from the harnessing of nuclear energy. Hosmer took me to task for this, arguing both my facts and my reasoning were faulty.

Craig Hosmer was right and I was wrong. For today, America faces a disastrous energy crisis. Unless the government and the country move energetically and decisively, within a handful of years there will not be enough electric power to turn the wheels of industry, to run our railroads, to keep our air conditioners humming, or to keep our houses warm.

The situation, as Representative Hosmer pointed out last week to a group of physicists, is grim. By 1985, he said, "United States dependence on imported petroleum will double, amounting to \$34 billion per year, and no one has any clear idea of how that much foreign exchange can be generated to pay for it."

The Interior Department reports, moreover, that the United States will be able to supply only two-thirds of its projected 1990 demand of natural gas. The shortage will be of a magnitude of 15 trillion cubic feet a year. As Hosmer notes, we have plenty of coal, but tough new laws proscribe its use in urban areas and other laws stand in the way of effective strip mining. And the environmentalists, while objecting to most means of producing electric power, are demanding a host of new plants, anti-pollution devices, recycling processes, etc.—all of which will need tremendous amounts of electricity.

The answer to America's skyrocketing energy needs is nuclear power which, despite its admitted drawbacks, is the cleanest available today. On this subject, Hosmer cites Dr. James H. Wright, Director of Environmental Systems for Westinghouse, who has estimated that chemically non-polluting nuclear power could replace 60 per cent of the primary sources of energy now used for transportation, 30 per cent of that for process heat, 25 per cent for space heat, and 30 per cent of the chemical primary energy now used for all other purposes.

"Such substitutions," Hosmer says, "together with other anti-pollution efforts would permit United States energy uses to rise unimpeded to the level predicted for the year 2000 . . . Regrettably, however, after 25 years of development . . . and the expenditure of billions of dollars by government and industry, the nuclear alternative . . . and the (nuclear) stimulation of natural resource production . . . have been singled out as whipping boys by a highly vocal, mixed-bag of tenacious opponents."

These highly vocal opponents are the environmentalists who howl at the sight of a beer can in a public park but do not bat an eyelash at the leadpipe certainty of an America grinding to a halt because of insufficient power. Thousands of Rube Goldberg suggestions are made to bridge the energy gap, including one from a Michigan housewife, Hosmer notes, who "plans to generate nonpolluting electricity with the methane gas given off by manure piles, an idea which undoubtedly struck her after she read some senator's speech."

Geologists estimate that through nuclear stimulation, America's natural gas reserves in the Rocky Mountain region alone could

be more than doubled—increased by 317 trillion cubic feet and shale oil formations could give access to 2 trillion barrels of petroleum. Yet "hypersensitivity to environmental critics (has) prevented our nuclear scientists from being turned loose on these resources" and the Plowshare program aimed at this end has been getting less and less funding from a careless Congress.

Much needs to be done, but if an "environmentalist" with a high school diploma and one year of science blows the whistle, the government trembles. Craig Hosmer has fought for some application of reason to the problem. He has made himself the outstanding congressional expert in nuclear energy. But he finds himself beset by pediatricians who demand an end to building fast-breeder reactors, or one or another "expert" prostituting his degree, as Hosmer laments, by holding forth on subjects of which he knows nothing. And all the while America moves ever closer to a devastating power shortage.

AMERICA SLEEPS AS COMMUNISM MARCHES ON

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, what is it going to take to make the American people wake up and realize that we are in a life-and-death struggle with communism, a multifronted war that we are now losing to an enemy so calculating and yet so evil as to be unexcelled in the annals of history?

Mr. Speaker, must we suffer a nuclear Pearl Harbor? Will that wake us up—assuming there are any of us left? Or are we going to continue in our apathy and unconcern until suddenly we are faced with a Communist imposed ultimatum—to surrender to superior forces or be annihilated?

Mr. Speaker, America today is on the way to committing suicide and our Nation is doomed unless we make an about-face. No, I am not dealing in hysterics; I am not attempting to use "scare tactics"—I am laying our cards on the table—our Nation is gambling with its security and we are going to lose.

In recent years this Nation has developed what amounts to a first-class case of paranoia—we have become so hung up on "reordering national priorities" that we are prepared to put the cart before the horse. We need to wake up to the reality stated years ago by Sir John Slessor that:

It is customary in democratic countries to deplore expenditures on armament as conflicting with the requirements of the social services. There is a tendency to forget that the most important social service that a government can do for its people is to keep them alive and free.

Until now our Government has done a good job in keeping us alive and free, and why? Because we have been strong. In this dangerous and fast-paced 20th century, America has been attacked or forced into war only during times of

weakness or indecision. An invincible United States cannot and will not be attacked, because no nation or person would in his right mind commit suicide.

Yet, our No. 1 deterrent to war, the key to providing Americans and the world with a "generation of peace" lies in our maintaining a strong national defense. And it is precisely this deterrent to war which has come under malicious attack and derision by the hypocritical and tainted "peacenik" element including several presidential candidates and Members of Congress. The kind of peace the apostles of appeasement would give us would bring to pass the very worst kind of world—capitulation on the installment plan to the Communist aggressors who wish to enslave the entire planet.

Mr. Speaker, over and over our people are being warned of the impending disaster and danger which confront us by learned and reasonable scholars, journalists, and public officials—including the President's own Blue Ribbon Panel on Defense. I include in the RECORD at this point two such recent commentaries, the first an editorial by William Randolph Hearst, the second an editorial appearing in a recent edition of the Amarillo News. The articles read as follows:

#### A PECULIAR BLINDNESS

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—Back from a fact-finding trip around the world, it is a bit disturbing to get home and realize how many Americans fail to face one of the grimmest facts there is—that Communism keeps working day and night to destroy freedom wherever it exists.

Our home-front apathy to this very real menace, coupled with the minimizing or denials it gets from many quarters, is in sharp contrast to the grave concern expressed in every country visited by The Hearst Task Force.

Throughout the capitals of Europe, and naturally more so in the actively beleaguered Far East, Communism with its insidious, tentacle-like global movements is seen clearly as the ever-looming threat it most certainly is.

At the very least the Communists, whether Chinese or Russian, are invariably trouble makers for any free country to which they have access. All you have to do is read the daily newspapers to know this—unless, of course, you are wearing the pink-tinted glasses of Sen. Fulbright.

At most, if successful, Communism's tenacious activities to weaken, subvert and eventually overthrow every non-Communist government will mean its domination of the whole world. That is its frank intent, proclaimed by its leaders time and again.

In the Far East this reality and what it can mean is thoroughly understood by everyone. The Chinese red dragon is breathing fire right down the necks of the Philippines, Thailand, Burma, Cambodia, Laos, South Korea, Formosa, and Japan, not to mention South Vietnam.

For a more detailed roundup on this, please read the important dispatch from Bangkok by Kingsbury Smith, our chief foreign writer, which appears on page two of this edition. Its final sentence reads:

"Despite the non-interference pledge in the Chinese-American communique (concluding the recent Nixon trip to China), every country in Southeast Asia continues to be beset by a Communist rebellion receiving at least moral and in most instances material support from Communist China."

Now I haven't got anywhere near the space even to summarize what the Russian Com-

munists are up to all over the world. You name a place and there they are, spreading their influence and stirring up trouble by any and all means possible.

For a recent example, Bolivia this week ordered 119 members of the Soviet embassy staff out of the South American country—allegedly for fostering and financing a left-wing guerrilla movement.

Think back and try to remember how many times you've read about Russian "diplomats" being told by various countries to pack up and git because of their spying or other subversive activity.

The fact is that Russia's diplomatic missions to free world countries are primarily headquarters for subversion and only secondarily for what we consider normal diplomatic and trade relations. That is why their embassies are usually staffed out of all proportion to obvious need.

Bolivia, for example, has three men at its Moscow embassy. Even in kicking 119 Russians out of their embassy in La Paz, the Bolivians will be permitting six or seven to stay—double their own crew in the Soviet capital.

The previous diplomatic exchange ratio of some 125 Russians to three Bolivians admittedly is unusually high—explainable by the volatile nature of Bolivian politics and the opportunity to assist a very strong revolutionary movement. A lopsided ratio of representation, however, is typical of the Soviets.

As of March 1, according to a State Department spokesman, our government had a total of 108 American nationals assigned to our embassy in Moscow. The Russians had 189 here—not counting the swarms at the United Nations.

As a general rule, the State Department spokesman told me, the Russians maintain roughly two to three times as many of their nationals in underdeveloped host countries as such countries do in Moscow; and as just noted, in Bolivia the ratio was 40 to one.

In view of the overwhelming evidence that Communism is the avowed enemy of all freedom—and the acceptance of this fact elsewhere in the world—I repeat it is discouraging to return home and suddenly re-experience American apathy or disbelief of the reality.

In no country that I visited have I ever run into anything approaching the fuzzy thinking about Communism that exists here.

Perhaps it's because most of the countries either have had their freedom threatened by them or taken away entirely or at least have had to fight for the cause of freedom that they see the facts so clearly.

Heaven knows—and readers of this column should certainly know after all these years—that I have done everything I can to publicize the danger. Yet there are many people throughout our country who are either confusedly vague on the subject or who flatly argue that there is no such danger.

Among them, unfortunately, are many teachers who are educating the next generation. Whether they are starry-eyed or stupid or deliberately malicious in spreading their views makes little difference. They are helping lull this nation into a false sense of security.

What these people teach, in essence, is that Communism represents a trend toward a future world of sweetness and light in which all men are brothers and justice prevails.

It is nothing of the sort. The most liberal and progressive form of government in this world is a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people" based on free people determining the details of the political structure for themselves.

Communism does not and never will represent rule by the people. It is rule by an elite group of privileged commissars and whatever social benefits they supply their people carry a terrible price tag.

That price is freedom—freedom to move about the world at will, freedom to write criticism, freedom to speak up in protest.

I say it is just plain foolish when Americans blind their eyes to reality and even go so far as to contend that anti-Communism is a "relic" of a now-defunct "cold war."

The cold and often hot war between Communism and Freedom will never be over so long as Communism exists.

The next time somebody tells you that Communism is nothing to worry about, you can be sure of one of two things.

Either he hasn't got all his marbles or he is quite far left of center politically and ideologically.

One thing is for sure if he honestly believes that life in some Communist state is better, more humane and fairer—he is certainly free to go there.

I, for one, wish he and all of his ilk would go and stay.

#### 11 TO 1 TO THE LEFT

Dr. George Benson is just back from Washington and his spirits are low. He says the evidence that the U.S. is losing the Cold War is piling up.

Dr. Benson, once a missionary to China, used the presidency of little Harding College in Searcy, Ark., upon which to build a widely hailed program of Americanism that soon outstripped the facilities of the little school. Today he is president-emeritus of the American Citizenship Center in Oklahoma City, and is more concerned than ever over "our swift slide to disaster through military weakness."

"I'm convinced, as are the Congressmen and Senators with whom I have just visited, that the Cold War being waged by world Communism against the U.S.A. is continuing, and that we are continuing to lose it," Dr. Benson reports.

The consensus of the people he visited is this: "Soviet Russia is building a military power to take over the world one way or another. . . . She is ahead of us in the most important strategic weaponry and constantly lengthening her lead. If she fails to overcome the U.S. by default (our weakness, and division, and ultimate surrender) she will strike militarily."

One of the responsible "higher-ups" with whom Dr. Benson talked in Washington was Rep. F. Edward Hébert, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

"Make no mistake about it," he told Dr. Benson, "by 1975, unless we keep pace and do things we are supposed to do, the Russians will outdistance us in every field of military operation, and challenge our military security."

The good doctor brought back a lot more in the way of warning against our worsening defense position around the world, but it has all been covered here, one way or another.

It all boils down to the fact that the United States is slipping rapidly behind the Soviet Union in military power, and nobody has yet discovered how one who keeps sliding downhill can avoid hitting the bottom.

To us, the significant thing about it all is that the American people don't seem concerned about this dangerous lapse into second place. Thousands of people will write their congressman protesting a reduction in some give-away program, but when the Congressional do-gooders propose that our military budget be cut some more so that such give-aways can be increased, there's not a peep from the other side.

How can this be?

We think it is the result of a long-range brain washing program centered in some of our more liberal colleges. For years radical speakers, mostly Communist, have been appearing on American campuses with the sanction of the college administrations. This has been gradually building up for 15 years.

A survey of college speaker programs in

1971 is just out. Its aim was to discover how many radical-liberal speakers appeared on college campuses as compared to the number of conservative speakers.

In the 40 schools selected from all over the country, the proportion of radical-liberal speakers to conservatives was about 11 to 1 in favor of the reds and pinks. This adds up to 431 left-wing speakers and only 38 conservative speakers.

Even more amazing were some of the fees paid to the more militant podium personalities. The University of California at Santa Barbara paid the notorious left-wing lawyer, William Kuntzler, \$2,000 for one speech. But that's nothing. The University of Maryland paid Panther leader Huey Newton \$4,801 for a single speech. Jerry Rubin, Abbie Hoffman, David Dellinger and their like make in excess of \$50,000 a year as campus speakers.

Yes, you say say; but what has this to do with Communist brain washing?

Here's what: Last year actress Jane Fonda told 2,000 students at Michigan State University: "I would think that if you understood what Communism was, you would hope, you would pray on your knees, that we could some day become Communist."

That's what she said. And do you know, not one of those 2,000 students challenged her!

Most students don't take a radical political philosophy to college with them; but a lot of them are picking it up after they get there. They get it from such speakers as Jane Fonda and William Kuntzler, and they find it accepted and supported—and even promoted—by an alarming number of the faculty.

Is all this planned? Of course it is. It is the great brain washing project through which the Communists hope to prepare the U.S. for easy plucking.

We don't say that every radical campus speaker takes orders direct from Moscow; but they are under some form of discipline, so that the program is kept moving.

Part of the brain washing is to convince us all that no money should be "wasted" on weapons that could be spent on people.

That's the refrain of the brain washers.

Mr. Speaker, most Americans do not fully appreciate the extent of our Nation's wealth, our power, and our many blessings, simply because we have come to take them for granted. We have become fat, lazy, and comfortable. No, I am not talking about all Americans, for a significant number fully understand and speak out on a crucial issue of defense. But, unless this Nation wakes up; unless the American people reject the false messiahs who promise peace without sacrifice and without constant vigilance, we may be not only the first, but also the last and only persons to enjoy the "generation of peace" we all so dearly want. Freedom today carries a high price tag, but life is not worth a plugged nickel without it. Are we still the same people who once shouted to our enemies—"Give me liberty, or give me death?"

WHAT APOLLO 16 MISSION MEANS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Peter Reich, aviation and space editor of Chicago Today, offers a most in-

teresting insight into the manned space flight program of the United States in the April 28, 1972, edition of that paper. Mr. Reich summarizes well the achievements and potential of our national space program with particular attention to the already established achievements of Apollo 16. I commend this article to your reading:

WHAT APOLLO 16 MISSION MEANS

(By Peter Reich)

The Apollo 16 astronauts are back on Earth—safe and sound.

What does the latest journey to the Moon mean? Where do we go from here?

For one thing, the United States now has sent aloft 26 different manned spaceships into the hostile environment beyond Earth's sheltering atmosphere—and brought them all back safely.

That alone is a remarkable achievement.

Thirty-two Americans now have traveled into space, 16 of them have made one or more repeat trips, 10 have walked on the moon—and not one has so much as scratched a finger in outer space mission.

By contrast, four Russian cosmonauts have perished in space, and no Russian has even circled the moon.

John Young, commander of the Apollo 16, and James Lovell are the recordholding astronauts. Both now have flown four space missions each, more than any other human beings.

Young must be given the edge. He has roamed the lunar surface. Lovell flew around the moon on two missions, but did not land. (He was supposed to land on the moon, but an explosion in the service module of his moonship, Apollo 13, canceled those plans.)

Four other Americans have made three space flights each—Wally Schirra, Charles Conrad, Thomas Stafford, and David Scott.

Ten other American astronauts, including two from the Chicago area, have made two trips into space. They include Gene Cernan, whose mother lives in suburban Bellwood, and James McDivitt, who attended Lane Technical High School in Chicago.

Also, Michael Collins, Edwin [Buzz] Aldrin, the late Virgil [Gus] Grissom, Nell Armstrong [first man on the moon], Richard Gordon, Alan Shepard [first American in space], Gordon Cooper, and Frank Borman [first man to circle the moon.]

There have been two suborbital [up-down] space missions in the one-man Mercury spacecraft, and four orbital missions by the same craft.

Ten two-man Gemini flights were flown. And now 10 three-man Apollo flights have been accomplished.

Of the Apollo flights, two were Earth orbit missions, three orbited the Moon without sending men to the surface, and five were moonlanding missions.

One Apollo mission remains.

Apollo 17 will be under the command of Bellwood astronaut Gene Cernan, who is scheduled to walk on the Moon with the first civilian-scientist to fly an American space mission, Dr. Harrison H. Schmitt.

Rookie astronaut Ronald Evans will wait for the pair in the circling mothership.

Launch date for Apollo 17 has been set for next December 6. Like the Apollo 15 and 16 astronauts, the Apollo 17 crewmen will ride in style across the lunar surface in another electric Moon Buggy.

And that will terminate the Apollo Moon-land program.

Beyond Apollo 17 are three planned Skylab missions. The first is to keep three men in orbit for 28 days. The second and third should keep three men up for 56 days each.

After that, in the late 1970s, should come the Space Shuttle, a winged craft about the size of a DC-9 jetliner which will rocket into

space like a spacecraft, but return to land on Earth like an airplane—and be able to make repeated flights!

Each of America's space programs has had a specific purpose:

Mercury-Redstone taught us that man can survive a rocket trip into space and return safely, at speeds of up to 5,200 m.p.h.

Mercury-Atlas demonstrated that man can safely orbit the Earth at up to 17,400 miles an hour.

Gemini showed that a manned spacecraft can be maneuvered, rendezvous with another manned craft, link up with unmanned satellites, change altitude, and can use an unmanned satellite's rocket to blast itself into a different orbit.

Apollo proved that men can fly beyond Earth orbit, around the Moon, and even land.

MRS. CONSTANTINE MACKARONIS:  
A GREAT LADY

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, recently one of my finest constituents, Mrs. Constantine Mackaronis, of New Brunswick, N.J., was honored for "outstanding civic work" by the New Jersey State Federation of Women's Clubs.

There is so much I could say about Mrs. Mackaronis. However, I think that the attached article published by the Home News, of New Brunswick, cites some of her remarkable activities, achievements, and leadership.

Mrs. Mackaronis is a woman of many talents, but her greatest gift is the love she has for people—it is deep and real and enduring. It is a special honor to have her live in Middlesex County, where she works day and night, not only helping people, but providing inspiration as well. Respected, admired, and loved, this great lady is a blessing to all who have the honor of knowing her. Like her husband, she always has love in her heart.

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Home News, May 10, 1972]

"OUTSTANDING CIVIC WORK" IS HONORED

ATLANTIC CITY.—Cited for her numerous civic activities, Mrs. Constantine Mackaronis of 11 Edgeworth Place, New Brunswick, has been honored with the Cecilia Gaines Holland Award by the New Jersey State Federation of Women's Clubs.

The award, presented last night at the federation's annual convention here, is given annually to the "clubwoman doing outstanding civic work in the State of New Jersey." It was instigated by Mrs. Holland, president of the federation from 1896-98, who is known for the part she played in helping to preserve the land along the Hudson River called Palisades Interstate Park. Criteria for the award is based strictly on civic activities rather than participation in club work.

Mrs. Mackaronis was nominated by Mrs. William Bornheimer, past president of the Raritan Valley Woman's Club, a club that meets in the evening for women who are unable to attend daytime meetings. Mrs. Mackaronis was its founder.

A member of the New Brunswick Historical Commission, Mrs. Mackaronis served on the New Jersey Tercentenary Committee in 1964 and was chairman of the United Nations celebration in New Brunswick. She is advisor to the Citizens Federation for the United Nations and is chairman of the Parent Council

for New Brunswick Schools and serves on the Community Advisory Committee to the city's Board of Education.

Both she and her husband are active in St. George Greek Orthodox Church where the former organized and was first president of the PTO. She also has been secretary of GOYA (Greek Orthodox Youth Organization).

Her husband is a former vice president of the St. George Board of Trustees. They have three children: Gregory, supervisor of the case workers for the Middlesex County Welfare Bureau; Candace, who teaches Spanish at New Brunswick High School, and Patrice, a social worker at Princeton Hospital.

Mrs. Mackaronis currently is serving as vice president and director of commissions on administration and individual development for the New Jersey Parent Teachers Association, and is president of the Middlesex County Past PTA Presidents Service Group. She is on the N.J. Education Association's committee planning a curriculum work conference to be held in November.

A member of the Middlesex County College Foundation, she also serves the Raritan Valley Girl Scout Council, the Linnaeus Garden Club and is a member of the National Association of Parliamentarians and a member of the Richard Kain Unit, NAP.

#### CRITICS GANG UP ON THE BICENTENNIAL

#### HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in *Business Week* of May 6, an article on the bicentennial. It is entitled "Critics Gang Up on the Bicentennial."

Mr. Speaker, this is a very perceptive and worthwhile analysis by a very capable author and reporter. Because this reflects a genuine concern on the part of many important people who have an understanding of and for American history and an appreciation of the challenge that is presented in properly commemorating the 200th anniversary of our birth, I call it to the attention of my colleagues.

Recently I placed in the *RECORD* an article in the magazine published by the American Association for State and Local History on its editorial page which indicates that the leadership of this very fine historical organization is discouraged. It is my belief that it reflects the thinking of many of its members and adds up to a growing collection of concern that ought to be noted by the Chairman of the Bicentennial Commission and especially by its Director, who many believe woefully inadequate for the challenge.

Mr. Speaker, that editorial ends with the observation that "time is running out." But it is not too late and it is my hope that the Commission will recognize its opportunity and respond to this challenge at an early date.

The article from *Business Week* follows:

#### CRITICS GANG UP ON THE BICENTENNIAL

Plans to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the American Revolution are stirring their own mini-revolt, centered around the agency in charge: the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. "They act like they're promoting a high school prom," says Representative Jerome Waldie (D-Calif.).

Similar complaints come from other congressmen as well as from historians. They charge that planning for the bicentennial has been preempted by promoters who are more interested in commercializing the 1976 celebration than in providing meaningful events to note the nation's 200th birthday. "Some very respected historians say that if the leadership is not changed, the bicentennial is doomed to failure," Representative Fred Schwengel (R-Iowa) charged in a House speech. Senator Charles Mathias, Jr. (R-Md.), and Representative Bradford Morse (R-Mass.), co-authors of legislation that created the commission, are both scathingly critical—Morse so much so that he voted against funds to keep the commission operating.

A primary target of this wrath is Jack LeVant, director of the commission and former senior vice-president of Colgate-Palmolive Co. LeVant, who was sworn into the job by none less than Chief Justice Warren E. Burger last October, is a long-time business associate of David J. Mahoney, chairman of the commission and also chairman and president of Norton Simon, Inc. "LeVant has to go," Schwengel says flatly, and a move to oust him is taking shape in Congress.

#### ACTIVITIES

Defenders of the commission argue that it has been handicapped by a small staff, little money, and frequent changes in leadership since it was set up in 1966. But now, with a staff of 60 and with new members of the commission, defenders say that it is broadening its representation and beginning to make progress.

Currently, the commission's plans center on two main proposals. One is for an international exhibition in Philadelphia—itsself a focus of controversy in the Quaker City. The second, still under study, is for a permanent "urban, recreational, and cultural" park in each state, financed with \$1.2 billion of federal funds. The parks would have such things as state historical exhibitions, craft bazaars, playgrounds, and restaurants.

So far, the commission has helped to set up state centennial commissions and arts groups to draw up projects for the celebration. It has also made a 14-minute film about the centennial, and is talking about other activities. Now it is seeking business participation, and will send out packets this summer to companies suggesting ways in which they might cooperate. Corporations and ad agencies are "thrashing about" for ideas, says a commission staffer. American Oil Co., for instance, has commission endorsement for its drive to raise funds to eradicate sickle cell anemia by 1976.

But, say critics, these activities simply are not adequate. "They conceive of it as a big birthday party," charges John Harr, editor of *USA 200*, an independent newsletter on bicentennial activities. Historians, he says, are in a state of near-rebellion. Professor Clarence VerSteeg of Northwestern University, chairman of the American Historical Assn.'s Bicentennial Committee, complains that he has not been able to get an appointment with Mahoney or LeVant.

"No programs are being planned to bring across the meaning of the American Revolution," VerSteeg says. "It shouldn't be a costume play. It should represent a clash of ideas." VerSteeg claims that the commission's operations have been "closed" and that the projects it has endorsed so far—a World Food Exposition in Iowa, for example—are "rather dreary and commercial." At the commission's May 15 meeting, historical groups will propose that a National Historic Records Commission be created. If the proposal is accepted, says commission member Professor Richard McCormick of Rutgers

University, it will "do a lot to restore the credibility of the commission" with the historians.

#### UNDER FIRE

Another target of the critics is the composition of the commission. Congress added eight new members to the commission, prompted by complaints that, of the 18 public members, only one was a historian, one was black, two were women, and none was under age 42. John D. Rockefeller III assembled a group of young people who wanted to help plan for the bicentennial, but after they were unofficially embraced by the commission as its "youth advisory committee," they pulled out, charging that they were being used as a "smokescreen" to make it appear that young people were participating.

Also under attack is the urban park proposal, which is cited as an example of the commission leadership's arrogance. The idea came up last October at an executive committee meeting of the commission. The staff then worked up a plan for the parks. This was presented to the full commission in February, with the recommendation that it be submitted to President Nixon for his approval. There was no indication on the agenda that the matter was coming up, says commission member McCormick, no advance documents for study by members, and less than an hour's discussion. "It was most extraordinary," McCormick says.

To LeVant, the fast action on the parks proposal was an effort to dispel charges of a "do-nothing commission." "We were asked by the President to get the wagon moving," he says.

Critics might be willing to let the commission operate more on its own if they had more confidence in the professional background of its director. "I have never heard of LeVant in the history field," says Schwengel, with some sarcasm. (Schwengel was chairman of the Civil War Centennial Commission and is president of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society.) McCormick does not press for a historian to run the staff, but he thinks that the director should "at least be someone who knows his way around the government" and has a background in public affairs. LeVant retorts that he thinks a business background is needed to cut through formalities and get things done. But critics still do not believe the commission and its staff are competent to stage a worthy commemoration.

#### TAX ACCOUNTANT REGISTRATION?

#### HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, although the tax filing season has just concluded, the subject of taxes and the role of the persons engaged to assist in the preparation of returns is still very much in the news.

A recent story appeared in the *Hutchinson News* concerning the proposal advanced by one of the professional organizations in the accounting field. The National Society of Public Accountants testified on this important subject on April 18, 1972, before the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs of the House Government Operations Committee.

I wish to thank Mr. John P. Shultz of Hutchinson, Kans., who is President of the Public Accountants Association of Kansas, the affiliate State organization

of the National Society of Public Accountants, for bringing this article to my attention.

This organization of professional accountants should be congratulated for seeking a practical solution to a most serious question touching millions of American taxpayers.

I insert the news article of April 16, 1972, from the Hutchinson News in the RECORD.

The article follows:

#### TAX ACCOUNTANT REGISTRATION?

The president of the National Society of Public Accountants this week called for registration of all income tax return preparers in order to cut down on improper preparation of the forms.

"Allegations by the IRS and the Treasury that many tax returns prepared for a free are either erroneous or fraudulent underscore the pressing need for immediate steps to identify and assure the competence of all preparers," said R. J. Passero.

"Every person who prepares federal income tax returns for a fee ought to be clearly identified by a registration system and be willing to demonstrate his competence by continuing study and familiarity with a constantly changing technical field."

He said that before a person could renew his registration at appropriate intervals, he would have to file an affidavit with the Internal Revenue Service indicating that he had complied with a reasonable on-going education program in the tax field.

"No one should be exempt," said Passero. "The only preparers who might be reluctant to register would be the marginal preparers who have something to hide."

Passero will testify formally at hearings of the Legal and Monetary Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee Tuesday.

The National Society of Public Accountants is composed of some 13,000 independent accountants in public practice. Organized in 1945, NSPA has been active in encouraging state legislation to regulate the accounting profession through the establishment of licensing or registration of public accountants other than CPAs.

The National Society's recent proposal was the first formal presentation made by the professionals in the tax and accounting fields in response to an IRS request for comments.

"This plan to identify every person making returns and to require some continuing education is designed to take some immediate, practical steps to halt the shoddy performance of some preparers," said Passero.

He stated that every effort has been made to avoid placing an administrative burden upon IRS while doing something to give the public a reasonable expectation of receiving qualified assistance.

"It is likely that many of the examples unearthed by IRS in its current probe will come about not from fraudulent behavior but from lack of knowledge of this complex tax field," said Passero.

"Without continuing technical education this aspect of the problem will remain a danger to the taxpayer seeking advice."

#### AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR FREE LABOR DEVELOPMENT IN LATIN AMERICA

**HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the American Institute for Free Labor Development is completing 10 years of activity in

CXVIII—1111—Part 14

Latin America, where it has sought to establish strong labor unions with a democratic orientation. It has been opposed by formidable obstacles—the Communist movement included.

This work deserves the continued support of the American people, and of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have a summary of the accomplishments of AIFLD over the past 10 years, but before I insert it in the RECORD, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the leadership of this organization.

George Meany of the AFL-CIO is president of AIFLD, and J. Peter Grace is chairman of the board, so we have labor and management teaming in this effort. Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, is secretary-treasurer, and William C. Doherty, Jr., is executive director.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a summary of the accomplishments of the organization during the past 10 years in the RECORD:

#### AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR FREE LABOR DEVELOPMENT

The American Institute for Free Labor Development, sponsored by the AFL-CIO, has completed a decade of operations with an outstanding record of helping the Latin American labor movement build its power and competence to the point where the Latin American Worker has his proper voice in labor-management relations in the area.

With the increasing support of the United States Government, this unique joint venture of American labor and business has significantly accelerated economic growth with justice in Latin America through programs of education, housing and community action, and has demonstrated to hundreds of thousands of workers that their best interests are served by a free and democratic society.

The tremendous progress of AIFLD is impressive, especially considering that democratic unionism has had to contend with strong communist opposition. Beginning in 1962 when Fidel Castro's popularity in Latin America was at its highest peak, AIFLD had to challenge Castroism on its home ground in Latin America and deal with its infiltration and attempted takeover of the labor movement. AIFLD has demonstrated that the democratic way offers greater dignity and a higher quality of life to the workers of Latin America.

How successfully it took up this challenge can be seen from the number of labor unions that have routed their communist leaders and joined the democratic camp.

Outstanding victories in cause democratic of reform were achieved in all of the Latin American countries where communist infiltration of the labor movement was a severe problem, notably in Uruguay, Brazil, Ecuador, Colombia, Panama, Dominican Republic, Guatemala and Guyana.

AIFLD's record of accomplishment is making trade unions effective engines of change in Latin America can best be seen in concrete data:

*In Education:* It has trained in ten years 188,795 labor leaders at residential centers and in regional seminars in Latin America; 1127 leaders in its advanced course at the Front Royal, Virginia Institute, and 89 labor economists who were educated at Loyola and Georgetown Universities. In 1972 it has set up training courses for an additional 36,000 leaders in Latin American training centers; 200 leaders at the Front Royal Institute and 21 labor economists at Georgetown.

*In Housing:* 16,269 units have been completed in 12 countries for an investment of \$70 million with an additional 1,619 units costing \$6.6 million now under construction.

*In Credit Facilities:* The Workers Housing Bank in Peru set up by AIFLD has \$4.25 million in deposits from 12,268 workers and has approved 961 loans for total of \$8.1 million. AIFLD has established a credit cooperative in the Dominican Republic to free thousands of workers from loan sharks.

*In Social Action:* 675 community action projects have been completed representing an investment of \$2.2 million in grants and interest-free loans funded by the AFL-CIO and AID.

*In Impact Projects:* The AFL-CIO has contributed \$600,000 to finance this program of grants and interest-free loans of less than \$5,000 to help unions build community centers, for school construction, repairing and remodeling, disaster relief, health services, educational equipment, and the like. Under this revolving fund 351 projects in 22 countries have been approved for a total of \$676,000.

*In Regional Revolving Loan Fund:* Financed by AID this program provides interest-free loans on projects costing between \$5,000 and \$50,000 for social projects and community development.

The "alumni" of the AIFLD education program have become top labor leaders in their home countries, directing labor federations or large key unions and in some cases they have become members of legislatures and cabinet ministers.

In recognition of its increased effectiveness, the U.S. Government, through AID, has substantially increased its grants to the Institute during the course of the past decade. In this same period of time it has had the strong support of both Democratic and Republican administrations.

Here are three Presidential comments:

"I am very pleased to express to the first group of participants in the American Institute for Free Labor Development my warm best wishes and congratulations.

"The Institute is a formal acknowledgment of the fraternity of spirit to which all who choose freedom belong American trade unionism, the beneficiary of an open political system and an accomplished economy, can impart to his brother trade unionists from other lands its technical know-how and its experienced methods. But it receives something in return—the refreshing reminder that those things have come into being and exist for the welfare of the individual and the advance of human dignity . . ."—John F. Kennedy.

"For over three years the education and social welfare programs of the American Institute for Free Labor Development have brought untold benefits to the Latin American workers. "The Institute has been in the vanguard of our efforts to promote the prosperity and well-being of the Americas. In it the Alliance for Progress has found a ready champion, and its countless beneficiaries have found the pathway to a better life . . ."—Lyndon B. Johnson.

"We have a special interest in the welfare of the people who share this Western Hemisphere with us and are currently seeking new initiatives to make our combined efforts more effective. The AIFLD, through its various self-help projects in such fields as cooperatives and housing and through its educational work in support of the development of free democratic trade unions, has played an important role by involving rank and file workers in its activities . . ."—Richard Nixon.

In the critical struggle for the allegiance of rural workers who suffered from exploitations, poverty, and disease, AIFLD moved rapidly during the ten-year period and successfully organized these workers into democratic unions. In the particularly needy northeast sector of Brazil, AIFLD set up three large rural centers to provide education, health care and agricultural training, and set up smaller centers in Ecuador,

Costa Rica and Honduras and other countries.

The Institute broadened its program by establishing in Colombia an inter-American training center to develop rural leaders to work in their home countries with farm workers by creating cooperatives and by providing education, medical, legal and credit services.

AIFLD today is one of the most dynamic and successful private organizations operating in Latin America. During its first ten years of operation it has overcome the opposition of Castro-Communism and is now re-oriented to meet the challenge of the 70's. It was strongly endorsed by Governor Nelson Rockefeller following his fact-finding tour of Latin America several years ago. He recommended increased financial and technical assistance through AIFLD for worker education and vocational training.

One of its major assets is the successful blending of American business, labor and government. AIFLD has demonstrated that the three essential sectors of a viable democratic society can work together toward a common goal in pursuit of common interests. It has proved itself a model for similar organizations working in other fields and in other activities.

During the past ten years labor and business support has been particularly encouraging to AIFLD and, in fact, it is essential in maintaining the labor-management-government concept on which it was founded to define and promote equitable patterns of labor-management relations in the private enterprise sector which forms an integral part of the mixed economies in Latin America.

AIFLD has pioneered in establishing and developing this unique joint venture which points the way toward the type of organizational base on which some of our foreign activities can operate with effectiveness and success.

#### A WELL-DESERVED TRIBUTE TO LUISA QUINTERO

### HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 21, a well deserved tribute will be paid to Mrs. Luisa Amparo Quintero, staff reporter of *El Diario-La Prensa*, by her many friends and associates at a testimonial dinner in the Metropolitan Opera House of the Lincoln Center in New York City. Mrs. Quintero, affectionately known in the Puerto Rican and Spanish-speaking community as simply "Luisa," will be honored for her many years of tireless and outstanding service to the community as well as for her distinguished journalistic career.

Born in Toa Baja in northern Puerto Rico, Luisa served as secretary to the great Puerto Rican national poet, Luis Llorens Torres. Arriving in the United States in 1928, she quickly launched her noted career as a newspaperwoman by taking a position with *La Prensa*. Both as a member of the press as well as in her private life, Mrs. Quintero has tirelessly worked to achieve equal rights for all peoples and to foster greater understanding among diverse ethnic and racial groups. She has also been a vital element in the progress of the Puerto Rican community, both in New York and on the island. Official recognition has been given to her important community contribu-

tions—in 1967 when she was named "Journalist of the Year" by the Institute of Puerto Rico, in 1968 when Terence Cardinal Cooke of New York bestowed the Gold Medal of the San Juan Fiesta on her and in 1970 when Mayor John V. Lindsay awarded her the Medal of the City of New York.

I feel a very special affection for Luisa and am proud to have had the opportunity to be associated with her in a number of community projects over the past years. I am indeed pleased to join in honoring her and in bringing her outstanding career to our colleagues' attention.

At the testimonial dinner Mrs. Quintero will be presented with a resolution which both aptly summarizes her many and varied accomplishments and contributions and appropriately expresses the gratitude of her many friends, both within and without the Puerto Rican community. I am pleased to present this resolution herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

#### RESOLUTION IN TRIBUTE TO LA SRA. LUISA AMPARO QUINTERO

Whereas, La Sra. Luisa Amparo Quintero is a noted, loved and respected journalist who has dedicated her personal and professional life to serving the Puerto Rican Community in the United States and Puerto Rico;

Whereas, Her Column, "Marginalia," which regularly appears in *El Diario-La Prensa*, is read by Spanish-speaking people throughout the United States and Puerto Rico;

Whereas, In addition to her journalistic career she has personally labored with unstinting energy to further equal opportunities for all Americans, whether Spanish-speaking or not;

Whereas, Her personal, heartfelt efforts have been devoted to fostering understanding, friendship, love and respect among all people, regardless of ethnic or racial background;

Whereas, Her career has included service to Luis Llorens Torres—Puerto Rican national poet; respected Spanish language newspapers including *La Prensa*, *Ecos de Nueva York*, where she was city editor, *El Diario*, and *El Diario-La Prensa*, as well as *Texas Magazine* and the Spanish Bulletin of the United Nations;

Whereas, Mrs. Quintero was a founder of the Puerto Rican Parade, the Fiesta Folklorica and the San Juan Bautista Fiesta;

Whereas, She was a founder of the Puerto Rican Forum; ASPIRA, Inc.; and the Puerto Rican Community Development Project;

Whereas, She was selected Journalist of the Year in 1967 by the Institute of Puerto Rico;

Whereas, The Medal of the City of New York was awarded to her in 1970 by Mayor John V. Lindsay for services rendered to the community;

Whereas, She was awarded the Gold Medal of the San Juan Fiesta for meritorious service to the community by H. E. Cardinal Terence J. Cooke, of the Catholic Archdiocese of New York in 1968;

Whereas, There is hardly an aspect of Puerto Rican life in New York City to which Mrs. Quintero has not devoted her energies;

Whereas, She was intimately involved with the efforts of President John F. Kennedy and Senator Robert F. Kennedy as well as with other national political and social leaders;

Whereas, She has lent wisdom and wit to the struggle to improve conditions for Puerto Ricans and others;

Whereas, When the history of the Puerto Rican contribution to the cultural and social life of this country shall be written, Mrs. Quintero's name shall stand as a shining light to guide future generations.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that Mrs.

Luisa Amparo Quintero be honored for her many years of tireless and devoted service on behalf of the Puerto Rican community and for her countless contributions to advancing the best interests of all Boricuas and other Spanish-speaking peoples.

Be it further resolved that Sunday, May 21, 1972, be proclaimed as a special day of tribute to Mrs. Luisa Amparo Quintero and that a testimonial dinner be held in her honor at which time we may personally express our gratitude.

#### TRIBUTE TO MRS. JOAN LORENZEN

### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the noted poet, Ralph Waldo Emerson, stated:

The true test of civilization is, not the census, nor the size of cities, nor the crops—no, but the kind of man the country turns out.

A glowing example of the product of our civilization is Mrs. Joan Lorenzen, a community-minded citizen who personifies the ideal referred to by Mr. Emerson.

By measuring the accomplishment of Mrs. Lorenzen against the "true test of civilization," we can, as a nation, take pride in the individuals who have worked to advance our society.

On May 30, the community of Wilmington, Calif., will pay tribute to Joan Lorenzen for her many years of dedicated service to the people of the harbor area.

Almost every area of social concern has witnessed the driving force and the inspiring devotion of Mrs. Lorenzen. Her activities have run the gamut of volunteer service in such projects as the Red Cross, the United Fund, the Cancer Society, and the Parents-Teachers Association.

Due to Mrs. Lorenzen's radiating personality, she has been selected by her peers to lead in these and other campaigns, and worthy causes including the hospital auxiliary, women's clubs, clean-up drives, and Government education. In addition, her work through the church has drawn praise from many quarters.

In fact, she received an "Oscar" from the city of Los Angeles for her work as the charter organizer and the charter president of the Senior Citizens at Banning Manor in Wilmington.

In 1966, she received well-deserved recognition for her most important activity—caring for her family—when she was nominated by the American Mothers Committee of the State of California for the award of "Mother of the Year." Mrs. Lorenzen and her husband, Fred, are the parents of a daughter, Marga Jean, and two sons, Harry and Frederick.

When the mayor established an advisory council consisting of local citizens who are involved in community projects, and who are aware of the needs and desires of the citizenry, one of the first selected was Mrs. Lorenzen.

In her efforts to preserve one of the few remaining landmarks to Southern California's activities during the Civil

War, Joan was instrumental in the establishment of the Society for the Preservation of Drum Barracks. Today she is the president of that organization whose purpose is to restore the 110-year-old Drum Barracks located in Wilmington.

She has served as the president of the Women's Division of the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce and was regional director for Women in Chambers of Commerce for California for 6 years.

In addition, Mrs. Lorenzen is the vice president of the Commission of Animal Regulation.

Mr. Speaker, Wilmington, the State of California, and the Nation are, indeed, better places to work and live due to the efforts of Mrs. Lorenzen.

If we use the test of a civilization established by Ralph Waldo Emerson, and measure a Nation by the quality and the character of her people, as exemplified by Mrs. Joan Lorenzen, I believe that we can take great pride in our country and in our civilization.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I join with the many friends of Mrs. Lorenzen in paying tribute to her for her achievements and for her efforts in behalf of the people of the harbor area.

#### LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

### HON. CHARLES THONE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of press and television attention has been given recently to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The bulk of that attention has been critical and has stemmed from two sources: First, press accounts of a majority report by the House Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, which has not yet been released; and, second, a segment on the "60 Minutes" program on CBS television citing the majority views and similar criticisms.

What has been overlooked in this flurry of criticism, of course, is the positive side of the LEAA story—or, to put it another way, there appears to have been little effort made in recent weeks to give a balanced account of the nationwide crime control program.

Thus, it was extremely heartening to read in the May 16 edition of the Wall Street Journal an eminently fair and balanced account of the LEAA program—which took into account both its successes and its past problems.

The Wall Street Journal's discussion of the LEAA program appeared in an editorial titled "Is LEAA a Flop?" It was a thoughtful and judicious discussion of LEAA and the controversies surrounding it, and I commend it to every member of the House with an interest in the subject.

I am certain that all members who may have formed opinions of the LEAA program based on premature press and television accounts of the majority re-

port's findings will wish to wait to form their final judgments until after the minority report of the House Government Operations Committee is issued shortly. I believe that such an important subject can be evaluated properly only by looking at both sides—and I am confident that the minority report, when it is made public, will present a convincing case for the worth of the LEAA program. I also believe it will make clear that less than a balanced view was sought by the majority in its examination of the LEAA program.

The Wall Street Journal editorial points out, for instance, that some money was hastily spent in the first 2 years of the program, and some was wasted. But it also goes on to say that:

Under the reorganization of LEAA by Jerris Leonard, its new Administrator, the agency is having more success in making sure the funds are being spent for reasonable purposes. It's now clear the program is operating far better than the Monagan report would indicate.

The editorial says, too, that one of the crucial points of the LEAA program is that it gives the basic responsibility for creation of anticrime programs to State and local governments, and that there are signs that this approach is strengthening our Government at this crucial grassroots level. This certainly was the intent of the Congress.

A social engineer in Washington would likely allocate the money differently.

The editorial says:

But past experience suggests more money is wasted by this method than by having local professionals decide and be held accountable.

And the editorial concludes:

Thus, while we can agree that LEAA had a shaky start, we think it's altogether incorrect to pronounce it a failure. Indeed, the preponderant weight of testimony from the criminal-justice and law-enforcement community indicates the Monagan view is a minority view.

It is urged that the editorial gives important insights into the LEAA program and current criticisms of it, and it is as follows:

#### IS LEAA A FLOP?

Democratic members of a House subcommittee last week endorsed a report that pronounces the Nixon anticrime program a failure, finding it shot through with waste, inefficiency, and corruption. The report catalogues questionable disbursement practices of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), an arm of the Justice Department, as well as dubious spending practices by state and local law-enforcement agencies.

Well, one might say, it's an election year. The Democrats could not be expected to pronounce LEAA a model of efficiency even if it were, which it isn't. Even so, there is more here than meets the eye, more at issue than simply presidential politics. What is developing is a classic struggle between Democrats and Republicans over the strength of the central government, a struggle that has taken various forms throughout the republic's history and now focuses on the President's decentralization program. A bit of recent history explains why.

In 1968, with Republicans vowing to make "Crime in the Streets" a principal issue, Lyndon Johnson rushed forth with a plan to spend several hundred millions a year to aid local law enforcement. His proposal would

have required state and local police, court, prison, and parole agencies to apply directly to the Justice Department for funds to pay for specific, approved projects. House Republicans (backed by Southern Democrats) insisted the effort be decentralized through the "block grant" concept. Under this system, each state would submit an overall plan on how it would spend its share of the total in the federal kitty. It would not be necessary to set up another giant federal bureaucracy to oversee the program. The states would be chiefly responsible for setting priorities and spending the funds wisely.

The liberal Democrats were aghast at the prospect of turning all this political power over to the states, and predicted waste, inefficiency, and corruption unless the federal government maintained direct control. Among those in the forefront arguing this line was Rep. John Monagan, Democrat of Connecticut. He lost, and LEAA was set up along the lines designed by the House Republicans. Mr. Monagan, chairman of the subcommittee whose Democratic members last week pronounced LEAA a failure, wants to replay the 1968 debate and this time get that political power back from the states.

That's fair enough. But the campaign is getting a bit nasty. Early last month, Mr. Monagan's staff leaked its hypercritical report on LEAA to Mike Wallace and the CBS television program "Sixty Minutes." Mr. Wallace accepted the report as gospel and took his cameras around the country to illustrate the flaws in LEAA. Republicans charged that the program was carefully edited to eliminate any evidence that did not jibe with the theme of the Monagan report. They turned up one Florida police chief who spent 2½ hours being interviewed by CBS and "had nothing but praise for LEAA," yet who didn't make the show at all.

Nonetheless, the question is a valid one: "Is LEAA a flop?" and if so, has the block grant concept been so discredited that one might as well forget all the Nixon ideas about decentralizing government—including revenue sharing? Can it be that state and local agencies just cannot be trusted to spend money wisely unless, every step of the way, the federal government is dictating directions?

So far as we can tell, having watched LEAA's development with a curious eye on the block-grant experiment, the results are mixed but hopeful. Undeniably, considerable money was hastily spent in the first two years of the program, undoubtedly much of it wasted.

The biggest mistake the Republican administrators made at the outset lay in trying to prove too earnestly that Big Brother wasn't needed at all. For its first two years, LEAA's staff included but five auditors, wholly inadequate for an effort that has thus far dealt out \$1.4 billion. Fortunately, after the initial experience, LEAA was reorganized under director Jerris Leonard, and the auditing staff of 50 is having more success in making sure the funds are being spent for reasonable purposes. It's now clear the program is operating far better than the Monagan report would indicate.

Even before the reorganization, the experiment showed promise. The process by which the criminal justice community sets priorities and divides up the money fairly seethes with contentiousness and compromise, signs of real decision-making at the local level. A social engineer in Washington would likely allocate the money differently. But past experience suggests more money is wasted by this method than by having local professionals decide and be held accountable.

Thus, while we can agree that LEAA had a shaky start, we think it's altogether incorrect to pronounce it a failure. Indeed, the preponderant weight of testimony from the criminal-justice and law-enforcement community indicates the Monagan view is a minority view.

## A CASE OF SLOPPY JOURNALISM

## HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the need for and advisability of granting amnesty to draft evaders has been debated rather heatedly for several months.

People on both sides of the issue have come up with numerous reasons for supporting their particular view. And there has been sharp divergence on such matters as if, when and how an amnesty program should be established and who should be eligible for this form of dispensation.

But on one point, people at both ends of the spectrum have been in relative agreement—that there are tens of thousands of young men in Canada who would be permanently barred from America if no amnesty were declared. Acceptance of the estimate that 70,000 to 100,000 evaders are now making their homes in our northern neighbor's cities and provinces has been universal. The 70,000 figure has gained the most acceptance in 1972.

An article in the May 9, 1972, Washington Post sheds some light on these estimates. It shows dramatically the way in which all of us have come to take for granted something which apparently is based on little more than speculation. The estimates were given credence not only because of the number of times they were repeated, but by the sources repeating them as well. Members of the media and politicians more and more came to rely on the 70,000 figure, and it thereby became "fact."

Mr. Russell Nye in his article offers a brilliant exposition of how we have trustingly allowed ourselves to begin using these estimates without questioning their source or accuracy. This example gives cause to wonder how many other times this kind of gradual misinformation takes place.

Will Rogers, of course, was famous for saying, "All I know is just what I read in the papers." They are, without question, an important source of information, but when they get complacent—and when we do as readers—the likelihood of this sort of situation occurring is increased.

The article follows:

## A CASE OF SLOPPY JOURNALISM

(By Russell B. Nye)

When it comes to facts, I have never really trusted newspapers very much. A youth spent in what Colonel Robert R. McCormick used to call "Chicagoland," reading the *Tribune*, and 25 years of historical research have convinced me that newspapermen are highly fallible sources of information. When I heard Martin Nolan of *The Boston Globe* remark confidently on television (October 24, 1971) that there were "over 50,000 war resisters in Canada," I thought he might really know. The figure seemed to me important, so I wrote to Nolan, asking his source.

Nolan's reply was not helpful. He cited James Reston Jr. who had used the 50,000 figure in *The New Republic* without attribution. Newspapermen quoting other newspapermen arouse my suspicion, so I thought I'd look it up, especially when that 50,000 began turning up all over the media.

I began in 1968. That year a writer in *The Progressive* thought there were "at least 10,000 draft evaders in Canada. *U.S. News and World Report* gave estimates varying from 300-400 to 25,000. Edmund Taylor, in a well-researched article in the soon-to-be-defunct *Reporter*, cited a *New York Times* estimate of 14,000 up. *The Atlantic*, using the Toronto group's figure, came up with 3,000-10,000.

In 1969 amazing things happened. The *New York Times* in April settled for "several thousand" draft evaders in Canada. In December, however, it raised that to 60,000 on the basis of estimates from the Toronto draft-resisters' group—a number soon to be enshrined in the American press. That the figure represented a spectacular increase of 56,000 over the 1968 news report bothered nobody at the *Times* while CBC's "Public Eye" program, perhaps carried away by the *Times*, also estimated 60,000.

In 1970 things settled down a bit, but not for long. The *Times* shifted its estimate to 6,000-60,000 (a delightfully flexible figure, I thought) as well as quoting an "independent estimate of 20,000." The Toronto group (which used 10,000 in 1968) now placed the number at 60,000 (the *Times* again?) which other papers dutifully printed. Stewart Alsop, in *Newsweek*, fixed for no discernible reason on 25,000-30,000. Roger Williams, of the Toronto group, used the *Times'* 60,000 but insisted that "qualified observers" calculated "many more than that." (This seemed to me an interesting situation, in which draft evaders in Canada quoted the *Times* which quoted draft evaders in Canada.) Vance Garner, of the Montreal Resisters' Council, entered the field with a statement that there were 14,000 draft-age landed immigrants "here now," a figure I found impossible to derive from any known Canadian immigration reports. He escalated things further by claiming that there were actually "three to four times that many" illegally in Canada, i.e., 42,000-56,000. A staff worker for the Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam told the press that there were 60,000 draft evaders in Canada (once more the *Times*), a figure which included 30,000 in Toronto alone.

The year 1971 was wilder. *Newsweek* cited 50,000-70,000, doubling what their man Alsop said a year before. *Parade*, apparently quoting the Clergy and Laymen group, said there were 30,000 in Toronto. The Toronto *Globe and Mail*, for its part, chose 30,000-100,000. Mike Wallace on "Sixty Minutes" used a new Montreal Resisters' estimate of 100,000, noting that it was perhaps inflated, but offering no alternative. Nolan, citing Reston, and Reston, citing nobody, said "over 50,000."

The most curious statistics of 1971, however, appeared in Roger Williams' book, *The New Exiles*, which had few footnotes and no bibliography. Williams on different pages cited both 40,000 and 60,000 (the *Times* again!) for 1970. On another page he put the number in mid-1967 at 5,000-6,000, representing an increase of 34,000-55,000 in less than three years, certainly one of the least-noticed mass migrations in modern history. On two other pages he reported 25,000 evaders and deserters legally in Canada, and on yet another page, by adding wives and children, he got the number (legal or illegal?) to 50,000-60,000. Finally, at the close of his study, he increased this to 50,000-100,000.

1972 may be a banner year for inflation. *Newsweek* led off in January with "75,000, mostly in Canada," while David Brinkley, with oracular finality, made it 75,000-100,000. Senator Robert Taft, in an interview given to *The Los Angeles Times* news service, estimated there are "about 20,000 of these men in Canada." Since Senator Taft, who has initiated legislation, and Brinkley, who was commenting on it, differ by 55,000-80,000, the variance seems significant. They can't both be right.

In January, Gannett News Service used the figure "60,000-100,000," which strikes me as

having a generous margin of built-in error. In February, UPI settled on 70,000. The last four references I have seen in January and February, 1972, choose 70,000.

What emerges from all this, and I have not by any means exhausted examples, is clear evidence of extremely sloppy journalism. Newspaper and television reports on draft evaders and deserters in Canada have, over those two years, varied from 10,000 to 100,000, a margin of error that ought to have stirred a twinge of doubt in some newspaperman's breast somewhere. Most striking in the stories was the almost complete lack of plain legwork. I found no journalist who had consulted easily obtainable Canadian immigration figures, and with one or two exceptions, none who had researched the realities of Canadian immigration laws. One cannot, as Alsop wrote, simply walk across the Canadian border and "fade into the economy," or, as *Newsweek* misleadingly implied, gain landed immigrant status simply by asking at the border. Canadian embassy and consular sources that have no ax to grind will, if asked, estimate about 10,000 American draft evaders in Canada (about the same number of Canadians have volunteered for the U.S. Army), but nobody asks them.

As for me, I trust the press no more than before, nor do I have any more information than before. I don't know how many draft evaders there are in Canada or elsewhere, but in the light of the growing debate over amnesty, I'd like to know as accurately and honestly as possible.

## IMPORTS AND THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

## HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, Members of the New York delegation met with representatives of textile workers and textile manufacturers from the State of New York to discuss the problem of imports, particularly those produced abroad by American-based "multinational" corporations.

While there was no agreement with respect to a specific piece of legislation, there was a most definite consensus that something has to be done. These American-based corporations develop their technology here in the United States, deducting the cost thereof from their income for tax purposes and then take advantage of tax incentives in our Internal Revenue Code to go elsewhere to produce their goods. The disastrous effect which this sort of thing has had on one industry—the garment industry—is amply demonstrated by the accompanying charts, prepared by the research department of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

My bill, H.R. 11783, would put an end to the incentives for multinational corporations to go abroad. It would end their tax deferral and accelerated depreciation advantages and repeal sections 806.30 and 807.00 of the Tariff Code—the provisions which permit American manufacturers to produce their products in Mexico at slave wages and then to import them into the United States for sale with almost no duty.

Mr. Speaker, something must be done,

and the failure of the Nixon administration to do it means that it is up to us in the Congress to act. As Louis Hollander of the New York State AFL-CIO so aptly put it, the figures in these tables are impressive, but the most important thing to keep in mind is that they stand for people—working people—who have lost their means of earning an honest living.

Tables follow:

**Apparel imports—Increase from 1969 to 1971**  
(In square yards of fabric used in their manufacture)

	Percent
All apparel.....	+564
Cotton apparel (subject to international agreements since 1961).....	+92
Man-made fiber apparel.....	+5,310
Wool apparel.....	+126

**Total apparel imports as percent of domestic consumption**

Year	Percent
1956.....	4
1961.....	6
1970.....	20
1971.....	25

**EXTENT OF IMPORT PENETRATION**

[As percent of domestic production]

	In 1961	In 1971
Women's and children's coats and jackets.....	1	40
Rainwear.....	6	26
Women's and children's blouses.....	9	51
Sweaters.....	5	87
Women's and children's trousers and shorts.....	23	52
Brassieres.....	15	29
Pajamas and nightwear.....	3	15
Women's and children's dresses.....	1	9

**IMPORTS OF SELECTED WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S GARMENTS**

	1961	1971	Percent of increase
Coats.....	558,000	15,672,000	+2,709
Suits.....	75,000	879,000	+1,072
Dresses.....	3,323,000	30,289,000	+711
Blouses.....	29,426,000	129,270,000	+339
Skirts.....	504,000	9,286,000	+1,742
Sweaters (for both sexes).....	7,201,000	116,710,000	+1,521
Slacks and shorts.....	31,146,000	136,488,000	+338
Playuits.....	10,988,000	20,215,000	+84
Raincoats (for both sexes).....	1,337,000	4,906,000	+267
Dressing gowns and robes.....	476,000	3,211,000	+575
Nightwear and pajamas.....	4,492,000	18,245,000	+306
Underwear.....	1,650,000	22,941,000	+1,290
Brassieres.....	31,523,000	59,938,000	+90

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and ILGWU Research Department.

**IMPORTS AS PERCENT OF DOMESTIC PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION—APPAREL (KNIT AND WOVEN), UNITED STATES**

Year	Percent of—	
	Production	Consumption
1956.....	3.9	3.8
1957.....	4.3	4.1
1958.....	5.5	5.3
1959.....	8.2	7.7
1960.....	8.6	8.0
1961.....	6.8	6.4
1962.....	10.2	9.3
1963.....	10.6	9.6
1964.....	11.8	10.6
1965.....	13.4	11.9
1966.....	14.2	12.5
1967.....	15.6	13.6
1968.....	17.7	15.1
1969.....	21.6	17.9
1970.....	25.2	20.3

1 Preliminary estimate.

Source: ILGWU Research Department.

**Net loss of potential jobs attributable to imports, apparel (knit and woven) industry, United States 1956-70**

Period:	Job Loss (-) or Job Gain (+)
1956 to 1957.....	-2,900
1957 to 1958.....	-12,700
1958 to 1959.....	-35,300
1959 to 1960.....	-3,700
1960 to 1961.....	+22,000
1961 to 1962.....	-46,600
1962 to 1963.....	-5,600
1963 to 1964.....	-17,100
1964 to 1965.....	-26,000
1965 to 1966.....	-15,600
1966 to 1967.....	-17,900
1967 to 1968.....	-30,600
1968 to 1969.....	-52,500
1969 to 1970.....	-43,500
1956 to 1970.....	-288,000

Source.—ILGWU Research Department.

**EMPLOYMENT, PRODUCTION WORKERS—APPAREL MADE OF KNIT AND WOVEN MATERIALS, UNITED STATES, AND NEW YORK STATE, AND NEW YORK CITY**

Year	United States	New York State	New York City
1960.....	1,293,500	292,900	238,800
1961.....	1,273,040	281,700	228,900
1962.....	1,321,500	282,400	229,000
1963.....	1,330,000	276,200	223,600
1964.....	1,351,400	271,000	219,300
1965.....	1,411,400	274,100	221,300
1966.....	1,456,000	273,000	219,900
1967.....	1,443,000	266,100	214,300
1968.....	1,460,100	264,600	212,500
1969.....	1,459,700	255,800	204,800
1970.....	1,419,500	233,500	186,300
1971.....	1,406,600	219,500	173,200

Note: Employment figures include Standard Industrial Classifications 23 and 225.

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and New York State Department of Labor (the latter information adjusted to reflect employment of production workers on the basis of benchmark information derived from the U.S. Censuses of Manufacturers for 1958, 1963, and 1968).

**Loss in employment of production workers apparel made of knit and woven materials 1966 to 1971**

	Number of jobs:	Percent
United States.....	49,400	3.4
New York State.....	53,600	19.6
New York City.....	46,700	21.2

**PRODUCTION OF KEY ITEMS OF WOMEN'S AND MISSES' GARMENTS, 1966-71**

	1966	1971	Percent change
Coats.....	27,700,000	25,200,000	-9
Suits.....	10,700,000	7,400,000	-31
Dresses.....	314,900,000	295,800,000	-6
Blouses.....	225,800,000	163,800,000	-27
Skirts.....	131,100,000	81,400,000	-38
Sweaters (men's and women's).....	144,500,000	116,000,000	-20
Slips and petticoats.....	150,800,000	111,800,000	-26

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and ILGWU Research Department.

**Unemployment rate among experienced apparel wage and salary workers, apparel and other finished textile products industry, United States**

Year	Percent
1966.....	6.0
1967.....	6.5
1968.....	5.9
1969.....	5.9
1970.....	8.2
1971.....	9.7

Source.—U.S. Bureau of the Census.

**INSURED UNEMPLOYMENT AS PERCENT OF WORK FORCE—APPAREL INDUSTRY, NEW YORK STATE, AND NEW YORK CITY**

Year	New York State	New York City
1966.....	9.7	9.9
1967.....	9.2	9.2
1968.....	7.5	7.5
1969.....	8.1	8.1
1970.....	11.3	11.2
1971.....	12.6	12.2

Source: New York State Department of Labor.

**THE CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS SALUTES THE COSPONSORS OF ITS CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL PRIORITIES**

**HON. LOUIS STOKES**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Black Caucus, of which I am chairman, would like to inform this body of a unique and gratifying experience we had recently. On April 5 and 6, 1972, we joined with three major newspapers of national repute in sponsoring a forum at Harvard University. The forum addressed the issue of reordering national priorities, focusing on the areas of education, health, housing, employment, law and justice, and mass communications.

Our cosponsors were the Boston Globe, the Chicago Sun-Times, and the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.

We of the Congressional Black Caucus would like to commend these newspapers which contributed so much to the forum on national priorities. Their concern for finding ways to balance the inequitable, uneven systems operating in this country with regard to minority people was unique. The mass communications media in America has shown a singularly callous disregard for the interests of blacks, the poor, and the disadvantaged.

Another unique aspect of the forum was that the newspaper sponsors knew that they themselves would come under fire as members of the mass communications media. The caucus contends that the media is largely responsible for setting national trends in public opinion and, therefore, creating the collective consciousness which determines national priorities.

The caucus wishes to pay tribute here to the newspapers and the individuals who made the Harvard forum possible. The Boston Globe, its president, John I. Taylor; its executive editor, Robert Healy; its community affairs director, Dexter D. Eure; the Chicago Sun-Times, its editor, James Hoge; the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, its publisher, Robert Taylor; its managing editor, George Packard; and forum coordinator, Warren Jackson.

Words cannot truly express our deeply felt appreciation for what these men have done. They displayed fortitude and courage by taking a stand for those people in this country who have the least and need the most. It is our hope that the information obtained at the forum

will aid and promote progress for all Americans. Other media organizations should take note and follow the pioneering example set by the Boston Globe, the Chicago Sun-Times, and the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.

#### RIO HONDO AREA ACTION COUNCIL

### HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in 1964 the Congress passed the Economic Opportunity Act to bring into being the Office of Economic Opportunity to wage the war on poverty. I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress and the Nation a very successful community action agency in my congressional district, the 19th District located in southern California.

The Rio Hondo Area Action Council, Inc., which administers and funds anti-poverty programs for low-income persons in the Whittier Health District of Los Angeles County, Calif., opened its doors in the summer of 1969. From a staff of four employees and two antipoverty programs, this agency has grown to a staff of 60 with 15 programs to serve the poor.

The agency has been under the direction of a board of directors composed of representatives of the poor as well as more affluent members. The officers are Rudy Hernandez, chairman and Wilbur W. Lorbeer, vice chairman. During the past year, this agency has been under the expert guidance of Ester J. Ortegon as executive director. Miss Ortegon is one of the few women directors of such agencies; she is Mexican-American, speaks fluent Spanish, and is especially successful with the community she serves, which is composed of about 85 percent Mexican-American people.

The Rio Hondo Area Action Council, was chosen as one of only 17 OEO agencies in the country as a model operation with the possibility that RHAAC will be chosen as the outstanding agency being funded by OEO.

I wish also to commend to you the public information program of the Rio Hondo Area Action Council, which is directed by Sarah P. Millier, and which keeps the community aware of the services the agency renders.

Programs to combat poverty being funded by RHAAC include dental treatment and education; senior citizens; alcoholism; child care; consumer education and a child care mobile program; N.Y.C. II; drug abuse; Head Start classes; public service careers; college recruitment; youth opportunities; dental education for low-income adults; community organization, and community service.

The Rio Hondo Area Action Council serves 30,000 poor persons in the Whittier Health District, Los Angeles County, Calif. and is making headway against some of the more pressing problems of

the low-income persons in that area. It is to be commended for its effort and for the dedication of its staff to the service of the poor.

#### DEVALUATION OF THE DOLLAR AND ITS CONSEQUENCES—RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I recently reported to my people on the recent devaluation of the dollar and its consequences. I insert the report at this point:

**RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE ON THE DEVALUATION OF THE DOLLAR AND ITS CONSEQUENCES**

Recent action by Congress which affects every American has received little or no report to the people.

In the Baton Rouge area, a brief wire service story advised you that the United States would formally devalue the dollar at noon Monday, May 15th. And, buried in the scanty report was this comment, "the Senate cleared the legislation Friday. It called for an appropriation of \$1.6 billion." The \$1.6 billion was written in that manner. Few people can envision the size of this amount of money. \$1.6 billion is written thus: 1 comma 6 hundred comma 000 comma 000. That's a lot of money in anyone's language, and what was it for? In reality, nothing. It was appropriated by Congress supposedly to maintain our obligations to international banking institutions in performance of our duty to them under so-called commitments.

To make the international deal even further complicated, it must be remembered that our country has no money, and so in order to restore the dollar which had been devalued at the urging of the international banking institutions to its world parity, it is now necessary that our country issue bonds to borrow the \$1.6 billion from the international bankers and then give them the money as well as the bonds on which the American people will need to pay interest.

\$1.6 billion will not go to create any jobs, to pay off any of our debt, or to furnish any of the long awaited domestic programs for our people. At most this was \$1.6 billion which vanished into the air like so much smoke as a result of financial manipulation to devalue the worth of the U.S. dollar by 8.57% when the value of U.S. gold was increased from \$35 to \$38 per ounce. Or, to put it otherwise, every American lost 8½ cents on his dollar by devaluation and then we had to pay the international bankers for the right to devalue our money. The tragic thing is that this may be just the beginning inasmuch as gold is now selling on the international market in excess of \$50 per ounce.

I thought we'd talk today about several aspects of the recent devaluation—devaluation of the dollar means diminishing the value of the dollar—about the events which paved the way for and brought about this drastic devaluation action, the meaning and consequences of the devaluation and the future outlook for the dollar.

A meeting which may have had a significant role in influencing subsequent events leading up to the devaluation took place in Woodstock, Vermont on April 23-25, 1971 at the 29th meeting of an internationally elite group known as the Bilderbergers. This exclusive international aristocracy, unknown to the vast majority of Americans, holds

highly secretive meetings annually or oftener in various countries to discuss matters of vital importance to the people of this country and the world. Represented at the meeting were the U.S., Canada, and 12 European nations. Among the some 100 participants were representatives of the international bankers, multinational corporations, and opinion makers as well as finance ministers, foreign affairs ministers, and Presidential advisers such as Dr. Henry Kissinger. At that time it was leaked out that the meeting was called to discuss the world monetary system and "the possibility of a change of the American role in the world and its consequences." Subsequent developments have made it increasingly more apparent that the "changing American role" is the replacement of the Bretton Woods international monetary system—which has bankrupted the American economy and eroded the value of the dollar—with a new form of international currency managed by the International Monetary Fund serving as an International Federal Reserve Bank.

Although the public was not informed of the plans laid by the Bilderbergers, we do know that less than two weeks following the Bilderberger meeting, the dollar crisis erupted in Germany, the Netherlands and other European countries represented at the meeting of the Bilderbergers. It marked the first time in this century that the American dollar was rejected on the international exchange. Several countries abandoned the fixed exchange rates of the IMF and allowed their currencies to fluctuate in value against the dollar.

It became evident in early 1971 that our government had overextended the dollar in international exchange and that several countries were going to redeem their dollars in gold. This would have been impossible for the U.S. for we lacked unencumbered gold to meet the demands of the holders of Eurodollars for gold. We were overdrawn—internationally bankrupt if you prefer.

Hence the President's sudden announcement on the night of Sunday, August 15, closing the gold window to foreigners wanting to exchange their dollars for gold at \$35 an ounce when gold was selling at \$40 an ounce. Foreigners could convert their dollar holdings into gold, a privilege denied to Americans and resell the gold at a profit.

It has been said that the August 15th action of President Nixon brought an end to the postwar international monetary system established at Bretton Woods in 1944. Under this arrangement the U.S. dollar had a fixed value in relation to gold. The dollar, which served as the standard against which other currencies were measured, could be exchanged for gold on demand by foreign governments.

The large deficits in U.S. balance of payments caused a decline of confidence in the dollar and a rush by foreigners to get rid of dollars exchanging them for Japanese Yen or European currencies.

At a meeting in the Azores last December 14th to discuss the international monetary situation with French President Pompidou, former President of the Bank of France, President Nixon declared his intention to devalue the dollar. This meeting led to a meeting of the major international banking representatives—the so-called Group of 10—or Smithsonian Meeting, in Washington, D.C. on December 17-18, 1971 on international finance and trade.

A new pattern of exchange rates among the currencies of the free world were recommended. In the weeks following the meeting, most of the countries increased the value of their currencies in relation to the dollar. In return, the U.S. Executive Branch lifted the 10 percent surcharge against foreign imports and proposed to Congress a means for

devaluing the dollar from \$35 to \$38 per ounce of gold.

In addition, President Nixon held high level meetings to seek economic accord with British Prime Minister Edward Heath and West German Chancellor Willy Brandt in December and with Japanese Prime Minister Sato in January.

On March 21, the U.S. House of Representatives passed 342 to 43, the Par Value Modification Act. That bill authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to take the steps necessary to establish a new par value of the dollar. This new par value, represents the relationship of the dollar to gold for international exchange purposes.

The Secretary of the Treasury was also authorized and directed to maintain the value in terms of gold of the holdings of the U.S. dollars of the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (known as the World Bank), the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Development Association, and the Asian Development Bank as required by the respective articles of agreement of these international financial institutions.

The market value of the dollar relative to the other currencies had dropped after the Smithsonian Accord of December 18th in anticipation of the U.S. devaluation of December 18th in anticipation of the U.S. devaluing the dollar. Although the devaluation bill was signed into law on March 31, the Treasury delayed notifying the IMF until Congress appropriated \$1,600,000,000 to pay off the IMF and the several international lending agencies for the loss in the value of their dollar holdings. No such guarantee or indemnity has been arranged to pay off the American citizen for the loss of his dollar holdings.

On May 4, the House—291-62—approved the \$1,600,000,000 "Supplemental Appropriation for Special Payments to International Financial Institutions, 1972" bill. This chart shows the percentage of total contributions to these international banks paid by American taxpayers and the additional amounts appropriated for each of these institutions because of the dollar devaluation:

MAINTENANCE OF VALUE IN INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

(Thousands of dollars)

Institution	U.S. contribution as percent of total	U.S. additional contribution May 1972
International Monetary Fund (IMF)	23.2	525,000
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)	27.4	560,000
International Development Association (IDA)	40.0	122,000
Inter-American Development Bank (IADB)	56.4	370,000
Asian Development Bank (ADB)	19.9	18,000
Total		1,595,000

Source: U.S. Senate Report No. 92-781.

Just imagine—\$1.6 billion of the fruit of your labor—your hard earned taxdollars—were appropriated by the Congress for these international banking institutions which discriminate against Americans! As with our contributions to the United Nations, the United States taxpayers per capita pay far more than do taxpayers of other countries. While American borrowers pay high interest rates, the foreign borrowers from some of the so-called international banks are extended long-term low-interest rate loans. Some of the loans are for 50 years with borrowers paying no interest or nothing on or the principal for the first ten years. They make a small payment during the second ten years and from 1 to 3 percent for the next 30 years. In actuality, many of these loans

will never be repaid. Other so-called loans by these American taxpayer-supported international banks have no other interest charge than a one percent carrying charge during the 50-year period.

Yet, in spite of this discrimination by the so-called international banks against U.S. taxpayers, the U.S. Government discriminated against its own citizens by devaluing their dollars by 8.57 percent while providing \$1.6 billion to maintain the value of dollars contributed by American taxpayers to these international financial institutions.

No legislation that I know of has been proposed to make good the devaluation of the dollar loss suffered by Americans with an interest in savings accounts, company retirement funds, labor union pension funds and in numerous other domestic funds. It appears that our Government—including a subservient Congress—is interested in maintaining the value only of dollars of international funds, which were supplied for the most part by U.S. taxpayers in the first place.

I cast our Sixth District vote for the soundness of your money by voting against devaluing the dollar and against giving \$1.6 billion more of your tax dollars to the international bankers. My vote was in your best interest. It was in keeping with my oath to preserve and defend the U.S. Constitution—not to aid international bankers. While many consider the devaluation a sign of weakness and of fiscal irresponsibility by the U.S., some Administration leaders actually hailed the devaluation as a great victory which would bring up to 750,000 new jobs for Americans and help the U.S. regain a favorable balance of trade by increasing the price of foreign goods in the U.S. and lowering the cost of American exports to foreigners. For these conditions to actually occur, there must be increased productivity at a lessened cost. But measures of the federal government aiding foreigners while discriminating against its own citizens, the shackles placed on free enterprise by the federal economic planners, and the demands by labor unions for increased wages without a proportionate increase in productivity can but result in continued inflation and an unfavorable trade balance.

These financial flimflams through international banking houses may be sold to unwary citizens as progress in the move to equalize world wealth by taking from those who have and giving to those who have not, but it is still a great betrayal of the American people by their governmental leaders.

The chickens have at long last come home to roost. America has arrived at a monetary crossroads and strangely the newsmakers—either because they do not understand the monetary crisis or they don't want to frighten the American people—simply soft-pedal this vital issue.

The average American, already confused by the many created crises which are blown up out of proportion to occupy and keep his mind from considering important matters, should start asking himself these questions: Why is it that the people who create the wealth are always those who are called upon to pay the debts; while, on the other hand, those who create the debts seem to always end up in control of the wealth? And, in a similar vein, why is it that the men who are always called up to fight our wars are never allowed to end them?

In my opinion, our country is faced with a monetary crisis which if not brought under control may end up in the demise of our Constitutional Republic. It is imperative that responsible Americans, rich and poor, young and old, in all walks of life inform themselves regarding the basic truths of our monetary system. The mysteries of the Federal Reserve, fractional reserve banking, the IMF, Special Drawing Rights, and Bretton Woods are matters about which the public, especially our young people, must become in-

formed. I say especially our young people because their future—whether it be a bright one full of hope and great expectations or a dismal one full of despair and apathy—depends on a fair and just money system, a dependable medium for earnings, savings and wealth.

We must return control over money to the people.

Three steps which we should take in that direction are the following:

1) to restore to Congress its Constitutional mandate to issue our money and regulate its value. To this end I have introduced H.R. 351 to vest in the Government of the United States full, absolute, complete, and unconditional ownership of the 12 Federal Reserve banks.

2) to restore to Americans the rights to own and trade monetary gold. My bill H.R. 353, if enacted would achieve this goal.

3) to cut off and withdraw all contributions from the International Monetary Fund and other international banks as well as to get out of the United Nations.

The love of money is said by the Bible to be the root of all evil. I contend that a dishonest money system—one which favors international bankers and furthers destruction of our nation—is the root cause of most of the problems plaguing us today.

Understanding our present money system as well as the tenets of an honest and scientific monetary system by the people as envisioned in the Constitution is then essential if we are to bring about monetary reforms so as to return power to the people over their money.

JOBS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, within the next few weeks millions of young people will be taking their summer break from school. A vast number of them will be looking for jobs and the jobs in sufficient numbers just are not there for them.

This is a sad state of affairs for the youth of our Nation. Only a small number of these youths will spend their summer willingly doing nothing. Most of our young people are eager to stay busy, to earn money either to further their educations, purchase things they want, or to help make ends meet at home.

These are worthy objectives, but in the current labor crisis many thousands of our youth will find "no help needed" signs wherever they may go in search of meaningful employment.

The immediate reaction is that jobs should be provided by Government and that Congress provide the funds to create jobs for these eager young people. First, let us point to the danger in relying too greatly upon Government as a cure for this problem. Already there is too much reliance on Government to solve our Nation's ills. There must first be participation by industry, by business, and by volunteer groups to utilize the services of deserving young people. All of this can provide a great many jobs which young people are more than willing to undertake in order to be of use to themselves and their country.

There is, of course, also a need for help from Government in providing summer

jobs, and steps are now in progress to add to the number of jobs originally projected. Many young people can be used to advantage in our national parks and forests. They can be used to help underprivileged children in the learning process. They can be used to help combat pollution in our lakes and streams. They can be used to work in the fields and in public works projects.

Our young people want to be contributors to society and it is up to Government to give them that opportunity at the earliest possible moment in their lives.

Too often, some of the elders among us seem prone to label every young person as a narcotics user, a vagabond, or just plain shiftless.

That is not so at all, but if we do not combine our forces to make work available to those who want it, some will fall into the trap of idleness and out of sheer boredom they will become the type of individuals whose presence in society we deplore. Jobs can help to prevent this.

#### TAX RELIEF FOR PHYSICALLY OR MENTALLY HANDICAPPED

### HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation which would provide new Federal income tax relief for individuals burdened with the huge cost of special care for the physically or mentally handicapped.

My bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide additional income tax exemptions of \$750 for each disabled person in the taxpayer's family. Further, it would provide a special deduction—up to \$750 a year—for transportation expenses to and from work for disabled individuals.

There is little doubt that legislation of this sort is urgently needed. Every handicapped American has the right to proper medical care as well as special education, training, rehabilitation and guidance to enable him or her to develop his or her ability to the fullest. These rights must not be lost because of rising costs. As we aid families of the blind with a special tax exemption, we should aid families of the handicapped, too.

Presently, taxpayers must itemize their returns in order to claim a deduction for medical care. This deduction covers only those expenses which exceed 3 percent of adjusted gross income and it altogether ignores the cost of custodial care. My proposal would aid all taxpayers, and particularly those low-income persons, who do not itemize, by enabling them to claim an extra \$750 tax exemption for each disabled member of the family.

Also, I am most concerned over a growing trend of abandonment, particularly of disabled children, to public institutions because of the family's inability to pay the cost of special care. This cruel and senseless deterioration of the family bond must be halted. I believe a reason-

able program of tax relief would go a long way to encourage stability in the family and greater responsibility on the part of some parents.

In addition, my proposal has a section designed to help prevent unemployment among the disabled who are unable to pay transportation costs to and from work. I urge adoption of a \$750 transportation tax deduction for the handicapped. If we encourage the handicapped to gain skills to perform meaningful work, we cannot abandon them at their doorstep. We must help them get to work so they can utilize their new skills.

#### TEXAS NATURAL GAS USE QUESTIONABLE

### HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, while Arizona and the Nation in general face critical natural gas shortages, an action is about to take place in Texas which raises a serious question about waste of this desperately needed natural resource.

In Houston, the city council will meet tomorrow—May 17—to accept a \$2,361,744 bid by Houston Natural Gas to construct and operate 20 neighborhood garbage incinerators at an estimated \$15 per ton cost to the taxpayers. I am told that this will be more than five times the cost of a sanitary landfill in a part of the country where there is still sufficient land space.

Sponsors of the project deem it at best experimental. Landfill, reclamation, and recycling are, on the other hand, proven. And they do not involve the reckless consumption of natural gas in unspecified quantities.

The Federal Power Commission has no control over intrastate distribution of natural gas. Thus entities such as Houston Natural Gas can freely commit their product to this proposed garbage incineration without regard to the ultimate best interests of our national constituency.

In Tucson, meanwhile, our utility is facing a 70-percent reduction in the amount of natural gas to be available to it for power generation in the area this coming winter. In other words, the utility will have only 30 percent of its normal natural gas supply for this vital production.

And the utility has had to restrict its firm power commitments to residential users. It can only contract with new non-residential users on the basis that gas service can be interrupted at any time.

So while we are apparently going to a proliferation of all kinds of nonregulated uses at the intrastate level, the vital, basic uses of natural gas at the interstate level are facing very serious cutbacks.

Regarding incineration, I also question the air pollution factor and would point out that imperfect incineration does not really end the need for residue disposal, it merely reduces the volume.

I think our natural gas priorities may be seriously out of order.

#### GOV. FRANCIS W. SARGENT, OF MASSACHUSETTS, SPEAKS ON THE MODERNIZATION OF JUVENILE TECHNIQUES

### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent statement made by Gov. Francis W. Sargent, of Massachusetts.

In this testimony Governor Sargent outlines the great progress that is being made in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the handling of juvenile delinquents. A new, creative program under the able direction of Dr. Jerome Miller and funded in part by the Law Enforcement Assistance Act—LEAA—has brought new hope to Massachusetts and to the Nation that there are ways to care for, treat, and educate juveniles so that they do not "graduate" into habitual criminals.

Governor Sargent's testimony was given on Monday, May 15, 1972, before the U.S. Senate subcommittee investigating juvenile delinquency:

GOV. FRANCIS W. SARGENT, OF MASSACHUSETTS, SPEAKS ON THE MODERNIZATION OF JUVENILE TREATMENT TECHNIQUES

I appear before you today to explain briefly what we have done in Massachusetts to rehabilitate the juvenile offender. I am also here to urge you and your colleagues to join with us in furthering our plans for the future.

Preventing crime is an activity which must involve every citizen in this country. There is no better place to begin than in forming a federal, state and local partnership to work with the juvenile offender. S-3418, filed by the Chairman of this subcommittee, contains a commitment to the philosophy of community based treatment centers such as we have adopted in Massachusetts.

It also calls for funds to implement this change in philosophy. Both forms of support are sorely needed. I would like to spend the next few minutes outlining what we have done in Massachusetts in trying to rehabilitate the juvenile offender and point to directions for the future.

A little over two years ago, I recruited a new Commissioner for our Department of Youth Services. His name is Jerome Miller. You will hear from him later today.

Dr. Miller was faced with a department that had operated the same way for about 100 years. A system not much different from those that exist today throughout this country. Under this system we take a child who has gotten into trouble, lock him up in a cell, punish him for some period of time and then send him home to commit another offense. Almost 75% of the children who were released fell into this pattern. That the remaining 25% did not return to an institution is a miracle, given the fact that they received no more than custodial care.

When I took office, I was soon convinced that there were better ways to deal with juvenile offenders. Better ways than simply shutting them away in institutions. I felt that a community based treatment system would provide better rehabilitative services. And it would cost less to the taxpayers of the Commonwealth.

With each new experience, I am more and more convinced that we were right. But it hasn't been easy. Dr. Miller had to convince his own staff that the community treatment

system was better. We had to embark on a massive public education program. Much of the public clings to the myth that walls mean protection for society and for the offender.

Notwithstanding this lingering opposition, we have continued to move forward. At this moment, four of our five major state juvenile institutions have been closed. By June first of this year, we will have closed the last institution thus ending the use of large barren facilities to care for youth who need real services instead.

There will always be a need for some security setting to protect the community. But only for a small percentage of children who are convicted. It is easy to make buildings symbols and to measure success in terms of how many buildings are closed. But if we fail to provide quality services to youthful offenders in the new community setting we will have failed.

In Massachusetts, we have devised viable alternatives to our institutions. Of the 600 children in state institutions in October of 1969, only 29 remain. In the past month, we have opened 13 new group homes and we hope to open 7 more as soon as possible. We have more than tripled the number of foster care placements.

We have 120 young people participating in a new and exciting program called "parole volunteers." In this program, a child receives close personal guidance from a college student who is paid a nominal salary to maintain a continuing relationship. It is too soon to tell what long term effect this new system will have. Our initial indications, however, are favorable. We are hopeful that a large number of these children will turn away from a potential life in crime to become productive citizens of our Commonwealth.

The community based concept has enabled the state to provide better rehabilitative services at lower cost. Under the old system we found ourselves supporting an entire system at a level that only a small minority of the population needed. We spent approximately \$10,000 a year to keep a child in an institution. Ten thousand dollars a year. Think of it.

For this money, we could buy each child a complete wardrobe at Brooks Brothers, give him a \$20 a week allowance, and send him to a private school, paying room and board and tuition. In the summer, we could send him to Europe and put a thousand dollars in a bank account for him each year. And we would still save the taxpayer over \$1,300.

This is the kind of money we have been investing in our institutions—and all of you know the results.

If, however, we invest in a community treatment program, we can provide individual services, personal counseling, job training, specialized education, and healthy group home settings for about half the cost.

For the child who needs an intensive parole counseling program, the cost is a little over \$2,600 per year, per child. A foster home which provides needed parental guidance costs \$1,200 per year, per child. And for those children who need a group home, the cost is approximately \$7,500 a year for each child.

In Massachusetts, we have a dual system to treat the juvenile offender. We have the unfortunate distinction of being the only state in the country to send children who have educational problems to institutions known as county training schools. These schools, three in number, were started in 1873. They are filled with children aged 7 to 16 whose only offense is that they were truants. These children are not criminals. None of them has committed dangerous criminal acts. Rather, these are children who suffer from behaviour problems rooted in social causes. Yet they are still locked behind walls.

I have acted to forbid the use of these

schools in Massachusetts. The legislation before you also deals with the problem of eliminating behavioural problems from the list of juvenile crimes.

Under present Massachusetts law, children with behavioural problems may be convicted of six different "crimes"—habitual truant, habitual absentee, habitual school offender, stubborn child, runaway and wayward child. I have filed legislation, in this session of our state legislature, which has the same intent as S-3418. That legislation would do away with these crimes.

Under my proposal, a child who would normally be convicted of one of these so-called offenses, will instead receive a civil commitment from a court. My proposal also provides the court with options. All of these options are designed to see that the child gets treatment, not punishment. I am convinced that this system will work. We have begun to initiate major reforms, but if anyone thinks these reforms will be easily accepted by the public—or by administrators—he is only fooling himself. The resistance however, can not be allowed to stand in the way of making the necessary changes. In Massachusetts, we have begun to reallocate state funds as well as \$1 million in LEAA funds.

But if we are to continue implementing the community based concept, we will need federal financial assistance, similar to that called for in S-3418. Eventually, the cost will be cheaper, but we must invest immediately in a host of community alternatives.

The community based treatment concept can apply not only to juvenile offenders but to adults as well. In my opinion, it is a new and needed direction for corrections generally.

While offenders of different ages have individual needs, there is one need common to them all. They must be assisted in learning to live in their communities. No longer can we continue to close them in institutions that leave them ill-prepared to be responsible citizens when they are released.

The work of your committee is vitally important. I would hope that the information you will hear today on the Massachusetts experience, will be of assistance as you proceed.

A BLOT ON OUR NATIONAL CHARACTER

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my horror and outrage at the attempted assassination of Governor Wallace on Monday during his campaign in Maryland.

Our system of government has no place for such violence. Democracy thrives on the open clash of ideas, and nothing is settled by the use of the gun. Whether or not one agrees with the views of Governor Wallace, he has a rightful place in our political process, and the discussions he has generated will ultimately benefit us all.

For some reason, we have been unable throughout our history to carry on a spirited political discourse without the process being stained by senseless violence. Worse, this and other similar acts of brutality seem predicated less on strong political differences than a twisted desire for notoriety. This anarchy is a

blot on our national character and should give us pause when we assess the health of our society and political system.

I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Wallace and her family, and to wish Governor Wallace a full and complete recovery and a speedy return to an active political life.

MY RESPONSIBILITY AND OBLIGATION AS A FIRST-TIME VOTER

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, Miss Kim Frazier and Miss Penny Watkins, both seniors at Dublin High School, Dublin, Ohio, and constituents of mine are the recipients of the annual U.S. Government Award presented by the Washington-Perry Women's Republican Club. The essays which won them the award deserve public dissemination and I recommend them to all would-be voters, irrespective of age.

The awards follow:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AND OBLIGATION AS A FIRST-TIME VOTER

(By Penny Watkins)

Not long ago, the youth of America cried out to be heard. Their nationwide cry was loud and unified. It was heard. As a result, every eighteen to twenty-one year old is faced with new responsibilities and obligations. It is really a challenge. Will the American young live up to it?

It is a challenge to the first-time voters to continue their cry. It would be easy to become a member of the "silent majority." It would be easy to retreat from the national spotlight, to raise a hand in a hopeless gesture, and to say in disgust, "What can just one person do?" It would be easy, but it would be a cop-out.

It is a challenge to the first-time voters to let their individual and independent cries be heard. To vote as one's parents do, merely because they are one's parents, would mean failure in meeting that challenge. To vote in opposition to one's parents, merely for the sake of the opposition, would only be perversity. And yet, to vote as one's contemporaries, merely because they are one's contemporaries, would simply be conformity.

It is a challenge to the first-time voters to be informed. Anyone can say, "I am for . . ." or, "I am against . . ." Anyone can pull a lever in a voting booth. Anyone can be informed; however, very few are.

Perhaps the greatest challenge of all, for the first-time voter, is to become involved. It would be wrong to retreat into the "silent majority." What good is being a member of the majority if it is silent? It would be wrong to say, "No one will listen to me." Someone must have listened, or the voting age would still be twenty-one. It would be wrong to turn away silently or to repeat some hackneyed phrase when the nation has just relinquished its most powerful microphone, and the population is waiting to hear what will be said. But, if the first-time voter has thoughtfully chosen a position, it would be wrong not to discuss it. Thus, he will be aware of further developments, and those around him will be encouraged to become aware. It would be wrong not to become involved in our government, for if we are not, who will be?

Not long ago, the youth of America cried

out to be heard. They were heard. Now America awaits to hear what else they will say. It is a challenge.

**MY RESPONSIBILITY AND OBLIGATION AS A FIRST-TIME VOTER**  
(By Kim Frazier)

My responsibility and obligation as a first-time voter are no different than those of a second-time, thirtieth-time, or even fiftieth-time. Through the process of voting, I, the same as all others who take the time to vote, will be selecting those who will be occupying a position of power and authority over those to be governed—including me. These two statements have deep implications. Responsibility associated with voting implies a moral accountability. To accept the obligation of voting is the acknowledgement of a liability. As a voter, I am then morally accountable and personally liable for the reasons for which I cast my ballot for a particular candidate.

The Apostle Paul, in his letter to the Romans said, "Let every person be in subjection to the governing authorities." The Bible also teaches "Render, therefore, unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God, the things that are God's." Caesar (in this case) represents the government of the time in which this statement was made. I believe in these teachings, but am grateful that I, unlike the people at the time of Caesar, have the privilege of voting for those who will occupy the worldly position of power over me.

I must make myself informed on issues; what the candidates are saying about these issues, and, most important, to differentiate between politically popular statements and promises, and realistic objectives. If I have done my homework well, my choice of candidates will agree with my moral as well as my political beliefs, or at least will not be in opposition to the former.

My strong belief in the purposes and advantages of local and grass roots government means my responsibilities as a voter extend beyond just being informed on national issues that are presented by presidential and congressional candidates. Admittedly, an awareness of the numerous state and local candidates and issues is not easily acquired.

Good citizenship, as practiced at the polls, can only come by voting from an informed position. This in turn will result in fairness to the other voters, myself, and the candidates involved.

**THE CONSTITUTIONAL ROLE OF THE CONGRESS IN OUR SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT**

**HON. OGDEN R. REID**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, today Congressman JOHN MOSS and I are jointly introducing a resolution and a bill which we believe to be of major importance to the constitutional role of the Congress in our system of government.

This legislation is designed to give Congress an effective means by which to obtain necessary and relevant information from the executive branch in furtherance of its constitutional responsibilities.

Every Member of Congress is aware of instances when the Congress or one of its committees or Members has been

denied information requested from the executive branch. Documentation of such denials is presently being compiled by the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information in comprehensive hearings on this and related "freedom of information" questions. I commend the record of these hearings to each of my colleagues when it becomes available, for I am certain that it will establish beyond dispute that the executive branch makes a common practice of withholding information from Congress when it deems such withholding desirable.

The time is long overdue for us in Congress to do something about this serious problem. Following are set forth what I believe are its basic constitutional implications, as well as a description of the legislative remedy we are proposing. Also appended are the texts of the joint resolution and the bill we have introduced.

**CONSTITUTIONAL IMPLICATIONS**

The bedrock principle upon which our system is founded is accountability to the people. But accountability is a hollow word unless the American people, and in their behalf the Congress, have the information necessary to judge the performance of their Government. Moreover, without relevant information it is impossible for either the Congress or the people to participate meaningfully in the making of fundamental decisions which, from time to time, truly alter the course of our Nation's history.

There is now a fundamental and growing imbalance between the Congress and the executive branch, with a major accretion of power on the side of the Presidency. This has occurred in part because the executive branch has actively expanded its power, and in part because the Congress has failed to assert itself.

The power to legislate, expressly granted to Congress by the Constitution, carries with it the further right of Congress to oversee the administration of the laws by the executive branch. Yet the information Congress needs, both to legislate in the first instance and to oversee the administration of laws it has previously enacted, is frequently in the exclusive possession of the executive branch.

In my judgment there is no information possessed by the executive branch to which Congress does not have a right of access when that information is legitimately needed to fulfill the responsibilities of Congress for legislation or oversight. If Congress must legislate out of ignorance, it will make bad laws. If it is impeded from studying the activities of the executive branch, there is no way it can identify and resist the arbitrary or unwise exercise of executive power. Full access by Congress to relevant information, therefore, is essential to preserve the constitutional balance of our Government.

While these principles seem self-evident, they have never been accepted by any Presidential administration. To the contrary, the doctrine of executive privilege, which dates back to the days of President George Washington, has been repeatedly invoked over the years, both expressly and silently, to deny the Con-

gress information which it sought in furtherance of its constitutional duties. The Constitution nowhere states that the President may withhold information from Congress, but proponents of executive privilege claim an inherent right on his part to do so.

Speaking for the present administration last June before this subcommittee, then Assistant Attorney General William H. Rehnquist strongly affirmed such a right as "implicit in the separation of powers established by the Constitution." Yet even some of the Supreme Court cases cited in support of this proposition seem to circumscribe its application. Specifically, in *Reynolds v. United States* (345 U.S. 1) the Court held that the executive branch does not have unlimited discretion to withhold information, stating, "the court itself must determine whether the circumstances are appropriate for the claim of privilege."

Because the question has never been settled by the courts, Congress cannot rely on firm judicial authority to support its claim for information. In the absence of an accommodation between the two branches of government, Congress must employ other means to make effective its right to know.

**PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE REMEDY**

Twelve years ago the House Committee on Government Operations made to Congress a recommendation of considerable importance. In concluding a report on this fundamental problem, the committee said:

What can the Congress do to combat abuses by executive officials in withholding from the Congress information which the Congress believes it needs?

Two existing powers of the Congress are available to oppose this abuse—the power of subpoena and the power of the purse. The power of subpoena, however, should be used only as a last resort.

Utilizing the power of the purse, the Congress can and should provide, in authorizing and appropriating legislation, that the continued availability of appropriated funds is contingent upon the furnishing of complete and accurate information relating to the expenditure of such funds to the General Accounting Office and to the appropriate committees of Congress at their request. ("Executive Branch Practices in Withholding Information from Congressional Committees," Report by the House Committee on Government Operations, August 30, 1960, p. 14)

Since the date of this recommendation, and indeed within memory, the Congress has taken no action to exercise its power of the purse following a refusal by the executive branch to furnish requested information. This is largely due, I think, to a lack of institution procedures which would facilitate such action. The organization of Congress and the requirement of concurrent action by the Houses in order to legislate a denial of appropriations simply do not lend themselves to prompt and decisive application of financial sanctions in response to specific instances of withholding by the Executive.

The bill we are introducing, as an amendment to the Freedom of Information Act, establishes a procedure designed to overcome this impediment. Essentially it provides that:

First, when any committee of Con-

gress requests information from the executive branch, the head of the agency concerned shall immediately furnish all the information requested;

Second, the agency head shall certify to the requesting committee whether or not full and complete disclosure of the requested information has been made;

Third, upon resolution of the requesting committee, funds for the program or activity in question shall automatically be suspended without further action being required by Congress if—an agency head fails to make a requested certification;

An agency head certifies that full and complete disclosure of the requested information has not been made; or

An agency head falsely certifies that full and complete disclosure of the requested information has been made;

Fourth, the GAO shall take all steps available to it under law, including refusal to countersign relevant warrants drawn upon the U.S. Treasury, to effectuate a suspension of funds.

In effect, the withholding of information by the executive would trigger a fund cutoff previously built into law by this legislation of general applicability. Because no new legislation would be needed at the time to deny funds, effective response on the part of the Congress would be greatly facilitated.

It is important to note that this legislation does not vest in Congress any power it does not already possess under the Constitution. It merely streamlines the procedure by which this power can be exercised and, as a practical matter, makes its exercise more possible.

Nor does this legislation, in my view, risk irresponsible action by a committee of Congress. Every Member of Congress is sensitive to the gravity of a fund cutoff under the conditions contemplated in this legislation. It is inconceivable that a majority of the members of a full committee would vote to initiate the fund cutoff process without first giving the most careful and sober consideration to the circumstances and ramifications of their action. For this reason, the procedure would not be invoked lightly or with great frequency, but only fundamental disagreements between the two branches could not be resolved in any other way.

The trustworthiness of the Congress or one of its committees to preserve the secrecy of such information when necessary and appropriate should not be doubted. Committees of Congress regularly receive secret information from the executive branch, as they have both a right and a need to do. The national security has never suffered as a result, for committees of Congress are no less responsible than their counterparts in the executive branch.

#### CERTIFICATION PROCEDURE

Under the terms of this legislation the executive branch would retain at all times the ability to avert a threatened fund cutoff. It need simply furnish the requested information and certify to the committee that it has made full and complete disclosure of the information sought. If such a certification were made, funds could not be cut off—unless the

certification were subsequently found by the Comptroller General of the United States to have been false. Funds could be cut off upon resolution of the requesting committee if the executive branch either, first, failed within the required time to make any certification of whether or not full disclosure had been made or, second, certified that full disclosure of the requested information had not been made.

By making the certification procedure the focal point on which a fund cutoff would depend, all subjectivity and ambiguity are removed from the process. The committee would not be in the position of having to judge for itself whether all the requested information had been furnished before resolving to cut off funds. In many cases, if a committee had to make such a judgment, it could not be certain whether it would be justified in cutting off funds, because it would not know whether full disclosure had been made.

The certification procedure establishes an objective identifiable event from which a fund cutoff would result, and the occurrence or nonoccurrence of that event would be totally within the control of the executive branch. Whether or not funds were cut off would depend entirely on whether the executive branch permitted them to be cut off by failing to certify that full disclosure of the requested information had been made. I wish to make clear that this means disclosure of all information requested, not merely all information which the executive branch deems it appropriate to disclose.

This procedure is fair to both the Congress and the executive branch. To Congress it would insure that either requested information was fully provided or financial sanctions were triggered. On the other hand, the executive branch would at all times control the "trigger," which could be pulled only if the executive branch deliberately and consciously refused to certify that it had furnished all the requested information. Thus, in no way could funds be cut off if the executive branch did not affirmatively choose to allow them to be cut off.

#### EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE

Under this legislation the invocation of executive privilege by the President would not avert a fund cutoff. Should the President choose not to provide Congress the requested information, for whatever reason, funds would be cut off. The President might prefer to lose funds than to disclose the information to Congress, but that is the hard—and the only—choice he would have.

#### OFFICERS AND AGENCIES COVERED

I should make clear, too, that this legislation exempts no office or agency within the executive branch from its provisions. Specifically, the President and establishments within the Executive Office of the President are included, so that no official, office, or agency may claim some undefined "privilege" flowing from his or its relationship with the President. Since the President is included, a fortiori so are all agencies and offices in the executive branch which are subordinate to the President.

However, the bill also provides that the President or head of any agency shall not be required to disclose the nature of any advice, recommendation, or suggestion made to him by a member of his staff or of an agency of the United States in connection with matters solely within the scope of his official duties, except to the extent that such information may be required to be made public or made available to Congress by some other provision of law. Any form of information included within or forming the basis of such advice, recommendation, or suggestion is not protected from disclosure.

The obvious purpose of this provision is to protect the confidentiality of staff relationships and to encourage free debate among agency heads and their advisers. At the same time, it is intended to insure that factual information—such as a finding by the President's science advisers that the SST would deplete the earth's ozone supply—be made available to Congress when relevant to its responsibilities.

#### JOINT RESOLUTION

Supplementary to the bill I have just described, we are also introducing a joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress that an office or agency of the executive branch should immediately make available all information requested by either House or any committee of Congress. The resolution is based on the same premises as the bill, and in my judgment would be a most useful reassertion by Congress of its constitutional prerogatives.

#### CONCLUSION

It has become common for administrations to apply a double standard to the release of information. Favorable classified information is frequently "leaked" to the press, while Congress and the public are denied information which could prove embarrassing to the Government.

This legislation is born of the premise that Congress, as a co-equal branch of our Federal Government, has both a right and a need to know information about all matters over which the Constitution gives it the power to legislate and the right of oversight. I can conceive in theory no justification for withholding from Congress information legitimately related to one of these functions. To keep Congress in the dark about the activities of the Government is to consign it to a subordinate and subservient role in derogation of the intent of the Constitution.

Observers have frequently criticized for allowing itself to become a second-citizen in our constitutional system. There is altogether too much truth in this assertion. In failing time and again over the years to exercise the prerogatives it unquestionably possesses, Congress has materially contributed to the relative decline of its influence over our Nation's course in the world. This need not have been the case, and the imbalance can be corrected if we in the Congress so desire.

The resolution and bill follows:

#### H.J. RES. 1201

Whereas, Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution empowers and charges Congress to "make all laws which shall be necessary and

proper" to carry into execution the powers vested in Congress and all other powers vested in the Federal government or any department or officer thereof;

Whereas, the express power of Congress to legislate necessarily includes an implicit right of oversight of the execution and administration of laws by the Executive Branch;

Whereas, Congress can properly and faithfully discharge its Constitutional responsibilities of legislation and oversight only if it has full and complete access to all information it deems relevant and necessary for this purpose;

Whereas, frequently much information needed by Congress for an intelligent exercise of its Constitutional responsibilities is in the exclusive custody of the Executive Branch;

Whereas, the withholding of necessary and relevant information from Congress by the Executive Branch contributes to a fundamental imbalance in our Constitutional system of government and vitiates the essential principle of accountability of government to the people; Now therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, that it is the sense of Congress that upon request of Congress, or of either House or any committee thereof, for information relating to programs or activities administered or funded by an agency or office of the Executive Branch of the United States, the head of such agency or office should immediately make all the requested information available to the requesting body.

#### H.R. 15006

A bill to amend the Freedom of Information Act to require the disclosure of information, upon request, to Congress by the executive branch

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, that section 552 of Title 5 of the United States Code (the Freedom of Information Act) is amended by adding to the end thereof the following:

"(d) (1) Upon written request of either House of Congress or any committee of Congress (hereinafter the 'requesting body') for information relating to programs or activities administered or funded by an agency of the United States, the head of such agency shall immediately make the requested information available to such requesting body and its duly authorized staff.

"(2) Within thirty-five days of receiving from such requesting body a written request for information, or within such later time as the requesting body may specify, an agency head shall, if so requested by the requesting body, certify whether or not full and complete disclosure has been made of the information requested insofar as that information is known to his agency.

"(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective upon—

(A) failure of an agency head to make a requested certification as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection;

(B) receipt by the requesting body of certification by an agency head that full and complete disclosure of the information has not been made; or

(C) formal determination by the Comptroller General of the United States that a certification of full and complete disclosure by an agency head was false;

and upon resolution of the requesting body, no funds appropriated after the effective date of this subsection shall be obligated or expended directly or indirectly by such agency for the programs or activities in question (as defined by the requesting body) until such time as, in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection,

full and complete disclosure has been made to the requesting body of all information specified in the request and known to the agency. If and when directed by the requesting body, the General Accounting Office shall take all steps available to it under law, including, but not limited to, refusal to countersign relevant warrants drawn upon the U.S. Treasury, to effect the purposes of this paragraph. Any officer or employee of the United States who willfully and knowingly expends, or causes to be expended, funds in violation of the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed to be in violation of the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 641 and shall, upon conviction, be subject to the punishment specified therein.

"(4) (A) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 551 of this subchapter, as used in this subsection, 'agency of the United States' means the President, and department, agency, office (including any establishment within the Executive Office of the President), officer, or other establishment in the Executive Branch of the United States Government, and any independent board, commission, corporation, or other instrumentality of the United States Government other than Courts of the United States.

"(B) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require the President or other head of an agency of the United States to make available to a requesting body the nature of any advice, recommendation, or suggestion (as distinct from any form of information included within or forming the basis of such advice, recommendation, or suggestion) made to him in connection with matters solely within the scope of his official duties by a member of his staff or of an agency of the United States, except to the extent that such information may be required by some other provision of law to be made available to Congress or made public; provided, that in no case shall information be refused to a requesting body under authority of this subparagraph in the absence of a written statement signed personally by the President describing the justification for such refusal.

"(C) Nothing in this subsection is intended to recognize or sanction a doctrine of 'executive privilege' or to permit the refusal of information on the grounds that such information constitutes 'internal working papers' if the requesting body believes that the information is needed for a legislative purpose."

#### FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY

#### HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, somebody once referred to it as a great big bowl of jello—you push your finger in here and it bulges out over there. That, Mr. Speaker, describes in a nutshell that great institutional wasteland known as the Federal bureaucracy.

Hundreds of thousands of bureaucrats—rooms, corridors, floors, buildings, even entire city blocks full of bureaucrats. Bureaucrats to the left of us; bureaucrats to the right of us—armies of bureaucrats with their concomitant acres of file cabinets and their reams and reams of forms and paper to be shuffled back and forth, to and fro.

Every bureaucrat moves or fails to move according to the "book." Human needs are reduced to letters written in quadruplicate, quintuplicate, sextupli-

cate, and more. The fate of communities, States, and the Nation is at the mercy of forms A, B, and C. Each decision must be reviewed by 17 superiors, inferiors, janitors, field agents, supervisors, coordinators, and authorized person.

Each bureaucrat is thoroughly trained in the Mickey Mouse school—each is an expert in paper shuffling, time consumption, space occupation. Each bureaucrat has a diploma trimmed in red tape and written in red ink. There is no wasteful project that is too insignificant to be hatched or implemented by a bureaucrat; the wheels of government grind relentlessly amidst a sea of blue ribbon panels, study groups, research projects, special and regular commissions, and authorized projects. Bureaucrats, thanks to their absorbing pursuit of knowledge have become experts on gallstone disease in Thailand, why birds leave home, and why poor people have less money than rich people.

Mr. Speaker, this would all be humorous if it were not so tragically true. While I am certain there are many dedicated public servants, persons who have a genuine interest in serving the people of this Nation, nevertheless the fact is bureaucracies exist to perpetuate themselves. If this were not true, why do we see each and every bureaucracy, be it Federal, be it State or local, whether it deals with health, education, agriculture, or tea testing continuing to expand, proliferate, prosper, and devise new and ingenious excuses for self-preservation.

President Nixon has rightfully pointed out that the American people are fed up with government—all government. The President is to be commended for recommending the most sweeping revision of the Federal bureaucracy in modern times. The magnitude of the problem has been well documented and discussed in an article appearing in the April 1972 issue of Reader's Digest, entitled "What's Wrong With Our Federal Bureaucracy?"

Mr. Speaker, we must do more than talk—the Congress of the United States must act if we are to prevent this Nation from being totally swallowed up in a sea of redtape and bureaucratic paper. George Orwell in his novel "1984" spoke of things to come—perhaps he had tongue in cheek when he wrote his book; but it is not so funny anymore.

The article follows:

#### WHAT'S WRONG WITH OUR FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY?

(By Charles J. V. Murphy)

(NOTE.—Inefficiency and mismanagement continue to characterize the most affluent government apparatus in history. Is reform possible? The President thinks so—and he has a plan. His problem: to convince a reluctant Congress.)

A year ago President Nixon turned in rare irritation to one of his executives, a senior bureaucrat. "The people are fed up with the government," he declared. "They think it doesn't work. And they are right."

That admission comes from an acutely organization-minded President who at this juncture might reasonably expect to have gained effective control of the vast federal executive machinery. But he has not, and for him it is the same maddening experience in powerlessness which vexed Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson.

Early in his Administration, President Nixon issued to the heads of all federal agencies a strong call for improvement of personnel management. A year later, Civil Service Commission Chairman Robert E. Hampton, himself a career public servant, and long-time bureaucratic troubleshooter Roger W. Jones, a former Civil Service Chairman, called in agency heads and directed them to press harder—far harder—to meet the new standards. As a result, says the *Washington Post*, bureaucrats are "feeling the impact of probably the most organized, systematic effort of any President to get a handle on the sprawling Executive Branch."

But it is a rugged, uphill battle, fought against the resistance of long-entrenched forces within the Civil Service and against powerful interests in Congress itself. Examples are abundant:

*Item:* Six months after a White House-directed task force had laid down a program of action for a broad decentralizing of federal authority, it was discovered that a bloc of bureaucrats inside the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) was furtively undercutting orders to transfer to local and state bodies the decision-making power in a number of educational grants-in-aid programs. The HEW bureaucrats were bent on keeping the grants under their own thumbs.

*Item:* Two years ago the director of Defense Research and Engineering, John S. Foster, Jr., discovered that 14 highly placed staff posts bearing on the management of critical military programs, separately spending millions of dollars annually, were occupied by civil servants grown rusty in their specialties or barren of executive experience. All had had 20 to 25 years' service and were in the \$20,000-\$25,000-a-year salary range.

Because it is virtually impossible to fire such senior people—mediocrity is hard to prove—Foster spent the better part of a year persuading six of the men to take early retirement and helping eight others to find jobs elsewhere in the government.

*Item:* Three years ago, the Office of Education had under way some 86 studies, costing \$22 million, that were designed to show whether the many federal education programs, especially those aimed at helping disadvantaged children, were doing the job. A government audit of 24 of these research exercises, which were budgeted for \$11.3 million, disclosed that one study had failed to produce any original findings, four others had stumbled along with inaccurate or incomplete data and two more were faltering.

These are only random cases of widespread and chronic federal mismanagement in the all but trackless forest of the world's most affluent bureaucracy. To be sure, some federal agencies are extremely well managed. For example, the Internal Revenue Service, the Social Security Administration and the Census Bureau have adapted their myriad routine functions to the computer. And NASA put a man on the moon. But elsewhere inefficiency is rampant, particularly in those agencies charged with executing the vast and costly social programs brought into being by the landslide of New Frontier and Great Society legislation of the 1960's.

#### AN HONEST DAY'S WORK

Why and where has the bureaucracy failed? Has it been for lack of money? Hardly. The federal government has spent \$1.1 trillion on domestic programs alone over the last 25 years. During the past two decades, the number of major domestic programs has leaped tenfold, from 140 to 1400. Today, at HEW alone, there are 270 programs, with annual outlays of over \$70 billion, and with 107,000 employees on deck.

So the root cause of the trouble with government, obviously, is not lack of people or programs or pay or even funding. It is, as just about everybody in Washington

knows, with the machinery of government—the permanent bureaucracy of some 2.8 million persons, practicing several thousand distinct and separate occupational skills, who man the 100 or so departments and agencies that form the framework of the federal management system.

Not surprisingly, Ralph Nader, who has made his reputation by pointing the finger of shame at corporations, has announced that he will now focus his attention on the federal bureaucracy. Hints have already been dropped by his lieutenants that preliminary findings suggest a third of the bureaucrats could be fired with no adverse effect on public services.

This, of course, is easier said than done. A succession of court rulings, particularly in Washington, D.C., and California, has made it nearly impossible for the Civil Service Commission to fire anyone unless it can show that his conduct has in some tangible way actually impaired the "efficiency" of the service. Not that this doesn't happen. While many leave the federal service voluntarily, close to 26,000 persons, mostly in the lower grades (below the command and staff level), are separated annually for cause—chronic absenteeism, not paying their bills, one blunder too many, etc.

Even so, sloughing off a nonproducer is so difficult that even the most ironfisted executives quail at the prospect. "Try to fire a man or woman with a little seniority," a veteran bureaucrat says, "and the labor unions, the Civil Liberties Union, the liberal press and a score of Congressmen will rush to that person's aid if there's the slightest possibility for a claim of discrimination." The statutory protection that was originally intended to protect the loyal and serious-minded civil servant from the capricious workings of the spoils system has been turned inside out. Today, along with the well-deserving, it clothes the goldbrick, the incompetent and the outright malcontent with immunity from a government that would like to demand an honest day's work from the people it pays.

#### TRUE ELITE

All this is serious enough. But the real crisis in government management is at the command and staff level—in the executive echelon where senior career civil servants and short-term professional in-and-outers function alongside, or a notch or two below, the Presidential policymakers who come and go as the political winds decide.

At the federal summit, the executive population numbers about 10,000 men and women. They draw salaries from \$29,000 to \$36,000 a year, generally have tenure and hold GS-16, -17, or -18 ranks, above which a bureaucrat can ascend no higher except by forfeiting the shelter of tenure. The best of them are a true elite, matching in intelligence, expertise, character and loyalty the best who come into government from business, the universities and politics. In fact, without this reservoir of experienced and trustworthy people, ready and willing to respond to even the most abrupt shifts in political course, the recurrent change in administrations could not be managed with anything like its habitual orderliness. All the same, the bureaucracy even at the top is marked by these troubling features:

*Tenure.* This gives ironclad security in the job, short of obvious malfeasance, dereliction or outrageous misconduct. An antiquated and illogical classification and ranking system makes it fiendishly difficult, on the one hand, to dislodge a fumbling supergrade from supervision of a failing program and, on the other, to promote an outstanding civil servant into a top policy-shaping management slot, without his forfeiting tenure. A management analyst who worked briefly in a top executive post at HEW estimates that from 15 to 20 percent of the civil servants

in the supergrade posts were grossly miscast. "It is not uncommon," he says, "to find bureaucrats running \$100-million-a-year social programs who were totally devoid of management experience."

*Parochial outlook.* Almost 70 percent of the supergrades have spent their federal careers in no more than two bureaus—a practice scarcely calculated to endow executives with a broad view of the government's business. When finally they arrive at the eminence of division and bureau chiefs, directors of operations, program managers, group administrators and special staff assistants, they tend to be narrow specialists. Yet it is at this very juncture that the government's most urgent need from them is a capacity to manage and measure vital programs in the context of the whole federal field of action.

*Backscratching.* Finally, super-bureaucrats tend to have a special loyalty to themselves and their pet programs. Bryce Harlow, a Washington-based corporation representative and top congressional adviser to both the Nixon and Eisenhower Administrations, holds that the careerists are the third force in what he describes as an "incestuous triangulation" that includes two other continuous sub-governments—the career members of the staffs which monitor legislation for the congressional committees and subcommittees, and the veteran lobbyists for the pressure groups congregated around Capitol Hill. These three forces form a kind of "Old Boys" network. They exchange intelligence. They come together to draft and defend programs. And it is not uncommon for bureaucrats, on their retirement from federal service, to take jobs with trade or professional organizations that have had a stake in the programs they have just been managing.

Early in the Nixon Administration, the new political management at HEW had the ground cut out from under it by a classic maneuver of these three powers. In 1970, as a beginning step toward its concept of a "new federalism," the Administration decided to transfer to regional offices a good deal of authority for dispensing an annual \$150 million in federal grants to some 450 community mental-health centers. Hardly had the decision to decentralize been made, however, than mid-level bureaucrats in the National Institute of Mental Health, secretly leagued with mental-health professionals and civil servants, tipped off friendly Congressmen representing the affected districts. Thus, when the proposal emerged from committee, an amendment was tacked on requiring that every grant first be reviewed in Washington—by an advisory committee composed mostly of mental-health professionals.

#### OPENING THE GATES

This is the kind of bureaucratic mousetrap President Nixon most wishes to eliminate. To do so, he has put forth a radical proposal for what is called the "Federal Executive Service." The idea was not original with him. A highly gifted federal careerist, Seymour S. Berlin, director of the Civil Service Commission's own Bureau of Executive Manpower, shaped the plan to meet the Administration's urgent desire for better performance. It would break the top 7000 supergrades out of the concrete of rules and regulations, and reconstitute them as a pool of talent upon which the various agency heads could draw at will. Grade levels and central classification would be abolished, and the barriers which keep the career bureaucrat out of policymaking jobs at the upper levels, except at the forfeiture of tenure, would also be discarded. In return for this, senior bureaucrats would be expected to accept a three-year contract, thus suspending tenure and permitting assignment at the need of the hard-pressed agency heads.

At the end of the three years, if the civil servant performed well, his contract would be renewed, no doubt at a higher salary and

perhaps with yet another promotion. If, however, he fell short, he would then have the option of retiring or stepping back into the bureaucracy at the GS-15 level.

The plan for the Federal Executive Service, if adopted, would give the Civil Service Commission, for the first time in its long history, sufficient authority to place career men with executive talent where they are most needed. It would also compel agency heads to comb the federal as well as the private market for high-quality managerial talent.

#### MOUNTING RESISTANCE

Last May the Senate Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service held a single morning of perfunctory hearings on the Federal Executive Service. After numerous delays, the corresponding House committee announced it was putting off its hearings until this spring. Since then, opposition has been quietly building in Congress, which largely regards the Civil Service as its own constituency. It fixes salaries, fringe benefits, retirement rates, the supply of jobs. And, whenever civil servants run afoul of their superiors, a Congressman can usually be depended upon to rally to their defense. Congress, moreover, is congenitally hostile to any change in the executive ranks, however desirable in itself, that might appear to foster something approaching a managerial elite.

Resistance is mounting in other quarters, too. Many senior bureaucrats fear any change in tenure policy. Nathan Wolkomir, president of the powerful National Federation of Federal Employees, has charged that the plan "would gravely undermine the merit system." This, of course, is a frivolous criticism. The plan would reaffirm the merit system which Congress, in alliance with the unions, has all but subverted.

The point that Congress, the unions and the balky bureaucrats are afraid to face up to is that the bureaucracy must be reformed if American government is ever again to work as it should. Indeed, it falls upon the Civil Service, in a practical sense, to restore the people's confidence in the capacity of government to govern. Or as Robert Hampton puts it: "The nation's business is too important to be in the hands of any but the best wherever they may be found."

### THE NONPUBLIC SCHOOL ISSUE

#### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota is a melting pot of nationalities and religions. Because many of these ethnic groups strive to maintain their cultural and religious backgrounds, we have a large number of parochial schools of every religious denomination.

Because people who send their children to parochial schools must also support the public schools, they are, in effect, paying twice for the education of their children.

Carroll Fey, editor of the Edgerton Enterprise, dealt with this matter in a recent editorial, which I would like to share with my colleagues and the many others who read it, by inserting it into the RECORD:

#### THE NONPUBLIC SCHOOL ISSUE

President Richard Nixon, in his address before the National Catholic Education Association convention in Philadelphia, raised some vital questions for American taxpayers

and parents concerning the future pattern of education in the United States. They are questions with no easy answers. As Mr. Nixon declared, "We are all well aware of the grave constitutional questions which have arisen in the past, each time the states or the federal government has undertaken to provide aid to nonpublic schools."

At the same time, Mr. Nixon was right when he said that "non-public schools confront a crisis of the first magnitude," and that the disappearance of all nonpublic schools in this country could "saddle the American taxpayer with an additional \$3 billion annually in school operating costs, plus as much as \$10 billion in new school construction."

Not mentioned by the President, but of equal import, is the growing widespread discontent of parents with the trends of public school education, such as the tendency towards downgrading patriotism, the elimination (in some states) of history as required study, the assault against prayer or any moral content in school activities and textbooks, etc. It is because of this that thousands upon thousands of concerned parents have been joining together to establish nonpublic schools where their children would not be subjected to the objectionable features of secularism and "humanism" found in many public schools.

At the same time that parents have been faced with a greatly increased financial burden imposed by tuition costs to nonpublic schools, the tax load for public schools has been skyrocketing. The public school system is largely sustained by property taxes, and we all know what has been happening; in all parts of the country, property taxes have been climbing out of sight. Thus, more and more people are paying increased taxes for schooling that they do not approve, while sending their children to nonpublic schools at a double financial burden.

This is not simply a question of "federal aid to parochial schools"; as pointed out by Citizens for Educational Freedom, indeed, almost all of the new nonpublic schools established over the last ten years have been sponsored by Protestant groups and churches.

What is at stake is the principle that each child and his parents receive equal treatment and have an equal opportunity to education under the law. Whatever is to be done must be fair to all, and should not penalize parents who want their children to have an education based upon the old-fashioned virtues of religion, morality and patriotism.

### SCL SPONSORED "EXCURSION" INTO FORESTRY, ECOLOGY, AND NATURAL RESOURCES IN SOUTH CAROLINA

#### HON. TOM S. GETTYS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 4, the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Co. ran a "Forestry Special" train from our State capital, Columbia, to Cane Savannah in Sumter County in my district, where a cooperative field forestry program, "Environment—A Look Ahead," was presented.

The program was heralded as a rational approach to the environmental issues of today—forestry, air, and water quality, recycling, agribusiness, pesticides and herbicides, wildlife, housing, and rural development—and each presenta-

tion was designed to educate and at the same time entertain the more than 1,200 spectators who turned out for the occasion.

I firmly believe that most of our problems can come nearer to being resolved through better communications. This program, treating all elements of public concern, "put it all together" in such a way as to promote a better understanding of the total resource picture. It was a classic example of good public relations.

The special train which departed from Columbia carried the Governor, State constitutional officers, members of the State legislature, educators, and business and industrial leaders to the field program in the Manchester State Forest.

The guest list included top leaders of industry who came from all parts of the United States, Canada, and Germany.

The train was met at the site of this truly festive occasion by the Sumter County High School Band playing spirited marches as the passengers alighted from the train and remained to open the program with the National Anthem.

Mr. Milton M. Bryan of the U.S. Forest Service gave the invocation:

Almighty and Eternal God—may we ever be aware of Thy overshadowing presence, as we pause at this noonday hour with bowed heads and humble hearts to thank Thee for the many blessings of life.

Thou knowest the circumstances of our times—many are shut in by the narrowness of a selfish interest toward the use or non-use of the resources with which our Nation abounds.

Help the leaders and participants in this field meeting to show us the truth—about the husbandry and use of a Natural Resource—that renews itself with the rain and sunlight from Thy heavens and the food from Thy soil.

Guide us, oh Lord, that we do not restrict our travel to the narrow road of absolute preservation, nor race down the freeway of reckless exploitation—but let us be true husbandmen—and "Dress the Garden and Keep It."

Man with Thy help, oh God, has been to the moon, and found it an environmental void; as we forge on to other planets, let us be ever mindful of the Natural and Human Resources—that have made possible the good life on the planet Thou has given us as a home.

As professionals in the agricultural sciences, leaders in business and industry, legislators, and landowners, give us wisdom and courage to "Look Ahead" to the far horizons—toward a better and more useful environment in which to survive.

We ask this in the name of the Creator, Redeemer, and Father of all mankind. Amen.

Many prominent local political leaders within a 75-mile radius of Sumter, local business leaders, farmers, and others with a stake in forestry, as well as 200 members of the Future Farmers of America, were on hand to greet the train.

It was my pleasure to be the congressional sponsor for this occasion. The man who directed the overall planning for this affair was my longstanding personal friend, R. N. "Bob" Hoskins, assistant vice president, Forestry and Special Projects of the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Co. Bob served as master of ceremonies and ran the entire program on schedule throughout the day. This was no small feat considering there were two

platform groups of business, industrial, and political leaders, 150 of whom were recognized in the course of the 4-hour program.

Mr. W. Thomas Rice, chairman of the board and president of the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Co., was a most gracious host.

Assisting in the arrangements for the field program were Mr. A. L. Fowler, assistant general industrial forester, Seaboard Coast Line Railroad, and members of the Sumter County Chamber of Commerce.

The following program indicates the nature and scope of the presentation:

#### ENVIRONMENT—A LOOK AHEAD

A cooperative field program with a rational approach to the environmental issues of the day—

Forestry.  
Air and water quality.  
Recycling.  
Agribusiness.  
Pesticides and herbicides.  
Wildlife.  
Housing.  
Rural development.

Location: On Manchester State Forest, seven miles west of Sumter on State Route #763, near Cane Savannah.

Time: 9:30 a.m.—Arrival of "Forestry Special" train from Columbia.

Master of Ceremonies: Robert N. (Bob) Hoskins, Asst. Vice President, Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Co.

Introductory remarks: Prime F. Osborn III, President and Chief Executive Officer, L&N Railroad Co.

Introduction of Governor: W. Thomas Rice, Chairman of the Board and President, Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Co.

Address of welcome: The Honorable John C. West, Governor, State of South Carolina.  
Introduction of keynote speaker: W. Thomas Rice.

Keynote address: William E. Galbraith, Deputy Under Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Special presentation: Roger Porter, President, South Carolina FFA Association, Loris, S.C.

Introduction of special guests: Bob Hoskins.

#### DEMONSTRATIONS

Station 1: The Super Trees Are Here!—D. M. Crutchfield, Westvaco Corporation, Timberlands Division, Summerville, S.C.

Pesticides and Herbicides Used Wisely!—E. Roland Laning, Jr., Dow Chemical Company, Midland, Mich.

Station 2: Burning the Woods Is Sometimes Best!—Stephen G. Boyce, Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, Forest Service, U.S.D.A., Asheville, N.C.

Forest Management Pays High Dividends.—Don M. Handley, South Carolina Society of Consulting Foresters, Florence, S.C.

Station 3: A Look Ahead—Long Range Plans of the S.C. State Commission of Forestry.—Walter T. Ahearn, South Carolina State Commission of Forestry, Columbia, S.C.

Wildlife—Our Responsibility!—Raymond D. Moody and T. E. Lynn, International Paper Company, Mobile, Ala.

Station 4: Steel—Wood's Partner in Housing.—Robert J. Richey, Residential Construction Marketing, United States Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Station 5: Quality Air Ahead—Quality Water Ahead.—Jack E. Martie, Air Correction Division, Universal Oil Products Co., Darien, Conn.

Station 6: Agribusiness and Export.—John S. Montel, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S.D.A., Washington, D.C.

The World Market for South Carolina Natural Resources—Coyte W. White, South Carolina State Ports Authority, Charleston, S.C.

Station 7: Clearcutting, Site Preparation and Regeneration.—M. F. Fox, Federal Paper Board Co., Inc., Bolton, N.C.

Recycling in Action!—John A. Reagan, Sonoco Products Company, Hartsville, S.C.

12:40 p.m.: Introduction of special guests—Bob Hoskins.

Introduction of principal speaker—W. Thomas Rice.

Principal address: James C. Hair, President, Bowaters Carolina Corporation, Catawba, S.C.

Introduction of congressional host: W. Thomas Rice.

Summary address: The Honorable Thomas S. Gettys, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

1:20 p.m.: Luncheon—Courtesy Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Co.

#### SPECIAL LUNCHEON PROGRAM

##### Fashion show in the woods

Featuring Disposables and Beautiful Girls. Staged by L. E. Haws, Jr., Bowaters Carolina Corporation, Catawba, S.C.

##### Forest fertilization aerial demonstrations

Robert A. Bartlett, F. A. Bartlett Tree Expert Co., Stamford, Conn.; Paul Kaiser, Bar Fly, Inc., Charlotte, N.C.; J. Horace Lanier, Smith-Douglass Div., Borden Chemical, Borden, Inc., Norfolk, Va.

2:30 p.m.: Departure of Special train for Columbia.

3:30 p.m.: Arrival of "Forestry Special" in Columbia.

The remarks of the Honorable William E. Galbraith, Deputy Under Secretary of Agriculture follow:

#### REMARKS OF WILLIAM E. GALBRAITH

Fortunate indeed is South Carolina—blessed as she is with a beautiful countryside, a wonderfully mild climate, an abundant and thriving forest resource, and in industrious people to tend and guard that resource—and use it wisely for their own benefit as well as for the Nation.

Fortunate, also, are the other States served by the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad. They, and the other Southern States have the potential to contribute half of the Nation's timber harvests that will be needed to meet demands at the turn of the Century. This is a formidable challenge as well as a great opportunity.

In order to meet this enormous challenge, the South is establishing its "Third Forest"—if I may borrow that descriptive phrase from the Southern Forest Resource Analysis. It will take the best coordinated efforts on the part of forest industry, State Forestry organizations, Federal agencies, and the nonindustrial private forest landowners to build that forest. Also needed is the understanding and involvement of the public at large—people who do not own forest land, but who are concerned with the environment. Without their support and understanding the job would be much more difficult and perhaps impossible to accomplish.

Forest industry has already shown a willingness to make the needed investments in its forest lands. The 32 National Forests in the South contribute their share of forest products as well as other public benefits. Management of State and other public lands is on a high level and still improving.

The key to success, however, will be to achieve good protection and management of nonindustrial private forest lands that constitute three-fourths of the commercial forests in the South. In this context, it may interest you to know that legislation is awaiting the President's signature that will authorize a significant expansion of funding and other aspects of the Forest Service programs of

Cooperative Forest Fire Control and Cooperative Forest Management.

The Forest Service Experiment Stations and the forestry schools, in cooperation with industry, are making important contributions in the coordinated effort to establish the Third Forest. Outstanding accomplishments in tree improvement, wood utilization, fire control, reforestation, and a host of other subjects have already been achieved. In short, the outlook in the South for meeting an increasing share of the National demands for timber products is good.

I must warn, however, against the notion that timber production alone deserves our concern. The forest must serve as well in meeting recreation, esthetic, wildlife, water quality, livestock forage, and related needs. There are increasingly strict constraints posed by the necessity to protect and improve the natural environment. The forester's concern for the environment is twofold. On the one hand, the forest has a positive influence on the environment through filtering the air, purifying and stabilizing waterflows, harboring wildlife, anchoring the soil, and in a host of other ways. These influences the forester must enhance. On the other hand, careless management can easily damage the environment. Harvesting systems, fire and the applications of herbicides and pesticides, for example, can have an adverse impact if they are not handled properly.

Let me take a few moments to talk about harvesting systems. The choice of harvesting systems depends largely on the objectives of the forest owner and the physical condition of the forest resources that are available to him.

In the South clearcutting to establish and manage forests on an even-aged basis is a proven and widely used practice. The size of clearcuts is usually kept small. Sometimes however, for good reasons, larger clearcuts do appear. Even-aged stands are preferred in most of the South because of technical reasons. It is possible to grow a more productive forest that way, and after the harvest, the area can be more efficiently and economically prepared for establishing a new forest. For example, all forestry interests—Government, industry, and universities—have made great progress in the development of improved strains of forest trees. Planting genetically improved stock on cleared areas that have been adequately prepared is the best way to make this improvement on nature pay off in a greater flow of better products from the forests. Not only timber production benefits from even-aged management, but most forms of wildlife flourish in and near openings in the forest.

Another success story here in the South is in the field of wildfire prevention and control. Techniques and procedures have improved steadily during the past fifty years. Fire Control agencies, through efficient control action, have been successful in steadily reducing the acreage burned by wildfires. However, the number of man-caused fires continues at about the same level—in spite of sustained prevention activities.

Prevention efforts, including the Smokey Bear, "Keep Green", and Southern Cooperative Forest Fire Prevention programs have produced good results, but a more intensive fire prevention effort is needed to meet the challenge of the future. We must direct major new efforts toward solving specific problems. For example, additional support must be given in the fields of education and law enforcement. Fire prevention legislation and enforcement action vary noticeably from State to State. Incendiarists, and the careless debris burners, present particularly difficult problems for law enforcement and prevention officers in the South.

To reduce property and resource damage from large, disastrous fires, we must expand

our program of specialized fire control training and develop our fire control forces with more suitable equipment. This would include expanding the use of aircraft in both detection and control activities.

Full use of mutual aid assistance available through the Southeastern Compact can be a vital force in the fight of prevent or control disaster fire situations. A high level of fire protection for the South's forest and watershed lands is essential and must be maintained if they are to contribute the maximum amount of timber and other needed resources.

Pesticides are important and useful tools in managing the forest of the South and other parts of the country. Chemical pesticides range from insect toxicants and repellents through plant toxicants and growth regulators. We find ourselves at cross purposes when it comes to using some pesticides. There is the urgent need to increase quantity and improve quality of the forest resource—and do it effectively and efficiently. But we must meet this need by using those tools that are safe to the environment.

In the recent past, and even now, the two principal pesticide uses in the southern forest have been insecticides for southern pine beetle control and herbicides for controlling undesirable hardwood overstory that inhibits good growth of pines. Even with the greater use of alternative control methods, the total job cannot be effectively done without pesticides. Southern Pine Beetle outbreaks are occurring in parts of eight Southern States—some chemical control will be necessary.

Forest management programs have been moving steadily toward increased use of cultural, biological, and integrated methods which utilize nonpersistent, host-specific chemicals instead of broad spectrum pesticides. The U.S. Forest Service, for example, has made no aerial applications of DDT since 1967. Here in the South, the use of benzene hexachloride has decreased from 8,790 pounds in Fiscal Year 1966 to 30 pounds in Fiscal Year 1971. It will be a real challenge to continue this program without the goal of sound forest management being sidetracked.

As time moves toward the twenty-first century, the forests of the South will have to provide an unprecedented flow of products and benefits. In doing so, a balance must be struck between accelerating timber production and providing non-timber benefits. These objectives are compatible and can be met. The resource is there, the technical knowledge is there and is being augmented by strong research programs, and the leadership is there to meet the needs of the future. We can look ahead with confidence and anticipation.

It has been a privilege to meet with you today.

Mr. Roger Porter, president of the South Carolina Association of Future Farmers of America presented the Honorary State Farmer Degree to each of the following:

First, the Honorable John C. West, Governor of South Carolina;

Second, William E. Galbraith, Deputy Under Secretary of Agriculture;

Third, W. Thomas Rice, chairman of the board and president of the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Co.;

Fourth, Allan C. Mustard, senior vice president of the South Carolina Electric and Gas Co.;

Fifth, John E. Streetman, vice president, Allied Mills, Inc., and the 1972 national chairman of the FFA Foundation; and

Sixth, James C. Hair, president, Bo-waters Carolina Corp.

In making these presentations, Porter observed that all of the recipients "have

supported and are continuing to support a great organization—The Future Farmers of America." He summed it up by saying:

They have given unselfishly of their time and resources toward agricultural betterment nationwide.

Following the presentations, Mr. W. Thomas Rice introduced James C. Hair, president and general manager of Bo-waters Carolina Corp., whose remarks, highly appropriate to the occasion, follow:

#### REMARKS OF JAMES C. HAIR

Mr. Chairman, distinguished platform guests, ladies and gentlemen:

It is an extreme pleasure to be with you on this splendid spring day and to enjoy with you the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad's Environmental Field Day. We all owe a vote of thanks to Tom Rice and Seaboard for sponsoring such a unique and interesting event as the Environmental Field Day.

For sometime now, at least since 1962 when Rachel Carson published *Silent Spring*, there has been a sudden, if not almost hysterical concern over our environment. Clean air, clean water, population, less noise and wilderness have practically become national priorities. Millions of people who never had the faintest idea of what ecology was all about are now talking like expert conservationists.

A decade ago, just a few groups and a few lone voices cried out about our decaying world. Now, everybody's in the act—politicians, government, students, educators, lawyers—all saying that we are in the midst of an environmental crisis and there is little time left to put things back in order.

We are continually bombarded by newspaper and magazine articles and television specials about our environmental problems. Man is portrayed as the despoiler, the purveyor of death on this planet.

It is a matter of survival, we are told, and that healing our world must be our highest priority.

We will all agree that we do have problems, and in some cases, they are severe. And we will further agree that we have not always done right by our environment. All too often we have fouled our nest.

As our country developed, grew and expanded, environmental quality was of little, if any, concern. Other things seemed more important. There was an industrial revolution, the Great Depression, two World Wars, and political, social and economic crises.

Now, we have come of age, and environmental problems are but one price we have to pay for progress. And more and more Americans are demanding that we cap our smokestacks, clean our rivers, and preserve the wilderness. And do it now, they say.

A recent public opinion poll by Opinion Research Corporation found that people are very much aware of environmental problems such as smog, oil spills, fish kills and air and water pollution. And, of course, industry is blamed for most of the environmental problems. Industry pollutes and, although industries are not directly responsible for litter and solid waste, companies do make the stuff and people feel industry should help correct the problem.

It is also interesting to note in the report that in a time when industry is doing more about pollution than ever before, the realization that something is being done has been diminishing.

When asked by Opinion Research how many companies are doing to control pollution, only 10 percent said a great deal. Thirty-five percent said a fair amount and a majority, 53 percent, said that companies are doing very little.

According to the report, the percent who

say companies are doing little about pollution has been rising. In other words, says Opinion Research, tolerance is diminishing at a faster rate than awareness of company actions to correct the problems.

Could it be that industry's voice is being drowned out by the rhetoric of environmental activists? Maybe if industry wants grease, we'll have to squeak a little louder—and more often.

And industry has a good story to tell, and I'm surprised at its reluctance to talk. We seem to have gotten a little gun shy. We seem afraid to tell our story.

I have spent most of my working life in the pulp and paper industry, and contrary to what you may have heard about the industry, it does have a pretty good record in conservation and environmental protection.

The pulp and paper industry's concern for the environment predates Earth Day and most environmental and conservation movements by many years. Although little known to the general public, a group of companies in the paper industry pooled their efforts in research for new and better ways to protect our streams as early as 1943—that's nearly 30 years ago. And individually, these and other companies had been studying the problem even before that date.

Out of this joining together came the National Council for Stream Improvement. In 1956, the Council added air improvement to its research objective, and still later, began studies in the field of solid waste disposal.

Today, it is known as the National Council of the Paper Industry for Air and Stream Improvement. Its main task is to carry out the paper industry commitment to a goal of a clean environment. National Council is totally dedicated to research and is spending well over \$1 million a year in research to improve air and water quality. Over 90 percent of the pulp and paper companies support this research effort.

At centers located at Tuft University, Western Michigan, University of Florida and Oregon State University, National Council is performing vital research that will advance the industry's ability to manage and protect the nation's environmental quality.

Publicity about environmental problems has made our forests a subject of popular concern, which is good. But much of the attention given our forest by environmentalists is based more on emotion than reason—and that's bad.

Most Americans believe that we are running out of trees, according to a recent survey. People believe that trees will be in shorter supply than coal or oil in the next ten years. Two-thirds of our population believe we are exhausting our forests.

The public seems to believe that once a forest is harvested that it is gone forever, like a vein of coal.

Are we running out of trees? Absolutely not. When Columbus landed, there were more than a billion acres of forest land in what is now the 48 contiguous states. Today, there are still 758 million acres of forest remaining. That's about 75 percent of the amount standing 500 years ago. This is after building a nation of more than 200 million people.

And more timberland is being added. There are 13 million acres more today than there were a generation ago, most of it on abandoned farmland reclaimed by nature.

"The South's Third Forest" which we are all so excited about, is a story unto itself. According to Southern Forest Resource Analysis Report, the South must provide most of the nation's wood products by the year 2,000 and in a volume twice as great as the region produces today.

The South's First Forest was the wilderness the colonists found when they arrived at Jamestown. From this wilderness came logs for cabins and stockades, hulls for ships, furniture for homes and implements for

farms. The South's First Forest yielded a trillion board feet of lumber—enough to build 100 million homes.

Then came the Second Forest which started to grow in the early 1900's on the South's cut-over lands. The Second Forest was, in many ways, more prolific than the First.

It was the Second Forest that brought the pulp and paper industry to the South.

The Third Forest is the one we'll need by the year 2000, and the wood products we'll need by then must be grown on less land. Part of the increased yield will come from "super trees," trees that grow taller, straighter and faster than ordinary pine trees.

An old forest with its stately and majestic trees is impressive. But it is a stagnate forest, slowly dying. Stagnation and decay consume more oxygen than the old forest can create.

Not so with the Third Forest. It will be a vibrant, growing forest. Every acre of vigorous young trees gives off four tons of fresh oxygen every year, while consuming six tons of carbon dioxide. A growing forest is the most efficient antipollution device so far developed.

While this massive reforestation effort has won acclaim from environmentalists, not so popular with them is the forestry practice of clearcutting. Cutting a single tree to some is bad enough, but clearcutting, where every tree in a stand is removed, causes critics to cry "devastation" and "plunder."

In a new book on clearcutting that was recently published by a leading environment organization, the author calls clearcutting "the most destructive tool ever applied to the American forest."

And a clearcut is ugly. All that remains are slash, stumps, branches and other debris. But what you don't see is a new forest starting to grow.

Environmentalists refuse to believe that all forests began with a clearcut, perhaps caused by insects, fire or man. Clearcutting is simply man's adaption of nature's way of regenerating forests. Whether by nature or man, clearcutting is just one step in the ecosystem of the forest.

Clearcutting does two beneficial things: It speeds up the regeneration of the forest; and we use the wood that would otherwise be wasted by fires, insect damage or other natural clearcut occurrences.

The forest products industry is not backing down in its fight to use clearcutting as a legitimate and proper forest management practice.

This time the industry has good support, including a number of experts from government, industry and forestry schools, who agree that clearcutting should be used to regenerate forests where nature uses the same technique.

The battle on clearcutting has just begun, and you're going to be reading and hearing much about it in coming months. The future of clearcutting is yet to be decided.

Another subject that is sure to get the environmentalist's adrenalin flowing is wilderness—the setting aside of more and more land for parks and wilderness areas where no wood harvesting is permitted.

Now, let me make it clear that I'm against neither parks nor wilderness. We need both. But the question we are called upon to answer is whether wilderness preservation best serves the recreation and economic needs of all Americans.

Most private timberland, as well as National Forest Land, has been managed for multiple use. The land is managed for timber, recreation, watershed development, fish and wildlife. Under wilderness plans, the land takes on a single use characteristic, that of limited recreation.

Wilderness means preserving nature in its original state with no roads and no eating and sleeping or sanitation accommodations. This restricts its use to those very few people

with enough stamina to hike or pack into the scenic and forested vastness of the wilderness.

Of course, if you have the time and money, a wilderness experience comes much easier.

Arthur Godfrey took a trip to the wild and desolate Middle Snake River in Idaho. He flew in his private jet, hired a guide and rented a pack train. Not many of us can afford that sort of a wilderness experience.

Even if you have money, accessibility to remote wilderness creates a problem. Roads, campgrounds, lifts and eating facilities are ruled out.

By contrast, Switzerland has made its spectacular terrain accessible by some type of transportation.

A former wilderness concept enthusiast, Los Angeles attorney, Eric Julber, called it ironical that in Europe—the old world, the land of aristocracy—the common people can see the wonders of our Creator, while in America, land of democracy, the common people are excluded.

He points out that the Swiss, who have 2,000 years of experience in the management of mountains and tourists, are opposed to our purist philosophy.

"The purist says: Keep people out. The Swiss ethnic says: Invite them in, the more the better."

He terms wilderness preservation a "purist-conservationist" philosophy since the acreage consigned to wilderness results in a 600 to 1 disparity between what is provided to the elite and what is provided to the common American. He says that this philosophy has made some of the most beautiful areas of America "off limits" to anyone who is not willing or able to backpack into them.

Julber testified before a Senate committee last year and, using Forest Service figures, showed that recreation use of Wilderness and Primitive areas of the National Forest were used by less than one million persons—that's less than one-half of one percent of our population. These users, he said, are shown by statistical analysis to be the financial and intellectual elite of our nation.

Placing large amounts of land in wilderness deprives the public of needed wood supply, wood that will be necessary for housing and thousands of consumer products made from wood.

Some areas should be preserved in wilderness, even though few of us can enjoy them. But let's be careful that we don't let a few environmentalists talk us into putting into wilderness so much land that the entire nation is deprived of the benefits of the forest lands.

You know, it seems to me that environmentalists believe complex problems have simple solutions. Take recycling, for example.

They see no reason why we cannot recycle all of our waste paper, bottles, plastics to reduce the solid waste problem. This certainly has merit, but it's not as simple as it sounds.

Let me give you an idea of the problems in recycling paper by comparing it to recycling of bread and pastries. Let's imagine that we are going to recycle all the breads, rolls, cakes, cookies, pies and pastries found in the bakery section of your supermarket.

Our first problem is getting rid of the wrapper and cartons. Remember, if our recycling program is to be successful, we must make a product which customers will buy and at prices which will cover expenses. With rye bread, white bread, cinnamon rolls, chocolate chip cookies and dozens of other products, you might run into a quality control problem. This is further complicated by the raisins, nuts and other goodies mixed in with some of the products.

Now you have an idea of what is involved in getting dozens of different types of paper, used for hundreds of different purposes ready for recycling.

Over 20 percent of all paper used in the

United States today is recycled. This amount is sure to increase as we learn how to separate the "nuts from the raisins."

Enormous strides have been made, too, in the use of residues that previously were burned or buried. The day is almost in sight when the whole tree and the residual materials of manufacturing will be put to use.

Years ago, bark, shavings, sawdust, limbs and foliage were generally burned, buried or left on the forest floor to decay and return to the soil. Today, more than 80 percent of wood residues are put to use. New products produced with wood residues include paper products of all kinds, particleboard, hardboard, roofing materials, ground cover, charcoal, fuels and insulation.

The National Industrial Pollution Control Council has stated that increasing utilization of residues is among the most important factors in reducing solid waste problems.

While total utilization of the forest harvest is still the goal of the forest products industry, the industry can nonetheless be proud of the progress already made in putting residues to good use.

For several minutes, I have been telling you about just a few positive examples of good environmental stewardship. I hope you won't think I am belittling those people who are deeply concerned about our environment just because we may disagree.

But I think it's time we quit yelling and shouting and begin establishing lines of communication between conservationist, environmentalist, industry and government. With understanding, we can move ahead to rectify some of our environmental sins of the past.

And it won't be easy, nor inexpensive. A recent report to the government on the impact of curbing pollution said that antipollution costs between 1972 and 1980 might decrease the Gross National Product some \$6 billion a year below the level it otherwise would reach; retard annual economic growth slightly; increase unemployment slightly and reduce the U.S. imports by some \$700 million a year.

Now, are we personally willing to pay to help correct pollution?

Again, going to the Opinion Research Poll, we aren't. Only 22 percent said they were willing to personally pay something in extra taxes or higher prices to help clean up pollution. Forty percent said they would pay nothing.

I suppose people think that someone else created the problem, so let them pay for it. But in the end, it will ultimately be the man in the street who will foot the bill, whether in increased taxes or higher prices.

I have not presented to you any solution to the environmental problems. I did not intend to. H. L. Mencken once said, "For every problem there is a solution—simple, neat and wrong."

Instead, I have tried to give the other side of the environmental coin, by calling your attention to what only one industry, the forest products, is doing to improve the quality of our environment. To me, it looks pretty good.

Let me say that I believe that man is not doomed, but that he will endure and that he will prevail because of reason, judgment and compassion.

We are all polluters—every member of our society; therefore, it must be all society that must respond to the call of a clearer environment.

This is our world and as long as we use its resources wisely, it will be a good world in which to live.

Dr. Barry Commoner, one of the nation's most knowledgeable and respected environmentalists, spelled out the four "laws of the environment." They are:

1. Everything is connected to everything else.
2. Everything must go somewhere.

3. Nature knows best.

4. There is no such thing as a free lunch.

ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS—THE OTHER SIDE  
OF THE COIN

I would like to take this means to express my thanks to all the people who made this outstanding program possible. The efforts put forth during the day point up clearly that many of our problems can be solved through better communications—which in turn create a climate of understanding that benefits all of us.

Certainly no one has shown greater leadership in promoting such cooperative endeavors than Chairman of the Board and President W. Thomas Rice of the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Co.

And in the same vein, I would certainly commend Bob Hoskins of Mr. Rice's staff for his industry and initiative in securing top-level representation from so large a group of industrialists, some of whom traveled great distances to participate in this forestry seminar.

At the local level the Committee of 100 in Columbia must be commended for their efforts in providing hospitality and recreation for the entertainment of the visitors, coordinated by Mr. B. B. Cole, Jr., their executive director.

In conclusion let me say that one railroad's "good neighbor" policy has not only created a better understanding but has also made a long lasting impression on all those who were fortunate enough to be on hand for another outstanding "Forestry Field Day."

RUMANIA: A PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC?

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, this month marks a series of important anniversaries for the Rumanian people. After a long history of invasions and domination by foreign powers, the basis for a free and independent nation was established by the creation of the Rumanian dynasty in 1866 when Prince Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen was proclaimed Prince of Rumania. Exactly 11 years later, in 1877, the Principality of Rumania severed her ties to the Ottoman Empire and declared her independence. On May 10, 1881, the country became a kingdom by crowning Charles I, King of Rumania.

The ensuing years were difficult ones in which the country grappled with the problems and responsibilities of self-rule. But by the end of World War I, a prosperous and progressive Rumania was a peaceful and stable member of the Central European community.

However, the situation changed dramatically during the closing months of World War II, when Russian troops moved into Rumania and freed it from the control of the Axis powers. The Soviet leadership dismantled the carefully constructed Rumanian Government and imposed virtual Soviet rule on the nation. In 1945, Communists were placed in key

positions in the Government and in March 1946, King Michael was forced to appoint a Communist front government. A Soviet-style election was held in November of 1946 consolidating Communist power and was followed shortly thereafter by the King's abdication under pressure from the U.S.S.R. The Rumanian People's Republic was thus created without the consent or consultation of the Rumanian people.

After the Stalinist years of terror were cut short by the Soviet leader's death, the Rumanian Government began to develop international policies designed to help Rumania rather than conform with the dictates of the leaders of the U.S.S.R. In foreign affairs, the Rumanian Government has established independent trade and diplomatic ties with a number of Western nations, including the United States, Great Britain, and France, and has voted independently of the Soviet Union on a number of issues in the United Nations. Cultural exchange between Rumania and the Western nations is a frequent occurrence.

President Nixon's conferences with Rumanian leaders during his visit there in 1969 exemplifies the independence with which the Government conducts its affairs.

Their assertion of national independence is a good sign and one which we should encourage. It is not, however, indicative of the conduct of internal Rumanian affairs. Suppressions and iron control of the populace are still the law of the land. The Communist Party maintains its monopoly of power within the state and the state remains rigidly organized along traditional Communist lines.

Increased contacts with Western nations cannot help but aid the Rumanian people in their continuing struggle for true independence and freedom. The United States must do all it can to foster this relationship and hope for true progress in terms of human freedom and dignity for the people of Rumania.

FRONTIER NURSING SERVICE

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, our rural areas face many problems in the matter of adequate medical care. I am very pleased to submit an article about an organization that is making great strides toward solving many of these problems—Kentucky's Frontier Nursing Service.

The dedicated people of the Frontier Nursing Service are fulfilling an important role in Kentucky that is now being emulated in other parts of the Nation.

The article follows:

[From the American Journal of Nursing, May 1972]

FRONTIER'S FAMILY NURSES

(By Barbara G. Schutt)

For nearly a half century the Frontier Nursing Service has been demonstrating that by the effective use of nurses an economi-

cally deprived area can get good health care. Recently, it has expanded its mid-wifery school to prepare, hence give formal recognition to, the "Family Nurse"—someone able to assume a constantly expanding role in the provision of primary health services to a whole family.

The advantage FNS has over many other agencies on a similar bandwagon today is that it has been proving the appropriateness of this role since 1925, and it has rich experiences on which to draw to refine it. For, in actuality, the FNS nurses have always been the primary health care givers to the people up the creeks, over the mountains, back in the hollows of Leslie County, Kentucky.

Those who know the FNS, however, must concede that there's more to preparing a nurse to give safe and effective primary care than supplementing her basic education and assigning her to her own clinic. For the FNS, where these nurses are learning and practicing, is a concept as well as a health service.

The FNS' mailing address and headquarters—is Wendover, Kentucky, "pop. 21 approx." Accessible until recently only on a horse or mule after one fords the Middle Fork of the Kentucky River, Wendover can now be reached in a car by crossing a bridge and following a "blacktop" which peters out into a dirt road, winding, sometimes precariously, with and above the river. Built by Mary Breckinridge, FNS founder, to serve as her home and headquarters, Wendover's rustic rambling buildings now house some of the administrative staff, guests, a district health clinic, and a few horses, used now only for recreation.

Wendover is central to the 1,000 square mile area in which the FNS gives health care to some 15,000 persons who live in Leslie and parts of neighboring counties. Average per capita income is \$1,000 per year and some 80 percent of the residents are medically indigent by state standards. Coal trucks symbolize the major economy to which many persons are still beholden. These are proud people, chivalrous, great respecters of human dignity and the right to privacy. They have retained, over the generations they have lived in these beautiful Appalachian mountains, many old customs and even some of their original British language.

The health needs of these people—especially of the children—haunted Mary Breckinridge. A member of a prominent Kentucky family, she was convinced that there were better ways to get health services to people in general and saw this spot in Kentucky as a logical place to demonstrate how.

Following World War I, she supplemented her basic nursing education (St. Lukes, New York, N.Y.) with midwifery courses and experiences in England and toured the Scottish highlands to see how nurses functioned in an area not dissimilar from Appalachia. Then she returned to Kentucky to explore her plans with physicians, public health officials, and leading citizens. In May 1925, she formed the organization later to be incorporated as the Frontier Nursing Service:

"To safeguard the lives and health of mothers and children by providing and preparing trained nurse-midwives for rural areas in Kentucky and elsewhere where there is inadequate medical service; to give skilled care to women in childbirth; to give nursing care to the sick of both sexes and all ages; to establish, own, maintain and operate hospitals, clinics, nursing centers, and midwifery training schools for graduate nurses; to educate the rural population in the laws of health, and parents in baby hygiene and child care; to provide expert social services; to obtain medical, dental and surgical services for those who need them at a price they can afford to pay; to ameliorate economic conditions inimical to health and growth, and to conduct research toward that end; to do any and all other things in any way

incident to, or connected with, these objects, and, in pursuit of them, to cooperate with individuals and with organizations, whether private, state or federal; and through the fulfillment of these aims to advance the cause of health, social welfare and economic independence in rural districts with the help of their own leading citizens. (1)

In an interview for the Voice of America shortly before her death in 1965 Ms. Breckenridge, then 84, asserted: "If you take the unborn child as the focal point, you will soon be led into a broad program of public health." Today's plans for the Family Nurse seem to confirm this philosophy. From the beginning, she was convinced that the primary means of attack must be through the use of prepared nurse-midwives. Until 1939, most of the FNS staff was made up of British-prepared midwives, either persons sent to England for their training, or wowed from that country. When many of the latter returned home at the beginning of World War II, she decided FNS should prepare its own and opened the Frontier Graduate School of Midwifery, which recently has been broadened to read "and Family Nursing."

#### MANY ELEMENTS IN A COMPLETE SYSTEM

The scope and philosophy of the FNS has not altered significantly since the early thirties when it was so effectively described by Ernest Poole in *Nurses on Horseback* (2). Indeed, about all that is obsolete is that title. Most people now live not far from roads at least passable by jeep. Thus, a nurse has had to substitute a certain mechanical skill for the once necessary horsemanship.

Half of the nurses' contacts with patients, outside the FNS hospital at Hyden, are in their often scarcely accessible homes. The other half of their patient contacts are in the clinics, located at Wendover, Hyden Hospital, and five outposts, from which no family is more than an hour's travel away. Two nurses, one a midwife and one having a strong public health background, live at the outposts and man the clinics which are scheduled several days a week there or in other buildings within the district.

Central in location and function is the hospital at Hyden built in 1928, owned and operated by the FNS. Here at least one of the four physicians employed by the FNS is always accessible. Fifteen nurses staff the hospital and its clinics. Both are terribly crowded. The hospital, licensed to operate 16 beds, last year had an average census of 18.8 patients. In the past the clinic has served 10,000 persons a year, last year 23,000 came.

Clinging precariously to a wooded hillside, the hospital looks down on land now being cleared for the new Mary Breckinridge Hospital, made possible by government funds and the financial contributions of local people and the FNS' many friends throughout the country.

Involvement of the community and outside friends has been characteristic of the FNS from its beginning. Long before the OEO clarified the principle, Mary Breckinridge recognized that to make such a program effective, the people, themselves, had to be involved and make some of the major decisions. "Since her purpose," writes Poole, "was to work through the people and not for them, she began by organizing a strong local committee of the leading mountaineers." (3) This was in Hyden, where she and two other nurse midwives opened the first center.

Similar committees for each of the outposts have been selected by the people to be served. They have helped to build, equip, and maintain the buildings. They look out after "their" nurses, meet with them regularly to consider community matters such as plans for an immunization program, how to collect overdue bills, or what hours clinics will be open. In response, the outpost nurses soon

learn to become neighbors, singing in the local church choir, attending social gatherings.

The outside friends of FNS have been cultivated through the work of committees located in many of the nation's major cities. Early, it was obvious that to provide decent health care to such a needy area, the organization would have to depend in part on volunteer service and philanthropy. Today, close to a third of the FNS million dollar income derives from contributions.

Obviously, some funds come from government sources—Medicare, or the local version of Medicaid. Some local persons can afford insurance or are able to pay a share of the costs of hospital care or clinic visits. But the bulk cannot begin to pay actual costs. Although the usual clinic or home visit charge is \$10.00 plus costs of drugs or equipment, the nurse generally collects \$1.00, in part to preserve the patient's pride. Actually, the FNS estimates that a home visit costs \$15.00, including supplies and drugs, not to mention travel. Still, the current director, Helen Browne, could submit her most recent annual report "with a small measure of pride that we owe no man a cent."

FNS also stretches its dollars through the use of young volunteers, "couriers" who are charged with running the errands, maintaining the horses—now the jeeps—occasionally helping out in the hospital or clinics, or visiting a chronically ill patient in his home. Most are young college girls, usually from families who have been affiliated with committees "beyond the mountains." They pay their own room and board, work from dawn to after dusk at any chore assigned to them, and get deeply committed to the cause.

The FNS employs some 170 persons, most of them local excepting the professionals—41 registered nurses, four physicians, a pharmacist, and a social worker. Heading this complex agency is Helen Browne who succeeded Mary Breckenridge seven years ago, having been on the staff since 1939. A state-certified midwife from Great Britain, she has had conferred upon her by Queen Elizabeth membership in the Order of the British Empire for her FNS contributions. Known as Brownie to the entire staff (nicknames are as common as animals in this relaxed setting), she is, nonetheless, a reserved and astute administrator who has preserved many of the values and precedents which are part of the service's tradition, at the same time that she has moved on new fronts—most particularly to get the new hospital started, and to gain acceptance of the family nurse concept and the educational program essential to it.

Through the FNS southeastern Kentucky has access to an almost complete system of health care. Because of a close association with regional hospitals and with the medical schools at the University of Kentucky and Cincinnati, consultation and other services are available to manage disabilities or illnesses beyond the capacities of the FNS personnel or facilities. And, one way or another, the FNS manages to get the bills for these paid.

The quality of care the FNS offers is best measured by the extensive use of the people, themselves, make of it. But there are also some impressive comparative records chalked up over the years. In 1932, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company reviewed FNS statistical reports after its first thousand midwifery cases and concluded:

*"If such service were available to the women of the country generally, there would be a saving of 10,000 mothers' lives a year in the United States, there would be 30,000 fewer still births and 30,000 more children alive at the end of the first month of life."*

The record has been continued over the years, and it is one built primarily by the nurse midwives; for, although every registered patient is seen at least once by a physician, midwives deliver 9 out of 10

patients, and give most of the pre- and post-natal care.

A more recent kind of record has been established in family planning. Less than 10 years ago, Leslie County had the highest birthrate in the nation. Today, as a result of intensive counseling, the use of contraceptive pills and IUD's, generally initiated by the nurse-midwives, it has dropped to the current national rate—from 41 to 16 per thousand. Dr. W. B. Rogers Beasley, FNS medical director, attributes most of this to the close relationship of the nurse-midwife to her patient.

#### GIVING THE PRIMARY CARE

Indeed, at the heart of the FNS service are the nurses. Today these FNS nurses are from all parts of the country, as well as from Canada and England. A number have been certified as midwives by the State of Kentucky; beyond that, their education and experiences run the gamut. Suzanne Johnson, working in one of the outposts, is a recent graduate of an associate in arts program in Minnesota; Gertrude Isaacs, responsible for the educational program, learned her midwifery at the FNS and earned the first nursing doctorate granted by Boston University. Some have had missionary experience, others have strong public health backgrounds. But paper qualifications are often not enough and sometimes not even necessary. Most new staff members are expected to work for several months in the hospital for orientation and observation before being assigned to an outpost. Sue proved in a short time that she was a "safe" practitioner: she knew when to ask questions, when to seek medical assistance, when to look in books; she was willing to make decisions, and could relate easily to people.

Last year in the 12 districts, 12 nurses attended some 10,000 persons—one third of them children and infants. These district nurses made nearly 15,000 visits to patients, and patients made over 15,000 visits to their clinics. In addition, patients made 23,000 visits to the hospital clinic. On most of these patients, nurses have complete records. The record keeping—with as many as 13 different forms on a single patient—has become extremely onerous, and much of it must be done in the evening.

Some patients come from outside the FNS boundaries, for no one is ever turned away. Some maternity patients actually return to the area to get complete midwifery care; the prenatal, lying-in, and postnatal package charge is \$100.00.

The simple clinics at each of the five outposts have a waiting room, examining room, and utility room, in addition to the nurses' living quarters. Closets are stuffed with supplies and drugs, and there is equipment for the simple laboratory tests the nurses do—hemoglobin, urinalysis, for instance. Clinic hours are set to accommodate patients. Occasionally, the nurses hold clinics in other buildings in their districts or in homes and public schools, if they are more accessible to the people.

Once a month, the staff obstetrician comes to the outposts for the obstetric clinic, and the chief of clinical services comes for a general clinic. Other specialty clinics, with consultants from the medical schools, are held but less frequently and usually at the hospital. The rest of the time, the nurses provide the patient care: doing the lab tests, doing physicals, counseling, suggesting attendance at a clinic when the physician will be there, dispensing drugs, altering doses—whatever the need seems to be. Subsequently, staff physicians sign the prescriptions and review the records. And, utilization review committees of nurses and physicians meet every three months in the outposts.

Although the original major purpose of the service was to focus on children and give midwifery care, today the majority of pa-

tients seen by the outpost nurses are over 16 and only 7 percent of the nurses' time is devoted to midwifery (4). In fact, these nurses are giving most of the primary health care in the community without any direct physician consultation—making the final decisions in connection with 75 percent of all visits at the outposts, and even 55 percent at the hospital clinic, though a physician is immediately available there (5).

"I wouldn't see a patient if a nurse hasn't already seen him, except, of course, in an emergency," asserts Dr. Anne Wasson, chief of Clinical Services. Most of the problems are minor complaints, 22 percent of them are connected with chronic illnesses, but nearly 35 percent are infections of some kind, many upper respiratory (6).

Several years ago the Appalachian Regional Commission purchased a walkie-talkie system, which hooks together the nurses, in their jeeps or at their outposts, with the Hyden Hospital and Wendover. However, Anne Wasson receives scarcely three calls a week for consultation.

By what authority do these nurses thus practice? Although for medico-legal reasons, they cannot write down a medical diagnosis, they go through the same process a physician does, and then decide to treat or call a physician. They are guided in that treatment by medical directives which have been written by staff—nurses and physicians—and approved by the FNS medical advisory committee—physicians from Lexington, most of whom are specialists. "After all," recalls Helen Browne, "British midwives have always functioned under similar directives"; hence the first directives prepared in 1928 were easily adjusted to by the British-oriented staff.

Today's "expanded" medical role, as well as that of nursing is attested to by comparison of that first edition with the present. Ranging from treatment of gunshot wounds to worms, both problems characteristic of the region, its large type filled only 24 pages. Just off the press, the present sixth edition, in much smaller type, covers some 150 pages, six of which carry a list of more than 150 authorized drugs. The contents range from care of fever to dealing with mental health problems. And, in the "utilization of these directives, the staff nurses are assured of the full medical support of the Frontier Nursing Service physicians" (7).

That support which, as Gertrude Isaacs asserts, is vital to the entire program, is apparent at every turn. It has been there since the most prominent physicians in Kentucky urged Mary Breckinridge to proceed with her dream. And, rather than altering the patterns begun in those days, the more recent employment of physicians by the FNS has reinforced it.

No nurse has ever been faced with a malpractice suit. Actually, the Kentucky Academy of General Practice has given procedural approval to the FNS, asserting that nurses are practicing within their legal right, for they are functioning under medical directives. And the Kentucky State Nurses Association has rewritten its definition of nursing practice to include the practice of nursing in the extended role.

Behind this kind of nursing practice, however, is more than procedure and medical sanction. The atmosphere within which these nurses function is one which expects and assumes the best from staff. "We operate under the assumption that nurses are safe practitioners to start out with and that they will ask if they don't know," observes Gertrude Isaacs, who has recently returned to the FNS to get the Family Nurse educational program going. "Nurses know much more than most people will give them credit for. It's time we stopped putting limits on what a nurse can do and start helping her do what she can do very well."

Of course, the responsibility is sometimes frightening, asserts Skip Spell, district supervisor. "But our motto is, act now, shake later." Helen Browne confirms the motto's wisdom. "What problems we do have usually result from hesitation by the nurse," she said.

Nurses derive great satisfaction from working at FNS. But, it is far from an easy job. When there's an evening clinic, it is a 16-hour day. The nurse can look forward to a 6-week vacation, and 4 long weekends a year, but she may earn only \$450 a month (living expenses are modest, however). As she drove her unheated jeep down a corrugated road in 10 above zero temperature. Skip talked about these problems, and of dealing with broken water pipes, and calls at any time at night. Why does she work here? "Gosh, it's fun!" (Skip had just performed a version on an obstetrical patient, at a moment's notice.)

Phyllis Long, recently returned to the FNS to help teach in the new Family Nurse program after service in Ethiopia, came back because, "This is the kind of place where you can give the kind of care you want to give and nobody stands in your way." Gertrude Isaacs returned, "because I like what I can do here. I like the freedom."

Some, of course, don't really want either that freedom or that responsibility. They soon leave.

There is an understandable educational atmosphere about the FNS. An attitude of answer-seeking is essential, not only to safe practice, but to the constantly expanding practice of these nurses. One of the primary functions of the staff physicians is teaching—constantly on the job, as well as in formal classroom settings, in utilization committee meetings, during lunch in the hospital dining room, while riding out to visit a homebound patient with a district nurse. A similar type of informal teaching takes place among the nurses themselves. In addition to planned seminars, there are regular staff conferences. Occasionally, the FNS sponsors programs for other professionals in the region. And a constant flow of visitors, from other parts of the country, and from other countries (60 different ones in the past 16 years) has an educational impact.

Such an atmosphere is, of course, enhanced by the presence of a formal school. Since its beginning in 1939, the FNS has graduated 376 students from its midwifery school—one of the few in the country. Many of these graduates have gone into the foreign mission field—in part because there is so little opportunity to practice the full role in the United States.

#### A RIGHT TO BETTER PREPARATION

As demands on midwifery knowledge have decreased proportionately with the increased demands for general medical knowledge, it has become apparent that the nurses working in the clinics must have more formal preparation for general practice. In October 1968, Kirk and others undertook a year's study of the work of FNS nurses to document the kinds of medical problems the nurses must deal with and to find out where they had gained their knowledge, as a foundation for introducing a formal training program. Some nurses had learned it in their own basic education, some in work experiences, some by consulting books, asking questions, watching physicians (7). It was becoming clear that the nurses were entitled to a better organized system of learning what they were being called upon to practice every day.

At the same time, there was growing evidence throughout the country of the great need to prepare personnel to take over much more of the primary health care which physicians were unable or unwilling to give, either because of lack of time, of opportuni-

ties, or increased specialization. Under the sponsorship of the Appalachian Regional Commission, and with some OEO funds, a study of the "Family Nurse Practitioner" of the FNS was undertaken by some management consultants. In this report, released early in 1969, they observed:

"In a situation where only one or two physicians have been available to care for some 10,000 to 15,000 people, the use of the specially trained Frontier nurse has made primary medical care both available and accessible. An equally important function of the nurse has been to identify patients who need a higher level of medical care, and to arrange for their entry into the medical care system."

And, they came forth with strong recommendations for the opening of educational programs for such practitioners, especially in surrounding universities (8).

Dr. Isaacs and Dr. Beasley had already begun their efforts to get university interest in a Family Nursing program. Finally, Vanderbilt committed itself to a master's program and this past fall admitted, for the first time, students who will have eight weeks of field experience with the FNS. But, FNS felt the need for its own program—for its own staff, as well as to prepare people of varied backgrounds to function as FNS nurses have—in other rural or deprived areas. Therefore, at the same time, it organized a one-year certificate program for students with all types of basic training. Recently, this program has been funded as one of the Primex projects, under contract with the Health Services and Mental Health Administration of the USPHS.

"It is designed for nurses who are committed to health services in rural and developing areas, and who are interested in service-learning experiences in preparation for providing primary health care with medical direction (9)."

Made up of 15-week trimesters (a student can terminate after any one), the program focuses in the first trimester on diagnosis, assessment, and management of common health problems, in the second on parent and child health care and family planning, in the third and fourth (alternates) on outpost nursing or nurse midwifery. Currently enrolled are 23 nurses, some of them FNS staff. Tuition is \$250 per trimester plus \$75 per month for room and board.

Response to the program has been phenomenal. Some 800 descriptive brochures have been sent out in the past six months. All at FNS look forward to the opening of the new hospital which will provide more clinical practice opportunities for a larger enrollment, and a new outpost is under consideration. Experience in both is part of the service-learning educational philosophy on which the program is based.

"I'm convinced," says Helen Browne, "that this educational program is as important as the service we offer to the community." And it probably is, for it assures a way to make available a similar kind of service to many other communities.

Similar, but not the same. For, in many ways, the FNS is unique; in part because its near-half century history and tradition cannot be duplicated; in part because there is a special spirit about FNS which has been born out of a combination of special people in a special place.

However, many of the principles which have governed it so consistently can be applied to other places and other persons: a constant focus on the needs of the people in that community; the determination to take some of the care to the people, and make it as easy as possible for them to come for the rest; the awareness that a patient is more than a complaint—but is a whole person, in a whole family, in a whole community; the conviction that the people to be served are entitled, and quite able, to share in making

many of the decisions affecting the way they will get that health care; the belief that so long as the cause is good, others from outside will want to help; and the belief that every nurse who has the opportunity will give even better care than she herself believes she is capable of giving.

## REFERENCES

1. Frontier Nursing Service, Articles of Incorporation, Article III.
2. Poole, Ernest. Nurses on Horseback. New York, Macmillan and Co., 1932.
3. Ibid., p. 16.
4. Kirk, R. F. H., and others. Family nurse practitioners in eastern Kentucky. Med. Care 9:162, Mar.-Apr. 1971.
5. Ibid., p. 163.
6. Ibid., p. 162.
7. Frontier Nursing Service, Medical Advisory Committee, Medical Directives, 6th ed. Wendover, Ky., The Service, 1972, p. 1. (In press)
8. Booz-Allen, and Hamilton, Inc. The Family Nurse Practitioner in Kentucky. New York, Mar. 1969.
9. Family nurse practitioner program. Front. Nurs. Ser. Q. Bull. 47:31, Summer 1971.

### THE FOLLY OF FOREIGN MILITARY ASSISTANCE

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

**GUNS AND DIPLOMACY: UNITED STATES, SOUTH KOREA FUMBLE FOR CHECK ON MILITARY COSTS**  
(By Laurence Stern and Selig Harrison)

"Are we stuck to Korea like the Tar Baby?" This question, both rhetorical and edged with exasperation, was posed in an interview with an American diplomat who is deeply involved in U.S. relations with the Republic of Korea.

It expresses the growing reservations within the American diplomatic establishment in Washington and Seoul over the size of the commitment that places South Korea at the top of the list of some four dozen nations served by the U.S. military aid pipeline.

In Nixon Doctrine terms, Korea is eating its cake and having it too. It has both American troops and a rising level of military assistance dollar aid. By fall, 19 years after the end of the Korean war, there will be more American troops (43,000) in South Korea than in South Vietnam if President Nixon sticks to his Indochina withdrawal timetable.

This year the administration is asking Congress for \$235 million in direct military grants and \$25 million in arms credits to implement a five-year "modernization" program now in mid-course. The cost: \$1.5 billion.

The new doubts about the scope of so large a commitment come against a background of thawing Sino-American relations and a new conciliatory posture by North Korea toward the South.

This impression of emerging contradiction between the new currents of diplomacy and the high profile of the American military aid program in Korea was underlined, though perhaps inadvertently, by Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Moorer said that "It is our firm desire that during the next few years relations with the People's Republic of China and North Korea will significantly improve."

Then, almost in the same breath, Moorer added:

"... South Korea, as an independent nation and Free World forward defense position, is a buffer . . . Its strategic importance to us is obvious because of its proximity of the People's Republic of China, the Soviet Union and Japan."

The \$1.5 billion modernization package, which accounts for the enlarged level of support to Korea, was negotiated by Seoul and Washington late in 1970—well before the move toward more cordial Sino-American relations.

The quid pro quo from the American standpoint was Korean acceptance of a 20,000-man U.S. troop withdrawal, which left 42,000 American troops behind to supplement a South Korean standing army of 632,000 (not counting the 40,000 Koreans in Vietnam).

North Korea's army numbers less than 400,000.

## HARD, PROLONGED BARGAINING

The bargaining between Washington and Seoul over the big modernization program was tough, protracted and immensely complicated. The goal is to give the South Koreans a major infusion of new equipment such as F-5 jet fighters, high-speed patrol boats and small arms.

Throughout the negotiations there was the constant rumble of bureaucrats infighting among the State Department, Defense and the White House over the terms.

Former Ambassador to Korea William J. Porter, who had been arguing that Korea could assume a greater share of its defense burden, sought to keep the terms flexible and less binding on the United States. The Pentagon's negotiating position was more sympathetic to South Korean demands for fixed commitments in dollars and equipment.

A subtle indication of the differing viewpoint on the \$1.5 billion program is that it is described in Washington as a "plan" and in Seoul, more rigidly, as an "agreement."

If anyone came out ahead in the months-long, tortuous negotiating marathon it was Seoul, which got the initial monetary level of the commitment raised from \$1 billion to \$1.5 billion on the strength of the Chinese threat, according to aid sources there.

Nonetheless, Washington did prevail in the adoption of language making the program subject to congressional approval and allowing for change after periodic review.

## AID, VIETNAM EARNINGS

The United States has given Seoul a grand total of \$6.4 billion in direct military aid between 1949 and 1971. South Korea's participation in the Vietnam war since 1966 earned \$857 million for Seoul through premium payments to families of Korean troops and the profits of Korean contractors.

Conservatively figured, the U.S. outlay for military aid to Korea, along with American subsidy in its Vietnam role and maintenance of 43,000 American troops in the country, runs to more than \$1.5 billion annually.

The Seoul government was also successful in parlaying its Vietnam role into an additional \$190 million bonus—the amount of the Korean Army's own operating and maintenance costs that Seoul had previously agreed to pay.

The obligation was canceled in a secret executive agreement signed by former Ambassador Winthrop Brown in 1966. This suspension was to remain in effect as long as Seoul kept at least two divisions in Vietnam.

The Brown memo, as the document is now referred to, is one of the examples cited by congressional critics of military aid of the secret executive processes by which American commitments are expanded or altered.

In 1970 Ambassador Porter took a tougher line with the Koreans. In a little-noticed speech to the American Chamber of Commerce Porter warned that "The time has come

when South Korea should assume an ever-increasing share of the costs of its own defense."

He pointed out that Korea had the largest defense force in "free Asia" and enjoyed the most rapid rate of economic growth of any of Asia's developing countries. Nonetheless, he said, the Koreans were allocating less of their total resources to defense than "the average for developing countries in east Asia."

Per capita spending for defense in the region (excluding Vietnam), he said, was \$13 as compared with the \$9.50 spent by the Seoul government.

The ambassador served notice to the Koreans that the Nixon Doctrine would mean "pointing out to certain countries that their economies would have now reached such a high state of development that they can afford to carry a larger share of the defense burden and should do so."

One of his last initiatives before being transferred to the Vietnam peace talks in Paris was to prepare Seoul for a reduction of 125,000 in the size of the Korean armed forces funded by U.S. military aid. Seoul then had a standing army of 672,000. It still does.

## PRESSING FOR AIR POWER

But the South Koreans are now pressing for a big increment of U.S.-financed airpower—four new F-5 jet fighter squadrons for its own air force—plus retention of the U.S. F-4 fighters now based in South Korea.

Seoul has persistently argued that North Korea maintains air superiority in east Asia, although the matter is in some dispute. The South Koreans appear to have 300 planes supported by an additional wing 54 American F-4s.

Officials in Seoul place the number of North Korean aircraft at 547, although the United Nations Command says that "Many of the fighters in the North Korean Air Force are older-vintage aircraft."

Opponents of South Korean President Park Chung Hee accuse him of inflating the extent of the North Korean military threat for domestic political reasons. Last December Park declared a national emergency in the name of the Communist threat and imposed restrictions on newspapers and trade unions.

Although Park's military aid pipeline to Washington tends to reinforce his authoritarian style of rule, he is not in any sense a hated dictator, and the growing taint of corruption in Seoul has not touched Park or his family in a direct way.

## CONCILIATORY TONE FROM NORTH

Despite the Seoul government's insistence on the dangers of aggression from the North, the conciliatory turn of North Korean policy is being pondered by U.S. military aid planners as a basis for a potential tightening of the aid faucets in Seoul.

The Pyongyang government has turned from its earlier posture of ideological rigidity and entered into Red Cross talks with Seoul on the reunion of divided families as a first step toward broader forms of accommodation. North Korea has offered to negotiate a "no-war" agreement with the South despite the continued presence of American troops.

Until now Pyongyang has made U.S. withdrawal a precondition for dealing with Seoul. The proposed "no-war" pact would lead to a mutual troop cutback of 100,000 or more, conditioned on removal of all U.S. forces.

In Seoul there is growing apprehension within the government that the changing direction of U.S. policy in Asia might diminish the flow of military largesse from Washington.

This was reflected in an interview with Korean Defense Minister Yu Jae Hung.

"We feel we have been good hosts," Yu told The Washington Post. "We do not charge you rent for your bases here, although we could. We want to show our good will, and we hope you will show yours."

GUNS AND DIPLOMACY; THAILAND: AMERICA'S  
"LAND-BASED AIRCRAFT CARRIER"

(By Laurence Stern)

Although Thailand has been one of the heaviest beneficiaries of U.S. military aid largesse (in the range of \$60 to \$80 million a year), its government is not disposed to brag about the fact.

The penchant for secrecy about American military activities and presence in Thailand is as strong as among any of the 46 countries that receive U.S. military aid.

It took the Thais well over a year to acknowledge the existence of six U.S. air bases that were secretly constructed during the mid-60s to attack Communist targets in Laos, North Vietnam and, most recently, Cambodia.

U.S. officials in Bangkok still regularly deny visiting American journalists access to the Thai-owned but American-built and operated bases. Courteously and with deep regret, the embassy explains that the Thais do not welcome visitors.

The Thais, who pursue a supple form of diplomatic *realpolitik*, Asian style, have thrown in their security chips with the United States by way of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and a bilateral agreement signed by former Secretary of State Dean Rusk in 1962.

FREE TO EXTRICATE

But, with an eye on their Chinese and North Vietnamese neighbors, the Thais want to be free to extricate themselves from the appearance of being in hock to a Western power which is, in turn, trying to disentangle itself from Southeast Asia.

Yet, in making the case before Congress for Thailand's \$60 million basic annual ration of military aid it is traditional for administration witnesses to speak of: (1) The Insurgency and (2) The External Threat.

Adm. Thomas G. Moorer, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, followed this script when he went before the House Armed Services Committee last March 15.

"Our military assistance program is planned," he said, "to improve the ability of the Thai armed forces to combat insurgency, and at the same time to increase their capability to combat the external threat."

However a week of interviews with official and non-governmental authorities in Thailand suggest a different view of the commitment.

The Insurgency: Yes, there is a worrying sort of insurgency that has slowly grown over the past five years. But from the perspective of Bangkok there is no clear and present danger from the 6,000 armed, insurgent soldiers scattered in the far provinces of the country. Thailand is a country of 35 million. Its armed forces number 170,000—a force that is supplemented by some 70,000 provincial and border police.

MISTRUSTFUL OF CHINA

The External Threat: There is little visible fear in Thailand's capital of armed invasion by China or by North Vietnam across the Indochinese peninsula. The Thais, though congenitally mistrustful of China, are now exploring possibilities of contact with Peking, after the example of President Nixon. The strategic interests of the North Vietnamese lie to the east of Thailand, along the Laotian portion of the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

If there are fears in Washington of the Thai domino tottering, it is a concern that is not evident in Bangkok.

In the tough, unsentimental view from Bangkok the hundreds of millions of dollars in aid that have been dispensed by the United States has been payment, both to the country and individual members of the elite, for Thailand's willingness to serve as America's "privileged sanctuary" in the Indochina war.

"The Thai government has been anti-Communist, conservative, pro-American and happy to accept enormous amounts of U.S. assistance," said one long-resident American observer in Bangkok.

Thailand has been called an American "land-based aircraft carrier" and events since the renewal of heavy fighting in South Vietnam tend to bear out this description.

BASE REACTIVATED

Since the North Vietnamese offensive started in March the United States has reactivated Takhli Air Force Base in Thailand to accommodate the post-offensive buildup of American airpower in the war zone.

While the U.S. troop presence is still, as the administration claims, drawing down in South Vietnam it is creeping back up in Thailand to match the switch in the American role from the ground to the air. As of last weekend 4,000 new American arrivals had augmented the 32,000 Air Force and Army troops in Thailand.

The United States has spent well over \$2 billion in Thailand since 1950, including several hundred million for air base construction alone. This year a combination of military and economic aid together with American military spending will add up to about \$215 million—far more if the buildup continues at its present rate.

PERSONNEL FREEZE

A striking indicator of the priorities of Americans in Thailand is the fact that only 4,000 of the 36,000 U.S. military men now based there are associated with activities inside the country. The rest are Air Force or Army personnel carrying out duties that relate to the Indochina war, according to officially sanitized figures released to the staff of the Symington Subcommittee on foreign military commitments.

A personnel freeze similar to the one Congress imposed on U.S. presence in Cambodia has been suggested for Thailand by Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.) "Thailand," said Symington, "would appear to be planned as the base for all United States operations in Southeast Asia."

In fact, the number of official Americans in Thailand has been substantially lowered from the high point of 48,000 in 1968 to 32,000 last February at the beginning of the offensive.

But the new upward turn of the war has, as Symington suggested, heightened Thailand's importance. From the standpoint of military planners the American investment in Thailand, cemented by SEATO and the 1962 agreement, is paying off once again.

The B-52s and fighter aircraft that are pounding North Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia are originating—in greater and greater proportions—from the six U.S. bases on Thai territory.

Thailand's agreement to furnish manpower for the teetering defense against Communist forces in Laos is credited by some high-level American officials with having saved Long Cheng, the Central Intelligence Agency base for the U.S.-supervised Meo guerrilla army.

In an interview with The Washington Post at Long Cheng in March, Meo guerrilla commander General Vang Pao paid tribute to the B-52 tactical strikes at Communist forces surrounding Long Cheng. The missions into Laos are normally flown from Thailand.

A more revealing glimpse than has previously been provided at the extent of official U.S. support of the Thai expeditionary force in Laos was provided Monday by the new Symington Subcommittee staff report.

It asserted that the United States had agreed to underwrite a Thai force of about 10,000 men in Laos at a yearly cost of \$100 million. CIA officials, the report said, paid the salaries of the Thai irregulars to Thai liaison officers at Udorn base.

The significance of the revelation is that it raised doubts about a Congressional prohibition against Defense Department funding of "third country" forces in Laos or Cambodia. The measure was an expression of the Congressional mood against expansion of American military or financial commitments in Indochina.

The Thai mood is changing, too, in the aftermath of President Nixon's trip to China and the President's alleged desire to disengage the United States from Southeast Asia. When the American military silhouette disappears, the conjecture in Bangkok now goes, Thailand may want its neighbors to forget about the golden pipeline that flowed from Washington.

HARVARD PROF. W. BARTON LEACH

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as part of a tribute to Prof. W. Barton Leach of the Harvard Law School, some of his friends have inserted in the university magazine a legal commentary he wrote. I believe through it all can appreciate the wit and humanity of the man.

The article follows:

MEMORANDUM

(By W. Barton Leach, Story Professor of Law Emeritus)

To: Harvard law faculty and teaching fellows.

I have recently come across a Canadian case which merits the attention of each of you. It is not officially reported but appears in 8 Criminal Law Quarterly 137 (Toronto, 1965) and is reprinted in a volume entitled "Legislation and the Courts," at page 512. The case is *Regina v. Ojibway*. If it had a headline, which it does not, it would be something like this:

"Is a pony, fortuitously saddled with a feather pillow, a 'small bird' within the meaning of the Ontario Small Birds Act?"

I here reproduce the Opinion in full as above reported:

[IN THE SUPREME COURT]

REGINA V. OJIBWAY

AUGUST 1965.

BLUE, J.: This is an appeal by the Crown by way of a stated case from a decision of the magistrate acquitting the accused of a charge under the Small Birds Act, R.S.O., 1960, c. 724, s. 2. The facts are not in dispute. Fred Ojibway, an Indian, was riding his pony through Queen's Park on January 2, 1965. Being impoverished, and having been forced to pledge his saddle, he substituted a downy pillow in lieu of the said saddle. On this particular day the accused's misfortune was further heightened by the circumstance of his pony breaking its right foreleg. In accord with Indian custom, the accused then shot the pony to relieve it of an awkwardness.

The accused was then charged with having breached the Small Birds Act, s. 2 of which states:

"2. Anyone maiming, injuring or killing small birds is guilty of an offence and subject to a fine not in excess of two hundred dollars."

The learned magistrate acquitted the accused holding, in fact, that he had killed his horse and not a small bird. With respect, I cannot agree.

In light of the definition section my course is quite clear. Section 1 defines "bird" as "two-legged animal covered with feathers". There can be no doubt that this case is covered by this section.

Counsel for the accused made several ingenious arguments to which, in fairness, I must address myself. He submitted that the evidence of the expert clearly concluded that the animal in question was a pony and not a bird, but this is not the issue. We are not interested in whether the animal in question is a bird or not in fact, but whether it is one in law. Statutory interpretation has forced many a horse to eat birdseed for the rest of its life.

Counsel also contended that the neighing noise emitted by the animal could not possibly be produced by a bird. With respect, the sounds emitted by an animal are irrelevant to its nature, for a bird is no less a bird because it is silent.

Counsel for the accused also argued that since there was evidence to show accused had ridden the animal, this pointed to the fact that it could not be a bird but was actually a pony. Obviously, this avoids the issue. The issue is not whether the animal was ridden or not, but whether it was shot or not, for to ride a pony or a bird is of no offense at all. I believe counsel now sees his mistake.

Counsel contends that the iron shoes found on the animal decisively disqualify it from being a bird. I must inform counsel, however, that how an animal dresses is of no concern to this court.

Counsel relied on the decision in *Re Chicadee*, where he contends that in similar circumstances the accused was acquitted. However, this is a horse of a different colour. A close reading of that case indicates that the animal in question there was not a small bird, but, in fact, a midget of a much larger species. Therefore, that case is inapplicable to our facts.

Counsel finally submits that the word "small" in the title Small Birds Act refers not to "Birds" but to "Act", making it The Small Act relating to Birds. With respect, counsel did not do his homework very well, for the Large Birds Act, R.S.O. 1960, c. 725, is just as small. If pressed, I need only refer to the Small Loans Act R.S.O. 1960, c. 727 which is twice as large as the Large Birds Act.

It remains then to state my reason for judgment which, simply, is as follows: Different things may take on the same meaning for different purposes. For the purpose of the Small Birds Act, all two-legged, feather-covered animals are birds. This, of course, does not imply that only two-legged animals qualify, for the legislative intent is to make two legs merely the minimum requirement. The statute therefore contemplated multi-legged animals with feathers as well. Counsel submits that having regard to the purpose of the statute only small animals "naturally covered" with feathers could have been contemplated. However, had this been the intention of the legislature, I am certain that the phrase "naturally covered" would have been expressly inserted just as "Long" was inserted in the Longshoreman's Act.

Therefore, a horse with feathers on its back must be deemed for the purposes of this Act to be a bird, and *a fortiori*, a pony with feathers on its back is a small bird.

Counsel posed the following rhetorical question: If the pillow had been removed prior to the shooting, would the animal still be a bird? To this let me answer rhetorically: Is a bird any less of a bird without its feathers?

Appeal allowed.

Reported by: H. Pomerantz and S. Breslin.

MORE SUPPORT FOR IMPEACHMENT RESOLUTION

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, since the introduction of House Resolution 976 which seeks the impeachment of the President for his violation of section 601 of the Military Procurement Act of 1972—Public Law 92-156—the Mansfield amendment, and his blatant violation of the Constitution which provides that Congress shall have the power to declare war, my office has been inundated with telegrams and letters protesting the President's illegal action and supporting the impeachment resolution. Large groups of concerned Americans from all parts of this country have been marching on the Nation's Capitol in order to lobby support for an end the war amendment and hearings on the impeachment resolution before the House Judiciary Committee. I submit the following petitions and telegrams once again to demonstrate the tremendous support in this country for our termination of the atrocities in Vietnam and the desperate need to change command at the helm of this ship of state:

CHICAGO, ILL.,  
May 10, 1972.

Representative BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

In response to President Nixon's blockade of North Vietnam: We, the staff, faculty, students and administration of Columbia College, Chicago, collectively go on record as committing ourselves and our skills to promoting the immediate withdrawal of all troops and equipment and the termination of all acts of war by the United States and its allies in the southeast Asia. Further, we specifically condemn the Presidents unilateral action in ordering this blockade.

Betty Shifflett, Charles Lyman, Gordon Weisenborn, Fred Lasse, Tim Drescher, Vanessa Sanders, Don Sanders, Betsy Edelson, Barry Burlison, Joel Lipman, Robert Edmonds, Charles Traub, Harry Boras, Mary McNulty, William Russo, Bryan Katz, Susan Kimmelman, James Newberry.

Mary Fisher, Tom Horwitz, Joy Darrow, Jim Gall, James Dyson, David Bowen, Donald Alexander, Myrna Gaddie, Betsy Edelson, Kevin Conley, Robin Karnes, Wendy Sander, Nick Sherstead, Jacob Caref.

Dale Landon, Willis Searles, Linda Swartz, Ernie Limon, Sue Davenport, Tom Goodman, Bob Sitter, Steve Perraud, Ken Levis, Gerry Gall, Larry Bafia, Sal Arnold, Kathi Chatel, Gollette McManus.

Sheldon Siegel, Louis Silverstein, Jane Mikes, Linda Larsen, R. T. Kowalski, Janice Booker, Connie Zonka, Mirron Alexanderoff, Bert Gall.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
May 9, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

Stop business as usual stop immediately this mad scheme for super escalation.

AURORA ZONA.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,  
May 9, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

We support your resolution to impeach Nixon his insanity must be stopped now.  
Mr. and Mrs. LARS ANDERSON.

GOLETA, CALIF.,  
May 9, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

As students and registered voters at the University of California at Santa Barbara we strongly support the impeachment proceedings against President Nixon we believe his recent actions to be an act of war and hence illegal we want our reactions to this aggressive known and considered immediately.

Kathleen Muleady, Robert Seager, Margo Janes, Lori Zink, Karen Elvi, Peggy George, Earl Byron, Fred Barnhar, David Pelter, Jackie Ball.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
May 10, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

Stop business as usual.  
Stop Nixon's made scheme for super escalation.

CELIA SAMSON.

CAMBRIDGE MASS.,  
May 9, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

Please stop Nixon please stop him please stop him please stop him.

JAN DEDERICK.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
May 9, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

Continue opposing mines and blockades this course is disastrous.

JAMES and LENORE PARKER.

VENICE, CALIF.,  
May 12, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

Please support procedure for the impeachment of Nixon.

JANET BROWN.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,  
May 9, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

We heartily endorse your impeachment proposal.

Mr. and Mrs. GEORGE McCLOUD.

MILLBURN, N.J.,  
May 9, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your courage to defend the constitution. Keep up the great work.

Mrs. MILDRED CHIVIAN.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.,  
May 10, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

We support you wholeheartedly in impeachment of Nixon.

OLIVER AND RUTH HOLMES.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
May 10, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

Do you really think a gutless Congress would impeach Nixon after allowing him

(and prior administrations) to USURP the powers vested in it (Congress) under article 8 of the constitution? Nixons flagrant disregard of public opinion, his pursuit of bankrupt policies, and crimes against the American and Vietnamese people historically emphasize our need for a parliamentary form of government, one that is immediately responsible to the people through their elected representatives.

MARY A. MULLINS.

DUNDEE, ILL.,  
May 10, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

I am sending this telegram in response to the presidents near declaration of war in his latest Vietnam speech. He has outrageously violated the Geneva Convention, the Tonkin Resolution etc. and is now posing a direct threat not only to world peace, but also to world preservation. I strongly urge that this threat initiated by President Nixon be halted through measures of impeachment granted to us by the United States Constitution. As the representative govt. of "We the People" you are the most direct route to these urgent proceedings. Presidential wars must be stopped.

LYNNE KNIGHT.

SAN CARLOS, CALIF.,  
May 9, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

President's actions caused enough for impeachment proceedings. God Bless your fortitude.

DON C. MATCHAN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
May 9, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

Stop business as usual. Block Nixon's schemes for Escalation in Vietnam.

GERTRUDE WALKOFF.

AUBURN, WASH.,  
May 12, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

Salvage us and presidential honor. Impeach Dick—L.B.J. retroactively. Inform State of Washington delegation.

R. E. SHABRINO.

NEW PLATZ, N.Y.,  
May 12, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

We support all congressional efforts to reverse the current escalation of the war in Indochina and to bring American military involvement there to an immediate conclusion.

Karen Andriolo, Perry Bailor, James Brain, Leonard Eisenberg, Giselle Hendel, Milton Jacobs, Sipra Johnson, Aaron Miller, Edward Pierce, Jack Preston; Anthropology Department, State College, New PlatZ, N.Y.

EVANSTON, ILL.,  
May 11, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

203 North Western University students have committed themselves to a hunger strike of indeterminable lengths to protest President Nixon's recent dangerous and irresponsible escalation of the carnage in South East Asia. We ask all healthy United States citizens who are with us in spirit to join us in body, hence we are seeking to broaden this action into a nation wide movement. We request that this statement be inserted into the Congressional Record.

NORTHWESTERN HUNGER STRIKE FOR PEACE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
May 11, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

Aghast at President's order to escalate war on Indo-China. Urge Congress withhold funds.

MRS. ROY R. NEUBERGER,  
President, Women's City Club of New York.

NORMAN, OKLA.,  
May 10, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

The Oklahoma Committee to Impeach President Nixon has in circulation petition that effect President Nixon has usurped the power of Congress, violated international law, and endangered the lives of untold millions.

ALLEN W. MORGAN.

DETROIT, MICH.,  
May 13, 1972.

HON. BELLA ABZUG,  
Washington, D.C.:

We commend your position on Nixon's escalation. We want out. Cut off war fund now.

Mr. and Mrs. JERRY McCROSKEY.

Congresswoman BELLA ABZUG,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ABZUG: We are directing the enclosed petition, addressed to the entire House of Representatives, to your attention.

Sincerely,

MARY W. ALLEN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

To the Members of the United States Senate:

We request that you now exert all your constitutional rights to curb the flagrant misuse of executive power by President Nixon in the present escalation in Vietnam.

The only solution to the current crisis—and safeguard against the undoubted worsening of events—now rests solely in your hands.

(Signed by 53 persons.)

#### PETITION

We, the undersigned as a coalition of students, employees and faculty of New York University, Bellevue, and VA Medical Center complex view with great alarm the recent actions of President Nixon in ordering increased attacks against North Vietnam and the mining and blockading of the North Vietnamese territorial waters.

Bloodshed is perpetuated, and world peace threatened by these transgressions.

The Administration's repeated insistence that the intensification of this conflict will lead to a more rapid resolution with less human sacrifice is ludicrous and frightening.

We demand the cessation of this latest course of action by the administration, and the immediate withdrawal of all American military involvement in Southeast Asia.

We urge our Senators and Congressmen to end the war immediately by shutting off all further funds for its propagation.

(Signed by 13 persons.)

OBERLIN COLLEGE—CITIZENS FAST FOR PEACE

We have joined together in Washington, D.C. as a non-violent gesture of our commitment toward world peace and as a repudiation of our country's continued militaristic direction. In order to proclaim our personal devotion to a moral communion of all people, our group is fasting for five days as a means of bearing witness to the pain of the Vietnamese people who have endured war for more than a generation. We would hope that our act of conscience would in some small

way generate a meaningful spirit of peaceful interaction.

We approach the power center of our government with the hope of underscoring the Nation's sentiment for an end to this unjust and cruel war. The presidential act of mining North Vietnamese harbors has been the catalyst for our present outcry. Our immediate and, alas, rational response was that of shock that our elected official would escalate this confrontation at a time of sustained peace activities all over the country. Through intensive lobbying on Capital Hill this week we hope to increase support for the Gravel-Drinan Bill in the Congress, which would terminate America's bombing of innocent civilians and which would end America's immoral intervention in Southeast Asian affairs via a calculated and efficient withdrawal of American military and para-military forces.

The moral and political commitment which we are undertaking reflects more than just twenty people fasting for a week and speaking with our governmental officials. Our actions, as well as the demonstration of other frustrated Americans, manifests our concern for the future of mankind. Only by immediate withdrawal of all American forces can America redirect its resources for the attainment of world peace.

STUDENT ASSOCIATION, SENATE,  
STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,  
Oswego, N. Y.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The petitions which accompany this letter express the feelings of many of the students, faculty, and employees of the State University College at Oswego, New York, and members of the surrounding community.

Forty-nine members of the college community traveled to Washington in order to protest the involvement of the United States in the war in Indochina and your policies concerning the war.

We would appreciate your reading these petitions and seriously consider their content, bearing in mind that they reflect the considered opinions of a large group of people, not trying to embarrass the administration, but sincerely concerned about our recent escalation.

We would appreciate your acknowledgment on this letter and that it be returned in the envelope accompanying this letter.

Sincerely yours,

STEVE H. WILKES,  
PHYLIS T. ROSS,  
STEVE LA MANTIA,

Cochairmen of Riders to Washington.

#### PETITION

We, the undersigned faculty, employees, and students of the State University College at Oswego, New York condemn the brutal and inhumane war in Viet Nam.

This petition affirms the support of the faculty, employees, and student body to our representatives participating in the present anti-war activities in Washington, D.C.

(Signed by 1,421 members of the college and surrounding community.)

#### RESOLUTION

(Passed on May 9, 1972, by The Faculty Executive Committee of Livingston College)

The Faculty Executive Committee of Livingston College vigorously protests Richard Nixon's latest desperate moves to escalate the war in Indochina. His actions will destroy the lives of Vietnamese people. His decisions will mean the destruction of the means of livelihood for even greater numbers.

We do in fact reject Richard Nixon's blockade of North Vietnam as his answer to a military debacle within a South Vietnamese Army that in large measure refuses to fight.

Furthermore, we do believe that this escalation may well mask Richard Nixon's intentions to bomb extensively the dike system in North Vietnam and bring immediate misery and death to hundreds of thousands if not millions of people. New York Times reports indicate that American planes have already struck at the dike system in Namha Province southeast of Hanoi. If these reports are true, we are witnessing the beginning of what could become a human holocaust recently sensed as a possibility and rejected as a monstrous calamity by many people, since it is similar in proportion to the destruction caused by nuclear weapons.

The destruction of the dike system in the Red River Delta would mean immediate death by drowning for a million and a half Vietnamese people and lingering starvation, pestilence and death for an additional three and a half million.

We must also be aware of what Richard Nixon is now doing. These actions and plans we find impossible to accept:

(1) Actions to mine all major North Vietnamese ports,

(2) Orders that all foreign ships in those harbors have three "day-light periods" in which to leave and that after this three day period, U.S. mines will become active and ships coming or going will move at their own peril,

(3) Declarations that U.S. and South Vietnamese forces would take "appropriate measures" to stop North Vietnam from unloading material on beaches from unmined waters,

(4) Plans to prevent, through bombing, the movement of material in North Vietnam over rail lines originating in China,

(5) Choices on the three alternatives to end the war—rejection of immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops, rejection of continued negotiation, and his implementation of the third alternative: "decisive military action."

Let the slaughter stop. Bring the G.I.s back to the U.S. Let the B-52s return to their hangars and gather dust. Bring the G.I. prisoners home. Let the Vietnamese people determine their own destiny. Let them reconstruct Vietnam with the aid of the world in order to undo the damage inflicted on the Vietnamese by the American military and its President.

When Hitler slaughtered millions in Europe, the German people were blamed—partly because so few did in fact protest. As Nixon proceeds to escalate the slaughter of Vietnamese, let us act to raise our voices and condemn such actions. Protest Nixon's escalation of the war. Act to support anti-war actions to be taken in the coming weeks. Stop the killing.

**A POWER SHORTAGE SENSE CAN AVERT**

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Banner in a recent editorial comment on my recent newsletter documenting the threatened danger of a national power crisis this summer.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject I place the editorial in the RECORD herewith.

The editorial follows:

[From the Nashville Banner, May 11, 1972]

A POWER SHORTAGE SENSE CAN AVERT  
It is an impressive array of witnesses Rep. Joe E. Evins cites to further confirm his

warning, not only to Fourth District constituents, but to the nation at large, that a severe power crisis is shaping unless the mounting conflict between "environment" and reasoned steps for increased power production is reasonably resolved on the latter's side.

Rep. Evins is not anti-environment. He does not advocate abuses of that environment by blind exploitation of resources within it. He does want a basic public interest protected—in the necessity of power production requisite to growing needs for domestic and security uses. He says bluntly that there is a danger of electric power shortages, amounting to brownout and blackouts—and such could be disastrous.

The witnesses he cites include Chairman John Nassikas of the Federal Power Commission; James R. Schlesinger of the Atomic Energy Commission; Secretary Rogers Morton of the Department of the Interior; Gen. George Lincoln, director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, colleagues in Congress, and the White House.

These should know. They have an adequate grasp of existing and prospective need—which has expanded with the population growth and increased power usage all over the nation. Note one paragraph:

"Despite these facts and warnings, many new power-generating facilities have been delayed or blocked by (environmentalist) lawsuits, injunctions and bureaucratic red tape initiated as environmental protection. As a result, a long, hot summer can produce demands in some areas that cannot be met, and brownouts or blackouts may occur."

It won't be much consolation to you when the lights go off, the air-conditioning, etc., on a hot night—or the turning ceases of essential industrial wheels for a protracted spell; or cities and regions suffer prolonged black-out . . . to learn that the calamity was caused by somebody's obsession with abated smoke and more rarified H and 2 and 0 in the wilderness.

In an effort to cut red tape and circumvent court delays, the House recently passed a bill which would permit operation of ten nuclear power plants in areas of expected shortages. That measure now is pending in the Senate.

Again, valid consideration preservative of natural resources, health and welfare, are not under attack . . . but the validity of proposals in that category are not rightly to be determined by arbitrary ipse dixits on the part of hobby-riding elements suddenly in love with "ecology." In the name of the latter, some peculiar situations have developed—including strangulation of the very lifeline of the nation and its security, if, just like that, these elements can call the shots on just where and how electric power is to be produced. That is more power, so to speak, than any such outfits should be granted. If there must be a power shortage, let it be in the capricious power of these hands.

Congressman Evins is right. The House is right in the measure it has passed, and similar action is recommended on the part of the Senate—to complete action on this vital piece of public business.

**MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?**

**HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 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?

**AMTRAK**

**HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, following is an article on the continuing problems of Amtrak:

**U.S. AUDITORS SWARM OVER AMTRAK'S BOOKS**  
(By Stephen M. Aug)

Government auditors may find themselves tripping over one another at the National Railroad Passenger Corp. (Amtrak) during the next few months.

The General Accounting Office, it has been learned, began a wide-ranging audit of Amtrak's operations about five weeks ago. GAO performs its audits on behalf of Congress.

Meanwhile, the Interstate Commerce Commission, sources said, is expected to begin its first full-scale audit of Amtrak probably within four to five months.

The ICC audit is expected to be a tough one in view of the differences between the commission and Amtrak—differences which began almost from the day Amtrak began operating most of the nation's railroad passenger service May 1, 1971.

**RUNNING ARGUMENTS**

Last year, ICC staff members and Amtrak were engaged in a series of disputes over the extent of the commission's jurisdiction over the largely federally funded corporation. The corporation eventually agreed to provide the ICC with the figures the commission sought—primarily concerning the financial operations of Amtrak.

But correspondence in ICC files indicates the company and the commission still are at odds over the quality of the information Amtrak is supplying.

Currently, Amtrak is nearly two months late in filing an annual report with the commission. Amtrak has said it will continue to file some reports late because the 13 railroads which operate Amtrak's trains have 60 days from the end of each month to provide the corporation with bills for operating expenses.

**DELAY OK'D**

The ICC so far has authorized Amtrak to file its 1971 annual report 60 days late. But one letter in commission files shows that an ICC staff board refused to allow the corporation a permanent exemption from regulations so it could file all reports 60 days late.

The ICC staff believes that now that Amtrak has a year's experience with operations it should file reports on an estimated basis, and later submit any necessary corrections after final figures are available.

Figures that Amtrak has filed, however, give some indication how the corporation has grown. During its first month in business—May 1971—Amtrak had 67 employees—27 of them transportation and dining car inspectors—and a total payroll of \$72,125.20.

**PAYROLL SWELLS**

In a year-end report, Amtrak told the ICC its employment had grown to 185, and salaries for 1971—actually for the eight months it was in business—totaled \$1,670,181. That averages out to about \$209,000 a month during 1971.

The latest report—for March 1972—shows Amtrak's employment has grown to 477 and its monthly payroll has swelled to \$503,317.

The reports do not show individual salaries by name—although Amtrak's annual report will have such a list for all officials earning \$30,000 a year or more. The March payroll sheet, however, shows that Amtrak's 10 top executives earned a total of \$42,667—or an average of nearly \$4,270 a month each.

Amtrak's two most highly paid executives are its president, Roger Lewis, at \$125,000 a year, and its executive vice president, J. Richard Tomlinson, \$74,000.

#### OFFICERS, AIDES

Another 25 division officers shared \$61,083 in March—or an average of \$2,433 each. Thirteen professional assistants received a total of \$18,656—or nearly \$1,500 a month on average.

Amtrak's clerical and secretarial help has grown considerably as the corporation has expanded. During the first month there were 37 employes classified as clerical and general—and three executives.

By March 1972 the number classified as executive had grown to 35, and there were 201

employes under various classifications of clerk. The company also reported it had 9 stenographer-secretaries earning a total of \$6,963 in March, while another 59 stenotypists shared \$35,995. The number of dining car and transportation inspectors had expanded from 27 to 67.

#### EXECUTIVE CHEF

Also shown in March—but not listed at all during 1971—was one dining car chef earning \$1,958 a month.

It turns out that Amtrak has hired an "executive chef" whose job description indicates he is responsible for research of on-board food and beverage service. He is also supposed to assist in planning menus and is "responsible for the operation of the experimental kitchen."

At least one Amtrak public relations official was emphatic that the chef—Richard Mack, former executive chef at American Airlines—"does not prepare food" for Amtrak executives.

He explained that Amtrak's executive dining room is catered by the Marriott Corp.

Sky Chef division which provides both food and those who serve it.

He added that food in Amtrak's executive dining room sells for \$1.75 for soup and a sandwich, and \$2.50 for a larger lunch.

#### Amtrak executive salaries

Roger Lewis, president.....	\$125,000
J. Richard Tomlinson, executive vice pres.....	74,000
Robert Medvecky, vice president-law.....	55,000
F. S. (Pat) King, vice president-operations.....	55,000
Harold Graham, vice president-marketing.....	50,000
Gerald Morgan, vice president-govt. affairs.....	50,000
Sydney S. Sterns, vice president-comptroller.....	40,000
David A. Watts, vice president-planning.....	37,500
Kenneth Housman, vice president-personnel.....	35,000
Edwin E. Edel, vice president-public rel.....	32,500

## SENATE—Wednesday, May 17, 1972

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JOHN V. TUNNEY, a Senator from the State of California.

#### PRAYER

The Reverend C. Leslie Glenn, D.D., subdean of the Washington Cathedral, Mount Saint Alban, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God, who hast created man in Thine own image, we give Thee thanks for these Thy servants who are spending their lives in the service of our country. Bless these evermore dear United States. Grant to all our people grace fearlessly to contend against evil and to make no peace with oppression; and that we may reverently use our freedom, help us to employ it in the maintenance of justice among men and nations, to the glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

#### DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JOHN V. TUNNEY, a Senator from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. TUNNEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

#### THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 16, 1972, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. TUNNEY) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of today's Senate proceedings.)

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S JOURNEY TO MOSCOW

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as the President goes to Moscow on a journey which all the doomsayers predicted would not take place, they are wrong again—they are wrong again.

In the press, on the networks, and in the Congress, they do not have the grace to admit their error or even to rejoice in the fact that the President, through his own masterly handling of foreign policy, has taken a strong, bold, and necessary decision in Vietnam. This decision has not met with the predicted repercussions from other nations but has been met, instead, by a responsible attitude and desire on the part of the Soviet Government, as well as that of the Government of the United States, for a continuing rapprochement and an improvement in relations and, I would hope, certain substantive achievements at that conference.

Normally, in the Senate, I would have

expected on both sides of the aisle that Senators would rise and express their good wishes to the President on his trip and their hopes for his success based upon their desire for peace in the world. Instead of that, they have been busy opposing an amendment to stop the killing, engaging in futile gestures, and attempting to second guess the President in his role as Commander in Chief.

This is a sad commentary, particularly in contrast to the actions of the Republican Party at the time of the Bay of Pigs and the missile crisis in Cuba and at the time of President Lyndon Johnson's numerous forays into foreign policy. At that time the Republican leadership—those who occupied these very two desks—one at which I now stand—forebore to embarrass the President of the United States, forbore to weaken his hand, and forbore the temptation to engage in political advantage with an absent President engaged on a mission of the highest import.

I hope that they will give the President a chance. I hope that they will give the country a chance. I hope that they will support the President of the United States.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the distinguished Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) is now recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

#### BEYOND "BREAD AND BUTTER"

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am grateful for the amplification we have in the Chamber these days. Having reserved this time for a statement this morning, I find that my voice is somewhat gone, so that I will try to keep the microphone in place.

Mr. President, a time of crisis may also be one of reevaluation.

Today, in Southeast Asia, our Nation faces a new and awful peril. As the military position of the Saigon government continues to deteriorate, the United