

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MANAGEMENT AND PENSIONS

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1972

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, it has been drawn to my attention that the New York Times of Sunday, May 28, contained an article on the subject of corporate pension programs by Harry E. Figgie, Jr., chairman and chief executive officer of A-T-O, of Willoughby, Ohio, which is near Cleveland. I understand that A-T-O is a large diversified company. Mr. Figgie's comments on the need for corporate chief executives to become involved in and know thoroughly all phases of their pension funding systems is thoughtful, timely, and informative. The article came too late to be included in the hearings of the Committee on Ways and Means on the subject of pension programs; consequently, I include Mr. Figgie's article in the RECORD at the close of my remarks:

MANAGEMENT AND PENSIONS

(By Harry E. Figgie, Jr.)

Never before has there been so great a need for corporate chief executives to become totally involved with all of the facets of their pension funding. If the chief executive and his top management fail to take the initiative, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the vacuum will be filled by government—both state and Federal. Few chief executives understand the complexities of pension funding, but fewer still recognize it as one of the great profit improvement tools with which they can deal directly, while at the same time providing greater safeguards for employees.

Direct involvement by top management has many advantages, for both corporation and employees. Management keeps in close touch with the realities of benefit requirements and both their present and eventual cost.

A chief executive may find that his actuary and his investment adviser or trustee are polarized 180 degrees. By his very nature an adviser or trustee knows he is in a competitive position and must produce or stand to lose the account. He speaks in glowing terms of 15 per cent growth per year regardless of economic conditions or the position of the investment cycle. Book value, stability, convertibility, downside risk protection, dividend yield, all pale before the magical 15 per cent yield from growth. In contrast, the actuary tends to be conservative, calling for unnecessarily high contributions from corporate operating profits. The difficulty lies in defining "yield."

Basically actuaries use one of two methods of evaluating yield, with broadly varying results. The first is adjusted book value (realized gains and losses), which gives yield credit only when a security is sold.

The second method is based on market value. The difference can be substantial, as illustrated by the accompanying table.

Unless a realistic appraisal is made of pension assets, taking into account unrealized gains and losses, the result can be unnecessary overfunding as well as higher expense to the corporation than is really required.

Recognizing certain fundamental numbers is another essential in guiding pension-fund investments.

A. Know your wage increase experience

from the actuarial standpoint and make certain you are on the conservative side.

B. Recognize that as unfunded liability decreases to manageable proportions a conservative 10-year funding of unfunded liability doesn't cost much more than 30-year funding.

C. The big savings available through sound investing lie in yield. Moving from a 3 per cent to a 5 per cent actuarial average yield can reduce your long-term pension costs by 40 per cent annually.

Over the long haul, all that may really be needed to satisfy the actuary's yield requirement of 4 per cent to 6 per cent is to build a strong dividend and interest base of 4 per cent to 5 per cent. This, together with the average growth performance of stocks listed on the New York Stock Exchange, should, over the long run, more than do the job. The additional growth that is reasonable to expect from properly selected advisers then goes largely against unfunded liability and protection against inflation and unforeseen future requirements. Using a long-range approach, you can afford to be conservative on investment and aggressive on yield.

This brings us to underlying philosophy. Set some long-range objectives. Because four years' good work can be undone by one year's miscalculation, stress conservatism, dividend yield, and both inflation and downside risk protection. When interest rates hit their 100-year high last year, bonds represented a good investment for tax-free funds. A 9 per cent A or AA bond covers a 6 per cent yield target and provides a 3 per cent cushion for annual inflation.

And be involved. Organize your own trustee group or a pension committee. Participate yourself. Use your financial officers and a financially trained director of the company. Don't delegate funding management too low inside or too far outside the company.

Let this committee select its fund advisers on the basis of the investment philosophy and objectives. Select and evaluate investment advisers not just on track record but on compatibility with corporate philosophy and goals.

To me, one of the valuable side benefits of direct involvement is that good advisers provide continuing economic evaluations and projections that are extremely helpful in managing the company. These advisers provide an excellent monthly cross section of various segments of the economy, evaluation of political decisions, where we are in the business cycle—all of which can be used to advantage in operating the company.

If you are willing to get deeply involved in pension-fund essentials, common danger will be minimized and a large capital asset will work better to supply benefits for employees and earnings for shareholders. If you aren't willing, then you're inviting the imposition of controls that may bear little relationship to actual needs of either employees or shareholders.

DIFFERENCE NOTED

The following table indicates the possible substantial difference between the book value and market value method of evaluating yield:

Investment action	Jan. 7, 1971 cost	Interim action	Dec. 31, 1971 resulting value	
			Book	Market
Buy stock X.....	100,000	(1)	\$100,000	\$200,000
Buy stock Y.....	100,000	(2)	50,000	50,000
Total.....	200,000		150,000	250,000

1 Appreciates and holds.

2 Declines by 50 percent and sells; buys new stock Z.

Actuary A looks at adjusted book value (\$150,000) and sees a net yield of minus 25 per cent.

Actuary B looks at market value (\$250,000) and sees a 25 per cent yield.

Fund advisers naturally tend to sell losers to reinvest in hoped-for winners, but if the adjusted book value formula is used in this theoretical example you have an unrealistically low yield and are penalized severely. The alternatives are to sell the winners and hold the losers, or sell enough winners to more than offset the losers, providing the necessary yield. Neither alternative may be sound investing philosophy.

A DOUBLE STANDARD

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1972

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has spent much more than a weekend in Washington knows that there is a double standard for Federal prosecution—one for those with powerful friends, another for those who do not know the "right" people.

Pulitzer Prize winning columnist, Clark Mollenhoff, is one of the most astute observers of life in the Nation's Capital and he has discussed this double standard of justice in an excellent article, which I include for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

DOUBLE STANDARD OF PROSECUTION

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A political fact of life seems to be that there is a double standard for federal prosecution—a lenient standard to be applied to the inner circle of government and a tougher one for those outside the sphere of the White House.

Rarely has this discrimination been more vividly dramatized than in the recent indictment of General Dynamics Corp. and four present and former company officials on charges of fraud involving the cost of defective parts for the controversial F111 fighter-bomber, formerly known as the TFX.

The indictment, involving defective parts worth about \$300,000, charged that the defendants conspired to falsify inspection reports to the government so the Air Force would pay for rejected F111 parts that did not meet specifications.

FALSE REPORTS

If these officers of a private corporation are convicted, it will mean that they knowingly filed false and misleading financial reports and intended to bilk the taxpayers of more than one-quarter of a million dollars. It is a serious enough crime to call for vigorous prosecution.

But what about the misleading financial reports, inaccurate testimony under oath, conflicts of interest and misuse of security classification by some of our highest former Defense Department officials who initially awarded the multi-billion dollar contract? The uncovering of these allegations was made during the eight-year "TFX Contract Investigation" in the U.S. Senate.

The hearing record established by Senator John McClellan's permanent investigating subcommittee laid out much of the evidence as early as 1963. The evidence came from the highest military officials and the most ex-

perienced civilian defense technicians as well as from accountants in the General Accounting Office (GAO).

The current indictments charge the General Dynamics officials "conspired to falsify inspection reports to the government, in connection with the \$300,000 cost of 'carry-through plates.'"

The "carry-through plates" are a critical part of the center section of the F111 wing structure. General Dynamics, according to the indictment, scrapped the parts because a subcontractor welded them in violation of contract specification. The Air Force emphasized that none of the parts got into the planes.

The charge by the federal grand jury in Dallas, Tex., is that General Dynamics assumed financial responsibility for a subcontractor's error and then tried to pass the cost on to the Air Force in violation of the contract.

If true, it is easy to see how the General Dynamics officials would have arrived at the conclusion that the slogan "public office is a public trust" had been discarded, and that the filing of false and misleading reports was no longer regarded as a crime.

NO CRITICISM

Presidents Kennedy and Johnson didn't criticize those who had the responsibility for awarding the F111 contract to General Dynamics in the first place.

In fact, the comments of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson seemed to condone the whole pattern of conduct of former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara. McNamara assumed personal responsibility for the award of the multi-billion-dollar contract to General Dynamics over the unanimous recommendation of the top Pentagon Source Selection Board that it be awarded to the Boeing Co.

The Source Selection Board said its recommendation was on the basis of "a superior operational performance" and a substantially lower price.

The report to the Senate described Secretary McNamara's decisions as "capricious, lacking in depth and without substantiation."

Deputy Secretary Roswell Gilpatric was guilty of a flagrant conflict of interest in the TFX award," the report said. "The record shows unequivocally that he deliberately attempted to mislead the subcommittee regarding his relationship with General Dynamics Corp. as it existed before he accepted the appointment as deputy secretary and that he tried to equate that relationship with a small part (as a witness) he once played in a Boeing case."

The McClellan subcommittee report said, "The record makes clear that he (Gilpatric) was a top level policy counselor to General Dynamics for the 2½ years immediately before his appointment and that he was a de facto member of the company's board of directors . . . belatedly, he admitted these facts under cross-examination by the subcommittee after the staff had discovered the true situation."

FINAL REPORT

The final report, signed by eight of the ten-man subcommittee, commented:

"Top presidential appointees in the Department of Defense during the McNamara era over-rode expert advice to impose personal judgments on complex matters beyond their expertise. These same officials then made extraordinary efforts to conceal the result of their errors in the TFX contract. These efforts included deliberate attempts to deceive the Congress, the press and the American people.

"Understandably, this sorry record has done nothing to enhance public confidence in the integrity and competence of the people charged with preserving the national security," the report stated.

Even the brief individual views of the two other members of the subcommittee did not dispute the facts in the report. Senator Edmund S. Muskie (Dem., Maine), a supporter of McNamara's position throughout the early hearings, continued to defend McNamara's actions as contributing to "more efficient defense management."

Senator Jacob K. Javits (Rep., N.Y.) disagreed with the committee's conclusion that Gilpatric was guilty of a "flagrant conflict of interest." But, he stated: "Hindsight indicates that Mr. Gilpatric would have been better advised to have avoided even the appearance of impropriety by not taking part in the final (TFX) decision to any extent."

REPRESENTATIVE REUSS AND CHAIRMAN STEIN DEBATE THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Congressman HENRY REUSS of Wisconsin, and Chairman Herbert Stein of the President's Council of Economic Advisers held a wide-ranging discussion of the state of the U.S. economy on the Martin Agronsky "Evening Edition" television program on Tuesday, June 13.

A transcript of the program follows:

EVENING EDITION

MARTIN AGRONSKY. Good evening. The state of the economy in recent months hasn't become much better nor has it become much worse. President Nixon's economic policies have begun to show some positive results. The size of economic recovery has been positive enough to prompt the President's chief economic advisors to warn against letting the expansion of the economy get out of hand. On the other hand, wholesale prices have continued to rise and unemployment has certainly shown no signs of declining. Well, tonight on Evening Edition then, a discussion of the state of the economy with Herbert Stein, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, and Rep. Henry Reuss, Democrat of Wisconsin, who is a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee and of the Congressional Joint Economic Committee . . .

Gentlemen, Mr. Stein is the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors. I think Congressman Reuss would agree you're entitled to the first word. Do you feel that the President's economic program—Phase II as it is right now—is working?

STEIN. Oh, yes, I don't think there is any doubt of that. We've seen improvement in all aspects of the economy since the August 15 program was launched last year. The rate of inflation has declined, employment has increased very substantially, the rate of increase of output has increased very substantially. As you pointed out earlier there is a problem that the unemployment rate remains higher than we would like, certainly too high . . .

AGRONSKY. 5.9 percent.

STEIN. 5.9 percent. But we expect that that will decline as the rise of the economy accelerates in the remainder of this year.

AGRONSKY. Congressman Reuss, are you optimistic the way Mr. Stein is?

REUSS. Well, I think that there is no doubt that gross national product has gone up. Corporate profits have gone up magnificently. They are at their highest level now

in the history of the world. But from the standpoint of the unemployed, it's not a very happy economic picture. We have almost twice as many unemployed today as when President Nixon took office. Phase II has not been a success. The rise in the wholesale price index during Phase II has been higher than the rise in that index in the six months before August 15, before price controls started. And more and more there is something approaching a taxpayer's revolt, a real revulsion against what is felt to be the unfairness of our loophole-ridden tax system. So I think that it is fitting and proper that we have a Presidential election this year and I think there are issues on both sides.

AGRONSKY. Well let me ask you, do you think that the state of the economy is going to be a major issue in the Presidential campaign?

REUSS. Yes, I do.

AGRONSKY. Do Democrats intend to make it that?

REUSS. Yes. Well, nature made it such, and we Democrats would be remiss if we sat idly by. The fact is that unemployment is at an unacceptable level, the fact is that price controls have been ineffectively administered and the fact is that the tax system—quite unfair, I must say, when we Democrats passed it over to the Republicans—has become more unfair and more regressive and more outrageous. All of these things will be issues.

AGRONSKY. Mr. Stein.

STEIN. Well, of course the state of the economy will be an issue in the sense that the Democrats will not have much else to talk about and there will be a great deal of grumbling from them about it. But, I think it will not be a very persuasive issue, partly because everybody recognizes that the economy is in much better condition than it has been for a long time.

While we can talk about the increase of profits, and we have no objection to profits increasing. We think that that is part of the health of the economy. It is also important to note that real spendable earnings of workers have increased during Phase II at about 5 percent per annum as compared with an average rate of about 1 percent in the preceding ten years. And as for taxes, of course, this may be a debate between Congressman Reuss and Congressman Mills, who has been Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for about 14 years now and has probably had more to do with the state of the tax system than anybody else now alive. But, you know, the state of the tax system is at best a nonpartisan condition. And we, like the Congressman, are interested in reforming it. But I think there is one thing to say about this taxpayers' revolt. I think what the taxpayers' revolt is about is a revolt against high taxes. It is not a revolt against a particular character of this tax system.

AGRONSKY. Don't you think it's a revolt really against the inequities of the tax system?

STEIN. No, I don't really think so.

AGRONSKY. You don't?

STEIN. No. I think that my experience in a long time is what everybody means by tax reform is that my taxes ought to be lower. Period.

REUSS. I think Herb is absolutely sincere about this . . .

AGRONSKY. Well, he thinks he's right beyond being sincere.

REUSS. I don't think he's right. I view it this way. The White House itself, a few weeks ago, got out a press release, a transcript of that Saturday night meeting at the ranch of Secretary Connally when President Nixon was down there. And right in that transcript it was written that President Nixon was promising his campaign contributors—the big oil men, big bankers of Texas—that not

only would he not touch the rapid depreciation loophole, the oil depletion loophole, he actually wanted to make them bigger. I just think that Herb is mistaken and that people are going to be disgusted by that, and really will not accept the fact that there are some Democrats, too, who have lagged on tax reform.

STEIN. Well, there are quite a number of them as you know, of course. We've had a number of tax reform measures before Democratic Congresses in the last ten years. We had one in 1963-64. We had one in 1969. We had one in 1971, and the large Democratic majorities had plenty of opportunity to send up to the President, the Democratic President in one case, Republican in the other, something repealing percentage depletion if they had wanted to do so. But obviously they didn't.

And I think that we have a little responsibility to point out to people that these things commonly labeled as loopholes or preferences serve some function. I went through a large part of my adult life being shocked by percentage depletion, but as I now look at the probable growing dependence of the U.S. on unreliable foreign sources of supply for fuel, I'm less certain than I used to be that this is a mistake. But, as I say, we want these things to be examined. We submitted a number of tax reform provisions in 1969 which were adopted and we agree on the need for a thorough examination.

REUSS. Let me ask Herb right now: what loopholes do you think should be closed? Can you name any? I can name a dozen that I think should be closed, and which, if they were closed, could raise a good many billions of dollars. What would your list be?

STEIN. Well, I wouldn't submit a list. I'm in a somewhat different position than the Congressman is, since I am a member of a team which has to consider these things jointly over a period of time. But we have said we will be prepared to cooperate fully with the Congress in considering thoroughgoing revision of the federal tax system.

AGRONSKY. Let me name just one spectacular, one dramatic, if you like, demonstration. We know for example, it was demonstrated that last year there were somewhere in the neighborhood of 250 persons with incomes of a million dollars a year or better who paid no taxes. I regard that as an inequitable observation to make. It's true and I regard that as a demonstration that there are inequities in the tax system which indicate that those who make an awful lot of money relatively pay . . . well, in some instances pay nothing, and many others . . . a great number of people who are in high income brackets in terms of percentages—pay much less than people in the lower income brackets. I think that is what causes the feeling that there are inequities and there should be reforms. Is that unfair?

STEIN. Well, in some degree it is, that is, these cases, these cases of the high income people—a rather small number—who pay no tax have been analyzed in great detail. We have explained, the Secretary of the Treasury has explained, why this was in all cases. And in some cases there are justifications and in some cases there are not. I don't want to pretend that this tax system which has grown up since 1913 is perfect. I'm sure there is a great deal that needs to be done about it. I don't think there is any disagreement about that. I think that there is a considerable exaggeration of the extent to which additional revenues can be obtained by closing loopholes which are considered to be of special benefit to the wealthy. I think that people who have looked into this recognize that in the early years, at least, of such moves the net revenue yield would probably be small.

AGRONSKY. Well, Congressman Reuss, you've certainly looked into it and very exhaustively. Is that right?

REUSS. It is certainly right that if you want to raise 70 billion of dollars in extra revenues, you have to close loopholes which to a large extent benefit the average person. And I wouldn't favor that. But there is a long list of loopholes that benefit solely the very wealthy, which if closed could yield at least 15 billion extra a year. Let me make a constructive suggestion. If Mr. Nixon really wants to be reelected, I would strongly recommend that this summer—in fact this month—he come before Congress with a constructive program for closing certain listed loopholes. I'm sure that with that kind of Presidential leadership, we'd have action from Congress. While this advice I'm giving might result in the election of Mr. Nixon, I would be willing to pay that price for patching up our tax system. As I see it we are heading for very serious trouble, Herb. We have about \$110 billion of deficits, back to back, in the current 3 fiscal years. Now, sure, expenditures should be curtailed wherever possible, waste should be eliminated, but even the Administration doesn't advocate cutting a dollar out of its 1973 budget. So you've got to have more revenue.

AGRONSKY. Mr. Chairman . . .

STEIN. If I could just respond . . .

AGRONSKY. I would like you to respond. I would like to point out that when Congressman Reuss, who is one of the chief spokesmen, as you know, on fiscal policy and economic policy for the Democratic Administration has made you a rather extraordinary offer and a rather extraordinary admission. He feels that it would help Mr. Nixon be elected if he were to undertake such a tax reform program, and I think that that would interest you. Does it?

STEIN. Well, I'm sure that Mr. Nixon wishes to be reelected and I'm sure that he welcomes Congressman Reuss' advice. I'm not in the business of advising the President on his political processes. He has people around who know much more about that than I do. But I will be happy to convey the suggestion to him. I think that . . .

AGRONSKY. Would you recommend that it be undertaken? Do you feel that a tax reform is necessary or don't you? That's what we're really trying to get at.

STEIN. I feel that these preferences which have been listed, and I think very well listed by Congressman Mills need to be examined.

I myself believe that calendar 1972 would be an inappropriate year in which to go very far with this, because I am afraid of its unsettling consequences for the business revival. I'm afraid that the form in which Congressman Mills made his proposal—that is to repeal all these things and then see which we decide to put back—is a particularly unsettling way of going about this. But I agree with the desirability of re-examining all these things and more. I would like to throw into the reexamination the question of the corporate profits tax which is usually overlooked, but which seems to me a great discrimination against people who earn income from the supplying of capital. However, I think there is no disagreement on this point.

I do believe that as a number of Democratic economists have recently pointed out that the issue of our tax reform, at least at the level of which the Congressman discusses it, is not a revenue issue. What we are going to get out of it is greater equity, maybe more efficiency in the operation of the economy, but not very much in the way of revenue. And all our experience has been—and the Congressman will certainly remember—that whenever we throw a tax reform proposal to raise revenue into the Congress what we get back is an enormous revenue reduction, as we did in 1969.

REUSS. Well, the moral is to get the reform without the leakage. I think you've made a very fair statement, Herb, of the advantages of tax reform; you pointed out that

equity is a principle consideration, or revenue . . . I think that reasonable men may differ. You think it yields somewhat less, others of us think it would yield somewhat more. I'd like to raise several other advantages of plugging some of these loopholes. One that commends itself to me is in terms of jobs here in America. Many of these loopholes lose us jobs. Take the fact that under our present tax system, if an American corporation establishes a manufacturing subsidiary abroad, in Belgium, or Mexico or Taiwan or Hong Kong or wherever, as long as it keeps its earnings overseas—doesn't repatriate them in dividends—it doesn't pay any corporate income tax on that income at all. So it has an unnatural incentive to close its plant here, fire its workers and plunk it down overseas.

AGRONSKY. How significant is that in terms of jobs and revenue?

REUSS. Well, you talk to the people in an electronics plant which has jumped ship to go over to Taiwan and it's their life's work. Those people are out of a job. So it's very significant to them. So all I'm saying is that by plugging that loophole you could not only raise several hundred millions of badly needed dollars for the Treasury but save thousands of American jobs.

AGRONSKY. Can I bring you back, Mr. Chairman, to the one observation that you did make about unemployment. It is 5.9 percent at this point; it's remained unchanged for three months. You recognize that it's bad and the question obviously is what are you doing about it? What do you intend to do about it?

STEIN. Well, I recognize that it's 5.9 percent, I think we should also recognize that the employment situation has greatly improved.

What we count on, what we are doing is following a policy which will bring about—which is bringing about—rapid expansion of the economy. I think I didn't get a chance to say that the economy in the last two quarters rose at a rate which is well in excess of the normal growth of the economy and which will absorb the unemployed, and I think every forecast . . .

AGRONSKY. Absorb them to what extent, Mr. Chairman?

STEIN. This is a difficult thing to predict, but I think we will see a very significant reduction of the unemployment rate. We've . . .

AGRONSKY. One percent, two percent, three percent?

STEIN. We've indicated that we expected by the end of this year . . . no, certainly not three percent. I mean three percent is an unreasonable expectation. We've said that we expect that by the end of this year to be in the neighborhood of five percent and that the unemployment rate would decline from then on.

AGRONSKY. That would be a decrease of nine-tenths of a percent. Now do you think, Congressman Reuss, that that is adequate and that they are doing enough? You have proposed legislation . . .

REUSS. I not only think it's adequate, I think this is a fundamental difference that we Democrats have with Republicans. By and large . . .

AGRONSKY. May I interrupt you for one second? Let's translate that 5.9 percent into numbers. How many unemployed is it?

REUSS. It's about a million unemployed per percentage point.

STEIN. About 800,000.

REUSS. So that reducing it to five percent would put roughly 800,000 back to work. I was just going to make the point that by and large the Republican economic philosophy—very sincerely held—is that by helping at the top by loans to Lockheed, bail-outs for Penn Central, tax reductions for corporations, fast depreciation, investment credits and so on, you thus enhance profits and

somehow or other this trickles down and makes jobs. It's the old "feed the horses and the sparrows will thrive" philosophy.

Well, in practice it just doesn't work out that way. We're seeing it now. We've had 5.9 or 6 percent unemployment now for 18 months. I think that the economical and sensible way to deal with the unemployment that we've got is to have an expanded public service jobs program which would give the returned Vietnam medical corpsman veteran a job as a hospital orderly, would help the...

AGRONSKY. What numbers are you talking about?

REUSS. Well, I'm talking about a public service employment program of about 500,000 jobs. That would make enough extra demand so that the private economy could employ another two million. That could reduce our unemployment to the order of three percent which should be our goal.

STEIN. Well, I think, of course, that is a caricature of our program, this notion about feeding the horses. We have expanded... in the first place, the tax reductions that have been given during this administration have been enormously more to individuals than to corporations and enormously more to the lower income individuals than to the upper income individuals. And we are now running—have been running up to this point—an exceedingly expansive budget policy with... we have a big increase in expenditures this fiscal year. We are beginning to be concerned, as you indicated at the outset, that the rise of the economy is going too fast. We've had some talk earlier about this taxpayers' revolt. I think there is a taxpayers' revolt and I think that what this indicates is that the American people would like to see the federal establishment, the federal programs, not rise so rapidly. Because that's the only source out of which they are going to get tax reductions.

AGRONSKY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask you this? The wage-price control system, do you see any end to it, before the election if you like?

STEIN. Well, I'm sure it will end, and I don't want to forecast a date. We've indicated that we intend to stay with it until it has achieved its objective.

AGRONSKY. Which would be when? What do you foresee?

STEIN. That's a matter of forecasting and speculation and I certainly can tell you it's not around the corner, it's not going to be tomorrow. But I'm not in a position, nor do I think it would be wise if I were, to indicate what...

AGRONSKY. Very quickly, let me ask you another thing. Can you conceive of this Administration proposing any increase in taxes?

STEIN. Well, I can conceive of it but I would consider it extremely unlikely. Well, I could make this exception: we have considered, as you know, the possibility of some substitution of federal taxes for state and local taxes, but our goal is not to raise the total tax burden on the American people.

REUSS. May I just ask a question on that? One of the rumors we hear is that from time to time the Treasury and the White House are supposed to be considering putting a so-called value added tax on the American consumer, which would be the equivalent of a sales tax added on to current sales taxes by the state and would be the straw that broke the camel's back. Can you give me positive assurance that that idea has now been kind of purged out of the system and that this isn't going to be visited on the American people if Mr. Nixon is re-elected?

STEIN. That is not an accurate description of the idea. We are not in the business of purging ideas. We're in the business of considering and evaluating ideas, and I don't think that the Congressman would want us to purge an idea.

REUSS. This one I would.

STEIN. What we have thought about was the possibility of substituting this tax for some of the local property taxes which are very onerous, as the Congressman knows. But this idea, I should emphasize, is a matter for consideration like many others.

AGRONSKY. Listen, we've got a minute left.

Let me ask you both, do you think in the election in November that the Democrats are going to make the state of the economy—unemployment and all the rest—the top issue, where do you think they are going to go in this area? Do you think that the Administration is vulnerable, very quickly.

REUSS. Yes I do. I think joblessness; ineffective administered price controls, huge feckless, "oops, sorry inadvertent budget deficits; tax loopholes—are all legitimate political issues. We Democrats intend to make what we may of them.

AGRONSKY. Mr. Chairman, do you think the Democrats are going to make anything of them?

STEIN. I think they will try. I think that they will be ineffective, and I think the Republicans will make an economic issue against the Democrats with respect to their proposals about spending, about income redistribution, about the tax burden and so on, which are things that the American people feel very deeply.

AGRONSKY. You don't feel that the President is vulnerable on the state of the economy?

STEIN. I think that this will be something that will be argued but I think it will not be argued convincingly to the American people.

AGRONSKY. Thank you, gentlemen. Good-night for Evening Edition.

A SALUTE TO AMERICA'S EDUCATIONAL POTENTIAL

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the National Educational Association will be holding its "Salute to Education" this month here in Washington, D.C. In honor of the occasion, I would like to say a few words about the potential of the educational system in this country.

On an average school day in the United States, 42,626,558 schoolchildren get up in the morning and go off to school. At the same time, 2,089,623 teachers are en route to meet them there. This process takes place in 16,920 operating school districts every day, at an annual cost of \$46,644,623.

There are times when we are aware of the importance and the magnitude of our country's educational system. For example, we will think of these factors this month, as 2,733,156 seniors receive their diplomas.

There are also times when we forget—when we lose sight of the fundamental goals involved in educating young people—1972 has been a year of such forgetfulness. It was a year when children's educations were made, in too many cases, subservient to their parents' politics. It has been a year when the word "busing" meant more to many people than the phrase "quality education."

It has been a year when all of those 45,633,748 students did not receive educations of equal caliber. This is amply

demonstrated in the illiteracy rate. In 1969, 4.3 percent of all black males over the age of 14 could not read. The illiteracy figure for white males in the same age group was only 0.7 percent.

And the inequities of our educational system do not stop on graduation day. In 1970, 9.2 percent of all black Americans who had completed 4 or more years of high school were employed in service positions. By comparison, only 7.5 percent of the white high school dropouts were employed as service workers. In that same year, 26 percent of all black Americans had jobs in private homes or in the service industries. The figure was 10.7 percent for white Americans.

Only one out of every 36 American physicians is black. And only one of every 420 American Ph. D.'s is black.

There is untold potential in our educational system. For example, there is one teacher for every 20.3 students. And yet, there are many school districts in this country where the student-teacher ratio is as high as 50:1. The expense of \$867 per student should, obviously, guarantee a student's learning how to read at some point in the educational process.

I am still hopeful, though, that despite the setbacks of 1972 and the basic inequities in the system, some day our educational potential will be fulfilled. On that day, all school systems in this Nation will be comparable. And all students, too, will be equal, only to be judged on the basis of their educational attainment.

Rather than saluting education as it is, I would prefer to salute education as it could be.

MOORHEAD ANNOUNCES HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION TO REQUIRE INDIVIDUALS TO BE APPRISED OF RECORDS CONCERNING THEM WHICH ARE MAINTAINED BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee will hold hearings next week on a number of bills that would amend the Freedom of Information Act—5 U.S.C. 552—to provide that individual citizens be apprised of records concerning them which are maintained by Federal agencies.

The so-called Koch bill, sponsored by the gentleman from New York, has more than 135 cosponsors. There are some 20 bills, similar or identical to H.R. 9527, on which the subcommittee will hold its hearings.

Members of Congress and others interested in testifying on this legislation or in submitting statements for the hearing record should contact the subcommittee office—225-3741. We have scheduled Members' testimony for Thursday, June 22 at 10 a.m. in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building. We have also invited witnesses from the Department of Justice and the Civil Service Commission to testify that day.

Hearings will continue the hearings on the Koch bill on Tuesday, June 27 at 10 a.m. in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building with testimony from the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, the Veterans' Administration, and from outside witnesses.

Written statements for inclusion in the record should be sent to room B-371, Rayburn House Office Building.

MR. LAWMAN, U.S.A.

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1972

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the June issue of Eagle, the publication of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, includes an editorial tribute to one of the organization's most famous members, J. Edgar Hoover, who died recently. The writer points out that, through the years, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its dedicated director worked hard not only to fight crime but to prevent its occurrence.

The editorial follows:

MR. LAWMAN, U.S.A.

J. Edgar Hoover—the man—the symbol—our Brother Eagle.

J. Edgar Hoover, the man, has passed on, as all mortals must.

The only Director the FBI ever had, the determined foe of crime, corruption and communism, succumbed to a fatal heart attack at the age of 77.

Not all mourned his passing. As he himself once said, "You are honored by your friends and you are distinguished by your enemies. I have been very distinguished."

And, indeed, he was. No one would expect a John Dillinger or Al Capone to praise his work. Nor did he endear himself to the commies like an Earl Browder or Angela Davis. But it was not the infra-reds who pot-shot at him most often. It was the ultra-violets who identify always with the law violator, never with the law enforcer. He never winced or wailed under their sniping, although once he did observe, quoting Alice, stepping through the looking glass in Lewis Carroll's story: "It takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place."

But J. Edgar Hoover, the symbol of effective law enforcement, will live on in the hearts of his countrymen.

This will be only in part because he built the world's finest investigative, crime-fighting force—the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

As much, it will be because he brought law enforcement across the nation into the era of test tubes, laboratories, fingerprint files, training academies and professional pay and stature for the profession of law enforcement.

Every local law enforcement agency in the nation has benefitted, not only from the FBI resources made available, but from J. Edgar's resolute spearheading of the drive for community support of community law officers.

And J. Edgar Hoover, for a quarter of a century a member of Alexandria, Va., Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, has a special place in the story of the Eagles. When he joined the Eagles, he said, "I like the Eagles, I always have." But, early in the 40s, his interest in the Eagles went beyond liking. He

had an idea of a special contribution that the Eagles could and ought to make to building a better America.

J. Edgar Hoover stood for fair and firm law enforcement. He was for law and order. No if's, and's or but's about it. But he wanted to prevent crime as well as to combat it. Back in 1944, he wrote in the Eagle magazine:

"Eagles can do a great deal to combat juvenile delinquency. Eagles are outstanding, experienced, respected men. By working with law enforcement agencies and providing guidance for selected children, Eagles might well direct many coming citizens away from the path of crime. Youth today needs our assistance more than ever before, and we cannot refuse its call."

Following the publication of that article, and the suggestion it made, a National Eagles Youth Guidance Commission was appointed, and there began the whole series of local, national and international youth-serving undertakings of the Eagles. The debt we, as Eagles, owe this distinguished fellow member of our Order from Virginia is clear. Whenever we expand and wherever we extend our youth guidance, projects, we will be helping keep green the memory and continuing the unique contribution to our Order of a great Eagle, a great lawman, and a great American.

MONEY SOUP

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1972

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, during the depression of the 1930's soup of any kind was the major dish on the unemployed American worker's dinner table. By continually adding water to it, you could stretch soup through several meals.

I was reminded of this depression delicacy by an editorial last week in the Daily News of McKeesport, Pa. The article pointed out the same stretching recipe is being used with today's dollar with inflation playing the part of water in making "money soup." The writer warns, however, there is a limit to how much water can be added to soup before it is no longer soup and he poses the intriguing question if this could happen to our money.

I am inserting the article into the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues. It may not be a tasty dish but it is food for thought.

The article follows:

MONEY SOUP

If you are a parent and want to teach your child the value of a dollar—you'd better act fast.

Getting the value of anything pegged these days is a tough job and the value of the dollar is the toughest job of all. We all know it isn't worth as much as it used to be and most of us are pretty confused about the entire subject. It's like instead of having money you haven't got, you have twice as much, but it's only worth half of what you'd have if you had what you don't have.

Did you follow that? Well, look at it this way. Any housewife can tell you that she can make a pot of soup stretch as far as need be if she just keeps adding water. Of course, the more water you add, the weaker the soup. The value of money must be something like that, with inflation playing the part of water in the money soup.

There's a limit to how much water you can add to soup. Eventually, you reach the stage where you can't palm it off as soup any more. Do you suppose the same thing could happen to our money?

NORTHERN IRELAND: A REGIONAL CRISIS

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1972

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to a paper on the crisis in Northern Ireland which has been written in part by a constituent of mine. It is entitled "Northern Ireland: A Regional Crisis" and presents a brief history of events leading up to the current conflict.

One of the authors is Fred O'Brien of Melrose, Mass. He graduated from Syracuse University and from Suffolk University School of Law. In addition he has a master's degree in government from Southern Illinois University. The co-author Claudette Pelletier is a graduate of Northeastern University in Boston, and has her degree in law from the University of Baltimore. She has studied at the Hague Academy in the Netherlands where she received a certificate in international law.

Both Mr. O'Brien and Claudette Pelletier have traveled to Ireland, and they have done much of their research firsthand. They were in Ireland in August of 1971 and most recently in April of this year. This paper represents their view of the background of the tragic conflict which has become a major international concern.

The paper follows:

NORTHERN IRELAND: A REGIONAL CONFLICT

(By Claudette Pelletier and Fred O'Brien)

The policy of government by colonization is at best a short term one, for colonists soon develop a sense of their own interests as being distinct from those of a home government. The body of land this article deals with—Northern Ireland—is a classic example. The Scot-Presbyterians are no longer Scots, but have evolved to be Scotch-Irish, a distinctive kind of Irish resident. The English in Ireland became referred to as Anglo-Irish with interests distinct from those of other Britons. What became a problem between the "New Irish" and the "Native Irish" was the religious problems which resulted in a polarizing of politics around religion. The Catholics were to be Nationalists, sympathetic to the Republic of Ireland to the South and the Protestants were to be Unionists and loyal to Mother England.

In 1920 the Government of Ireland Act established two separable governments, in the North and the South of Ireland. The Act, later amended, had as its original intention the reunification of Ireland when the problems pressing at that time could be worked out through reason rather than arms. In the 1920's and 1930's violence continued by groups pro and con on the question of one Ireland. The violence subsided in the South but has never really let up in the North.¹

Intermittent violence over the years again surfaced in the Ulster riots of 1969 through

Footnote at end of article.

the present time and no solution has as yet been reached. Religious bigotry resulted in street fighting in many cities, but particularly Belfast and Derry in Northern Ireland. Demonstrations for civil rights by Catholics and parades by the Protestants provoked each to violence against the other that will not subside due to refusal of compromise by both groups.

Today many domestic issues confront the people of Northern Ireland and a crucial factor is the high unemployment rate resulting from the violence and years of religious discrimination in awarding jobs. Unemployment is the highest in the Catholic areas³ and as a consequence, emigration is also highest in the same areas; a fact pleasing to Protestants, who welcome a diminishing Catholic population.

The so called West of the Bann policy⁴ which is supposed to provide employment for those forced from the land, has to say the least, never succeeded. The question is—Whether it was ever intended to succeed? The Wilson report of 1965,⁵ adopted by the Government advocated the development of 9 industrial centres, but only one of these was west of the Bann. Unemployment is the greatest West of the Bann and in Catholic areas of the east. Example:

Town	Percent unemployed	East/West
Enniskillen.....	17.7	West.
Newry.....	14.5	East (Catholic).
Derry.....	12.7	West.
Coleraine.....	8.1	East.
Bangor.....	4.5	Do.
Larne.....	4.3	Do.
Lisburn.....	4.2	Do.
Ballymena.....	4.1	Do.

The problem of unemployment is only a portion of the ills of Ulster, but fair employment would solve many other parallel problems.

The Republic of Ireland felt that the deterioration of the situation in Northern Ireland in 1969 had come to such a low point, that it was compelled to appeal to the United Nations on behalf of the minority Catholics and Nationalists in the North. Whether the topic was within the jurisdiction of the U.N. became the question. The Irish Government held it was under Article 56⁶ dealing with human rights, while conversely the British argued that it was solely a domestic problem and was, therefore, prevented from consideration under Article 2(7), which maintains that domestic jurisdiction prevails in matters of this kind.

In 1969 the Government of The Irish Republic did in fact raise formally with the United Nations the question of the North of Ireland.

In a press conference at New York on April 23, 1969, the Irish Minister for External Affairs to the U.N., Mr. Aiken, told of his purposes in coming to the U.N.: simply, to advise the Secretary-General of the situation in Ulster and that he would not make any request of the Secretary-General. Ireland's purpose was to demonstrate its serious view of the situation and that it expected civil rights to be restored to all sections of the community in the North of Ireland plus an end to all discrimination. This would be a first step toward reconciliation among the Irish people and eventual reunification of the country by agreement.

The Government of Ireland had requested the British Government to apply immediately to the United Nations for urgent dispatch of a peace-keeping force to the North. Following rejection by the British Government of this request and of an alternative proposal

of Irish troops as well as British for a joint Irish-British peacekeeping force, the Irish government felt there was no other alternative but United Nations consideration. The Irish representative by virtue of Article 35 of the Charter requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council in connection with the situation in Northern Ireland.⁷ The council convened on August 20, 1969 to consider the Irish problem.⁸

The Republic of Ireland's Foreign Minister, Dr. Hillary, further stated that denial of the civil rights to a large part of the population of the six northern counties has been the immediate cause of the demonstrations and resulting bodily harm. The Irish Government in accordance with a statement made by the British Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs delivered before the General Assembly on another matter:

Article 56 of the Charter makes it clear that no country can say that the human rights of its citizens are an exclusively domestic matter. A country that denies its citizens the basic human rights is by virtue of Article 56 in breach of an international agreement.⁹

The Question, whether the Irish Resolution should be accepted on the General Assembly agenda and in the Security Council, was further supported by reference to statements made by United States Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge in regard to application of Article 2(7):

In the period since the establishment of the United Nations certain principles and rules concerning the application of Article 2(7), have emerged. It has become established, for example, that the inscription and then discussion of an agenda item do not constitute intervention in matters which lie as initially within domestic jurisdiction.¹⁰

Continuing, Mr. Lodge said:

We hold the same views with respect to the Security Council that we do in the General Assembly. When a question such as the present one is involved, Article 2(7), must be read in light of Articles 55 and 56. Under Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter, all members of the United Nations have pledged themselves to promote universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.¹¹

Lord Caradon of Britain even with all these logical statements again invoked Article 2(7) as a bar to discussion of the matter while stating that action was being taken domestically to remedy the situation in Northern Ireland, and a debate could compromise peace there. What was done was to bring in troops as a peacekeeping force and the institution of the Downing Street Declaration of Reforms.¹² The Irish request was reasonable but the British alternative proved to be a disaster.

In the United Nations session in 1970, John Lynch, the Prime Minister of Ireland, again made a plea for U.N. intervention into the Northern Ireland problem, but again was turned down due to Britain.¹³

The Irish presented a good case based on humanitarianism to the United Nations both in 1969 and 1970. After the recent waves of violence in the North resulting in many dead and maimed, the Irish problem should be raised again at the U.N. and Britain would find it a bit more difficult to bar debate, since their promised reforms were passed but never enforced and her troops are despised by the people.

The violence continued in Ulster after the proposed reforms. It was a case of too little, too late, and the I.R.A. continued their terrorist campaign with retaliation from the Protestant militants. Mr. Faulkner, the Prime Minister of Northern Ireland, while admitting the Protestants threw a few bombs, blamed all violence on the I.R.A. He referred

to the I.R.A. as a "whole unified group," implying all Catholics were involved in terrorism.¹⁴

When violence appeared to be getting out of control, Prime Minister Faulkner on August 9, 1971, under the Special Powers Act,¹⁵ instituted the most repressive and hated law—Interment without Trial—directing it only against Catholics and the I.R.A.

The Prime Minister of Ireland issued a statement concerning interment without trial which is worth considering:

"The introduction of interment without trial in Northern Ireland this morning is deplorable evidence of political poverty of the policies which have been pursued there for some time and which I condemned publicly last week. Even if it succeeds in damping down the current wave of violence, it does nothing to forward the necessary long term solutions.

"The sympathies of the Government and of the vast majority of the Irish people, North and South, go to the Nationalist minority in the North who are again victimized by an attempt to maintain a regime which has long since shown itself incapable of just government and contemptuous of the norms of the British Democracy to which they pretend allegiance."¹⁶

This statement of the Irish Prime Minister is well put and echoes the sentiments of the author, who witnessed Northern Ireland during the imposition of interment.

The British, who complain that I.R.A. gunmen make raids in the North then slip back into the Republic, have now taken it upon themselves to pursue I.R.A. members into the Republic. This caused an uproar in Dublin, and Ireland lodged a complaint with Britain over the incident. This border incident could have serious repercussions. The Republic could have interpreted this as a show of force by Britain and a warning to curtail I.R.A. activity in the Republic or Britain would do so.

According to Article 34 of the United Nations Charter, the Security Council may investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute or situation, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

The fact of Britain deploying troops on the Irish-Ulster border is a clear indication that there is the possibility of a violation of the Irish border and its domestic territory. This is a threatening situation, since Britain has violated the border in the past.¹⁷

Article 35 gives the Irish Republic the right to bring the dispute to the attention of the General Assembly and Article 34 then permits the Security Council the authority to hear the matter.¹⁸ Beyond this point there is the necessity of consent from Great Britain before the U.N. can proceed to arbitrate the dispute or to take any action at all.¹⁹

A great gesture in the interest of international peace would be for Britain and Ireland to sign a treaty to allow the U.N. to send representatives to travel freely through the North and South of Ireland and oversee peacekeeping operations and the institution of concrete reform to insure human rights. Consent could be requested and assuming it was given according to Articles 12, 13, 14, and 15 of the Vienna Convention²⁰ of the Law Treaties, it would be binding on the nations involved.

The nations (Ireland and Britain) would be obliged to comply with such a treaty by virtue of Article 18 of the Vienna Convention which would be a committal toward ending hostilities in Ulster. By consenting to a treaty, the U.N. observers would then be in a position of stopping the smuggling of arms over the border of the Republic and Ulster. The U.N. observers, including military, could

Footnote at end of article.

be impartial while the British troops cannot. They could ensure the imposition of the reforms to the dissident groups and see that all persons received their rights in an equitable manner regardless of any other considerations.

In past operations the United Nations has accomplished worthwhile missions. In one such investigation over a dispute between Arabs and Israelis, there were similar complaints that are parallel to those in Northern Ireland. The committee's recommendations are now stated:

1. To secure the scrupulous implementation of the provisions relating to human rights contained in the Third and Fourth Geneva Conventions, and in particular to investigate and determine facts in the case of allegations of the violation of human rights provisions of those conventions or of other applicable international instruments.

2. To ensure that the population of the "occupied territories" is treated in accordance with the applicable law (in Northern Ireland to make sure Catholics got equitable treatment).

3. To bring to an end the indefinite and prolonged detention without trial of all persons, including those detained under security regulations and those under administrative detention, by releasing them or affording them a fair trial in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Conventions.²¹

The Governments of Britain and Northern Ireland have failed to curtail violence and correct the grievances of the minority. There is the obvious necessity for the intercession of a third party. No faction in the North has any trust for any other and there is such historical evidence of this fact that only outsiders are going to be able to effectively communicate with all sides. There is little hope for peace in Ulster, unless Britain agrees to allow the U.N. to arbitrate the crises.

In an attempt to curtail violence, the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association has re-instituted peaceful demonstration, but they were given a severe setback on January 30, 1972 in Londonderry when British soldiers killed thirteen innocent civilians. The following week Irish men and women all over the world paid tribute to the Derry Martyrs. In Newry just over the border in Ulster thousands demonstrated peacefully to the memory of Derry. Among the participants were members of the British and Irish Parliaments, the British actress Vanessa Redgrave and U.S. Congressman Mario Biaggi of New York. This incident in Derry insured world opinion was behind the minority in Northern Ireland in their quest for basic human rights.

Because of the actions of the British Government in its enactment of the Northern Ireland Act of 1972, legalizing all actions of the British Army in Ulster, the Government of Ireland has added to its dossier of information on Ulster, a protest of this action. This dossier will be put before the European Court at Strasbourg. This piece of legislation seems to give the Army a free hand for other incidents like Derry. The situation can only deteriorate from acts like this.²²

EPILOG

On March 24, 1972, Mr. Edward Heath, The British Prime Minister, made the long anticipated announcement that Britain would assume responsibility for security in Northern Ireland. They would also appoint a commission that would rule the country and be under the direct guidance of London. Mr. Heath also indicated that a plebiscite would be held soon on the question of re-unification with the Republic of Ireland.²³

These initiatives would have been the solution to the problem if taken in 1969 when serious outbursts of violence started, but today they could be the cause of even more violence and possibly war. London by previous

inaction allowed itself to be put into a position where almost any solution would not be considered sufficient. A plebiscite now would be premature. All factions must be allowed to present ideas both pro and con on the matter to insure success if enacted. The next few weeks are crucial to the British. If violence and bloodshed can be avoided, it is possible these initiatives might step toward eventual unity, when the plan is put to a vote in Parliament in the first week of April.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Government of Ireland Act of 1920 as contained in *A Sourcebook of Irish Government*, B. Chubb, P. 5.

² See *Divided Ulster*, Liam de Paor, Chapter 4.

³ Crises in Northern Ireland, *Nusight Magazine*, Dublin, Ireland, August, 1969, P. 34.

⁴ Id.

⁵ Id.

⁶ Article 56 of the Charter of the United Nations. All further reference to any Article will mean an Article of the U.N. Charter unless otherwise specified.

⁷ S. 9394 . . . (Official U.N. Document Number) On August 17, 1969, the Permanent Representative of Ireland on the instructions of the Government requested the President of the Security Council to convene an urgent meeting of the Council.

⁸ The Security Council met on the 20th of August to consider its provisional agenda (Document S/Agenda/1503—"letter dated 17th of August, 1969, from the Permanent Representative of Ireland to the President of the Security Council—S/9394").

⁹ Delivered 14th of October, 1968, in the general debate at the 23rd session of the General Assembly. Record of the 1693rd meeting of the Assembly. (A/PV, 1693, P. 42.)

¹⁰ Discussion of the Irish Resolution can be allowed as competent for discussion before the General Assembly. The above quote by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge of the United States, at the 832nd Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly on October 20, 1969, bears this point out.

¹¹ Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge of the United States, made this statement before the 851st meeting of the Security Council on March 30, 1960.

¹² See *Factionalism in Northern Ireland*, O'Brien, 92 C.R.E.2071.

¹³ Statement delivered by Prime Minister John Lynch, Republic of Ireland, at the 1879th Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly on October 22, 1970.

¹⁴ The New Initiative, a report by the Government of Northern Ireland, delivered by Mr. Brian Faulkner, Prime Minister, in the House of Commons, Stormont (Belfast) on July 23, 1971, P. 4.

¹⁵ The position of Northern Ireland on Internment without Trial, Official Document delivered by Mr. Brian Faulkner, Prime Minister of Northern Ireland in Belfast, August 9, 1971, as published in British Information Services Publication 3/6/71—N.I.

¹⁶ Internment in Northern Ireland, Official Statements of the Republic of Ireland, through Taoiseach (Prime Minister), Mr. John Lynch, T.D. published in *Iris na Roinne Gnothaí Eachtracha* (Foreign Affairs Bulletin), No. 839, September, 1971, P. 2.

¹⁷ Dublin Protests to Britain over Border Clash, *Washington Post*, 9/1/71, P. A-14.

¹⁸ See a New Concept of Consent and World Public Order; "Coerced Treaties" and the Convention on the Law of Treaties, published in the *Vanderbilt International*, Winter, 1970.

¹⁹ Official statement on the Irish Border Incident, 9/2/71, published in British Information Services Bulletin, sec 12/71, N.I.—P. 1.

²⁰ Refer to A/conf 39/27, United Nations General Assembly, May 23, 1969, Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

²¹ Refer to Official U.N. Document A/7922.

²² Irish Times, Editorial, March 9, 1972, P. 8.

²³ London Times, March 24, 1972, P. 1.

OWENS-ILLINOIS WINS ENVIRONMENTAL AWARD FOR TEXAS WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1972

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Owens-Illinois, Inc., headed up by president, E. D. Dodd, is an industry pacesetter in pollution control. The Texas Water Conservation Association has presented its first award for improving the quality of the State's water resources to Owens-Illinois for their outstanding leadership, accomplishments and service to Texas and the Nation in water quality enhancement.

This is the first environmental award ever given by the association which is composed of Texans interested in conserving and making the best use of the State's water resources. The member in all of Texas' 254 counties include representatives of river authorities, water and irrigation districts, navigation boards, municipalities, and industry.

President of the Texas Water Conservation Association, Beeman Fisher, and general manager, Bill J. Waddle, presented the award to Frederick A. Adams of Toledo, Ohio, vice president of Owens-Illinois' Forest Products Division. Fisher said:

Owens-Illinois was presented the award for the outstanding job it has done at its Orange Mill near the Sabine River in controlling water pollution. However, we also wanted to recognize the company's leadership in water pollution control at its older mills at Tomahawk, Wisconsin; Big Island, Virginia; and Valdosta, Georgia.

In building the Orange mill, which was officially opened in the fall of 1968, Owens-Illinois spent several million dollars on advanced systems for control of water and air pollution. Major water control items included a mechanical clarifier, a 37-acre aeration basin where oxygen during the manufacturing process is put back into the water by mechanical aerators, and a 1.7-billion-gallon holding pond to insure proper treatment of the mill's effluent.

Long before ecology became a household word Owens-Illinois installed, at a substantial investment of time and money, at its Valdosta mill a unique ponding system for control of water pollution that attracted worldwide attention.

Owens-Illinois' pioneering and continuing efforts in water pollution control won it the 1970 Gold Medal Award given by Sports Foundation, Inc., for outstanding achievements in control of water pollution. The company's contributions to improving the environment also have won it the Holiday Magazine Award for a Beautiful America, a distinguished service citation from Keep America Beautiful, Inc., and an Isaac Walton League Award.

Mr. Speaker, all Texas and the Nation should be proud of Owens-Illinois' fine work in water quality enhancement. We in Dallas continue to be impressed with

the progress made in the Dallas branch which is under the capable leadership of Phil Friday. We applaud the recognition given these outstanding leaders in pollution control by the Texas Water Conservation Association in awarding Owens-Illinois their first Industrial Environmental Award.

FROM THE MOUTHS OF CHILDREN

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1972

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, recently I received two essays written by sixth grade students in my district. The lesson the stories contain is as deep as many of the lengthy speeches made in the Halls of Congress. The message concerning pollution is profound, but even more so are the concern and perceptiveness of these two young people.

I am sure that all of my colleagues in the House will join me in congratulating these two girls on their fine work. While their imagination exceeds the currently operative facts, what is important is that the essays represent a deep concern of two young people for the future well being of Americans. Furthermore, can we be sure that the threat of serious environmental catastrophe has been adequately balanced by the program, laws, and agencies brought into being by the Congress? We must, Mr. Speaker, pledge to these two young Americans and all those of their generation that we will leave no stone unturned to insure that these two essays remain fiction:

BROOKHURST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,
Garden Grove, Calif., May 18, 1972.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HANNA: These are two representative imaginary stories of the future written by my 6th graders. These girls wanted their letters shown to government officials and company leaders that cause pollution.

I find them very disturbing and I think you will too. Please show them to those people that support factories, etc.

Thank you,

Mrs. LAURIE KNOX.

BY KATIE BATES

"What is a tree?" asked Peter. "Don't you know what a tree is?" I asked him, but I should have known better. The year was 2000 and all the pollution had ruined our once beautiful country. Peter is my grandson and is only 2 years old. "Well, Grandma, what's a tree?" he repeated. "A tree, Peter, is something that was once beautiful." I knew he would not understand this but I went on. "A tree is big and has long branches with leaves on them." "Oh, could you draw me one?" he asked. "I think I can." So I drew him one. He liked it very much and asked if he could keep it. I said, "Yes, you can," and I thought to myself it will probably be the only tree he would ever see. Then Peter asked what a flower is. I tried to explain it to him. I said, "A flower is a plant (which we have very few of now, I thought). And it grows in the ground. In the spring it grows beautiful leaves and petals." "What are petals?" he asked. "They are colorful things that are on a flower." "Boy, I wish I could see those things." And I practically turned away and cried. I thought, "So do I, so do I."

BY PATTY

"Mommy, what's this," cried Libby as she pointed to a page in her story book. "Well, the tall green and brown one is a tree." "What was a tree?" asked Libby. "A tree was a small or sometimes short brown stump with branches on it. Birds built their homes in trees until man polluted them. They also had little green pointed oval things on them called leaves." "Well, what's a bird," cried Libby. "A bird was a reptile; some were big and some were small. They all had wings, though. They could fly very high in the blue sky." "Is this a blue sky?" "Yes, but we don't have those anymore. The only time I remember when the skies were even half way decent was in 1972. A blue sky was something that supplied us with oxygen and was very beautiful. I'm sorry you weren't there to see it."

TRENDS TOWARD SLAVERY

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, it was Bishop Fulton J. Sheen who once said that "History is memory and memory guides the present." If ever there was a need for this country to look to the lessons of history, it is at this very moment. Bishop Sheen once had a telecast on his "Life Is Worth Living" series and discussed the Soviet Constitution. In his introduction he stated that there were 19 chapters and 117 articles that one had to go through prior to coming to a single right. The first right cited was the right to work. Of more significance on the contemporary scene was the article on religion which is article 124, which states in essence that freedom of religious worship and freedom of antireligious propaganda is permitted for all its citizens. Bishop Sheen then pointed out that the Soviets recognized religion by closing 52,000 churches and liquidated the clergy. That happened back in the period following the Bolshevik Revolution. As J. Edgar Hoover stated so often:

The leopard never changes its spots.

I am submitting today for the RECORD three brief documents that should give Americans much food for thought on the recent agreements reached in Moscow which the Congress will be called on to approve. The first is a paper submitted by Commodore Perry before the American Geographical and Statistical Society, at a meeting held March 6, 1856. The second is a column by one of the more credible columnists in America, Mr. Paul Scott, and is dated June 2, 1972. The third is an extensive, yet abbreviated record of perfidy in all our past dealings with the Soviet Union. It was written by Mr. Dan Smoot, who spent almost 10 years with the FBI, has been a radio and TV commentator for 15 years while authoring his own Dan Smoot Report which had a circulation in excess of 40,000. Mr. Smoot currently writes exclusively for the Review of the News, and his article, "American-Soviet Relations" appears in the June 14, 1972, issue of the Review of the News. As Americans read these short articles, they would do well to reflect on the echo that some can still hear from

the tattered Continental Army soldier at Valley Forge:

I gave you a Birthright of Freedom only in trust
And you are squandering it on a luxury labeled Expediency.
I stood in snow without shoes to give you a Right to Vote
And you stay home on election day whenever the weather is bad.
I left my family destitute so that you could have Freedom of Speech
And you remain silent because it might be bad for business.
I orphaned my children to give you a government to serve you
And through neglect you permit it to become masters of your children.

Pay heed, fellow Americans. The hour is late; yet not too late to reverse the trends toward slavery. The articles follow:

FROM PAPER BY COMMODORE M. C. PERRY, USN

"It requires no sage to predict events so strongly foreshadowed to us all; still 'Westward' will 'the course of empire take its way.' But the last act of the drama is yet to be unfolded; and notwithstanding the reasoning of political empirics, Westward, Northward and Southward, to me it seems that the people of America will, in some form or other, extend their dominion and their power, until they shall have brought within their mighty embrace multitudes of the Islands of the great Pacific, and placed the Saxon race upon the eastern shores of Asia. And I think too, that eastward and southward will her great rival in future aggrandizement (Russia) stretch forth her power to the coasts of China and Siam; and thus the Saxon and the Cossack will meet once more, in strife or in friendship, on another field. Will it be in friendship? I fear not! The antagonistic exponents of freedom and absolutism must thus meet at last, and then will be fought that mighty battle on which the world will look with breathless interest; for on its issue will depend the freedom or the slavery of the world—despotism or rational liberty must be the fate of civilized man. I think I see in the distance the giants that are growing up for that fierce and final encounter; in the progress of events that battle must sooner or later inevitably be fought."

THE SCOTT REPORT

(By Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON, June 2.—Senate critics of the U.S.-Soviet arms limitation agreements will center their coming attacks on the substantial numerical advantage in strategic land and submarine based nuclear missiles provided the Soviet Union.

That's the strategy agreed to by a small group of Senators headed by Senator Henry Jackson (D. Wash.), who are deeply concerned that President Nixon went too far in granting concessions to Russia in the Moscow summit.

The Jackson group, as it is referred to here, includes Senator Barry Goldwater (R. Ariz.), and Strom Thurmond (R. S.C.), members of the influential Senate Armed Service Committee, and Senator James Buckley, the Conservative-Republican from New York.

Preliminary examination by this group of these "interim agreements", which do not require Senate approval as does the Treaty limiting anti-ballistic missiles, has raised grave questions whether they imperil the future security of the U.S.

The Senators' studies show clearly that the Moscow arms agreements give the Russians tremendous advantages over the U.S. in the expansion of strategic weapons systems. Most important of these Russian advantages are:

The Moscow agreements freeze the U.S. at a four to one disadvantage comparing our overall missile payload to that of Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union has three missiles for every two of U.S. and theirs are substantially larger. The agreements guarantee that this gap will continue and likely widen.

Soviet missiles carry payloads several times larger than U.S. These agreements not only protect the Soviet advantage, but authorize them to increase it.

The agreements forbid U.S. to increase number of submarines but authorizes the Soviets to continue building them until they first equal and then greatly surpass U.S.

The Jackson group is now readying a reply to the Nixon Administration's main argument in defense of the Moscow arms accords. This argument is that the U.S. now has twice the number of nuclear warheads than the Soviets.

In countering this argument, the Jackson group plans to show that the arms agreements reached in Moscow are tailor-made to help the Russians overcome this U.S. lead in the shortest amount of time. Their memorandum, citing the Soviet advantages, puts it this way:

"It is no answer to say that we now have more warheads than the Soviets: for under the agreements they are not only free to multiply their warheads, but they are authorized to expand greatly the overall missile capability that makes such multiplication possible."

Linking the issues.—Whether the Jackson group will be able to force changes in these strategic arms limitation agreements is highly debatable since the President did not include them in the ABM Treaty he plans to send to the Senate.

The "interim agreements" covering the strategic weapons are known as executive agreements which do not need Senate approval. Because of this Presidential maneuver, the only course open to the Jackson group is to link their attacks against the agreement to the ABM Treaty. They could do this by threatening to hold up the ABM Treaty until the President agrees to renegotiate changes in the strategic weapons agreements.

The Jackson group will try to establish this link by presenting a strong case to the Senate that the concessions granted the Soviets in the strategic weapons agreements increase the need for a U.S. ABM system in order to protect our land-based ICBMs. It will be their argument that either the ABM treaty or the "interim agreements" must be changed.

The ABM Treaty.—In their study of the anti-ballistic missile (ABM) limitation Treaty, the Jackson group noted:

"The agreement prevents the U.S. from an effective ABM defense of its missile sites, while permitting the Soviets to expand their Moscow-area system and their strategic weapons capability."

The reference to the "Moscow-area" ABM system will be stressed by the Senators to show that this system is designed to defend a sizable portion of Russia in addition to the Soviet Capital. The U.S. has no similar ABM defense for Washington or any region of the country.

Since the Joint Chiefs of Staff were opposed to the concessions the President made to the Russians, the Jackson group is now trying to determine how many of them will publicly oppose the "interim agreements".

Should one or more of the President's military advisers publicly come out against the strategic arms accord, the Senators believe there would then be a good chance of forcing the President to renegotiate them. Without the public help of the military, however, the odds are heavily against either forcing a delay in the Senate ratification of the ABM Treaty or forcing any changes in the strategic weapons agreements.

AMERICAN-SOVIET RELATIONS

(By Dan Smoot)

President Nixon's recent visit to Moscow was a farce, a staged spectacular intended

primarily to deceive the American public into believing that something good was being accomplished for America and the world. President Nixon, himself, being an intelligent and well-informed person, could not possibly believe that his agreements with the Soviets would produce any good for anyone except the Communists. The historical record repudiates any such belief.

In the 1950s the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress spent two years on a study published in 1956 as *Soviet Political Agreements And Results*. The staff studied nearly a thousand treaties the Soviets had entered into with the United States and other countries since 1917—and found that the Soviets had broken their word to virtually every country to which they had ever given a signed promise. In 1964, the Senate published the third revision of *Soviet Political Agreements And Results*, updating it to August of 1963, showing that the Soviet record of treaty violations remained unbroken.

Just before President Nixon went to Moscow for the May, 1972, summit meeting, the Senate Judiciary Committee made available for him and his advisors a staff study which revealed that in seven previous summit meetings between U.S. Presidents and Soviet leaders, twenty-five specific agreements had been reached—and that the Soviets had violated twenty-four of them. The only summit agreement the Soviets ever kept was their promise to Roosevelt at Yalta to enter the war against Japan; but they waited to do this until we had already won the war, and did it then only to rape Manchuria, help sovietize China, and set up a Communist puppet regime in North Korea.

The fact that such Leftists as Senator Edward M. Kennedy praised the Nixon-Communist strategic arms limitations agreement is proof enough that the agreement will be detrimental if not disastrous to America. It will, in fact, freeze the United States into second place as a nuclear power, but will have no effect on future arms development, production, and deployment by the Soviets.

WHAT CAN WE EXPECT?

The trade agreement was not completed during Nixon's visit to the Kremlin; but negotiations are continuing; and we can safely predict what will happen. We will write off at least 90 percent (more likely about 95 percent) of the Soviet's more than \$11 billion World War II debt to us, then grant them almost limitless credit to buy from us foodstuffs, industrial machinery, and highly sophisticated technological equipment. The Soviets will use the fact of getting American credits as a bargaining tool to get similar credits from industrial nations in Europe, and possibly from Japan. Following American leadership, the industrialized capitalist nations will thus, once again, finance the Soviet military machine whose sole purpose is to conquer and enslave the world, especially the industrialized capitalist nations.

Why is all this predictable? Because the Soviets have never changed the Lenin principle that treaties are made to be broken for the purpose of promoting the interests of Communism; and the United States has never abandoned the principle laid down by Franklin D. Roosevelt that the only way to negotiate with the Soviets is to give them everything they want and get nothing in return.

In this regard, it is most instructive to examine the one volume on American-Soviet relations which the State Department has compiled and released: *Foreign Relations Of The United States: Diplomatic Papers: The Soviet Union, 1933-1939*, published in 1952. This book is a chronological collection of confidential State Department official documents, reflecting the history of American-Soviet relations during the six-year period 1933-1939, and giving some background for

that period. It would be interesting to review a later volume, dealing with a later period, but the State Department has not published one. Since the essentials of our government's relationship with the Soviets have not changed, however, we can use the pattern set in 1933-1939 to foresee what will happen in the future.

Here are highlights of what the 1952 State Department volume reveals:

From 1919 to 1933, the American government looked upon the Soviet rulers as a band of criminal conspirators and refused to recognize them as legitimate. By 1933, it was clear that if the Soviets could not get American recognition their regime would collapse. Japan threatened the Soviets militarily in the east. The starving and brutally oppressed population of Russia was on the edge of revolt. The Soviet's socialist economy could produce nothing; and, the Soviets could get no foreign credits to create agricultural, industrial, and military production.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt did not wait for the Soviets to ask him for help. He took the initiative. On October 10, 1933, he wrote to the President of the Soviet Union asking that a representative come to the United States for personal negotiations. On November 8, 1933, Maxim Litvinov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, arrived in Washington. Litvinov refused to negotiate with the Secretary of State or anyone else except the President. So, Roosevelt invited him to the White House. For six days and most of six nights, Roosevelt and Litvinov were alone, for the most part, in Roosevelt's study.

In the dying midnight hour of November 16, 1933, Roosevelt and Litvinov established diplomatic relations between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. by drinking a toast in 3.2 beer.

The only written record of the Roosevelt-Litvinov agreements is contained in the "Gentlemen's Agreement" between them—which consists of twelve memoranda they exchanged in the White House on the evening of November 16, 1933. The next morning, Roosevelt released these twelve papers for publication, thus notifying Congress, the American public, and the world that he, acting in secret for the government and the people of America, had extended the hand of friendship to the bloody rulers of the Soviet Union.

Izvestiya, official newspaper of the Soviet Government, hailed the event as proof that, "... the United States ... has at last been compelled to establish normal diplomatic relations. ... Great interest in the Soviet experiment, attempts to introduce planned economy and to regulate the contradictions of monopolistic capital now going on in the United States, have all been a factor in that complex which has compelled the White House to remove the juridical barrier between the United States and the USSR. ..."

CONSERVATIVE WARNINGS PROVE TRUE

Prior to Litvinov's arrival in the United States, professional diplomats in the State Department, having studied the perfidious Soviet record of treaty violations, had urged Roosevelt not to extend recognition until he had obtained ironclad agreements concerning: (1) the \$628 million in debts which the Soviets owed us from World War I credits to the Russian Government and from Soviet seizure of American property in Russia; (2) activities of the Communist Party inside the United States; (3) activities of the Communist International which were directed by the Soviet Government, and whose known published aim was to foment revolution inside the United States; and, (4) the religious and legal rights of American citizens in the Soviet Union.

As to the debts: The only thing put in writing was Litvinov's promise to stay in Washington to negotiate a settlement. Litvinov returned immediately to the Soviet Union. No beginning had been made on settlement of those debts.

In February of 1934 the State Department sent to our Ambassador in Moscow, William C. Bullitt, a formal proposal. We offered to accept settlement of the \$628 million Soviet debt for the equivalent of \$90 million. When Bullitt presented this proposal to Litvinov in Moscow, he was amazed at the anger and vehemence with which Litvinov rejected it. Litvinov told Bullitt that the Soviet Union was not interested in building up trade with the United States, that it now had credits and could get needed industrial equipment elsewhere. Throughout the year 1934, the only concrete proposal that Litvinov ever made with regard to the debts was that the Soviet Union would settle the \$628 million of American claims for \$100 million, provided the U.S. Government would give the Soviets an unconditional, no-interest loan of \$200 million.

On September 15, 1934, Secretary of State Cordell Hull said: "Personally, I have little idea that the Soviet officials will come to any reasonable agreement. Litvinov won his victory when he obtained recognition, and regards everything else as of minor importance." Hull kept trying, however. The American Government reduced its debt claims to practically nothing, and offered the Soviets an open-end loan to cover just about anything and everything they wanted to buy in the United States. On January 31, 1935, Cordell Hull recorded that the Soviets would make no agreement with us about the old debts and that negotiations had "come to an end." The old Soviet debt to us was never settled. It was merely forgotten.

In the "Gentlemen's Agreement," Maxim Litvinov promised Roosevelt that the Soviets would disband the Comintern in Moscow, and have nothing to do with the American Communist Party, although those organizations were not specifically named as such. The opposite, of course, happened. On direct and specific instructions from Moscow, the American Communist Party immediately intensified its subversive activities in the United States. The Comintern expanded its program of holding conferences in Moscow, attended by American delegates, to plan and foment subversive and revolutionary activity in the United States.

Our government ignored these violations of Litvinov's agreement for almost a year. In October, 1934, Ambassador Bullitt mentioned to Litvinov that the activities of the Comintern were a violation of his promise to Roosevelt. Litvinov snapped:

"No nation ever starts talking about the activities of the Comintern unless it wishes to have as bad relations as possible with us."

We made our second protest against the activities of the Comintern on August 25, 1935. The Soviets rejected our protest before reading it—announcing, however, that they would read it. After they read it, Litvinov closed the matter with a blunt remark:

"The Soviet Government would not in any way restrain the activities of the Communist International in the United States or the Soviet Union or of American Communists connected with the Communist International in the Soviet Union."

Our government never again protested against the Soviets' meddling in the internal affairs of our country.

PROMISES ARE LIKE PIE CRUSTS

From the beginning of the Bolshevik revolution, foreigners in Russia were harassed, jailed, and murdered. Religious worship, by foreigners as well as by Soviet citizens, was viciously persecuted. In the "Gentlemen's Agreement" with Roosevelt, Litvinov promised that the religious and legal rights of American citizens would be respected in the Soviet Union. This promise, like all the others, was broken from the moment it was given.

From the day our first Ambassador arrived in Moscow, the American Embassy had to deal with difficulties, harassments, and insults which Cordell Hull characterized as "not common to any other civilized nation,

nor even . . . uncivilized nations as a rule." But, whenever a Soviet official did anything that was less insulting to us than was habitual with Soviet officials, the government and press of the United States would seize upon the event as an indication that the Soviets were mellowing and changing and that an era of constructive friendship was dawning. But William Bullitt, our Ambassador, warned: "We should not cherish for a moment the illusion that it is possible to establish really friendly relations with the Soviet government, or with any communist party or communist individual."

In January of 1937, Roosevelt replaced Bullitt with a new Ambassador, Joseph E. Davies, who was enthusiastically pro-Soviet. The change made no difference. By September of 1937, Stalin's purge trials were reaching a climax of indecency, and foreigners in Russia were being subjected to indescribable brutalities. Our Embassy continuously but futilely tried to protect American citizens arrested in the Soviet Union. In all cases, Soviet officials refused to notify us of the arrests, and held the Americans incommunicado, our Embassy finding out about them indirectly. Our Embassy officials were not permitted to communicate with the imprisoned Americans, and never knew whether we even had a record of all such arrests. Our Embassy did find out about 134 specific cases, and sent formal notes to the Soviet Government. The notes were not answered. In one case, more than a year lapsed before the Soviets notified us of the death of one detained American "in one of the northern regions of the Soviet Union." If our Embassy were able to effect the release and deportation of an American citizen within a year, it complimented itself that its efforts had been "crowned with success."

Soviet trade with the United States never did amount to much, despite the credits our government gave them, and despite Roosevelt's extravagant promises about the rich commercial harvests recognition would bring to American business. Soviet orders in the U.S. for the most part, were for small amounts of recently developed materials and were, obviously, attempts to copy trade secrets. Hence, not only private American businessmen, but subordinate officials in our Departments of State, Navy, and Army felt it unwise to do business with the Soviets. Roosevelt overruled them but Soviet harassment continued.

Laurence A. Steinhardt became American Ambassador to Moscow in August of 1939. He recommended reciprocity in our relations with the Soviets, saying we should treat them the way they treat us. President Roosevelt said we could not requite their "downright rudeness" in kind, but that "we should match every Soviet annoyance by a similar annoyance here against them."

Neither Roosevelt nor any succeeding President has ever done that, however.

The present Nixon round of giving the Soviets what they want, and getting nothing in return, is fairly close to the final round. When the Soviets complete their armaments buildup with our money, while we honor Nixon's agreements with them, they will be able to take what they want. The farce of negotiation will no longer be necessary.

Americans should bombard all U.S. Senators with demands that they reject all of the Nixon-Kremlin agreements.

TOURING FARMERS TELL FOOD PRICE STORY

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the price of food to the American consumer con-

tinues to be in the spotlight. A few months ago, four farmers performed a valuable service to producers and consumers. They traveled across the country on an 11-day tour to inform urban consumers about the important role that agriculture plays in our economy and, in particular, to respond to consumer concern over food prices.

The tour was labeled as Operation FACT—Food and Agricultural Communications Tour—and was sponsored by the National Agricultural Institute. The purpose was to open up a dialog between farmers and consumers on a wide range of issues and problems involving food production in the United States. FACT participants—J. S. Francis, Jr., a cotton and alfalfa producer from Peoria, Ariz.; Eugene Moos, a wheatgrower from Edwall, Wash.; Thurman Gaskill, a corn-hog-soybean producer from Corwith, Iowa; and John Barringer, a cattleman from Memphis, Tenn.—made a major effort to communicate directly with consumers and hear their views. They met with shoppers in supermarkets and shopping centers, participated in forums with consumer representatives, appearing before college and graduate school classes in business, marketing, and economics, and addressed a joint session of a State legislative body.

Through extensive news media coverage in the seven urban areas visited—Chicago, Seattle-Tacoma, Houston, Atlanta-Macon, Boston, New York, and Washington, D.C.—the group was also able to reach large numbers of consumers they were unable to meet with personally.

The ability of American agriculture—with only 5 percent of the population of this country on the farm—to feed the American people is the economic miracle of this century. The maintenance of this highly efficient and productive agricultural plant in the years ahead will require a great deal of public understanding and support. I believe that the best way of achieving that understanding and obtaining that support is through direct face-to-face communication between those who produce our food supply and the consuming public. Operation FACT has taken an important first step in this direction and I want to congratulate the participants and the National Agricultural Institute for undertaking this most worthwhile project.

Mr. Speaker, I insert for the RECORD a representative news article on the tour from the Boston Globe of April 27, 1972:

FARMERS' SIDE ON FOOD COSTS

(By Bruce Davidson)

Farmers are feeling tender because they think the public misunderstands their role in the cost of food and they have mounted a campaign to tell their story around the country.

The campaign is being run by the National Agricultural Institute and four of its members have included Boston in a seven-city swing from coast to coast—J.S. 'Jack' Francis Jr., co-chairman of NAI, John Barringer, Thurman Gaskill and Eugene Moos. All are active farmers.

The heart of the farmers' argument is that "we're not getting rich on high food prices, that this country enjoys the lowest food prices in the world, that the average American is spending a smaller proportion of his income for food than ever before, and that farm productivity is advancing at twice the

pace of industrial productivity." Those are all familiar arguments to anyone who has been listening to farm spokesmen in recent weeks and months.

President Nixon, in effect, backed the farmers on this score when he accused "middlemen" of being responsible for the sharp rise in food prices during February. That sent the Price Commission scurrying out in search of someone to blame.

"For several days we looked for the elusive middleman, sort of like the abominable snowman," Price Commission chairman C. Jackson Grayson told a congressional committee the other day. "But I'm not so sure there is a culprit," he went on.

Interestingly, the farmers here yesterday tend to agree with him in the sense that they doubt that there is flagrant profiteering at any given level. But Francis adds a dimension to the controversy by suggesting that "it may not be any particular set of middlemen that is doing too well, but that there are too many middlemen."

Barringer, a cattleman from Tennessee, seconds that by saying that "from the time it leaves me and reaches the packer, it has been through five other hands—and then 11 more people before it reaches the buyer."

Like Francis, Barringer is not automatically critical of those middlemen. Every one of them who handles cattle between his farm and the packer actually owns the animal, subject to all the fluctuations of market prices, rather than just adding on to the price as he passes it along. Barringer says it costs him about \$125 a head for feed, capital costs and care of a calf until it is large enough to be sold at 400 pounds to someone who will pour more feed into it to get it up to slaughter weight in the neighborhood of 1,000 pounds. If he's lucky, he may get 40 cents a pound when he sells the 400-pound animal, a gross profit of \$35. He criticized a recent Life magazine article on meat prices for claiming that farmers were making \$66 a head on cattle, laughing that "if you could make \$66 a head on cattle, there'd be a million people doing it."

Moos, a wheat farmer from Edwall, Wash., says it costs him \$1.40 a bushel to grow wheat, a fairly standard figure—and that he gets \$1.25 a bushel in the grain markets. "The only profit we make is from what the government gives us," he says. And the government's total direct subsidies to farmers in the form of price supports and such programs as soil bank subsidies for the retirement of farm acreage, amounts to \$4 billion annually compared with a Defense Department budget in excess of \$70 billion.

Gaskill, a corn-hog-soybean farmer from Corwith, Iowa, argues that Commodity Credit Corp. reserves of feed grains have served consumers well by stabilizing prices during crisis periods. During the 1970 corn blight, for example, when nearly 10 percent of the crop was affected, "we could have had a dollar-a-pound increase in meat prices," Gaskill said, had it not been for feed-grain reserves.

The farmers have persuasive arguments on the productivity question with our food supply and an extensive export market produced by a farm population of less than 10 million (and that includes wives and children), less than 5 percent of the population. As recently as 1950 persons living on farms accounted for 15 percent of the population. During this same interval output per man-hour has risen 3.3 times while manufacturing output has gone up 1.6 times. The long-term point of this, they contend, is that for the most part we have a growing and successful system as it stands, the envy of and model for the rest of the world. Under these circumstances, they say, it would be a mistake to let the recent flap over prices obscure that central fact.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HAWTHORNE, CALIF.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, the city of Hawthorne will celebrate its 50th year as an incorporated city.

I have a great affection for this community, Mr. Speaker, for this is the area in which my parents chose to reside when they first came to California. In fact, they were the first family to build a home in Hawthorne near the turn of the century.

This is where I was born, where I went to school, and where I grew up; this is where I began my career in both business and public service, as I was once mayor of Hawthorne; and this is where my life has been centered.

Originally a cattle ranch, this area in the heart of the Centinela Valley later became a leading producer of barley, and by 1880 it was producing a million bushels a year to be shipped all over the world.

Named by a land developer's daughter, Mrs. Laurice Harding Woolwine, who shared her birthday with author Nathaniel Hawthorne, the area became a community of families interested in poultry raising and vegetable growing. In those days, the "downtown area" was only a single grocery store, and meat was brought in by wagon from Inglewood three times a week. Another small building was used as both a school and a church. The school had 16 pupils ranging from kindergarten to 18 years of age.

Offering a mild, temperate climate, a convenient location, and in esthetically pleasing surroundings, Hawthorne has grown from a community of 2,000 in 1922, to a thriving city of over 57,000 residents today.

But this growth has been orderly and planned by past and present city administrators and community leaders. Expansion has been marked by the retention of a balance between industrial, commercial, and residential development.

Located between the "city and the sea," Hawthorne is ideal from the point of view of the employer and the employee. Approximately 187 industries manufacture a wide variety of products ranging from aircraft to steak platters, and from toys to vacuum systems. This industrial diversification is undoubtedly one of the most important factors contributing to the stability and prosperity of the community.

In the center of the transportation area, Hawthorne is only 15 miles north of the giant port of Los Angeles, known as the cargo capital of the West, and is approximately 2 miles from the Los Angeles International Airport. The southern California freeway network, especially the San Diego and harbor freeways, offer easy access to the manufacturing and industrial plants and the transcontinental truck lines which are

located within the city. In addition to the rail freight service provided by both the Southern Pacific Railroad and the Santa Fe Railroad, Hawthorne has a municipal airport which is widely used by businessmen and industrialists.

The citizens of Hawthorne, naturally, take great pride in the educational system which has grown from the one room schoolhouse serving 16 students to a system serving over 17,800 students today. Quality education, however, is far more important to the citizens, and emphasis is placed on individualized instruction which allows the student to progress educationally as far as his capabilities will allow. This is illustrated by the small size of a class in the school system which averages 24 students for each teacher.

The attractions of Hawthorne are even greater when one examines the wealth of recreational activities in the Los Angeles area. Some of the finest beaches in California are but a few minutes away where a day of fishing, swimming, surfing, or simply a day of taking in the warm California sun can be enjoyed. With a total of eight parks open to the public in Hawthorne, the residents can take advantage of the picnic areas, baseball diamonds, shuffleboard, tennis, handball, croquet, basketball, and volleyball courts. As a result, the people of this area enjoy a reputation of being advocates of outdoor living.

Declining property tax rates, coupled with a steady increase in assessed valuation, is an attribute that speaks for itself. Since incorporation in 1922, the property tax rate has been more than cut in half, while assessed valuation has increased in excess of four times.

A pay-as-you-go philosophy with respect to capital expenditures, significant increases in sales tax collections and business license revenue have all contributed to the city's sound financial position.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I pay tribute to the city of Hawthorne, Calif.; her accomplishments; her people; and her outstanding educational, industrial, and residential facilities.

Hawthorne is truly a great city and will continue to be a most enjoyable place to live and work.

ASBESTOS—A TREACHEROUS KILLER TO WORKERS AND A COMMUNITY

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are slowly realizing that community pollution has its beginning at the workplace. There is a close interrelationship between the outside and inside of many factories. There is no other situation in which this is more true, than in the studies which show what is happening as a result of asbestos exposures.

Asbestos happens to be a substance which has been rigorously researched,

and it is also a substance whose deadly effects are not felt until 20 to 30 years after an exposure. Asbestos, if improperly handled, can infect a worker, can infect members of his family, and can infect a nearby community.

The basic research regarding asbestos has been done by the great epidemiologists, Irving Selikoff and Cuyler Hammond, whose paper "Mortality Experience of Amosite Asbestos Factory Workers" presented at the Fourth International Pneumoniosis Conference last September contains much of the information we have on what asbestos exposure does to human beings.

I ask unanimous consent that this scientific paper be included at this point in the RECORD.

MORTALITY EXPERIENCE OF AMOSITE ASBESTOS FACTORY WORKERS

(By I. J. Selikoff, M.D., E. Cuyler Hammond, Sc. D. and J. Churg, M.D.)

(NOTE.—This research has been supported in part by research grant ES 00358 of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, U.S. Department of HEW.)

Possible gradations in the disease potential of the several commercially important asbestos fiber varieties has been considered important, since the industrial use of asbestos might be guided accordingly. (1) Experimental observations have not indicated any critical differences, at least insofar as mesothelioma is concerned. The tumors can be produced easily by intrapleural inoculation of various types of asbestos. (2) There is less information concerning experimental lung-cancer.

There are few data concerning the comparative neoplastic potential of the several kinds of asbestos in man. Some information is available for chrysotile (3), crocidolite (4) and anthophyllite (5). However, there has been no evidence to indicate that the amosite variety is so implicated. In large part this has been the result of epidemiological difficulties. Since, under industrial circumstances, there is often admixture of fiber varieties, the experiences of employed populations are not always readily ascribed to a single fiber variety. Diligent efforts have been made to investigate the occurrence of disease in the Transvaal in South Africa, the only area in which amosite is mined, and where populations exposed only to amosite could be identified. Environmental studies in this area, reported in 1964, showed no instance of mesothelioma in amosite miners and only isolated instances of carcinoma of the bronchus, although asbestosis was found (6). This survey has since been complemented by a study of miners in the area. The fate of white miners employed between 1954 and 1958 was investigated. Unfortunately, the records turned out to be imperfect and incomplete, since the caucasian work force in these mines was unstable. Moreover, no attempt was made to study the Bantu workmen, who are in the majority, since labor turnover is very high and "... records kept are such that follow-up of individuals over a period of time is impossible." (7) Only 147 white miners could be followed at all, and only 20 of these were observed for more than 20 years after first exposure to asbestos. Of these 20, there was 1 instance of lung cancer and none of mesothelioma. Elsewhere, comment is made that "The position of amosite is not clear ..." with only 1 pleural mesothelioma stated to be known in the Transvaal (8).

INCREASING USE OF AMOSITE IN THE UNITED STATES

Whether or not amosite is carcinogenic is of some practical importance. Because this variety of asbestos has not been reported to

cause cancer, there has been a tendency, as in Great Britain, to substitute it for other kinds of asbestos, especially crocidolite. Moreover, increasing amounts of amosite are being sent to the United States from South Africa. There is no record of amosite being imported before 1930 and to 1940, only small amounts were received. Since the second world war, the situation has changed. Annual imports have risen from less than 500 tons in 1935, to 4500 in 1945, 18,000 in 1955 and 21,400 tons in 1965 (Table 1).

These data should be considered with appreciation of the long lapsed period between onset of asbestos exposure and appearance of asbestos cancer—usually 20, 30 or more years. Such cancers as may be associated with the amosite now being imported will not become clinically evident until the 1990's or after the year 2,000.

CURRENT INVESTIGATION

We have investigated the mortality experience of a group of workmen occupationally exposed solely to amosite, whose employment started June 1941–December, 1945. This cohort has been followed through June 30, 1971.

Employed population

933 men were employed for varying periods of time in an asbestos products factory in an eastern city of the United States, starting work at some time between June, 1941, when the factory began production and December, 1945. The plant continued production until November, 1954, when it closed its doors. It manufactured amosite asbestos insulation, primarily for use in shipbuilding and ship repair.

We have sought to trace each of these men and have successfully done so in 868 instances (93%). In 65, tracing is still incomplete. Data concerning date of birth, onset of employment, duration of employment and type of work are known.

For the purposes of this report, we have investigated the mortality experience of those individuals who had at least one year of employment. There were 333 such men who began work, as noted, 1941–1945. 88 had died by Dec. 31, 1959. 15 were lost to follow-up. 230 were alive on Jan. 1, 1960 and each of these men has been followed since.

We have calculated expected death rates for these men Jan. 1, 1960–June 30, 1971, using age, year and sex specific rates for U.S. white males. Expected deaths were then compared with those observed.

Amosite exposure

No information is available concerning dust levels in this plant. Although exhaust ventilation was used, discussions with surviving workmen and plant management indicate that dust exposures, at least in some circumstances, could have been high. Respirators were issued to the work force but were in-constantly used.

We have ascertained that only amosite asbestos was used in this factory, in several ways:

1. Review with plant management indicated that only this fiber variety was purchased and utilized. This is consistent with the ship insulation specifications under which the products were made.
2. We have obtained samples of the products made and examination by polarized light microscopy, electron microscopy, electron diffraction and electron microprobe analysis, showed only amosite to be present.
3. Asbestos was still present in the factory building's storeroom. When retrieved and examined, this was found to be amosite, using the same analytical methods.
4. Several workmen had kept the respirators used by them during their period of employment. The filters in these respirators were studied. Fibers retained on the filters were removed and analyzed. They were invariably amosite.
5. We have extracted mineral fibers from

the lungs of individuals in this cohort, who had died. Very large numbers of fibers were present. Electron diffraction and electron microprobe analysis showed them to be amosite, (10) except for the occasional chrysotile fibril expected to be present in the lungs of urban dwellers in this area. (11)

Results

The mortality experience of this group of workmen, 1960–1971, demonstrates that a serious health hazard was associated with this industrial use of amosite.

Total deaths were among more than twice anticipated; 46.4 were expected and 105 occurred. This excess mortality was limited to two categories, cancer of various sites, and asbestosis.

14 deaths were due to asbestosis, whereas virtually none were expected. That amosite could result in asbestosis has been previously recognized. (7) In physiological studies of a select group of workmen in this factory from 1954, (12,13) serious pulmonary insufficiency was demonstrated.

Both lung cancer and mesothelioma were also found in considerable excess. 2.4 deaths of lung cancer were anticipated, 25 occurred. In calculating expected rates, smoking habits have been disregarded, since the smoking habits of individuals not examined by us are not accurately known. In prospective studies from this point on, smoking habits will be taken into account. (14)

Mesothelioma caused 5 deaths; 2 pleural and 3 peritoneal. Each has been histologically verified, in material obtained at operation in 2 instances and at autopsy in 3. In one case, there had been prior chrysotile exposure; in 4 only amosite asbestos exposure had occurred. Parenthetically, additional instances of mesothelioma have occurred among men working in this plant, other than in the cohort reported here.

It may be of interest that more deaths of cancer of stomach, colon and rectum have occurred than expected. The increase is only threefold, however. As with similar previous experiences, it is considered that further observations are required before this association be regarded as clearly established. (15)

CONCLUSIONS

These data indicate that occupational exposure to amosite asbestos can be associated with serious hazard of lung cancer, pleural and peritoneal mesothelioma, pulmonary asbestosis, and perhaps cancer of stomach, colon and rectum.

Its continued industrial use requires rigorous control, with appropriate industrial hygiene measures to eliminate this totally unacceptable occupational health hazard.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We are indebted to Mrs. Dorothy Perron, Mrs. Shirley Levine, Mrs. Rayla Margolies and Charles V. Nolan for their meticulous field investigations which have allowed us to establish the current status of this cohort of workmen.

REFERENCES

1. Report and Recommendations of the Working Group on Asbestos and Cancer, UICC. Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sc. 132:706–721, 1965.
2. Wagner, J. C. and Berry, G. Mesotheliomas in rats following inoculation with asbestos. Brit. J. Cancer 23:567–581, 1969.
3. McDonald, J. C., McDonald, A. D., Gibbs, G. W., Siemiatycki, J. and Rossiter, C. E. Mortality in the chrysotile asbestos mines and mills of Quebec. Arch. Env. Hlth. 22:677–686, 1971.
4. Wagner, J. C., Sleggs, C. A. and Marchand, P. Diffuse pleural mesothelioma and asbestos exposure in the North Western Cape Province. Brit. J. Indust. Med. 17:260–271, 1960.
5. Kivluoto, R. and Muerman, L. Results of asbestos exposure in Finland. International Conference on Pneumoconiosis, Johannesburg, 1969. Proceedings, Ed. H. A. Sha-

piro. Capetown, Oxford University Press, 1970, pp. 190-191.

6. Sluis-Cremer, G. K. Asbestosis in South Africa—certain geographical and environmental considerations. *Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sc.* 132:215-234, 1965.

7. Sluis-Cremer, G. K. Asbestosis in South African asbestos miners. *Envir. Res.* 3(4): 310-319, 1970.

8. Wagner, J. C. Editorial: Asbestos cancers. *J. Nat. Canc. Inst.* 46:v-ix, 1971.

9. Selikoff, I. J., Bader, R. A., Bader, M. E., Churg, J. and Hammond, E. C. Editorial: Asbestosis and neoplasia. *Am. J. Med.* 42(4): 487-496, 1967.

10. Langer, A. M., Rubin, I. and Selikoff, I. J. Electron microprobe analysis of asbestos bodies. *International Conference on Pneumoconiosis, Johannesburg, 1969. Proceedings*, Ed. H. A. Shapiro. Capetown, Oxford University Press, 1970, pp. 57-69.

11. Langer, A. M., Selikoff, I. J. and Sastre, A. Chrysotile asbestos in the lungs of persons in New York City. *Arch. Env. Hlth.* 22: 348-361, 1971.

12. Bader, M. E., Bader, R. A. and Selikoff, I. J. Pulmonary function in asbestosis of the lung; an alveolar-capillary block syndrome. *Amer. J. Med.* 30:235-242, 1961.

13. Bader, M. E., Bader, R. A., Teirstein, A. S. and Selikoff, I. J. Pulmonary function in asbestosis; serial tests in a long-term prospective study. *Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sc.* 132: 391-405, 1965.

14. Selikoff, I. J., Hammond, E. C. and Churg, J. Asbestos exposure, smoking and neoplasia. *JAMA* 204(2):106-112, 1968.

15. Selikoff, I. J., Churg, J. and Hammond, E. C. Asbestos exposure and neoplasia. *JAMA* 188:22-26, 1964.

TABLE 1.—CAUSES OF DEATH AMONG 230 AMOSITE ASBESTOS FACTORY WORKERS, JAN. 1, 1960, TO JUNE 30, 1971¹

Cause of death	Observed deaths	Expected deaths ²
Total cancer, all sites.....	43	8.5
Cancer of lung, pleura, bronchus, trachea.....	27	2.4
Lung cancer.....	25	(³)
Pleural mesothelioma.....	2	(³)
Peritoneal mesothelioma.....	3	(³)
Cancer of stomach, colon, rectum.....	5	1.6
Cancer of all other sites.....	8	4.5
Asbestosis.....	14	(³)
All other causes.....	48	37.9
Total deaths.....	105	46.4

¹ 333 workmen were employed in this factory 1 year or longer, 1941-45. 88 died by Dec. 31, 1959. 15 were lost to follow-up. The remainder, 230, have been studied to June 30, 1971. Analysis of lifetime work experience indicates that, for the very large majority, this was the only occupational asbestos exposure.

² Expected deaths: 1960-64 are based on U.S. age-specific rates for white males in 1962. For 1965-71, rates for 1968 were utilized.

³ U.S. data not available, but the figure should be only slightly less than 2.4.

⁴ U.S. data not available but these are rare causes of death in the general population.

COAST GUARD RESERVISTS RECEIVE THEIR DUE PRAISE

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1972

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, since the Coast Guard Reservists are often an overlooked part of our national military force, I would like to take this opportunity to present this article for the review of the Members of Congress because I feel it expresses clearly the very

vital role these men play in the defense of our Nation:

CGR'S PRAISED FOR WORK ON CRUISE TO GUAM

GUAM.—Three aging former seaplane tenders, making their final cruise under Coast Guard colors, may have signaled a new era for the Coast Guard Reserve.

The 311-foot high endurance cutters Absecon, Chincoteague and McCulloch were turned over to the Navy here May 9 after a 10,000-mile journey from Little Creek, Va.

For the trip, however, instead of their normal crews, the vessels were manned by nearly 50 percent Coast Guard Reservists.

It was the first time since World War II that such a large number of Reservists had been used to augment active-duty forces for a period of more than two weeks.

In addition to providing training for the Reservists, the project freed active-duty Coast Guardsmen who otherwise would have had to man the cutters.

The vessels, which eventually may be turned over to the South Vietnamese, were organized as Coast Guard Squadron 2 for the trip. In all, 275 Regulars and Reservists manned them.

Most of the Reservists took leaves of absence from school or jobs to participate in the cruise and some even quit their jobs to sail with the squadron.

Said Regular Master Chief Yeoman Orllon McWhorter, who served aboard Chincoteague, "I guess most of the Regulars were understandably apprehensive of the large number of Reservists we were going to have with us."

"But I think we found them more eager and more capable than we thought they would be."

McWhorter made his first cruise as a Coast Guardsman aboard Chincoteague in 1949 when she, too, was brand new to the service. He volunteered to serve on her last cruise as a Coast Guard vessel and with his retirement coming in August, the trip also will be his final cruise.

Capt. Herbert M. Hartlove, chief of the Reserve Planning Division of Coast Guard Headquarters, temporarily stepped down from his regular duties to serve as squadron commander and commanding officer of Absecon.

"I was fantastically satisfied with 'the Reservists,'" he said. "I always said our Reservists are a capable group of people. The experience of our Regulars and the enthusiasm of our Reservists are unbeatable."

All three ships had active-duty commanding officers but two of the three executive officers were Reservists.

Executive officer of Absecon was Cmdr. Dan H. Briganti, a marketing specialist for a Philadelphia industrial concern.

Briganti brought along his two high-school-age sons and planned to continue west with them after being detached from active duty in Guam. They were to complete an around-the-world trip, visiting the Philippines, Vietnam, Thailand, India, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and Spain before returning to the United States.

McCulloch's commanding officer was Cmdr. Ted L. Gannaway with Lt. Cmdr. Robert F. Boysen, Jr., XO. Boysen plans to spend the summer teaching Reservists at the Alameda, Calif., training center before returning to civilian teaching this fall.

Cmdr. Benjamin R. Shaeffer commanded the Chincoteague with Lt. Cmdr. Albert C. Buechler, executive officer. An active-duty Reservist, Buechler was to report to the 1st District at Boston at the end of the cruise to join the Reserve staff there.

Chincoteague also boasted a father and son aboard. Reserve Commissaryman F1st Peter T. Vinnette, Jr., took a leave of absence from his job in Syracuse to participate in the cruise and his son, active-duty Commis-

saryman Third Peter III, asked to be transferred to Chincoteague for the trip.

Summed up Hartlove: "The cruise proved to be a vivid example of how Regular and Reserve Coast Guardsmen can work together as one Coast Guard."

"Once some initial minor frictions were out of the way, the active-duty personnel gained a new perspective of the Reservists. And the Reservists had renewed regard for the professional capabilities of their active-duty counterparts."

As for the future, can Reservists be counted on to augment active-duty forces in other Coast Guard operations?

"There is no question about it," said Hartlove.

AFRICA—A PROSPECT OF RECONCILIATION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the heading preceding my remarks refers to the possibility of a reconciliation between the blacks and whites of Southern Africa. It is the title of a report by Colin Eglin, leader of the Progressive Party of South Africa on his tour of African states with Mrs. Helen Suzman in 1971.

The optimism of this heading and the report may or may not be warranted. But as Mr. Eglin's report indicates, there are some whites and blacks in South Africa still committed to peaceful multiracial development in that part of the world.

The report follows:

AFRICA—PROSPECT OF RECONCILIATION

At the end of 1971 I undertook a journey to seven countries in Africa. Botswana close to our border; Senegal, Gambia and Ghana in West Africa; Kenya and Tanzania in East Africa; Malawi, that attractive strip of land situated in a key position between Mozambique and its hostile neighbours Zambia and Tanzania.

During our tour Mrs. Suzman, M.P., who accompanied me to six of these countries, and I had the unique and valuable experience of having frank discussions with Government leaders in these countries. With President Seretse Khama in Botswana, President Leopold Senghor in Senegal, President Dauda Jawara in Gambia, Prime Minister Dr. Kofi Busia (recently deposed during a military coup), Vice-President Arap Moi and Attorney-General Charles Njonjo in Kenya, President Julius Nyerere in Tanzania and President Kamuzu Banda in Malawi.

Some of the leaders are regarded by South Africans as friendly and others as hostile. Some are advocates of dialogue, others oppose it. Some are against the use of force, while others are already involved in it. All are hopefully waiting for a sign of change in South Africa, all are affronted by the policy of apartheid—a policy which they see as one regarding Blacks as inferiors and treating them as such.

Why did I undertake my journey? What were the people like that I met? What about their countries, their citizens, their problems and achievements? And, what were the attitudes of these leaders towards the White in South Africa?

I return from my trip through Africa with a kaleidoscope of impressions, and yet there is one which dominates all others. It was the absence of race tension in the seven states I visited.

In fact, it was more than an absence of

tension. It was an apparent lack of race or colour consciousness.

Wherever I went—in the lounge of an hotel in Dar-es-Salaam, being served by a Black bank teller in Nairobi, being introduced to members of the Club Nation et Development in Dakar, shopping in the market place in Accra, on the crowded launch crossing the Gambia River or flying to Addis Adaba on Ethiopian Airlines—I could not help feeling that somehow colour and race were irrelevant.

This relaxed racial atmosphere was reflected not only in the mood of the people it was reflected in the attitudes of the Black leaders we met. Leader after leader proclaimed his commitment to non-racialism.

Take President Leopold Senghor of Senegal, for example. He asked, "How can race possibly be the test of a man's ability?"

Such a view was typical. Having cast off colonialism and the racialism which was part of it, it is as if the leaders of today are determined to show that in rising to independence their countries would also rise above policies of discrimination on the grounds of colour.

SOMBRE NOTE

It was President Julius Nyerere who struck a more sombre note when expressing his fear that a gulf could develop between White and non-White people around the world. "I am concerned for mankind. There is a risk that the non-White people will see the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism as a struggle against the White man. Race could become identified with issues. . . . The fact that there are White people in South Africa working for peaceful change provides a hope that in Africa we will be spared a catastrophic clash between White and Black."

The absence of race tension was one of the factors which turned my journey, undertaken originally as a political exercise, into a rewarding human experience. It is one of the reasons why I can say, too, that whatever the political advantage, either to the Progressive Party or even perhaps to South Africa as a result of my 18 days in Africa to the north, I feel a richer person for having been there.

My journey to the north was partly to satisfy an urge. I had always wanted to return there since being in Kenya in 1960 and 1965, in Zambia in 1964, and in Botswana in 1967.

For a long time I—and no doubt other South Africans—felt a sense of isolation here in Southern Africa, with no first-hand knowledge of the African continent which is having so profound an impact on South Africa's politics in the field of defense, foreign affairs, economics and race relations. I believed the time had come to attempt to establish contact with the African leaders in the states to the north.

LUSAKA MANIFESTO

I wanted to go to these countries to see for myself something of their problems and of their achievements, to discuss with these leaders their attitudes towards South Africa and to attempt to evaluate their attitudes, using the Lusaka Manifesto as a yardstick.

Incidentally, what a pity it is that we in South Africa have not paid more attention to this manifesto for, in spite of the knife-edge difference which it draws between the methods of negotiation and the method of violence, I believe it is a restrained and hopeful document—one of the most significant to come out of Africa in the 1960s.

Of course my journey was not without tensions, and doubts and apprehensions, but in the end Mrs. Suzman and I were overwhelmed by the warmth of the reception we received. We went to make political contacts, we returned having made personal friends.

There were moments when we were received with restraint and given critical or quizzical looks. This was when we were first introduced as South Africans. It was as if there was a veil between us and our hosts. "What does it feel like to sit between two

Black men?" I was asked over lunch when I was seated next to two lecturers from Legon University at Accra.

"What would you feel like if you, as the mother of two White daughters, found that one of your daughters had brought a Black man home to tea?" Mrs. Suzman was asked by an aggressive interviewer for a Ghanaian newspaper.

But the veil soon lifted when our hosts realised we were relaxed in their company. Soon their aloofness changed to warmth. We left with invitations to us to come back again, and with quite a few inquiries about the prospect of visits to South Africa.

In particular I recall the Kenya Parliament's enthusiastic reception of the Speaker's reference to "two distinguished friends in the gallery". President Jawara of Gambia's comment, "This is an historic occasion. I have often spoken about South Africans but this is the first occasion that I have spoken to White South Africans here in my country. And Prime Minister Dr. Kofi Busia of Ghana's quiet words, "I thank you for coming."

AFRICANISATION

During the past decade we have frequently heard the word Africanisation. In the countries to the north of us it is more than a slogan. It is a reality. Wherever we looked as we toured seven African states we found Black people doing work which in South Africa is generally done only by Whites.

There were Black bank tellers and Black bank managers. Black people were running the hotels, the shops, the factories.

There were the computer operators, the journalists, the broadcasters, the postmasters and the judges in the high courts.

Black women were air hostesses. And on some flights Black men piloted the aircraft.

I could not help thinking: How stupid we are in South Africa to endure a so-called labour shortage when millions of our own Black citizens are undertrained and underemployed. Surely, given the opportunity, Black South Africans will prove to be just as competent as Ghanaians, Kenyans or Senegalese.

To keep pace with the demand for sophisticated labour new high schools, polytechnics and universities—most of them with faculties of science, engineering and medicine—have been built. Dakar, Accra, Nairobi, Dar-es-Salaam Universities each have fine modern campuses. Even in tiny Gaborone, Botswana, a new campus of the University of Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland has just been opened.

An interesting feature of all the countries we visited was the impact of the French and English language. Not only is French or English the language of commerce and industry, it is the official language of the country. It is used in Parliament, in the courts, on government business. It is also the medium of instruction in the schools, right from the primary standards.

DIFFICULT TO BELIEVE

Black educationists in the north found it difficult to believe that Mr. Vorster's White Government insisted that Black South Africans be educated through the medium of the vernacular.

We saw evidence of solid economic progress. Much of this progress is still dependent on the infusion of capital and know-how through various international agencies, nevertheless one felt that the people were moving ahead.

Progress, however, has not been evenly spread and some states are desperately poor.

This is shown in some of the figures of the annual average income a head of population in the states we visited. These figures, compared with R462 for South Africa, are given in parentheses below.¹

¹These figures were corrected before the world-wide monetary adjustments were made.

Botswana (R73, 50) is excited following the discovery of diamonds at Arapa and copper and nickel in the Selebi-Pikwe area. Malawi (R35, 70 in 1969) has experienced a dramatic upturn in the gross national product in the last four years. Tanzania (R54, 60) is attempting to grapple with real poverty through its policy of African socialism. Kenya (R71, 40) has its capital, Nairobi, shooting skywards—five new first-class hotels and a new 23-story building crowned with a revolving restaurant.

The Gambia (R63) has a population of only 320,000 living in what is said to be a smugglers' paradise. There are package tours for Scandinavian holiday-makers and even a Swedish nudist colony at the mouth of the Gambia River! Senegal (R136, 50) has Dakar, once the commercial hub of what was formerly the French West-African empire. Now it is the chief city and port of the Senegal River States Organization.

Ghana (R225, 20) has a capital, Accra, with its harbour town of Tema, bustling with activity. Industrial development is taking place in the hinterland as well. Incidentally, the sharp drop in the world price of cocoa which annually forms more than 80 percent of Ghana's foreign currency, together with the annual payments of millions of rand which Ghana had to make to settle the debts made by the previous President Nkrumah, brought about an enormous rate of inflation. Just before Dr. Kofi Busia's rule was overthrown this year, he was forced to devalue the Ghanaian cedi by no less than 44 percent!

But what we found especially fascinating was the attention that these African states were giving to rural development. A strenuous attempt is being made to stabilise the population and so prevent a massive migration to the towns.

The tribal system of land tenure is giving way to individual land ownership. In these countries they realise that the stability which comes from the ownership of land is an essential factor in the development of a sound community.

Again I could not help saying to myself: "How crazy we are to allow our Bantu homelands to degenerate into vast rural slums." In Black Africa they encourage individual land ownership. In our country the White Government insists on the tribal system of land tenure for our Black citizens.

Incidentally, more than one person with whom I discussed our situation pointed out that in spite of the average income a head of population in South Africa being many times that in their countries the income a head earned in the Bantu homelands was actually less than that in the poorest African countries.

Remarkable one Ghanaian wryly: "And this is the part of your country in which Mr. Vorster's Government say Black South Africans can have their independence!"

ISOLATION OF OUR COUNTRY

One further impression. Even before I left South Africa I was struck by the isolation of our country from the rest of Africa. I soon realised it was easier to communicate with Dakar, Dar-es-Salaam, Nairobi and Accra through Paris, London, Bonn and New York than it was from either Johannesburg or Cape Town.

And while I travelled I sensed the insecurity of travelling in Africa on a South African passport. For the first time in my life I sensed what it must be like to be a Black man in the urban areas of South Africa. My freedom, my security and my movement depended on a stamp in a book and so often in getting that stamp I was at the mercy of some petty Government official.

The heads of government I met on my tour of seven African states were all sophisticated, intelligent and well-educated men, men who would be a credit to any Cabinet anywhere in the world.

All have travelled widely, all have a good

grasp of modern problems and all have post-graduate degrees.

There is President Seretse Khama of Botswana, who studied at Fort Hare and Witwatersrand Universities before going on to read law at Oxford and the Middle Temple, London. President Leopold Senghor of Senegal is a member of the Agreges de Grammaire, the highest French academic society. As a poet he was in 1962 a strong contender for the Nobel Prize for Literature. He has twice represented France at UNESCO. In 1969 and 1960 he was the minister-counsellor for Cultural Affairs, Education and Justice in the French Government.

President Dauda Jawara of Gambia is a veterinary surgeon with six years of study behind him at Edinburgh. Dr. Kofi Busia of Ghana has a Ph. D. in history and sociology and was a lecturer for six years at St. Anthony's College, Oxford.

In Kenya, Vice President D. T. Arap Moi was formerly a teacher, while our host, Mr. Charles Njonjo, the Attorney General, received a BA degree from Fort Hare University before going on to the London School of Economics and to a practice at Grey's Inn in London. President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania has an MA degree from Edinburgh University and Dr. Kamuzu Banda of Malawi has a Ph. D. degree from Chicago University and an M.D. degree from Nashville, Tennessee, in the United States.

But it was not only the heads of government who impressed us in this way. It was the breadth of knowledge of the assistants as well.

The young man in the president's office, the secretary in the department of foreign affairs, the newspaper editors, the broadcasters, the academicians.

Time and time again one found that these people had obtained degrees at Makerere University in Uganda or Legon University in Accra or at the University of Dakar and had then gone on to do post-graduate study at the Sorbonne, Columbia, Chicago, Edinburgh, London or Leningrad Universities.

These younger men, who will be the leaders of tomorrow, are modern men with a grasp of the politics of the 20th century.

MESSAGE FOR SOUTH AFRICA

We asked the leaders we met: "What message can we take back to the people in South Africa?"

Different leaders put it in different ways, but the message was basically the same.

"We are not anti-South African per se. We are not opposed to South Africa because of its four million Whites, not even because it has a White Government. We are not opposed to your people but we are unalterably opposed to your policy of race discrimination."

The leaders with whom Mrs. Suzman and I spoke understand the complexities of the South African situation. They appreciate the fears of the minority groups in Southern Africa. They realise, too, that change could best come from within South Africa.

They recognise the permanence of the White man in South Africa. They acknowledge the case for the protection of minorities. They recognise, too, that the time table for the implementation of a new policy cannot be forced from outside.

They made no attempt to prescribe a detailed policy to South Africa, but they made it clear that as long as South Africa had a policy of race discrimination entrenched in its law, as long as men were denied dignity and opportunity because of their colour, the country could not be accepted into the African community.

I believe that all the leaders we met want to see a resolution of the situation in Southern Africa, that they are all looking for signs of a change, that they would all prefer peace to violence.

In the words of the Lusaka Manifesto to which they subscribed: "We would prefer to negotiate rather than destroy, to talk rather than to kill."

But their attitude to dialogue with South Africa differed widely. President Julius

Nyerere of Tanzania would have nothing to do with dialogue with the South African Government until it changed its policy of race discrimination.

President Kamuzu Banda of Malawi said that he was prepared to engage in dialogue in the hope that this would bring about a change. President Seretse Khama said that for dialogue to be meaningful it should start in South Africa among South Africans.

The Kenyans, perhaps because a number of them were educated at South African universities, adopted a somewhat cynical view towards dialogue and asked: "Do you really think that talking will cause Mr. Vorster to change?"

WILLINGNESS TO TALK

President Senghor and President Jawara showed no special interest in talking to the apartheid government, but did indicate a willingness to talk to people who wanted change in South Africa.

Prime Minister Dr. Busia of Ghana has already declared himself in favour of contact as a means of bringing about change.

He was, however, prepared to consider dialogue as "another weapon in the armoury of the strategy for the elimination of apartheid." Because of his attitude he was strongly criticised by the Opposition in his country.

I return to South Africa more than ever convinced that it is possible for us to resolve the problems of our multi-racial country; that Black, White and Brown can cooperate within South Africa. I believe that there can be a reconciliation between South Africa and the states to the north.

But there can be neither co-operation within South Africa nor reconciliation with the rest of Africa as long as we treat men of colour as lesser beings. When there is a meaningful change in the direction of human dignity and equal opportunity for all South Africans not only will the doors of dialogue be thrown wide open but we will be able to play our full part as the leading independent state on the African continent.

The ball is in our court.

SENATE—Monday, June 19, 1972

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in Thy holiness, justice, goodness, and truth, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee for life and liberty and national well-being. Preserve this Nation under Thy sovereignty that it may increasingly serve Thy purposes for all mankind. Keep the President and all our leaders under Thy grace and guide them by Thy wisdom through the perilous times in which we live. Direct us in our labors in this Chamber that what we think and say and do may enhance the Nation's welfare and promote Thy kingdom among men and nations.

And to Thee we ascribe all glory and praise. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the CXVIII—1343—Part 17

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., June 19, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. RANDOLPH thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 16, 1972, the President had approved and signed the bill (S. 1736) to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, to provide for financing the acquisition, construction, alteration, maintenance, operation, and protection of public buildings, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. RANDOLPH) 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 Senate proceedings.)

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 16, 1972, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Legislative Calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.