

xxx-x... Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas Edward Fitzpatrick, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Magoun Wallace II, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Neale Mackinnon, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harold Gregory Moore, xxx-xx-x... Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Echols Spragins, xxx-xx-x... Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Terrell Carley, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Peter George Olenchuk, xxx-xx-x... Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frank Anton Hinrichs, xxx-xx-xx... Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Curtis Wheaton Chapman, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Chester M. McKeen, Jr.; xxx-xx-x... Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Dean Van Lydegraf, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Banks Cooper, xxx-xx-x... Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Dennis Philip McAuliffe, xxx-xx-x... Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Edward McConnell, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Carter McAlister, xxx-xx-x... Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Herbert Joseph McChrystal, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SPEEDY TRIAL

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, last November I introduced a bill designed to insure the prompt disposition of criminal cases arising in Federal district courts, and this legislation was drawn up in light of evidence of increasing time intervals between the arrest of criminals and their trials.

Nevertheless, steps are being taken in many areas throughout the country to correct the problems caused by backlogs in courtroom dockets. An article recently appearing in the Cincinnati Enquirer helps to illustrate what is being done in my own congressional district, where judges are under strict orders from Chief Justice C. Williams O'Neill of the Ohio Supreme Court to expedite the disposition of criminal cases.

Mr. Speaker, it is highly gratifying to note this kind of response from State and local officials to insure the guarantee of criminal defendants to a "speedy and public trial." Properly implemented across the land, speedier trials will certainly help to reduce the overall crime rate, as well as help to restore a measure of lost confidence in the ability of our judicial institutions to deliver a fair and prompt application of the law to all offenders.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this article from the Cincinnati Enquirer into the RECORD at this point:

JUDGES REDUCE BACKLOG OF CASES

Under the watchful eyes of the Ohio Supreme Court, local Common Pleas Court judges have reduced their backlog of pending cases this year.

Cases awaiting final disposition dropped from 6089 in January to 5546 in June, according to statistics released by the Supreme Court this week. During this period, 3424 new cases were filed.

The figures used by the high court were supplied by the 11 local judges, who, for the first time, are individually accountable for all matters before them.

Previously, the 11 judges combined their figures into a single report which was submitted to the Supreme Court.

Ohio Supreme Court Chief Justice C. William O'Neill believes the new system making each judge responsible for his docket has speeded up case disposition throughout the state.

Many local Courthouse observers agree and say Hamilton County Common Pleas Court judges are working harder and disposing of more cases than ever.

According to the figures, in the first six months of his year, judges disposed of an average of 362 cases, including 145 criminal cases. They had an average 504 cases pending, including 76 criminal cases. During this time there was an average of 311 new cases filed per judge.

Here are the actual figures released by the Supreme Court showing cases disposed of during the first six months of 1972 and cases pending as of June 30:

Judge Gilbert Bettman, cases disposed, 381; cases pending, 439.

Judge Lyle Castle, cases disposed, 407; cases pending, 486.

Judge Frank Gusweiler, cases disposed, 296; cases pending, 552.

Judge John Keefe, cases disposed, 292; cases pending, 589.

Judge Ralph Kohnen, cases disposed, 302; cases pending, 499.

Judge Robert Kraft, cases disposed, 441; cases pending, 510.

Judge William S. Matthews, cases disposed, 321; cases pending, 496.

Judge William R. Matthews, cases disposed, 463; cases pending, 601.

Judge William Morrissey, cases disposed, 409; cases pending, 470.

Judge Melvin Rueger, cases disposed, 387; cases pending, 424.

Judge Robert Wood, cases disposed, 290; cases pending, 480.

EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR TEST AT AMCHITKA, ALASKA, A YEAR AGO

HON. MIKE GRAVEL

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, the data and evidence of the effects of the AEC underground nuclear test at Amchitka, Alaska, a year ago are still trickling in. At the time I opposed the test on the grounds that it was unnecessary from a weapons standpoint, it was hurtful to our international relations and was unduly destructive environmentally. A news story in the Washington Post of July 23, 1972, presents further information on the ecological damage reported. The number of sea otters killed in that blast was at least 1,000 as opposed to the AEC claim that only 18 otters died. In the interest of sharing this information with Senators who may have missed the informative news item, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMCHITKA OTTER KILL HELD 1,000

(By Dennis Cowals)

AMCHITKA ISLAND, ALASKA.—A month-long survey on this remote Aleutian island has convinced biologists that shock waves from last November's underground test of a prototype anti-missile nuclear warhead killed as many as 1,000 sea otters.

But Alaska State game Biologist Karl Schneider, a sea otter specialist who had claimed earlier that the five megaton hydrogen bomb killed more otters than the Atomic Energy Commission admitted or had predicted before the Nov. 6 blast, says there is "no significant long-term damage" to the island's otter population.

Scientists believe 6,000 to 8,000 sea otters inhabit this rocky, treeless island, 1,200 miles southwest of Anchorage, Alaska.

Schneider said recently completed population surveys "didn't change our opinions of what happened a great deal."

AEC CLAIM CHALLENGED

A week after the detonation of project Cannikin more than a mile underground, Schneider and other state biologists challenged the AEC's claim that only 18 otters died, suggesting instead that 800 to 1,000 had been killed along a seven-mile stretch of Bering Sea beach.

Dr. Melvin R. Meritt, the AEC's top environmental effects scientist for Cannikin and the island's 1969 Milrow test, doubted the charge, saying he "couldn't believe 800 otters were killed." A month before the blast, AEC scientists had predicted that perhaps 240 otters would die as a result of the test.

But a savage, 100-mile-an-hour Aleutian storm swept the island the night before the test. Its dying gusts would have removed the evidence, carrying away nearly all of the otters that were killed by the blast, Schneider and others countered.

Only comparison studies requiring a new otter census this year would settle the matter, the scientists agreed.

From the Las Vegas test headquarters of the AEC, an agency spokesman admitted the discrepancy between otter counts made this summer and last.

The highest otter tally along the area showed 1,215 animals in the area. "This year the count was 452," the spokesman said. "It is assumed there are fewer sea otters there because of Cannikin," he allowed.

An official report is expected this fall, he said, following yet another autumn otter census which will be compared with a similar study made a month before the test.

This summer's work, involving researchers from federal, state and university laboratories under contract to the AEC, revealed "a clear pattern of otters coming into the area from both sides," said biologist Schneider.

PREPARING TO LEAVE

While the otters are moving in to reclaim their feeding and rearing grounds, the AEC's 300-man work force is packing up and preparing to move off the island the agency has occupied for more than five years and in which it has invested more than \$200 million leading up to the Cannikin test.

This month, workmen had begun dismantling the trailer camps which once housed 700 men, reeling in more than 1,000 miles of cable stretched across the tundra, and generally trying to clean up the debris left from AEC's tenancy.

The 200-man camp from which scientists triggered the controversial blast has already been dismantled and trucked 42 miles along the spine of the barren island to Constantine Harbor, where it now awaits shipment to an Air Force radar station at Shemya, 225 miles farther down the Aleutian chain.

But teams of biologists and other scientists will keep coming back to Amchitka over the years to check for leaking radioactivity at the AEC's two test sites and another used by the Defense Department in 1965.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH RECORDING REQUIREMENTS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in order to carry out the purposes of the Williams-Steiger Occupational Safety and Health Act, employers are required to keep and make available to the Secretary of Labor records on certain activities under the act. Employers are also required to maintain accurate records and periodic reports of work-related deaths, injuries, and illnesses.

The Department of Labor's recent proposal to exempt businesses of fewer than eight employees from certain record-keeping requirements is a sensible move. This proposal would serve to reduce the amount of paperwork now required of the small businessman. As you know, the Department continues to want to develop, even with this exception, a capability of judging the hazards in those businesses. This, it seems to me, is vital to our effort to begin to pull together the kind of accurate data which we now lack about the extent of accidents at the worksite.

I am pleased to share with my colleagues the following proposal to amend the recordkeeping requirements under the Occupational Safety and Health Act, as published in the Federal Register for Wednesday, July 10, 1972:

[Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, 29 CFR Part 1904]

SAFETY AND HEALTH RECORDS AND REPORTING SMALL EMPLOYERS

Pursuant to section 8 of the Williams-Steiger Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 657) and Secretary of Labor's Order No. 12-71 (36 F.R. 8754), it is hereby proposed to amend 29 CFR Part 1904 by establishing a new § 1904.15 to read as set forth below to facilitate compliance with recording and reporting requirements by employers with fewer than eight (8) em-

ployees. As used in the proposal, the term "employee" is used without limitation. Therefore, the term is intended to include all employees, whether full-time employees, part-time employees, or seasonal employees.

The proposal is in furtherance of section 8(d) of the Act providing, among other things, that information obtained by the Secretary be obtained with a minimum burden upon employers, especially those operating small businesses.

Written data, views, and arguments concerning the proposal may be submitted to the Office of Occupational Safety and Health Statistics, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Room 3818, 441 G Street NW., Washington, DC 20212, within 30 days after the publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER. The data, views, and arguments will be available for public inspection and copying at that office.

The new § 1904.15 would read as follows: § 1904.15 Small employers.

Any employer who had no more than seven (7) employees at any one time during the calendar year immediately preceding a current calendar year, shall meet his obligations under this part by: (a) Complying with any reporting obligations under § 1904.8 concerning fatalities or multiple hospitalization accidents, and (b) meeting any obligations for maintaining a log of occupational injuries and illnesses under § 1904.2 and for making reports under § 1904.21 upon being notified in writing by the Bureau of Labor Statistics that the employer has been selected to participate in a statistical survey of occupational injuries and illnesses.

(Sec. 8, 84 Stat. 1598; 29 U.S.C. 657)

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 10th day of July 1972.

G. C. GUENTHER,
Assistant Secretary of Labor.

[FR Doc.72-11105 Filed 7-18-72; 8:53 am]

OIL IMPORT CARGO PREFERENCE AMENDMENT

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, later this week it is expected that the Senate will begin consideration of H.R. 13324, the maritime authorization. Included in the bill is a provision requiring that 50 percent of oil imports, excluding residual fuel and No. 2 fuel oil, be carried on costly U.S.-flag tankers.

On three separate occasions—June 13, 29, and 30—I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD correspondence between myself and each of several Cabinet officials concerning the oil import cargo preference amendment. To date the responses from these officials, including the Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, Mrs. Virginia Knauer, have been unanimous in their opposition to this amendment.

I further invite attention to the letter which I received from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, Mr. J. Fred Buzhardt, dated July 21. It is the opinion of the Department that:

The enactment of Section 3 of H.R. 13324, as reported in the Senate, *would be inimical to the nation's security.* (emphasis added).

In addition, Mr. President, I have received a memorandum on the cargo preference amendment in H.R. 13324, pre-

pared by the economists Oscar and Edna Gass. Their conclusions concerning the effect of such an amendment include, among others, the following:

The added costs of the more expensive U.S.-flag tanker operations will . . . in time, be borne by the whole body of Americans, partly as taxpayers and partly as consumers of oils.

We would expect a U.S.-flag "cargo preference" program to contribute significantly to the already-ongoing "export" of petroleum refinery capacity from the United States.

The balance of reasoning and of experienced judgment stands *against* the proposition that "cargo-preference" for commercial import tankers will contribute to the National Security of the United States.

Mr. President, these statements speak for themselves as to the undesirability of imposing for the first time a restrictive cargo preference requirement on the carriage of private commercial cargoes. I ask unanimous consent that copies of my correspondence with the Department of Defense and a summary of the memorandum by Oscar and Edna Gass be printed in the RECORD.

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

JUNE 16, 1972.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Senate Committee on Commerce recently reported the bill, H.R. 13324, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1973 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

In reporting this bill the Committee amended it by inserting a new section 3, the effect of which is to require that at least 50% of all oil imported on a quota basis, allocations or licenses, other than residual fuel oil to be used as fuel and No. 2 fuel oil, be carried on higher-costing U.S. flag tanker vessels. I and several of my colleagues opposed this amendment when it was considered in Committee and presently intend to move to strike it at such time as the Senate considers this bill.

Enclosed is a copy of the bill, H.R. 13324, and the report of the Committee accompanying it (Rept. No. 92-841). You will observe that a considerable portion of this report is devoted to trying to justify this oil import cargo preference amendment on such grounds as national security (see pages 12 and 13) and the alleged unavailability of vessels of the so-called "Effective U.S.-Controlled Fleet (EUSC)" (see pages 17-19). Knowing that your Department does conduct continuing studies on our national seafight requirements, and that such matters as national security come within the particular expertise of the Department of Defense, I would appreciate receiving your comments on those portions of the Committee's report which seek to justify section 3 of the bill, H.R. 13324, on these grounds.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

NORRIS COTTON,
U.S. Senator.

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., July 21, 1972.

HON. NORRIS COTTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR COTTON: This is in response to your letter of June 16, 1972, requesting comment with respect to certain portions of the Committee report on H.R. 13324, 92d Congress, a bill "To authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1973 for certain mari-

time programs of the Department of Commerce." The portions of the report to which you make reference are those justifying the bill's oil import cargo preference amendment on the grounds of national security and the unavailability of vessels of the so-called "Effective U.S. Controlled Fleet (EUSC)."

The growing dependence of the United States on foreign oil is a matter of great concern to the Department of Defense. That dependence poses a threat to the security and well being of the nation, in the event that availability of foreign oil is denied, whether through political, economic or military actions.

A key factor in insuring our capability to move oil over hostile seas, or to provide flexibility of source, is an adequate tanker fleet which can be relied on for delivery of whatever oil is available during periods of political or economic stress of war. U.S. flag vessels with American crews are the most reliable source of ocean transport. Availability of Effective U.S. Controlled (EUSC) vessels or other foreign flag vessels is of course less assured. However, in view of the probable denial of some oil sources, a possible reduction in world civil consumption in times of stress, and the surplus in world tanker tonnage, it does not appear that non-availability of tankers, although of concern, would be the only problem in some future crisis. From a security standpoint, we believe the oil problem centers heavily on the availability of the oil itself, and in time of war, the ability to provide adequate protection for tankers on the high seas.

Even if it were to be concluded that a substantial portion of our oil import should move in U.S. flag vessels for security reasons, we do not believe that H.R. 13324 would accomplish that purpose. By exempting fuel oil from its provisions the bill would leave the East Coast totally dependent on foreign vessels for a vital segment of its oil supply. And by financially penalizing the U.S. refiner of fuel oils who would be required to import half his crude oil in U.S. flag vessels, it would discourage increases in domestic fuel oil refining capacity, already in critically short supply, and encourage expanded offshore construction of refineries with attendant security risks.

The bill would lend further encouragement to the already developing trend towards the construction of offshore transshipment terminals, and do much to eliminate the economic pressure for construction of deep water ports in the U.S. In the process, the 50% U.S. flag rule would apply to a declining volume of direct shipments from oil sources to the U.S., and to an increasing volume of short haul relay movements. The total U.S. flag tonnage likely to result from application of H.R. 13324 under those circumstances would be only a small fraction of the total tonnage involved in the delivery of oil to the United States.

The degree of improved security which might accrue from the relatively small gain in U.S. flag vessels would be more than offset by likely developments resulting from application of similar legislation by foreign nations on which we depend for oil. A growing percentage of our imports might then depend on the availability of giant crude carriers wearing the flag of oil supplying nations instead of the third party nations now providing flags of convenience. Thus, a nation which chose to deny supply of its oil, could simultaneously deny us the means to transport replacement oil from other sources.

In view of the foregoing, it is the view of the Department of Defense that the enactment of Section 3 of H.R. 13324, as reported in the Senate, would be inimical to the nation's security.

Sincerely,

J. FRED BUZHARDT.

MEMORANDUM

Preliminary Observations on the Proposal to Accord Legal Preference to US-Flag Tankers in the Carriage of 50% of Imports of Oils (with certain exceptions)

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

1. If not offset by substantial export of US refinery capacity, the proposal to preempt 50% of all US imports of oils (excepting residual and no. 2), through US-flag "cargo-preference", would require the construction, in US shipyards, of something like 3,600,000 deadweight tons of ocean-going tankers, in each of the next 12 years.

2. This building of tankers, on a steady schedule, would give rise to perhaps 50,000 to 60,000 permanent manufacturing jobs, in the shipyards and in the establishments of the shipyards' suppliers.

As these new tankers came into service, the permanent operating jobs afforded, to US seafaring men, would gradually cumulate to a total, toward 1985, of perhaps 5,000 to 10,000—the exact number depending both on the characteristic ship-size adopted and on the degree of continued overmanning on US ships.

3. The construction subsidy cost, to the Treasury of the United States, of this program of pre-empting tanker import cargo would be a minimum of \$110 per deadweight ton. This would mean a minimum subsidy cost of \$400 million annually or a total subsidy in the range of \$5 billion for the 12-year program.

The US Treasury would then be paying a subsidy of some \$7,000 each year for every job this program created in US manufacturing.

4. We do not have any reliable way to estimate how much more will be charged, on import carriage from the increasingly distant origins of oils, by US-flag tankers, under conditions of 50% monopoly, than would be charged by fully competitive foreign-flag tankers. We merely report the opinion, now current in Washington, that US-flag vessels are likely to charge, on the average, something like 50¢ per barrel more.

Such a 50¢ additional charge would yield, toward 1985, on oils "eligible" for cargo-preference, something like \$2¼ million per day or more than \$800 million per year! We do not characterize this total as probable or improbable. We do however urge that every reasonable step of policy and administration be taken to prevent the emergence of such a monstrous development of the current US maritime ideology of "operating-differential" subsidies.

Were this 50¢ added charge indeed to be paid, it would amount (on the basis of 10,000 additional seafaring jobs) to an additional burden of \$80,000 each year for each additional American seafaring man afforded employment by this program.

5. In the very short run, where the U.S. general price level of oils does not move, we anticipate that higher import costs for crude oils (whether arising from added tanker charges or any other cost) will operate to diminish the profitability of U.S. refining and marketing.

In the long-run, however, when capital must be attracted into U.S. oils to permit expansion, there is no presumption that higher materials import costs will operate to reduce the rate of profit in American oil refining and marketing. It is therefore to be anticipated that these higher costs will be "passed on" to others.

The added costs of the more expensive U.S.-flag tanker operations will then come, in time, to be borne by the whole body of Americans, partly as taxpayers and partly as consumers of oils.

6. We would expect a U.S.-flag "cargo-preference" program to contribute significantly to the already-ongoing "export" of petroleum refinery capacity from the United

States. This export involves especially a near-circle of offshore territories, for whom the long-haul foreign-flag carriage precedes refining. The location of these refineries abroad might involve, in the next decade, a multi-billion dollar outflow of capital, together with the export from the United States of the related skilled employments. These would be employments both in petroleum refining and in other industries which are advantageously located when they can receive short-distance deliveries from refineries.

7. U.S.-flag "cargo-preference" would operate, like any other factor which increases the cost of foreign oils delivered to U.S. ports, to facilitate the raising of the prices of domestically produced American crude oils.

8. The burden of "cargo-preference" will fall unevenly on various groups of firms in U.S. petroleum refining and marketing.

(a) The smaller refiners will be more damaged than the larger. The smaller refiners now receive a relatively larger share of crude import quotas, and they will correspondingly lose more when import rights (burdened by "cargo-preference" costs) lose some of their value.

(b) The "independent" refining companies (who produce in the U.S. little of their own crudes) will be more damaged than the "integrated" companies (who largely produce in the U.S. the crude oils they refine here).

(c) The companies already positioned in ocean-going tanker operations may be less damaged than others.

9. The balance of reasoning and of experienced judgment stands against the proposition that "cargo-preference" for commercial import tankers will contribute to the National Security of the United States. One element in the current pattern is large (about 25%) American ownership and control of the worldwide commercial tanker fleet, though dominantly through economical (and non-controlling) "flags of convenience".

This pattern has proven compatible with nearly worldwide (fully 90%) tanker cooperation in "crisis management" whenever the ocean-going oil supply has been threatened with disturbance. "Cargo-preference" would breach this cooperation, through segmentation and counter-segmentation of world tanker carriage. For the National Security of the US, the consequence would more probably be loss than gain.

10. A substantial alleviation of the burden and damage of "cargo-preference" would result if, in the basic enactment, the initial experience of preference were limited to the carriage of tanker cargo originating in the Western Hemisphere. This limitation would reflect recognition that there are not, at present, the US-flag tankers which would be required for a responsible 50% participation in worldwide tanker movements to the US. The regional limitation would reduce—though not eliminate—the "scalping" of importers by tanker operators. Properly formulated, such a limitation would also provide for a review by the Congress, after a term of years, when the experiment could be abandoned or enlarged.

11. An even more fundamental alleviation would be constituted by a provision, in the enabling legislation, that no requirement of "cargo-preference" should operate to bar any US refining company from using the cheapest import transportation it could find, including foreign-flag tankers, to carry to the United States a minimum of 25% of all the crude oil the company must purchase for refining in the US, after deducting from its total refinery runs the full amount of crude oil this refining company itself produces in the US. This alleviation would give recognition to the fact that, on present trends, imported crude oils from overseas are likely to become, in the next decade, fully as important an element in US crude oil supply as the entire production of crude and field

condensate of the "lower 48" States. It would reflect recognition also that, in the measure that a refiner needs to make net purchases of crude oils for his own US refining, he is not benefited by the crude import quota system which operates to raise the prices of domestic US crudes. This net buyer of crude oils for refining needs competitively, in proportion to his crude buying requirements, to have access to the cheapest crude imports—supported by the cheapest tanker transportation—anywhere available.

12. "Cargo-preference" belongs to the profoundly defeatist camp of public economic policy. Such defeatism regularly looks, in international transactions, toward curtailing US expenditures on (cheap, competitive) imports of goods and services and then substituting for these imports more expensive domestic production of equivalent things. A US economic policy not permeated by this defeatist outlook would look rather toward increasing US incomes by expanding American exports of those goods and services in which US production is most competitive.

It is of the nature of the defeatist approach to arise from an initial weakness and to deepen the weakness from which it springs.

OAKLAND NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF BUSINESS DOES GREAT JOB

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to express my appreciation for the magnificent efforts of the Metropolitan Oakland Area National Alliance of Businessmen, and especially their former chairman, Mr. Edward J. Daly.

Under the inspired 4-year leadership of Chairman Daly, the Oakland NAB energetically pursued the development of jobs for the hard-core unemployed and the returning veteran. The Oakland NAB has proven itself to be of invaluable aid to the community by activity engaging business participation in combating the crisis in unemployment.

During the tenure of Mr. Daly, 8,256 deserving persons found full-time employment in over 351 companies, both large and small; 9,800 young people found summer jobs; and 38 companies loaned 90 executives to help in the organization and operation of the JOBS program.

These figures alone, however, only provide a measure of progress, they are not a final analysis of result. They are but the indicators of an on-going commitment by aware private industry and concerned individuals, such as Mr. Daly, to solving one of the major problems facing America today.

The response of these men and their companies to the often heard call for involvement in civic affairs has been honest and unhesitating. Those who work to further the goals of the National Alliance of Businessmen unselfishly give of their time and energy because they know how desperately their services are needed by this Nation's underprivileged.

Mr. Edward Daly, as president and chairman of the board of World Airways, is an outstanding example of a man who has been willing to add to the

burdens of his position and do whatever he can to end the pressing problem of unemployment in the Oakland metropolitan area. His selfless devotion to the NAB and its purposes should not only serve as an example to us all, it should reassure us of the value—not to mention the necessity—of individual involvement for the good of the community.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I again wish to state my deepest appreciation for the fine service rendered the people of the Oakland area by Mr. Daly and the National Alliance of Businessmen.

AHEPA CELEBRATES ITS GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association celebrates its golden anniversary this month. It was 50 years ago that the order was founded, on July 26, 1922, in Atlanta, Ga.

The aims of this fine organization reflect a highmindedness worthy of every American. In addition to the good fellowship which one finds in the order loyalty to the United States and respect for its institutions and laws are paramount objectives.

The educational goals have found tangible expression in the form of financial support for scholarships and institutions of higher learning both here and abroad.

Few fraternal organizations have contributed so much to aid the victims of national disaster than the Order of Ahepa.

I am proud to be able to count myself as a member, and I cherish the friendships which I have found there as much as I do the ideals for which it stands.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to salute this great order on its 50th anniversary, and I am appending the names of our local chapter officers in the Commonwealth of Virginia:

ORDER OF AHEPA

VIRGINIA

Local chapter officers

John Samos, President, Newport News.
Theodore Takis, Vice President, Newport News.

Mickey Markos, Secretary, Newport News.
Peter Savrides, Treasurer, Newport News.
George Zambos, President, Fredericksburg.
Mike G. Kontounadis, Vice President, Fredericksburg.

James Govenides, Secretary, Fredericksburg.

Mitchell P. Raftelis, Treasurer, Fredericksburg.

Arthur Craten, President, Alexandria.
Nicholas Collasanto, Vice President, Alexandria.

Emanuel Psarakis, Secretary, Alexandria.
Nicholas Charuhas, Treasurer, Alexandria.
Stephen Andrews, President, Williamsburg.
Dr. Pete N. Poulos, Vice President, Williamsburg.

Col. Christopher L. Pappas, Secretary, Williamsburg.

John Baganakis, Secretary, Williamsburg.

Constantine A. Anthony, President, Arlington.

Harry Brown, Vice President, Arlington.

Chris A. Varelán, Secretary, Arlington.

Michael P. Pappas, Treasurer, Arlington.

Pano Liatos, President, Richmond.

Frank Yannis, Vice President, Richmond.

G. T. Georges, Secretary, Richmond.

X. Morris, Treasurer, Richmond.

Theodore Boyce, President, Norfolk.

Joseph Mandeleris, Vice President, Norfolk.

Stanley C. Passaris, Secretary, Norfolk.

George Pahnó, Recording Secretary, Norfolk.

N. G. Theodisious, Treasurer, Norfolk.

Paul C. Flegas, President, Roanoke.

James V. Mallis, Vice President, Roanoke.

John G. Peroulas, Secretary, Roanoke.

James Tames, Treasurer, Roanoke.

George Kolidakis, President, Hopewell.

Dean Vonetes, Vice President, Hopewell.

James Matthews, Secretary, Hopewell.

James Basis, Treasurer, Hopewell.

Milton Sarris, Secretary, Arlington.

Ken Bellas, Treasurer, McLean.

Current national officers

Col. Peter N. Derzis, Chairman, Supreme Trustee, Arlington.

John Angelopoulos, Ahepa Mother Lodge, Danville.

Current district lodge officers

George Johnson, Lt. Governor, Arlington.

Milton Sarris, Secretary, Arlington.

Chris A. Varelán, Athletic Director, Falls Church.

Past national officers

Alfred G. Vonetes, Past Supreme Lodge, Hopewell.

John P. Angelson, Past Supreme Lodge, Norfolk.

PENNSYLVANIA ANALYZES STATE INSURANCE PROBLEMS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the State of Pennsylvania is taking what may be a leader's role in analyzing State insurance problems.

The following article should be of interest to all who purchase life insurance: VARIATION IN SURETY COST CITED—CHARGES CAN DOUBLE FROM FIRM TO FIRM

(By Bob Woodward)

A national shopper's guide for life insurance shows that some major companies charge more than twice as much as others for similar policies, and that some of the best known firms charge the most for coverage.

Among the life insurance firms doing business in the Washington area, for example, average annual cost for the same \$10,000 straight life policy from Connecticut Mutual Life is \$22.40 compared to \$53.10 a year from Travelers Insurance Co.

This means that over 20 years it takes to pay off such a policy, the Connecticut Mutual subscriber would pay \$448, compared to \$1,062 paid by a subscriber of Travelers.

The national shopper's guide was released this month by Pennsylvania's crusading insurance commissioner, Dr. Herbert S. Denenberg, as an outgrowth of a shopper's guide released in April for firms selling life insurance in Pennsylvania.

The national guide shows the actual cost of insurance after the insured person has paid premiums and deducted the ultimate cash value of the policy and the money paid back by the company in dividends.

This method of arriving at the average an-

nual cost was developed by a committee of insurance industry representatives and is generally considered the best way to compare policies and show true cost to the subscriber.

Spokesmen for the Life Insurance Association of America and the Institute of Life Insurance said yesterday that the method is probably the best.

However, both noted that there are other ways to compare policy costs and take into consideration such factors as the desire of some policyholders to pay less of a premium in the years when they are young.

The chief conclusion of the national guide is that the firms charging the lowest premium are not necessarily the best buys.

The Connecticut Mutual annual premium, for example, is \$135 a year, compared to \$118 for Travelers. But the guide calculates interest, dividends and cash value and concludes that the ultimate cost of the Connecticut policy is \$614 less over 20 years.

The comparisons were done on the \$10,000 straight life policy because it is the most popular and representative of life insurance offerings. It is popular because it provides both life insurance coverage and return on investment.

Ranking on the national guide is for the 30 largest life insurance firms in the nation. They hold more than half of all life insurance policies nationally, and all have offices in the Washington area.

The large firms with higher than average

costs include Metropolitan, Prudential, John Hancock, Travelers, Connecticut General, Occidental Life of California, Lincoln National and Mutual of New York.

The guide says that the best buys are Bankers Life, Connecticut Mutual, The Northwestern Mutual, Massachusetts Mutual, New England Mutual, New York Life, and Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada.

Denenberg does not conceal his purpose in publishing the guide: "We will continue to publish the list of the highest cost companies in order to put pressure on all life insurers to lower their premiums," he said in a recent speech.

In a telephone interview yesterday, Denenberg said that the life insurance industry "hasn't tasted the lash of competition."

He said he will periodically publish a list of the ten firms with the highest life insurance cost and the lowest. "It will be like the FBI's 10 most wanted list, only we'll have a 10 least wanted list also," Denenberg said.

The national guide, he said, should cause the 450,000 agents selling life insurance to put pressure on their companies to make their prices competitive.

Denenberg said that the guide could easily save consumers \$3 billion a year in premiums if they shop for the best buys, and the publicity forces rates down in the entire industry. Total payments for life insurance in 1970 were about \$37 billion.

About 7 of every 10 people in the nation have a life insurance policy. The average

family has \$20,900 in coverage. Total life insurance in force is now more than \$1.4 trillion.

The national shopper's guide was compiled from a \$25 book called "Cost Facts on Life Insurance," which is published by the National Underwriter Company of Cincinnati. Denenberg has also issued shopper's guides on automobile insurance and hospitals in the Philadelphia area. Both have been followed by a storm of protest from those involved.

In issuing the national guide on life insurance, Denenberg emphasized that a person with a higher cost life insurance policy would probably make a mistake to switch to another company.

He said this was because cash value and dividends increase sharply as the policy gets older, making a switch a mistake.

The ranking of the companies is based solely on cost and does not take into account the overall financial conditions of the company and the service provided by the agent.

Denenberg said his insurance department has already received about 50,000 requests for copies of the life insurance shopper's guide. He predicted that millions of copies of the guide would soon be in circulation.

George K. Bernstein, the federal insurance administrator, and Edward P. Lombard, superintendent of the D.C. insurance department, both said yesterday that the guide is an excellent aid for anyone shopping for a new life insurance policy.

PREMIUMS AND INSURANCE COST FOR A \$10,000 STRAIGHT LIFE CASH-VALUE INSURANCE POLICY SOLD BY THE 30 LARGEST COMPANIES (3)

COMPANY (5)	Male Age 20 or Female Age 23 (4)			Male Age 35 or Female Age 38 (4)			Male Age 50 or Female Age 53 (4)		
	Average (6)			Average (6)			Average (6)		
	Annual Premium	Yearly Cost of Insurance	Ranking At Age 20/23	Annual Premium	Yearly Cost of Insurance	Ranking At Age 35/38	Annual Premium	Yearly Cost of Insurance	Ranking At Age 50/53
1. Bankers Life Company (Iowa).....	\$149.70	\$24.70	2	\$229.10	\$42.00	1	\$400.30	\$119.20	1
2. Connecticut Mutual Life Ins. Co.....	135.00	22.40	1	218.50	46.70	3	397.70	132.70	6
3. The Northwestern Mutual Life Ins. Co.....	157.40	28.70	3	234.80	45.50	2	405.40	129.40	3
4. Massachusetts Mutual Life Ins. Co.....	156.30	29.50	5	236.10	50.00	4	407.90	131.40	5
5. New England Mutual Life Ins. Co.....	155.20	31.70	6	232.50	50.50	6	398.80	129.70	4
6. New York Life Ins. Co.....	152.40	32.50	8	233.40	52.40	8	400.50	127.70	2
7. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada.....	153.30	29.10	4	234.00	50.10	5	409.00	137.90	7
8. Great-West Life Assurance Co. (Canada).....	131.30	31.90	7	206.00	52.20	7	366.80	140.70	8
9. The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the U.S. (NY).....	152.70	33.60	10	233.20	56.60	12	404.50	141.10	9
10. The Manufacturers Life Ins. Co.....	127.80	37.10	19	197.00	56.00	10	343.70	142.50	11
11. The Penn Mutual Life Ins. Co.....	153.00	35.60	14	235.40	58.30	15	412.70	144.10	13
12. State Farm Life Ins. Co. (2).....	146.10	32.60	9	227.40	53.60	9	409.20	152.80	18
13. Mutual Benefit Life Ins. Co.....	158.00	34.90	12	238.70	58.00	14	412.30	147.60	15
14. Aetna Life Ins. Co.....	160.60	42.00	25	239.50	56.40	11	408.50	142.30	10
15. John Hancock Mutual Life Ins. Co.....	157.00	35.70	15	242.10	61.60	19	415.70	144.90	14
16. Continental Assurance Co.....	155.70	36.00	16	241.20	59.10	18	419.90	147.90	16
17. The Prudential Ins. Co. of America (2).....	157.10	36.40	17	244.40	63.20	21	438.10	143.90	12
18. The Canada Life Assurance Co.....	141.20	35.00	13	214.00	56.80	13	384.60	153.00	19
19. The Mutual Life Ins. Co. of N.Y. (2).....	152.00	34.20	11	234.10	58.50	16	416.20	152.60	17
20. The Lincoln Nat'l. Life Ins. Co. (Ind.).....	155.20	36.60	18	235.60	58.90	17	408.60	153.00	19
21. Occidental Life Ins. Co. of California.....	153.30	42.10	26	233.50	65.80	22	401.30	156.30	21
22. The Minnesota Mutual Life Ins. Co. (2).....	156.40	39.70	23	238.90	62.50	20	414.80	162.10	22
23. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co. (2).....	158.60	37.20	20	248.10	66.80	23	427.10	165.80	23
24. Connecticut General Life Ins. Co.....	139.40	39.50	22	220.40	70.70	24	398.80	175.30	24
25. American National Life Ins. Co. (2).....	155.80	38.40	21	239.70	71.30	26	423.50	180.20	25
26. The National Life & Accident Ins. Co. (1).....	116.50	40.30	24	190.80	73.60	27	343.70	180.60	26
27. The Western and Southern Life Ins. Co. (2).....	156.60	43.60	28	246.30	73.80	28	426.30	184.40	27
28. Allstate Life Ins. Co. (1).....	109.00	42.50	27	176.00	71.10	25	343.00	194.80	30
29. Provident Life and Accident Ins. Co. (Tenn.) (1).....	108.80	48.10	29	177.30	77.30	29	328.70	184.70	28
30. The Travelers Ins. Co. (1).....	118.00	53.10	30	190.90	84.70	30	348.10	194.40	29

(1) Policies that pay no dividends, but guarantee premium rate.
 (2) Policy includes waiver of premium for disability at no extra cost. Costs have been adjusted to remove the estimated charge for this benefit.
 (3) Largest by volume of total life in force. Only companies licensed in the United States are shown.

(4) Usual premiums for a female are the same as those for a male three years younger.
 (5) Listed according to the average of the costs at the 3 ages.
 (6) Ranked at each age according to the average yearly cost of insurance over a 20-year period.

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution held its 82d

Annual Congress at Indianapolis from June 11 to June 14.

At the Congress, this patriotic organization adopted 12 resolutions, some dealing with national and international affairs and others commending officials of the society.

The SAR is to be commended for its firm adherence to patriotic principles and its service to the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the 12 resolutions adopted at the SAR

Congress be included in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

RESOLUTIONS

The National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, at its 82nd Annual Congress, assembled from June 11th through June 14th, 1972, at the Indianapolis Hilton, Indianapolis, Indiana, adopted by unanimous vote, the following resolutions:

RESOLUTION NO. 1

Whereas, President Richard M. Nixon's policy regarding the war in Vietnam is to continue to seek to negotiate a just and honorable settlement and a return of American prisoners held by the Communist forces, but not to participate in a surrender of the freedom of the millions of South Vietnamese citizens nor in a surrender of the honor of our nation;

Now, therefore be it *Resolved*, that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution in its 82nd Annual Congress assembled hereby affirms its support of these policies as stated by The President of the United States and urges that he take all necessary and responsible action to effect an end to the conflict, a prompt return of American prisoners held by the Communists and the reasonable assurance of the freedom of the South Vietnamese people whom we have befriended from future political and military aggressions.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

Whereas, the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution has noted a rapid rise in public proposals that the United States should grant amnesty to those young men who have fled their country to avoid military service and those who have deserted from military service, and

Whereas, we believe those young men who have fled or deserted have refused to fulfill one of the most essential duties of citizenship and that it would be a violation of faith with those hundreds of thousands of brave men who have honorably served their country, those who are prisoners of war and those who have given their lives, the ultimate sacrifice;

Therefore be it resolved, that we express our strong opposition to such action; that we call upon our Senators and Representatives in the Congress and the President of the United States to resist the pressures being mounted for amnesty; and that the appropriate authorities prosecute those offenders swiftly and fully when and if they are apprehended.

RESOLUTION NO. 3

Whereas, truth constitutes the greatest weapon against communist falsehoods; and

Whereas, "Radio Free Europe" and similar agencies have done a commendable task, on a relatively modest budget, in penetrating the Iron Curtain and presenting essential and truthful news, thereby bringing a ray of hope and comfort to the enslaved masses laboring under the communist yoke;

Now, therefore be it resolved that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution favors these programs and urges that they be continued.

RESOLUTION NO. 4

Whereas, many citizens are expressing concern for the moral decay, the spiritual dearth and the rise of destructive revolutionaries who are seeking to destroy the American way of life and undermine the principles of our Constitutional Republic; and

Whereas, every endeavor to make the fibre of our country stronger has little hope of success unless our citizens are inculcated with the need to observe the principles of love of country and our countrymen, justice and service; and

Whereas, the Chaplain General of the National Society in his report to this Congress has urged a National spiritual effort on the part of all Compatriots of the Society;

Now, therefore be it *Resolved* that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution at its 82nd Annual Congress assembled endorse the recommendation of the Chaplain General in said report and urgently ask all Chaplains of the State Societies and local Chapters of the Sons of the American Revolution and all Compatriots everywhere, to give earnest and active encouragement to

all programs of the Society for a deepening of the spiritual motivations of our people.

RESOLUTION NO. 5

Whereas, for many years, certain agencies of the Judiciary and Executive Branches of the Federal Government have directed various local school districts to adopt courses of action which have encroached upon parental and local authority governing neighborhood schools; and

Whereas, such encroachment threatens to destroy our public schools and places in jeopardy the traditional control of Public Education by the States;

Now therefore be it *Resolved* that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution in its 82nd Annual Congress assembled, urges the United States Congress to propose and the States to adopt a constitutional amendment which would assure the preservation of our neighborhood schools and promote the provision of a quality education to all children, and prohibiting any form of compulsory busing of students to achieve racial balance.

RESOLUTION NO. 6

Whereas, one of the most revered men in the United States, President Abraham Lincoln, directed that the song "Dixie" be played at events celebrating the end of the War Between the States; and

Whereas, "Dixie" is a most important part of Americana, and should be recognized as such by all patriotic citizens; and

Whereas, respect for America and its old and respected institutions and traditions, including the music which makes up a part of her history, should be displayed by all patriotic citizens;

Now, therefore be it *resolved* that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution in its 82nd Annual Congress assembled endorses the right of all free citizens to freely play and sing the song "Dixie" and other music forming a part of our American heritage, and urges all civil authorities to preserve this right as one of those fundamental freedoms which are so dear to the hearts of true Americans.

RESOLUTION NO. 7

Whereas, the California Society, Sons of the American Revolution has taken appropriate action to support the establishment of the Patton family home in the City of San Marino, California as a memorial to the late, General George S. Patton, Jr.;

Now, therefore be it *resolved* by the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution in its 82nd Annual Congress assembled that it endorses the action of the aforesaid California Society and urges the establishment and maintenance of the Patton Home in San Marino, California as a permanent memorial to the memory of General Patton.

RESOLUTION NO. 8

Whereas, the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution and the Indiana Society, Sons of the American Revolution lost a steadfast and valiant compatriot upon the passing of Compatriot James Arthur DeWeerd, D.D.; and

Whereas, upon the occasion of the 82nd Annual Congress being convened in his beloved State of Indiana, it is deemed fitting that a special tribute to our late Compatriot DeWeerd be adopted by this Congress;

Now, therefore be it *resolved* by the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution in its 82nd Annual Congress assembled, that we express our deepest regret upon the passing of Compatriot James Arthur DeWeerd we extend our sincere sympathy to his family and many friends; and we express our deep gratitude for all of the dedicated service he gave during his lifetime to the Society and to the preservation of the principles upon which our Republic was founded.

RESOLUTION NO. 9

Whereas, the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution has learned with deep

regret of the recent death of F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover; and

Whereas, the 81st Annual Congress by its Resolution No. 7 has strongly approved Mr. Hoover's policies, leadership and dedication to law and order; and

Whereas, Mr. Hoover was the first recipient of the National Society's Law Enforcement Commendation Medal being presented to him by the then President General, Walter Sterling;

Now, therefore be it *resolved* by the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution at its 82nd Annual Congress assembled that we express our deepest regret upon the passing of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and extend our sincere sympathy to his family and many friends and we express our deep gratitude to the dedicated service he gave during his lifetime to the people of the United States of America and to the preservation of the principles upon which our Republic was founded.

RESOLUTION NO. 10

Whereas, the United Nations General Assembly has expelled loyal member of the U.N. the National Republic of China, and

Whereas, this action by the U.N. violated the principles of its own Charter, and

Whereas, Nationalist China was a peaceful, dues paying member of the U.N. and a friend of the United States, and

Whereas, the U.N. has admitted Communist China, a government which has slaughtered millions of its own people, and has imposed a constant reign of oppression and slavery, and

Whereas, Communist China, having been given a seat on the Security Council, can now veto any action by the U.N. thereby making it totally impotent as a force for peace, and

Whereas, many of the United Nations proponents seek to grant a total Power of Attorney over the internal affairs of its members which would thereby deprive the United States of its Sovereign Powers and make it subservient to the will of multitudinous, foreign countries, and

Whereas, competent testimony shows that certain foreign nations are using their membership in the U.N. to bring in spies and subversion to attack the United States internally;

Now, therefore be it *resolved*, that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution again goes on record as opposing continuation of our membership in the United Nations.

RESOLUTION NO. 11

Whereas, it has been the policy of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution to re-affirm and re-adopt all previous Resolutions;

Now, therefore be it *resolved*, that the National Society does re-adopt and re-affirm all previous resolutions where applicable.

RESOLUTION NO. 12

Whereas, the 82nd Annual Congress of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution has been successful in every respect; and

Whereas, our appreciation should be extended to the individuals and groups that contributed to the success of this Congress;

Now, therefore be it *resolved*, that the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution hereby expresses its grateful appreciation to President General Eugene C. McGuire and to his charming and devoted wife, Paula, for the faithful performance by him of the arduous duties of his high office and the gracious giving of their talents to his outstanding administration; and

Be it further *resolved*: that our appreciation be given to our Executive Secretary, Warren S. Woodward, and his lovely wife, Gisela, for their vital role in the arrangements for, and execution of, the Congress, and

Be it further *resolved*: that our grateful appreciation and thanks be extended to:

Compatriot Marshall E. Miller, Chairman of the Indiana Society Congress Arrangements Committee, and his attractive wife, Marilyn, and Compatriot Jack M. Carmichael, President of the Indiana Society and Co-Chairman of the Indiana Society Congress Arrangements Committee, and members of the Indiana Society and their ladies who assisted them, and in particular, Compatriot and Mrs. Cyril L. Johnson, Compatriot and Mrs. Albert T. Morris, Walter C. Bridgewater, Troy G. Thurston, Lowell C. Reed, Adam Riggins and Estel L. Allen:

The Honorable Edgar D. Whitcomb, Governor of the State of Indiana and The Honorable Richard G. Lugar, Mayor of the City of Indianapolis and The Honorable John W. Walls, Senior Assistant Mayor of the City of Indianapolis for their well-received greetings and remarks to this Annual Congress;

Compatriot Fred J. Milligen, Speaker at the Monday luncheon;

Mr. M. Stanton Evans, Speaker at the Tuesday evening banquet;

Colonel (and Compatriot) Charles M. Duke, Jr., USAF, the first member of the Sons of the American Revolution to walk on the Moon, and Speaker at the Wednesday evening banquet, and his lovely wife, Dottie, who charmed everyone;

Mrs. Donald Spicer, President General, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution; Mrs. Roy D. Allen, Senior National President, National Society, Children of the American Revolution; Mr. Philip E. Horne, National President, Children of the American Revolution; and to Mrs. Floyd H. Grigsby, State Regent, Indiana Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, for their attendance at and greetings to this 82nd Annual Congress;

Past President General Charles A. Anderson, M.D., for arranging the display of Compatriot S. Hubbard Scott's collection of historical, State and Territorial flags belonging to the Ohio Society, Sons of the American Revolution;

The Staff of the Indianapolis Hilton for their cooperation and assistance in connection with this 82nd Annual Congress of the Society.

Be it further *Resolved*: That the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution, in its 82nd Annual Congress assembled, hereby expresses its sincere appreciation to all the many others whose efforts contributed to the success of this Congress.

THE 13TH OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. HICKS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this past week, we have been marking the 13th observance of Captive Nations Week. It's a sad anniversary for it reminds us that, in spite of the latest discussions with the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union, vast areas of the globe and a vast portion of humanity still do not know the freedom and independence we sometimes take for granted.

Lands with great pride and ancient heritages have fallen before the juggernaut of the armed doctrine of communism. Regimes imposed on these lands persecute religion, stifle individual free-

dom, and reduce citizens to serfs in their own country.

A good example, one I have often talked about, is the country of Lithuania. This is a nation of freedom-loving peoples who have struggled under the yoke of communism since 1940 when Lithuania was forced into becoming a part of the Soviet Union.

Lithuania's history goes back to the 12th century. For more than 600 years her people repeatedly were compelled to fight in defense of their national sovereignty. By a peace treaty in 1919, however, the Soviet Government recognized the rights of Lithuania over its territory and people. During this period of independence Lithuania made progress in many areas such as agriculture, industry, education, and social reforms.

Although Lithuania had established a firm basis for a free and self-sufficient nation, at the end of the second decade of independence she was swallowed up in the grasping clutches of the Soviet Union along with her stout hearted Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia. The fires of freedom, which once burned so brightly, were extinguished.

Another, more recent example of the repressive hand of communism, is the treatment the Soviet Jews are now receiving in their own country. Many have made attempt after attempt to migrate to Israel only to be thwarted by the Soviet Government.

The great courage of these people—and people all over the world now under the iron hand of communism—will serve as a warning that freedom cannot be suppressed forever. Thus, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in commemoration of this great time of re-dedication to the ideal of freedom and justice for all.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF AHEPA

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the Order of Ahepa is observing its golden anniversary this year, and it can look back on its first half-century of existence with well-earned and well-deserved pride. Its contributions to the betterment and enrichment of social, moral, and family life in the American Republic through its civic works and programs are famous. I believe, however, that one of its most important and significant roles is that expressed by Ahepa itself, as one of its objects:

To promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic Culture.

Peoples, cultures, nations, societies, are all too often prone to forget that from which they sprung, and to which they owe so much. Still, from time to time, they return to these things; as Longfellow noted, "Cato learned Greek at eighty," and this is one indicator of how

much classical Rome realized its debt to Greece.

The legacy of Greece to the rest of the Western World is beyond compare and value. Hellenism sparked the Renaissance; from there the spirit of "the glory that was Greece" permeated so thoroughly into the mainstream of the Western World that Sir Henry Maine's classic remark is not too far off the mark:

Except the blind forces of nature, nothing moves in this world which is not Greek in origin.

Our present-day political system has reached a point that would seem strange to the classical Greek, it is true. Yet, the idea of a government answerable to the governed, trial by jury, civil liberty of thought, speech, writing, assemblage, and worship have all had major stimulation from Greek beginnings. These things set off the Greek from his Oriental neighbor. They gave the Greek an independence of spirit and initiative that the Greek, in turn, has passed on to us.

Ahepa has among its members the lineal and spiritual descendants of the men and minds who began these things and to whom the Western World owes so very much of its heart and soul. Here, then, is a factor of Ahepa's existence sometimes forgotten, but always present: to preserve these ideals and serve as a constant reminder of the rock from which we are hewn.

As Will Durant put it, in the concluding lines of his book "Our Greek Heritage":

Greek civilization is alive; it moves in every breath of mind that we breathe; so much of it remains that none of us in one lifetime could absorb it all. . . . those who cherish freedom, reason and beauty . . . will hear behind the turmoil of political history the voices of Solon and Socrates, of Plato and Euripides, of Phedias and Praxiteles, of Epicurus and Archimedes; they will be grateful for the existence of such men, and will seek their company across alien centuries. They will think of Greece as the bright morning of that Western civilization which, with all its kindred faults, is our nourishment and our life.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S VIETNAM BUDGET "EXCUSE" FOR NEW WEAPONS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration is using the \$2.2 billion Vietnam supplemental budget request as a convenient excuse to purchase some military equipment which has nothing to do with Vietnam or the recent North Vietnamese offensive.

The Nixon administration has used as a principal justification for its supplemental budget request the need to replace weapons including aircraft lost during the recent fighting. But the administration is simply wrong. There is in this supplemental budget \$161 million for 200 new aircraft sought by the ad-

ministration which is not to replace aircraft lost during the offensive but to buy brand new equipment.

Among the items sought by the administration are more than 40 F-4 Phantom jets, 132 big Huey helicopters, and 93 A-37 attack jet fighters.

Some of these are for replacements for planes lost in the fighting, but others are simply additions to our forces. To date absolutely no justification for putting this \$161 million purchase into the supplemental budget has been offered.

Mr. Speaker, most of the planes would not be available until at least 1973 or 1974 and will have no effect on the current offensive. Maybe the administration is counting on the war continuing until 1973 or 1974? If the administration feels that it needs these 200 new planes, then it should request them in its regular budget next year with full justification.

I am calling upon the Nixon administration today to revise the supplemental budget request to include only the real cost of the war.

The supplemental budget which totals \$2.2 billion is an addition to the \$83.6 billion sought by the Nixon administration for defense spending this year.

Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam supplemental budget should only contain those items needed to fight the present offensive.

NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT PROSPECTS SHOULD NOT BE HINDERED

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I commend the July 21, 1972, lead editorial in the Washington Post for the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues. Many of us want the Congress to play a far more active role in sharing responsibility with the Chief Executive in foreign policy and military decisions. We are concerned with the erosion of powers during this century, clearly vested in the Congress by our Federal Constitution.

The Post editorial considers the latest attempt to legislate an end to the war, and concludes that a vote for it at this time would be "capricious." It questions the aptness of even calling a fund cutoff an "end the war" amendment. It points out that, if passed, the war would continue; our POW's would still be hostages; and the present Saigon regime would still be in power.

The editorial recognizes the basic risk in passage of the Mansfield amendment—that it would undercut the Paris negotiations, in no way assist the negotiating process and only hamper the present hopeful signs of a negotiated settlement.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 21, 1972]

THE MANSFIELD AMENDMENT

At Senator Mansfield's initiative, the Foreign Relations Committee wrote into the

Dummy Sig 77

military aid authorization bill a provision categorically cutting off funds to maintain "any" American forces in South Vietnam after Aug. 31, that is, to preclude a residual force; Mr. Mansfield indicates he would slip the date a month. The administration opposes this particular "Mansfield amendment," which differs from earlier versions, on grounds that the President alone should direct policy on Vietnam and that passage would deprive him of an important bargaining chip—the threat of indefinitely maintaining a residual force—which he is using at the Paris talks. (The amendment further states that all American military operations in Indochina should end after the United States and Hanoi agree to a cease-fire and after the prisoners are released, but this part of the amendment is simply a declaration without the force of a fund cutoff behind it.) A vote could come as early as today.

The issue is more complex than the debate on it has so far made out. To start, we would reiterate our judgment that it is unfortunate and gratuitous for the President to keep contending that Congress has no role in foreign affairs beyond ratifying his own decisions. The Congress—in this instance, the Senate—has ample constitutional and institutional claim to try to affect war policy. And although the onset of the political campaign undeniably complicates the matter, the issue posed by the Mansfield amendment should not be regarded as one to be treated on party lines.

But neither can the amendment be taken simply as an index of whether a given senator is "for" or "against" the war, regardless of the tendency of some of its supporters to call it an "end-the-war" measure. In no conceivable sense could the removal of American forces from South Vietnam alone "end the war," or even the American role in the war. American planes based outside of South Vietnam could still be bombing, American prisoners would still be captive, and the American-supported government in Saigon—whose leader's removal is Hanoi's dominant war aim—would still be in power. Passage of the amendment would no doubt be taken by many as a triumph for the "peace" movement. It would be politically embarrassing to the President, though surely he could find a political riposte by accusing his supporters—and fairly so—of undercutting his negotiating strategy in Paris. But none of these results, however they are evaluated, should be confused with ending the war.

The core truth is that the denial of funds for a residual force would indeed undercut the President's negotiating strategy. That being so, we submit that the only basis on which a responsible vote can be cast for the Mansfield amendment is the belief that Mr. Nixon's strategy is not going to work by November anyway and that he will then be defeated by Senator McGovern. Mr. McGovern has pledged, of course, not only to pull all forces out of South Vietnam within 90 days of taking office but—a step not contemplated at all by the Mansfield amendment—to stop the bombing on Inauguration Day. That is to say, before taking a crucial card out of Mr. Nixon's bargaining hand, legislators must be persuaded that the President's policy and political career alike are bankrupt. Without such a dual conviction, a vote for the Mansfield amendment would be capricious in the extreme. And even with those two convictions, those who vote for the Mansfield amendment must take upon themselves the responsibility for bringing Congress into the act not only far too late in the day but in a way which would threaten to undermine or even scuttle the Paris negotiating process which, whatever its promise, is now so clearly under way.

BUYING POWER OF CORN AND WHEAT NOW A SMALL FRACTION OF 1952 VALUE

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been in Congress, I have been working for 100 percent of parity prices for our agricultural producers. They need these prices because everything they buy has advanced greatly in cost.

This tremendous increase in farm production costs over the last 20 years was dramatized in a recent analysis prepared by the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress.

Walter W. Wilcox, senior specialist in agriculture, was asked to determine how many bushels of wheat and corn it took to buy a selected list of production items in 1952 and 1971.

He found, for example, that it took almost three times as many bushels of wheat to buy a half-ton pickup in 1971 as it did in 1952. It took more than four times as many bushels of corn and more than five times as many bushels of wheat to pay real estate taxes on farm land.

This is the selected list of production items and the number of bushels of wheat and corn required for both years:

Production item	1952 bushels	1971 bushels
30-39 HP tractor:		
Wheat.....	1,283	3,074
Corn.....	1,659	3,291
12' self-propelled combine:		
Wheat.....	2,483	8,051
Corn.....	3,210	8,622
½ ton pickup truck:		
Wheat.....	792	2,324
Corn.....	1,024	2,488
4-door standard-size automobile:		
Wheat.....	943	2,882
Corn.....	1,220	3,087
Real-estate taxes per 100-acres farm land:		
Wheat.....	36	195
Corn.....	46	209
All machinery repairs per tractor on farm:		
Wheat.....	56	138
Corn.....	72	148
Building repairs per farm:		
Wheat.....	68	191
Corn.....	88	205
10-hour day of farm labor:		
Wheat.....	3	11
Corn.....	4	12

THE CONGRESS PROJECT

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I know that many of my colleagues are pondering over the ponderous questionnaire prepared by the Nader organization and delivered to Members of Congress. As Members of this body, we are constantly being asked to give our opinions or explain our voting records—so questionnaires themselves are not new to us.

The length of the Nader survey, however, involves considerably more than just filling in information. The Wall Street Journal of June 29 comments on the size of the job Mr. Nader expects of Congress and the unlikely aspects of the survey really receiving the attention from Congress that Mr. Nader demands. The text of the editorial is as follows:

THE CONGRESS PROJECT

It will be, says Ralph Nader, "probably the most comprehensive and detailed study of the Congress since its inception." Some 800 people, mostly volunteers, are arriving in Washington to gather the statistics, conduct interviews and write studies. "The project is by far the largest undertaken by Nader," says an associate. "There's no other major project going on now—this is the whole ball game."

The project's scope is indeed awesome, perhaps as ambitious as the building of the pyramids, if not the filming of "Gone With The Wind!" There is a report that one Nader volunteer drove 450 miles in Wyoming to conduct a single interview. Ultimately, the research will yield a 3,000-page study on congressional committees and a similar volume or volumes on the legislative process. Mr. Nader promises recommendations for reforms in "excruciating detail." And there will be 35 to 40-page profiles on each of the 535 members of Congress, which he hopes to publish well before this November's elections.

We can hardly wait, yet we suspect the venture may take Mr. Nader and his crew a bit longer than they at first imagine. The heart of the research appears to be a questionnaire that has been sent to each member of Congress. There are 633 questions, each of which would easily require a half-hour of a Senator's or Congressman's time, in addition to the research services of his staff. Working nonstop during a 40-hour week, with time out for an occasional coffee break and to change the ribbon on his typewriter, a Congressman could have the questionnaire in Mr. Nader's hands by mid-September.

Some members of Congress might wish to take more than a half-hour for each question, to make the Nader project truly meaningful. The questions are fairly sweeping, after all. Consider the first three:

"1. Since becoming a member of Congress, what have been your three greatest accomplishments for your district? Your reasons?"

"2. Since becoming a member of Congress, what have been your three greatest accomplishments for the country? Your reasons?"

"3. Overall, do you believe the Congress today has more ability or less ability to solve contemporary problems facing this country than it did a generation ago to solve the country's problems then? Your reason?"

Surely it would be more reasonable of Mr. Nader if he only required that one question a day be answered. Each member of Congress could then plan to get up a little earlier, and while his mind was still fresh, answer a question before breakfast. Or, he could spend the day contemplating that day's question and put his thoughts to paper just before bedtime. True, the project would then take just under two years, but the pyramids weren't built over the weekend. And the study would be ready by the 1974 elections.

Given a little extra time, members of Congress might even be willing to answer a few more probing questions that the Nader people somehow failed to include in their questionnaire. Question No. 634, for example, could be: "How did you spend your summer vacation?" Then again, we realize that Mr. Nader had to draw the line somewhere. If he didn't, Congress would not be eager to assist him.

IT IS TIME WE WERE HEARD AGAIN

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, there is a feeling of mistrust and fear building in our land. Nothing seems to work the way it should anymore. Things are strangely out of control.

Government is bigger than ever before. But it cannot be trusted and it cannot perform.

Business is richer than ever before. But its products are shoddy and its concern seems only with private profit and ever higher prices.

Labor is stronger than ever before. But it is powerless to keep its members' wages ahead of rising costs and is too often blind to the rights of the country as a whole.

For all our bigness and power, things as simple as a job for every citizen, food at prices a family budget can stand, or even a clean flowing little stream, seem beyond our ability to create.

The root cause of this powerlessness in the midst of great strength is not hard to find. It is the direct result of big organizations whose very power blinds them to the needs of the common citizen.

When you are mighty, as Government and big business and labor surely are, it is all too easy to use your might instead of your commonsense.

For example, if you are Government, and you are all powerful, why bother asking the average guy if he thinks it is worth it to spend \$150 billion to pulverize a little country in far-off Asia? Your foreign policy experts tell you you have to do it, and your computers tell you you can win, so what more advice do you need?

Or if you are a giant corporation, and you are rich, why bother asking the working farmer what it will mean if you move in, buy up land, and monopolize agriculture from seed to supermarket. Your analysts tell you land is a good investment, and your tax lawyers tell you if you lose on farming you can write it off on taxes anyway, so why ask anyone else if you should do it?

Of course, if Government had bothered to ask the average guy about Vietnam before it was too late, he might have said he would rather have his tax dollars used for schools and hospitals and drug abuse clinics. But nobody asked.

Or, if business had asked the farmer what he thought of conglomerate farming, he might have said it would break millions of family farmers and drive them into the crowded cities where they would be forced onto welfare. But nobody asked that question either.

I believe those are the questions that have to be asked. And if Government, or business, or labor will not ask them, then the people must give their answers without being asked.

The elected representatives of the people are supposed to speak for them. They are supposed to be the ones who question the powerful on behalf of the people. They are supposed to be the ones who stop pointless wars before they get

started, control the appetite of profit blind corporations, and remind big labor that its responsibilities extend beyond an extra dollar for its members.

Too often the elected representatives of the people have done just the opposite. Instead of controlling the big and the rich, they have been controlled by them. Instead of questioning the arrogant expert, they have bought his advice and laughed at the plain ideas of the average citizen.

It is time to put a stop to this sort of thing. It is time to look at the simple wisdom of the average American.

We know that we need jobs. Let us make it our business to insist that Government put us to work when we need it. And let us end this foolishness that there is not anything to do when we need better schools, curbs on pollution, new hospitals, drug abuse clinics, recreation facilities, and a hundred other things.

We know that inflation is robbing us blind. Let us end it with a program that asks equal sacrifice of all, instead of putting the whole burden on the wage earner who can least afford it.

We know that our tax system is a bad joke. Let us insist that the rich and the corporate giants pay their fair share. And let us use their share, once they start paying it, to relieve the crushing property tax burden on the average family.

Finally, we know above all that our country is in real trouble. Let us face that fact by demanding that foreign wars, exotic weapons, and multiple moon shots wait until we have put our own house in order. We pay the taxes. We have desperate needs of our own. Let us take care of those needs and worry about outer space later.

This, then, is the basic outlook I have brought to my work in the U.S. Congress. I deeply believe that the average American, as an individual, has much of value to offer his country. His voice has been drowned by the loud demands of the rich, the big, and the well organized.

It is time we were heard again.

**COMMERCE LIAISON JOB OUT-
STANDING**

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join those colleagues who have paid tribute to the fine work which Marvin "Lucky" Mondres has done as the congressional liaison officer of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

I had a particular interest in the appointment of Mr. Mondres as he is from my great State, coming here in 1967 to serve as administrative assistant to Congressman HERBERT BURKE.

In the past 3½ years, serving with the Commerce Department, I have had numerous occasion to call on Lucky and I have always found him to carry out his assignments with thoroughness and dispatch. The Department will have a difficult time in finding someone as conscientious in the performance of these duties.

Establishing some liaison between the huge bureaucracy of the Federal Government is a continuing problem. Those of us in the Congress have to count on men such as Lucky Mondres to get us through to the right officials when we are working on projects to help our constituencies.

There is a corresponding responsibility to advise on the part of congressional liaison officers to inform their respective heads of departments of congressional attitudes and proposals.

In both instances, Lucky Mondres has been outstanding and I join with my colleagues in expressing our appreciation for a job well done.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, each year since I came to Congress in 1959, the Congress has joined with private individuals and organizations throughout our Nation in marking Captive Nations Week.

The observance allows all of us an opportunity to speak with a collective voice of the plight of the peoples of the captive nations.

The oppression of these individuals is hard for many Americans to understand because it is so foreign to their way of life. Yet for so many, many years the peoples of the captive nations have been under the whip and restrictions of their Communist leaders.

Our Federal Government has made overtures to the Soviet Union, and our Chief Executive recently was entertained by the Russian leaders. But there has been no apparent defrosting of the cold war as it applies to the captive nations.

During the past year, 17 Latvian Communists smuggled a memorandum out of Latvia which exposed the criminal colonial policies of the Soviets in Latvia. In this memorandum the Latvians asked for world help in stopping the colonization and Russification of Latvia.

Earlier this year, 17,000 Lithuanians signed a petition asking for their rights and a halt to religious persecution in Lithuania. More recently, thousands of Lithuanians demanded their rights and independence in Kaunas and battled the Soviet police and paratroopers who were sent to suppress them.

The Ukrainians are more vocal than ever in their demands for independence despite ever-increasing Soviet repression. The other captive people hope and wait for their independence and the day they can live and build their future in their own sovereign lands.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress must continue our support for peaceful efforts to bring freedom and a better way of life for these oppressed peoples.

As part of my remarks I include the text of the proclamation issued by Governor Rockefeller of New York designating Captive Nations Week.

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

The United States Congress, in enacting Public Law 86-90, has called for annual observance throughout the country of Captive Nations Week.

It is a basic American principle—shared by all New Yorkers—that everyone should be able to choose the type of government under which he would prefer to live.

Many residents of our state are linked by ties of birth, culture, family, and principle with those in foreign lands who have lost their national independence directly or indirectly to foreign powers.

These New Yorkers—many of whom have themselves found asylum in America from captive nations abroad—have deep convictions about the political oppression of their homelands. It is fitting that we express our sympathy with the aspirations of liberty which they hold so dear.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the week of July 18-22, 1972, as Captive Nations Week in New York State.

CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS CONFERENCE ON CHINA TRADE

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, last June 12 and 13, the Center for International Business sponsored a conference in Los Angeles concerning trade and investment in Taiwan and the People's Republic of China. At this assembly, senior government officials and business leaders of many nations joined together to discuss the many aspects of international business activities. I submit the text of a newsletter I received regarding this conference:

UNITED STATES-CHINA TRADE CONCLAVE CONCLUDED—INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS OUTLOOK CONFERENCE FORESEES SELECTIVE GROWTH OF TRADE WITH CHINA

LOS ANGELES.—Growth of trade with China is foreseen as slow and selective, yet very significant.

This was among the general conclusions reached at a major, two-day conference held June 12-13, 1972, at Los Angeles. The conference, attended by some two hundred domestic, as well as international business and government leaders, was sponsored by the Los Angeles-based Center for International Business. The Center is an affiliate of Pepperdine University.

"Focus of the conference was necessarily on the People's Republic of China because that is the area we know least about," said Richard C. King, executive director of the Center. King noted, "With regard to Taiwan, we as U.S. businessmen are certainly aware of their 'economic miracle' with substantial GNP growth of approximately 10% annually, which provides attractive investment and trade opportunities for many foreign countries."

"Most likely opportunities for U.S. businessmen are in high technology areas that relate to economic development, such as aircraft, heavy equipment, turnkey industrial installations including petrochemical plants and hydro-electric generating facilities." "However," King continued, "We have ignorance and misunderstanding to overcome, and we lack experience in trading with the People's Republic of China, since we are,

after all, the last major country into that market."

"On the one hand," King concluded, "we have the People's Republic of China looking inwardly and relating their trade and investment policies to the goal of sustaining an economic system built on self-sufficiency. On the other hand we have Taiwan, externally oriented, building an economic destiny based on trade and investment and reaching out from a viable economic base. Common to both is the great Chinese asset of capability being admirably applied to two different systems."

The "China Conference," is the second annual International Business Outlook Conference principally sponsored by the Center for International Business. The first conference in this continuing series was the highly successful program, "Japan's New Role in the World Economy," held in Los Angeles, October 18-19, 1971.

Conference speakers included the Honorable Herman H. Barger, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Department of State, Washington, D.C.; B. T. Rocca, Jr., former President and Chairman, and currently a Director, Pacific Vegetable Oil Corporation, San Francisco, California; Pat Clever, President, Canadian Manoir Industries, Limited, Toronto, Canada; Dr. Robert F. Dernberger, Professor of Economics, University of Michigan; Kenneth D. Gott, Managing Director, Business International Asia/Pacific, Hong Kong; Dr. Stanley Lubman, Professor of Law, University of California at Berkeley, California; Wilford Welch, Senior Staff Member, Arthur D. Little, Inc.; Dr. David Wilson, Editor, *China Quarterly*, London, England; and Dr. Yuan-I Wu, Professor of Economics, University of San Francisco, President, Asia Science Research Associates, San Francisco, and former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, International Security Affairs, Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

The Center for International Business is a non-profit, international research organization. Its purpose is to study economic and political issues basic to the formulation of policies affecting the international business environment and to develop objective analyses which can be translated into practical courses of action by the business community and other decision-makers in the private sector.

The Center also serves as a focal point for the dissemination of information and ideas of value to international businessmen in their policy- and decision-making activities; and provides information and guidance in the field of world trade through its World Trade Libraries Division, in San Francisco, California.

AHEPA CELEBRATING GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the golden anniversary of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association. I extend my congratulations to this great patriotic and philanthropic organization.

Their achievements and their contributions to worthy causes are well known and appreciated. Ahepa can point with pride to a half century of noteworthy progress. They have made an outstanding record of which they have good reason to be justly proud.

GUN CONTROL

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting an article from today's Christian Science Monitor which I believe is a timely analysis of myths which prevent any reasonable discussion of the need for gun control legislation.

As the article points out, there is exaggeration and misunderstanding on both sides of the gun control issue. Only a rational as well as factual discussion, however, will result in legislation beneficial to us all.

In an effort to promote a calm and rational approach to the issue of gun controls, I am submitting the article written by Franklin E. Zimring, a professor of law at the University of Chicago and associate director of the university's Center for Studies in Criminal Justice. It is as follows:

GUN CONTROL

At times of violence or assassination, Americans tune in to the hopeful optimism of those who see the end of violence around the next corner of gun legislation. Even more regularly, gun-owning groups assure us that the 30 million handguns in the nation have nothing to do with violent crime in the United States. Each side is convinced that it is absolutely right, and nobody bothers to get his facts straight. Sadly, our national debate over gun control is often a battle of empty slogans.

Before we get suitably serious about the gun problem in this country, it will be necessary to clear away some of the rhetorical excesses that have marked the gun-control debate. The first step is a few basic facts.

There are about 100 million guns in this country—more than two-thirds of them shot-guns and rifles, the traditional sporting weapons in American life. The other 30 million or so are handguns owned more in cities than in rural areas, rarely used in sport and nine times as likely as long guns to be involved in crime.

The vast majority of all guns are not violently misused, but guns are involved in a quarter of a million violent episodes each year, and our millions of guns—again particularly handguns—contribute to the crime problem by making robbery easy and serious assault more deadly. The real difficulty in the present debate over gun laws is that half of the participants underestimate the problem while the other half underestimate the time, money, and loss of liberty that will probably be necessary to solve it. The best way to illustrate this theme is by examining eight myths about guns—four from each side.

Myth No. 1: "We have a crime problem, not a gun problem."

This refrain, often heard from anti-gun control groups is true to the extent that 100 million guns would pose no problem in this country if nobody fired one. The problem is that robbers, angry husbands, and barroom debaters use them hundreds of thousands of times each year.

And when guns are used, they increase the chance that death will result by a factor of four. We have both a crime problem and a gun problem, and each makes the other worse.

Myth No. 2: "The handgun is a useful tool of household self-defense."

Millions of Americans (myself included)

live in some fear of robbers and burglars invading their homes. About 25 percent of all households have acquired handguns in the belief that they provide an effective defense against the criminal stranger, and this is why we have 30 million privately owned handguns.

Yet the homeowner's gun rarely protects him against burglars, who seek to elude him, or the occasion robber, who counts on surprise and a weapon of his own to render the homeowner helpless. The loaded handgun in your home is much more likely to accidentally kill someone in the family than to save his life.

Perhaps if this were fully understood, most domestic handguns, and most of our gun problems, would go away by themselves. But that is unlikely.

People seek guns for a sense of security and will resist heeding any information that undermines that sense of security.

Myth No. 3: "Legitimate citizens are not part of our gun problem."

Since crime is caused by criminals, many people argue that our many million gun-owning families have nothing to do with the gun problem.

Yet the truth is that the majority of all gun homicides are committed by persons without serious prior criminal records. And even more important, without registration and license laws it is very difficult to keep 30 million handguns in legitimate hands while still preventing potential criminals from buying guns secondhand or stealing them.

Even registration of guns and licensing of their owners might not stem the flow from legitimate to illegitimate owners with so many millions of guns in circulation.

So it appears that we will have to bring many millions of guns under control to get at the violent quarter of a million gun episodes.

Myth No. 4: "Gun laws can't work since criminal don't obey laws."

There is a grain of truth to this argument, but it is nonetheless a dangerous oversimplification.

In fact, the argument proves a bit too much since it suggests that all criminal laws are futile, because all the people who violate them are, indeed, criminal. The more complicated truth is that laws do not work automatically. They must be enforced and they must deal with the reality of gun use in this country. But laws that cut down the transfer of guns from legitimate to illegitimate owners or dramatically reduce our domestic handgun supply, can cut down on the role of guns in violence.

Myth No. 5: "Gun laws can reduce crime in the United States to the same levels experienced in countries like Britain and Japan."

If the anti-control partisans tend to forget the gun part of our crime problem, some of the pro-control people seem to forget that guns are only a part of the set of special problems that make violent-crime rates higher in this country than in the rest of modern Western society.

We often hear that the United States has a gun-killing rate 38 times as high as England, which presumably means that we could reduce killing to the English rate if we adopted stern gun controls. Unfortunately, our violent crime rate will remain much higher than that of other developed countries no matter how much we do about guns, because Americans rob and attack one another with all weapons at greater rates than do the English or Japanese.

Reducing the proportion of attacks by guns will reduce the death toll from attack because other weapons are less dangerous. But it is not a cure for crime, and those who oversell gun control in this way only add to our profound national confusion over guns and violence.

Myth No. 6: "Gun laws would not result in much cost or inconvenience to law-abiding citizens."

There are, to be sure, some gun-control laws that won't cost much—the problem is that they might not achieve much either.

If we really want to keep guns out of the hands of the irresponsible, we must put all owners to the inconvenience of getting licenses and registering guns. If we want to dramatically reduce handgun violence, we probably have to reduce the total number of such guns.

This is really a simple corollary to Myth No. 3, because if legitimate gun ownership is part of the problem, loss of freedom and inconvenience to legitimate gun owners is part of the solution.

Myth No. 7: "Only the National Rifle Association stands between this country and effective gun laws."

Just as gun-owning groups see the call for more controls as an evil conspiracy, many pro-control citizens think that the only real opposition to gun regulation is the National Rifle Association. But opposition to compulsory licensing and schemes to cut down on handgun ownership has its roots much deeper in American culture.

People in this country are afraid of crime, and having guns makes them feel better. It is also difficult for legitimate gun owners to see themselves as any part of the problem, since 99 percent of all our guns are used responsibly and everyone sees himself as part of that 99 percent. It is thus difficult to convince him that there should be gun laws that inconvenience him.

Myth No. 8: "All that is needed to solve our gun problem is strict legislation."

American experience with prohibition of alcoholic beverages suggests that new laws, alone, are not any guarantee of significant social change.

Public support for law must be high for if a law cuts against the grain of public sentiment, too many people will disobey it. Police and court support are necessary if legislation is to be more than a hollow shell. Also, it should be clear by now, with as many thousand gun laws scattered around this country as gun deaths, that passing the right laws under the right conditions is much more important than passing another law.

We need to know more than we do about guns and the effect of gun laws. We need to change attitudes and values.

Clearing away a few of the myths surrounding the gun debate is only a first step in choosing the appropriate national gun policy. Once it is known that gun controls will be expensive, might take many years to accomplish, and are not the final solution to the crime problem, we must address the question of whether various types of control are worth their costs.

In relation to mild steps such as firearm registration, the answer is easy to find. Even if the effect of such laws is modest, the failure to try them can only mean that we are not serious about curbing violence.

A campaign to remove the handgun from civilian ownership raises harder questions. In a nation dedicated to individual freedom, in an era when we are finding that the criminal prohibition of things like marijuana and abortion may not be worth the cost, there is a special irony in hearing liberal politicians urge a criminal prohibition of handguns.

Yet the handgun is a special problem.

With the possible exception of heroin, never has a product cost so much and given so little to the quality of American urban life.

A strategy as unstylish as prohibition may be the appropriate solution to the handgun problem. It may not. But before we can make intelligent choices in this area, we must face the real issues.

VIEWS ON GUN CONTROL: CHICAGO TRIBUNE TASK FORCE REPORT PART V

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, gun control has become an explosive issue in Congress. As many fight for strong controlling laws, others fight for no fire arm restrictions. Still others try to remain out of the issue, but as public pressure increases, they find it harder to avoid.

This is the fifth in a series of 10 articles recently written for the Chicago Tribune. The task force was created to study the role of the handgun in the epidemic of violence throughout America.

Today's entry is based on interviews and statements made by various Congressmen. It expresses the dilemma of many Members of Congress—caught in a crossfire between the gun lobbyists and public pressure for gun control legislation. The views of those violently opposed to restrictions and those desperately trying to get legislation passed are portrayed.

The article follows:

GUN CONTROLS TOO HOT FOR MOST POLITICIANS

It is one of the most politically explosive issues in the country today, and that is why the Nixon administration, its predecessors, and political leaders have sat on gun control legislation for years.

That was the candid confession of a high administration official who described a "conspiracy of silence" between Congress and the White House "not to bring up the gun control issue," until at least after the election.

Pending bills, the official said, "are just window dressing to save the national conscience," and no one has any illusions that they will pass into law. "The only solution to the nation's gun problem is total domestic disarmament, which is politically unacceptable and impossible at this time."

POLITICIANS AFRAID TO ACT

So, as firearms violence stalks the country, most politicians remain in a state of paralysis, cringing at the mere mention of those two words . . . "gun control."

"The Congress is scared out of its wits because of public pressure on gun control," said Congressman Abner J. Mikva [D., Ill.], who has futilely requested hearings on his tough gun control bill for more than two years.

Political leaders see the powerful gun lobby, with its millions of supporters, flexing its muscles at the most casual suggestion of more firearms legislation.

"This is a very, very, potent political force," said Sen. William Proxmire [D., Wis.], who voted for the 1968 Gun Control Act and then said in his last campaign that he would vote to repeal it. "We have literally millions and millions of people who own guns and the intensity of their feelings runs high."

LAW USELESS: HRUSKA

"The people don't want their guns taken from them," said Sen. Roman L. Hruska (R., Neb.). "There are 2.5 million handguns made each year. Are there 2 million criminals a year buying them? The consumer buys them, and you're not going to stop them by passing a law. This mania for passing laws and saying the problem is solved is foolishness."

Hruska has staunchly supported the position of the most powerful antigun control force, The National Rifle Association (NRA). He hopes the NRA will build its \$25 million "mecca" for sportsmen in Nebraska, a Hruska aide confided.

Political leaders can also feel the stirrings of less vocal and unorganized urban dwellers who are demanding action to control gun sales.

FEAR LOSING SEATS

"Altho the big majority favors gun control, a strong and intense minority believes this issue and owning guns is all important," Proxmire said.

That is the dilemma of Washington leaders today.

Their minds are haunted by the shadow of former Sen. Joseph Tydings (D., Md.) and others whose political careers were supposedly crushed by the steamroller of the antigun control forces.

"The administration just doesn't want to deal with that political bru-ha-ha," said one legal adviser when asked if the White House favored bans on handguns. "Not at this time, in this administration. The political liabilities are fantastic. Let's face it. There are several former senators you can ask about that."

"Every Congressman who lost his seat in 1970 is convinced he lost because he voted for the gun control bill. The gun lobby takes credit for their defeat," Mikva said.

Some legislators like James Abourezk (D., S.D.), a freshman congressman, sit back hoping the issue will pass them by. Abourezk may have to vote on a gun bill for the first time after hearings held this week on House Judiciary Committee chairman Emanuel Celler's proposal.

CONSTITUENCY "EMOTIONAL"

"We were hoping there wouldn't be a bill to vote on," said David Voight, an aide to Abourezk who sits on the committee. "Our constituency is very emotional about guns. Guns are a way of life and their attitude is if you take away my guns, you'll take away my wife next."

Stirring among the shadows of Tydings and the others are memories of more tragic events. More than a political career was lost when bullets killed the Kennedys and nearly took the life of Gov. George C. Wallace last month. It is events like these that periodically bolster the mounting clamor for gun control.

"But the administration reads all the polls of the rural states and ignores the cry of the urban areas," Sen. Edward Kennedy [D., Mass.] told Task Force reporters. "They think the guns are where the votes are."

There is some telling evidence to support this.

NRA, WHITE HOUSE TALK

The White House has opened its doors to the NRA and firearms proponents for at least two "mutually helpful" conferences on gun bills and enforcement problems, Treasury Department officials confirm.

"The doors are open for our views," said Gen. Maxwell Rich, NRA executive vice president and lobbyist. "I understand we weren't welcome during past administrations. Now we have been asked our opinion and we gave it. But we haven't written legislation and I don't suppose we'll be asked to."

But a comparison of positions taken by the administration and the NRA belie that last disclaimer—they are one and the same on gun control.

Both oppose federal gun registration, licensing, and confiscation, contending they are unenforceable measures that should be left to the states and not the subject of federal control.

Both claim general support for the 1968 Act, but contend some provisions, like ammunition record keeping, are unenforceable and useless.

And both advocate a bill banning handguns that cannot pass a "safety and reliability" test rather than a "sporting purposes" test now applied to imported guns under the 1968 Act.

CONSPIRACY OF SILENCE

The administration promised to produce such a bill seven months ago, but it has yet to be seen. The history of this long-promised measure best reveals the administration's attitude on handgun legislation. A top administration official explained it this way:

"Before the Wallace shooting there was a conspiracy of silence between Congress and the administration. There was nothing spoken, but we got clear signals that no one wanted to bring up the gun control issues. Everyone from the top on down said 'Don't send that damn bill up here.' It wouldn't get anywhere and all it would do is result in tremendous exposure to editorial criticism before an election."

"When Wallace got shot, [Sen. Birch] Bayh [chairman of the juvenile delinquency subcommittee] and Celler broke the silence and started calling hearings and making noises about moving bills.

"They sensed the public tide turning and it became politically expedient to put up an appearance of advocating gun control. They are no more sincere now than before. They knew we were sitting on the thing and they didn't do a damn thing until Wallace got shot. Even now, no one has any illusions about those bills passing into law."

Bayh's bill would apply the same "sporting purposes" test to American-made handguns used on imported handguns. But his voting record and failure to push his own bill thru lends some credence to the accusations.

He voted for the 1968 Gun Control Act but voted to repeal it only a few months later.

"Did I vote that way?" he asked, incredulously. "Well, if I voted that way I voted wrong."

He voted against three other bills aimed at gun registration, but voted for one bill that called for licensing of firearms owners.

While a Presidential candidate last October, Bayh held hearings on his own handgun bill, leaving a tougher bill, proposed seven months earlier by Sen. Kennedy, languishing before the subcommittee.

After holding the hearings, he let his own bill sit for months, only pressing to report it out days after Wallace got shot.

IGNORE MIKVA BILL

Like Bayh, Celler refused to hold hearings on two tough gun control bills proposed by Mikva and Rep. John Murphy [D., N.Y.], claiming for years that the "climate wasn't right." The NRA's monthly magazine praised him in December, 1970, for "tying up all major gun bills" in his committee.

After Wallace was shot, Celler announced hearings would be held on his own bill. Murphy wrote Celler that 9,000 people had been killed by handguns since he introduced his measure a year ago, and the bill would have banned the sale of the gun used to shoot Wallace.

William Dickey, deputy assistant secretary of the Treasury Department, denied the agency was deliberately stalling on the "safety and reliability" proposal they promised to prepare by last November. "We just ran into extreme technical and legal problems in setting the criteria," he said.

STANDARDS RECOMMENDED

A \$136,000 study of 150 handguns completed last September by the H. P. White laboratory concluded that standards can be set, "but they don't establish them," Dickey explained.

The report recommends a safety and reliability test of 3,000 firings and a modified drop test. The problem, Dickey said, is that some cheap handguns would pass and some expensive ones would flunk. The report notes that under this test procedure one gun priced

under \$20 would pass and eight guns over \$100 would fail.

A close look at this safety and reliability proposal reveals it is really not a gun control measure at all, but a consumer protection bill. Experts, including Dickey, agree it would put safer more reliable guns in the hands of criminals as well as consumers.

In fact, the White laboratory only agreed to conduct the test after it was assured it was for a consumer protection bill and not gun control, said Donald Dunne, manager of the laboratory.

WOULDN'T CONTROL SALES

"When we were first asked to do it we saw a thinly veiled attempt to deprive citizens of a right to own a gun and we wanted no part of it. Then they explained to us that this was in no way a gun control matter but a product evaluation done against the background of consumer protection," Dunne said.

An administration legal adviser explained the strategy of this safety and reliability proposal this way:

"It was a perfect solution. It would get the job done of getting those Saturday Night Specials off the street without hitting raw nerves. The minute you talk to a sportsman about banning guns based on size or anything else, you start getting into all kind of insolubles."

"PLAYING DEVIOUS GAME"

He charged the Treasury Department was incompetent for failing to produce the bill by now and lamented, "Look where we are—trying to ram something thru in the second half of an election year when you're supposed to be cleaning house and getting things together."

Congressional criticism of the Treasury Department is also aimed at what some politely describe as its lack of enthusiasm about existing as well as pending gun laws.

"They are playing a devious game. Their heart just isn't in gun laws," charged Mikva. He recalled one department official remarking to him, "I sure hope your bill doesn't pass because they'd have to kill me to get my guns."

The Treasury Department has a chartered NRA gun club entitled the U.S. Rifle and Pistol Club, records show.

Rep. Murphy has had some of the more frustrating experiences with the agency. In April, 1971, he wrote to the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms Department [ATFD] asking its opinion on the effectiveness of the 1968 Gun Control Act. He sought to learn if the act was unenforceable and ineffective, as the administration claimed.

CITES ARREST INCREASE

Acting ATFD director Ralph H. Alkire responded May 12 crediting the act with a 234 per cent increase in illegal gun sale cases and a 409 per cent increase in arrests over the 1934 act. The letter included an interdepartment memo detailing how the 1968 act was being circumvented by some gun dealers.

On June 3, 1971, Murphy wrote a letter thanking the Secretary of the Treasury for the quick response and asking for details on these unscrupulous dealers.

The July 14 response from the head of the Internal Revenue Service disavowed the ATFD report as the "opinion of its author only," and said a review showed Alkire's letter was incomplete and inaccurate. Murphy never received a reply when he asked for specifics on the inaccuracies.

PURCHASED AMMUNITION

In October Murphy asked for an ATFD agent to accompany his aides to Maryland gun stores to ask for their ammunition sales records. He wanted to learn if the provision of the 1968 act was unenforceable and useless, as the administration claimed. Congressional investigators had done this before and in 90 minutes found that 37 per cent of the 177 ammunition purchasers taken at random

from records of a Washington dealer, had criminal records.

"If we could do that, why can't the Treasury Department?" commented one of the investigators, Carl Perrian, now a Murphy aide.

But when Murphy sought to repeat what had been proven successfully in the past—that the records were valuable—the Treasury Department ignored his request.

"They sympathize with the gun people," Murphy said. "It's their political interest with the gun lobby that's been delaying everything."

AMERICAN SPIRIT

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure of attending the 1972 Volunteer Girl's State Convention in Murfreesboro, Tenn. The young ladies who were delegates to this convention impressed me with their dedication of purpose and boundless enthusiasm. Highlighting the convention was an address by Cathy Campbell, this year's Girl's State Governor. Cathy expressed in her speech many thoughts which can best be described as exemplifying the "American Spirit." Miss Campbell's speech tells of a young Tennessean's love for her country tempered only by a devotion to her God.

I would like to share Cathy's address with my fellow Congressmen as they should hear the true voice of our young people ringing out loud and clear:

ADDRESS BY HON. CATHY CAMPBELL

Live each day to the fullest. Get the most from each hour each day and each year of your life. Then you can look forward with confidence and backward without regret.

As we arrived here at Girl's State Sunday many of us were in a sense poor because we had not experienced what Girl's State had to offer. But as the week progressed we too progressed from poor to rich.

We have opened our eyes and hearts with love for our fellow man. We learned to share our thoughts. Working side by side taught us the true meaning of love and everlasting friendships.

Girl's State has given us a great pride in our country, America. We have learned hand in hand to express our feelings of love for our great country without being ashamed. Many of us have learned God plays an ever more important part in our American life.

Sunday when looking at quite a few faces we couldn't see how we would ever get the Girl's State spirit. But we did and now we know what past Girl Staters know, that the loving spirit of Girl's State will never die but will continue in our hearts as we tell others of our adventures.

We are not afraid to express our feelings of love. We are not ashamed to be seen crying for our country and fellowman.

If we have put our best foot forward here at Girl's State this week we will leave tomorrow with a lot of love for our fellow citizens, a greater pride in America, not afraid to shed a tear of love and have a great spirit of Girl's State forever.

If we have become rich in these ways then we have succeeded at Girl's State.

What's to come tomorrow? What about the people back home and in school who need our help? Will they ever know what it's like to stand hand in hand with 475 girls and sing the song "America"?

It is our duty to go back to our homes and show just what Girl's State has taught us. We are the people who will teach them.

Remember as Girl's State has taught us this week:

Be yourself—be your best self. Dare to be different and to follow your own star.

And don't be afraid to be happy. Enjoy what is beautiful. Love with all your heart and soul. Believe that those you love, love you.

Forget what you have done for your friends and remember what they have done for you. Disregard what the world owes you, and concentrate on what you owe the world.

When you are faced with a decision, make that decision as wisely as possible, then forget it. The moment of absolute certainty never arrives.

And above all, remember that God helps those who help themselves. Act as if everything depended upon you and pray as if everything depended upon God!

HUSAK TURNS THE SCREW

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, lest we again be misled as to the mellowing of the Communist regimes, an editorial commentary in yesterday's Washington Star on the latest developments in Czechoslovakia is a clear indication of the oppression which continues behind the Iron Curtain.

It must be noted that while Communist regimes have made certain diplomatic adjustments primarily for economic purposes with the free world, there is very little, if any, lessening of control as exercised over their own subjects.

The editorial follows:

HUSAK TURNS THE SCREW

When he came to power three years ago, in the aftermath of the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia, Communist party leader Gustav Husak, who himself spent more than 15 years in Stalinist prisons or as an "unperson," promised that no one would be persecuted for what he had done or said during the 16-month reformist regime of Alexander Dubcek.

Although many Czech and Slovak liberals, including Dubcek himself, lost their party membership, their jobs and their homes, Husak for many months at least stopped short of trying those who sought to give communism "a human face."

But Husak gave way to the hardliners in the fall of last year and there followed a wave of arrests, with perhaps 500 prominent liberals being picked up. Last week, several of these men and women were sentenced to prison terms of up to 2 years, other trials are underway and still more are expected to start next month.

Hardest hit have been the journalists, writers, actors and intellectuals who were the spearhead of the "Prague spring" of 1968. Those who refuse to recant, and to express their gratitude for the "fraternal" rape of their country by the Soviet Union, risk never being able to send their children to high school, to hold a job which is other than menial, to publish their works or to perform in public.

As a consequence of this conspiracy of silence, not a single new word of Czech fiction was published in one recent year, the vibrant film industry is in shambles and the

world-famous Prague theater. "Behind the Gates," has been closed. The Czechs, who retain their capacity for wry humor, maintain that the Prague subway now under construction has the most artistically distinguished work force ever assembled for such a project.

The recent trials and those now in progress have been closed to the public and the press. Nor have the sentences been announced to the Czechoslovak people. It's a pity that Communist party member Angela Davis, who has vowed to continue her fight on behalf of "oppressed people everywhere," cannot stop in Prague during her tour of Eastern Europe to see how the Red establishment treats dissenters.

HOW MUCH IS A BILLION DOLLARS?

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, a Democratically controlled Congress—which it has been for most of the last 30 years—persists in overspending the revenues of the Nation and forcing us further and further toward the precipice of national bankruptcy. Despite the alarming fact that the Nation is operating in the red to the tune of nearly \$30 billion this year, the Congress is appropriating additional billions upon billions without providing matching revenue.

As the interesting editorial from yesterday's Sunday Star-News points out:

The consequences are bound to be painful. The government will have to raise taxes—the more Congress and the Administration spend beyond what is prudent, the more inevitable a truly large tax increase becomes.

And as the Star-News also interestingly points out, if one were to start today to count a billion dollars at the rate of one bill per second it would take until November 24, 1978, working an 8-hour day, 7 days a week.

I commend the editorial to the thoughtful consideration of all who realize that the No. 1 problem this Nation faces is not crime, not Southeast Asia, not education, not pollution, not drugs. Rather, it is a fiscal situation in which years of fiscal irresponsibility threaten to destroy our national ability to provide the funds with which to protect the United States and attend to its urgent problems both foreign and domestic:

TODAY'S ASSIGNMENT: COUNT UP TO A BILLION

President Nixon, the reports say, is considering a special message on what Congress is doing to his budget and what, if the spending binge continues, is certain to follow: Higher taxes and renewed inflation.

These are hot-weather days, a time when the mind tends to turn away from heavy subjects. These are times, too, when it has become fashionable to pooh-pooh any suggestion of fiscal discipline on the grounds that it is somehow gauche and unprogressive. And we are in an election year, meaning that anything the President says about the Democratic Congress will be construed as wholly political.

But we hope the President goes ahead and, in addition, grabs for as much public atten-

tion as he can get, for the issues involved are truly crucial. He would be wise to remain objective and to put his case in terms that the average man, wrestling with his own budget, can understand. What we have partly in mind is a refresher course in sixth-grade arithmetic, something that for many members of Congress—and also the administration—is long overdue. It could start something like this:

A billion is not, as many people may be led to believe by the numbers that fly around this town, another word for a million. Neither is it on the order of, say 10 million. It is a thousand million. A million one-dollar bills, laid end to end, would stretch one and a half times around the Capital Beltway. A billion one-dollar bills laid end to end would reach around the world four times. Columnist Art Buchwald recently suggested that Melvin Laird or Elliot Richardson or anyone else who wants to spend a billion dollars or more be obliged to go to the bank and count it out in tens and twenties. An engaging idea. Let no one try it, though. For starting today, working an eight-hour day and a seven-day week at the rate of one bill per second, the job of counting \$1 billion in equal numbers of ten and twenty-dollar notes would take until November 24, 1978.

All this is by way of saying that the concept of a billion defies easy comprehension, so that to toss the number around casually is usually to operate in an air of unreality. It also points up the fact that when the President asks for an extra billion dollars, or when Congress tacks on to an appropriation bill an extra billion, an enormous amount of money is involved.

The Nixon budget, presented in January for the fiscal year that has just begun, calls for taking in about \$220 billion and spending about \$245 billion. Knock off seven zeroes in each of those figures, and a picture can be drawn of a man who will earn \$22,000 while planning to spend \$24,500 in the year ahead. Once again, the million-billion contrast is instructive. A million dollars to the federal budget is the same as a dime to our \$22,000 wage earner, or the price of a small cup of coffee. A billion dollars, though, is the same as \$100 to that wage earner. A taxpayer in the \$22,000 bracket would give a good bit of thought before putting out an extra \$100, and another \$100 after that. He might defend it if he were in good financial shape, but not if he were already thoroughly overcommitted.

Now the congressional spenders might reason that federal revenues are constantly on the increase. So they are, by about \$20 billion a year. The trouble is that automatic spending obligations—meaning those Congress has no control over, such as interest on the debt, public welfare and farm subsidies—are rising about \$12 billion a year.

That leaves about \$8 billion in what might be considered newly disposable income if the government were on an even fiscal keel. But it is not on an even keel. A big deficit is inevitable. And knowing that, even before this fiscal year got underway, Congress added \$6 to \$7 billion to the '73 budget. A good part of this represented the 20 percent Social Security increase. And that, along with much of the other increases, reflects what now has become standard and somewhat cynical operating procedure on Capitol Hill: Whatever the budget request for a politically visible and attractive program, pile on more money and dare the President to veto it. This is an upmanship game that has been played in the past, but with millions and not billions of dollars.

Congress cannot be called entirely oblivious to the government's fiscal plight. Just last week, knowing full well a presidential veto was certain, enough Democrats and Republicans teamed up in the House to defeat a completely irresponsible \$5 billion public-works bill. But that does not mean

true fiscal responsibility has set in, nor that the budget-deficit problem will come under control. The problem, in fact, is almost certain to get much worse. The President's budget managers are desperately trying to convince themselves they can keep the 1973 deficit under \$30 billion, for they know that beyond that figure, further red ink will have a decidedly inflationary impact.

But all the forces are going in the wrong direction. For one thing, Tropical Storm Agnes came along, and the President has proposed, and Congress will certainly agree, to spend \$2 billion to aid the flood victims. And the war goes on, with the cost of air and naval bombardment certain to cost billions above what the budget men calculated for military spending in January. Then comes the legislation still pending—the big water pollution bill is a good example—already carrying a price tag billions above the budget figures. Finally, another debt ceiling bill must be enacted by October 30, one week before the election, and nobody knows how many billion-dollar goodies Congress will seek to attach to it. At any rate, this year's deficit could well run to \$40 billion and beyond. With the economy now on the upswing, this is precisely the wrong time for that to happen. If it does happen, though, the President and Congress will have to share responsibility and the next President, whoever he is, will be forced not only to raise taxes but to raise them on a very large order.

Another look at our \$22,000 wage earner is in order. He makes good money and gets a raise every year. But months ago he knew that even if he grew cautious, he would spend \$2,500 more this coming year than he would make. He has not been cautious. In the first six months of the year, he obligated himself for a further \$600 to \$700. Now he is preparing to spend hundreds more. Between now and next July, he may well have spent \$26,000 or more, adding to his debts by at least \$4,000.

There are such people, of course, and they usually suffer painful consequences. Their only recourse is to rein in on spending, or make more money or both. For the federal government—and, ultimately, for all of us—the consequences also are bound to be painful. The government will have to raise taxes. And sooner or later, it will have to recapture a sense of reality about expenditures. In the meantime, the more Congress and the administration spend beyond what is prudent, the more inevitable a truly large tax increase becomes.

As a nation, we are very much in the position of the man who is making more money than he ever made before, possibly more than he ever dreamed of, but who is so undisciplined in his spending and so overcommitted that he cannot do the things he wants to do, and should do. Congress by and large has ignored this lesson. The President should speak out on it. So should the public.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,757 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

THE TROUBLE WITH JUDICARE
EVALUATIONS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in the continuing consideration of Judicare and legal aid, this article from the July 1972 American Bar Association Journal is analytically helpful:

THE TROUBLE WITH JUDICARE EVALUATIONS
(By Samuel J. Brakel)

In the May issue of this *Journal* (page 476) there was an article by Messrs. Goodman and Feuillan entitled "The trouble with Judicare". In my view, that article was more a convincing demonstration of the trouble with judicare evaluations than of any deficiencies of judicare as a legal services system. There are three basic problems with the article: (1) It relies exclusively on statistical information. (2) It uses defective statistics. And (3) it applies defective analysis to the defective statistics.

Having been involved in the study of judicare since June, 1971, I believe I am in as good a position as anyone to discuss the difficulties posed by the Goodman-Feuillan article. I am not a judicare proponent or a staff attorney proponent. I do believe, however, that on the whole judicare has not been given a fair shake in the evaluative literature which has accumulated over the recent years. The Goodman-Feuillan article is a case in point, and with that assertion I risk being labeled "biased", "reactionary" or even a "shoddy researcher". Such is the degree of polarization that characterizes the legal services debate in which academics and politicians participate with equal vigor and polemics. It is a risk I am willing to take.

The Goodman-Feuillan article comparing Wisconsin Judicare to the Upper Peninsula Legal Services in Michigan (and occasionally to the staff attorney programs of Colorado and Maine) made four main points:

1. That Wisconsin Judicare performs less adequately than the staff programs in reaching the "more rural" (the more isolated, "poorer") poor.
2. That Wisconsin Judicare performs less adequately than the staff programs in numbers of cases handled relative to the total eligible population (ratio of families served to families eligible).
3. That the delivery of legal services under Wisconsin Judicare is more costly than under the staff programs.
4. That the presumed inadequacies of Wisconsin Judicare stem from and are inherent in the judicare concept, its "voluntaristic" set-up.

All four conclusions are highly questionable.

SERVICE TO THE "MOST RURAL" POOR

The authors conclusion that Wisconsin Judicare performs more "poorly" (their pun) in this respect than staffed programs is based on several distinct errors in both their data and their analysis.

1. Failure to analyze the caseloads sufficiently—Goodman and Feuillan have compared the judicare performance in twenty-eight different Wisconsin counties to the staffed office performance in Upper Peninsula's six strategically preselected areas, each served by a regional office. Obviously the authors would find, as they did, that the performance judged by volume of cases relative to number of eligible families varies only slightly (1:6 to 1:9) among the six U.P.L.S. regional offices, whereas a greater disparity in performance exists among the twenty-eight Wisconsin counties.

The problem is that Goodman and Feuillan have failed to make the relevant inquiry of where within the six U.P.L.S. regions the cases come from. The fact is that the situation within the regions in Upper Michigan is quite similar to that in Wisconsin: a disproportionate amount of service goes to the poor in the urban areas, especially in towns where the regional office (the private lawyer in judicare) is located and areas immediately surrounding these towns, to the disadvantage of the poor in the more rural counties, the more isolated areas removed from the urban centers. The director of U.P.L.S. voluntarily and candidly admitted to this problem.

A brief and sketchy analysis of the U.P.L.S. caseload reveals that those counties not favored with the location of a regional office receive about 25-30 percent less service—proportionate to population—than the counties where the regional offices are situated. More significantly, however, within each county a strongly disproportionate number of clients are residents of one or two of the larger towns, the county seat where the regional office is located or to which staff attorneys travel one day a week and perhaps a neighboring town or two.

This is not a criticism of U.P.L.S., but a neutral exposition of the fact that the difficulty of serving the more rural poor is attributable to a variety of factors neither Wisconsin Judicare nor U.P.L.S. has been able to overcome entirely. By definition, the "more rural" the poor the more isolated they are from social services generally and from legal services specifically, whether supplied by private lawyers or through neighborhood offices. There not only are physical problems of distance and lack of transportation, but also the psychological obstacles of lack of awareness of the nature and function of service resources, lack of perception of problems as meriting legal or other professional attention, and so forth. Among the more rural poor there seems to exist even a culture of self-reliance and voluntary isolation.

Goodman and Feuillan are correct in recognizing elements of the problem in Wisconsin. They are wrong in concluding that it has been overcome in Upper Michigan. What the authors have demonstrated about U.P.L.S. is analogous to the following hypothetical situation: If Wisconsin Judicare had central recording offices in Green Bay, Rhinelander, Ashland, Eau Claire, and two in Superior, then the distribution of its cases would be relatively even.

2. Use of inaccurate statistics for Wisconsin—Apart from failing to make a genuine comparison, Goodman and Feuillan base their distribution conclusion on statistics that are defective and greatly exaggerate the problem in Wisconsin. Because the authors use "lawyer" statistics in analyzing the distribution of cases in the Wisconsin counties, they fail to take notice of the fact that Wisconsin Judicare clients (and sometimes lawyers) cross county lines to obtain (deliver) services. This constitutes a particularly serious error for the more rural, poorer counties with few lawyers—the counties about which the authors make their basic point. For example, more than 65 per cent of the caseload in Forest County, Wisconsin, which has only one resident attorney, is handled by a lawyer from Oneida County who practices two days a week in an office in Forest County. None of the Forest County clients represented by this attorney show up as part of the Forest County caseload in the Wisconsin Judicare records. An even more drastic example is Menominee County, which has no lawyers and where the entire caseload is handled by Shawano County lawyers and recorded as Shawano County cases. In short, the Goodman-Feuillan analysis completely breaks down precisely in the counties of concern.

SERVICE TO THE POOR GENERALLY: VOLUME

The Goodman-Feuillan conclusion that Wisconsin Judicare compares unfavorably to the staff programs in number of cases handled in proportion to the number of eligible families is unsupported by the facts and based on several fundamental analytical errors of commission and omission.

1. Undercounting—For reasons I shall speculate about a little later, Goodman and Feuillan have missed counting about one third of the Wisconsin Judicare caseload. The ratio of one case for every thirty-two eligible families derives from their "finding" that there were 922 closed cases (excluding initial conferences) in 1970. The official Community Services Program Progress Reports (known as "MIS Reports") reveal, however, that Wisconsin Judicare produced 1,425 closed cases (still excluding initial conferences) in 1970 for a ratio of 1:20.7 rather than 1:32.1 But there are additional problems with the Goodman-Feuillan analysis.

2. Unrepresentativeness of the period selected—Goodman and Feuillan choose the year 1970 to make their quantitative statements about Wisconsin Judicare and the staff programs. But 1970 was not at all a typical or average year in terms of the performance of the various programs. During all of 1970, due to insufficient funding, a restriction on divorce intake was in effect for Wisconsin Judicare that reduced the number of divorces handled by about 50 per cent. Since divorces constituted about 35 per cent of the judicare caseload in years when the restriction was not operative (1966 through the middle of 1969 and part of 1971), the trouble with selecting 1970 as the comparative twelve-month period becomes clear. To illustrate: the number of closed cases (excluding initial conferences) in 1969 was 1,895, a ratio, per eligible family, of 1:15.6. For an "average" twelve-month period during the life of the Wisconsin program the ratio is about 1:16.5, rather than 1:20.7 in 1970, and far from the 1:32 per Goodman-Feuillan.

The year 1970 is also highly unrepresentative of the U.P.L.S. performance. Its total caseload for 1970 is about double of what it was for each of the first two years of the program, 1967 and 1968. It is also considerably (about 25 per cent) higher than the total volume in 1969. While a good deal of the increase in the 1970 U.P.L.S. caseload is taken up by initial conferences, the ratio of closed cases, excluding initial conferences, is also strongly affected. Rather than the 1:8.0 ratio arrived at by Goodman-Feuillan, the "average" annual ratio for U.P.L.S. is about 1:11.0. The comparison now becomes Wisconsin Judicare, 1:16.5; U.P.L.S. 1:11.0; Pine Tree Legal Assistance of Maine, 1:16.1; Colorado Rural Legal Services, 1:14.6. Very little difference really, especially when additional distorting factors are taken into consideration.

3. Statistical incomparability: Problems of definition, recordkeeping and significance—In the above paragraphs I have played along with Goodman and Feuillan to show that if they had played their game correctly they could not have reached the conclusions they did. I want to go beyond this now and demonstrate the futility of the game itself, to prove that statistics alone are meaningless, that they can be manipulated to support just about any point the "analyst" desires to prove a priori. Absent an understanding of what the statistics mean, what they refer to and an exposition of the extent to which they are or are not comparable, the entire effort is spurious at best.

For example, Goodman and Feuillan chose to exclude initial conferences from their computations of volume. I suspect that this led them to their initial serious error when they wound up excluding "advice plus" cases from the Wisconsin Judicare caseload but

only "advice only" cases from the other programs.² But the problems go deeper.

WHY EXCLUDE "ADVICE ONLY" CASES?

Why exclude "advice only" cases at all, when these are often final and effective dispositions? What effect does this exclusion have on the case per eligible family ratio? Can one simply ignore the fact that under judicare approximately 10-15 per cent of the caseload (mostly "advice only" cases) never is recorded? More serious are the classifications under which the various programs record their cases at all comparable? Is a "referred" case, an "advice only case" or an "advice plus" case under Wisconsin Judicare anywhere near the same thing as under staffed programs? An analysis of hours spent per case under judicare compared to staffed programs suggests that the classification schemes are not at all comparable. Should one then only compare cases "litigated"? Or should one look at the total number of hours spent per program? If so, what about efficiency, impact, quality?

This only hints at some of the many complexities inherent in doing a fair and meaningful comparison. Even avoiding the more obvious errors of differential exclusion or incomparable comparison, one can tilt the case in favor of one program over another by mere selectivity of presentation. For example, one could emphasize that the Wisconsin Judicare performance surpasses the U.P.L.S. performance as measured by the volume and ratio of cases litigated (the only truly comparable cases?). In 1969 Wisconsin Judicare litigated 1,207 cases; in 1970, 649. U.P.L.S. produced only 367, 466 and 526 litigations in 1968, 1969 and 1970, respectively. But is this a meaningful way of comparing programs? Should Wisconsin Judicare litigate less or U.P.L.S. more? The answer to that depends on a variety of factors and value judgments. In short, mere statistics, whether reflecting total volume less initial conferences or cases litigated only or whatever, mean very little even if statistically accurate and "comparable".

The crucial point to be made is that there is simply no basis in the limited information presented by Goodman and Feullan for the inference that there is "trouble" with judicare and none with staff offices. Wisconsin Judicare in the first five years and three months of its existence has handled about 12,500 cases, including initial conferences but excluding unrecorded cases and cases handled by the Madison office, for a ratio of one case for every 2.36 eligible families. This ratio is surpassed slightly by U.P.L.S. over its life but not quite attained by the Maine and Colorado staffed programs.

NO PROGRAM CAN BE ADJUDGED ON BASIS OF MINOR VARIATIONS

But no program can be adjudged to fail or succeed on the basis of minor variations in volume of disputable significance. In any attempt to draw conclusions from volume, certain factors relating to the finiteness of legal need or demand must be considered. Goodman and Feullan have not done this. What portion of volume computed reflects service to new clients or multiple service to families previously served? How many legal problems does one "typical" eligible family have over a period of, say, five years? How many of these merit the time and energies of the program attorneys? Does the demand for legal services run in cycles or is it constant? Has Wisconsin Judicare peaked? Can U.P.L.S. be expected to maintain its 1970 pace? What are the inhibitions posed by limited funding and limited staff? And so forth.

COST ANALYSIS PROVES SELECTIVE

Goodman and Feullan conclude—something by implication—that judicare is more costly than the staff attorney method of delivering services, but only a very selective analysis produces this conclusion.

FUNDING BY DOLLARS PER ELIGIBLE FAMILY

	Wisconsin judicare	Upper Peninsula legal services	Pine Tree legal assistance	Colorado rural legal assistance
Total annual funding-----	\$240,181	\$222,712	\$440,052	\$274,816
Eligible families..	289,792	14,547	39,547	14,726
	29,537			

1. Fairness of "the only fair calculation"—The authors begin by asserting that costs can be compared fairly only for particular types of cases—divorce and bankruptcy. Their calculations lead to the result that these cases under Wisconsin Judicare are handled at anywhere from three to seven times the cost for which the staff programs handle these cases. Assuming the calculations are correct, which is doubtful in view of the erroneous statistics on the volume of cases, they only prove the obvious—that a staff attorney program may make some savings in some areas because of economies of scale. The same could be demonstrated about a private Wisconsin lawyer in Superior or Eau Claire, with an office half a block from the bankruptcy court and a potentially large urban caseload, who probably could handle bankruptcies more cheaply than the lawyer whose office is in Glenwood City, population 822 and forty miles from the nearest courthouse.

2. Less selective statistics—The Goodman-Feullan implication that judicare is excessively costly is negated by facts and figures other than the divorce-bankruptcy comparison of dubious accuracy and validity.

The table demonstrates that Wisconsin Judicare is funded at a level considerably below the staff programs in dollars per eligible family. This gives credence to the Wisconsin Judicare complaint that reductions in caseload (divorce) have had to be made owing to lack of sufficient funding. More significantly, however, why has Wisconsin been funded at a lower level? Where do the funds go under the staffed programs, reportedly so much less costly than judicare? What is the validity or meaning of the "fair" cost comparison offered by Goodman-Feullan?

Our re-examination of the question of volume shows that the larger annual costs of the staff programs cannot be attributed to the greater volume, either absolute or proportionate, handled. Wisconsin Judicare, Maine and Colorado are very close in volume. Only U.P.L.S. is distinctively higher in volume, but the cost-saving implications of this do not remotely resemble the ones proffered by Goodman-Feullan in their cost-per-case comparison. Moreover, the straight volume focus is of marginal usefulness in any event. It ignores the fact that there is a larger amount (proportion) of litigation under judicare. It also ignores the greater amounts of time spent per case by judicare lawyers than by staff attorneys.

It could be argued that these are the advantages of the staff attorney system. Perhaps. One can also debate at length whether a "typical" divorce merits closer to two than to ten hours of attorney time. It is more difficult to argue, however, as Goodman and Feullan do, that the comparison of Wisconsin Judicare divorces averaging 10.5 hours of attorney time versus staff office divorces averaging 2.25 hours of attorney time (including travel and court time!) constitutes one of the "only fair" comparisons.

The greater costs of the staff programs must come from elsewhere. Perhaps "overhead". Or perhaps the significant expenditures go into law reform, or what Goodman and Feullan might call other "noncomparable" cases or activities. The proper data and analysis are lacking here. Quite probably, Wisconsin Judicare has done more "law reform"—whatever that may be worth—than U.P.L.S. Most of this work emanates from

the Madison central office, although the private Wisconsin lawyers also make some contributions. Legislative lobbying is also an element in Wisconsin Judicare's tactics. Perhaps the Wisconsin activities are equaled by Maine and Colorado. No evidence exists, however, that these staff programs greatly surpass the Wisconsin performance in these areas.

In sum, there is absolutely no basis for the conclusion that the cost of delivering legal services generally under judicare is greater than under staffed office programs.

JUDICARE AS A "NONSYSTEM"

Goodman and Feullan conclude their article with a sweeping statement that the trouble with judicare is inherent in the judicare concept, in the "voluntaristic principle" that gives individual attorneys a measure of control over their caseloads. Judicare is labeled an "uncontrollable system", "a non-system", with whatever negative implications accompany that labeling.

This is mere sociological name-calling. Since the authors have failed to demonstrate by facts that there is any particular "trouble" with judicare, applying a derogatory label to the concept hardly helps the case. At any rate, if the authors felt it to be profitable to engage in a conceptual critique, they should at least have focused on the following questions: Is the judicare attorney's control—individually or collectively—over caseload any different from the staff attorney's? If so, to what effect? Would judicare be a workable system if attorneys were compelled to take all cases brought? Could a staff program operate on that basis? Is there something to be said for the "non-system" which appears to result in the more dedicated and public-spirited attorneys handling most of the cases? Or is the implication necessarily and exclusively negative?

The main point which should emerge from this response is that an analysis of program statistics only is not likely to yield much in the way of fair and comprehensible comparisons. Too many operative factors remain unknown or unaccounted for in looking at statistics only. Unwarranted selections are made; crucial data are ignored because not easily available or dismissed as irrelevant; comparisons are made among elements that are not comparable. Without a knowledge and understanding of program operations, it is impossible to do a meaningful evaluation and the sequence of statistical analysis becomes inevitable.

The trouble with the Goodman-Feullan article, however, is not just that what they have done is inadequate, that they have missed the mark. Rather, in missing the mark, they have contributed to the distortion of legal services realities that characterized the earlier evaluative literature. They have not simply failed to perform a much-needed service; they have done the academic and political community concerned with this field a disservice.

There are now no grounds for conclusions that judicare is either "better" or "worse", cheaper or more costly than staffed programs in either rural, urban, semiurban, most rural or suburban areas. The data to support these conclusions have not been gathered; the analysis has not yet begun.

J. HAROLD MOORE RETIRES

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to take note of the civic acti-

vities of a man who will be retiring this September after 42 years with Western Electric Co. J. Harold (Hal) Moore has not only been valued employee of Western Electric, he has dedicated himself to civic-spirited endeavors and the betterment of the community in which he lives.

In past years, Hal Moore has served as chairman of the youth employment project of the Sunnyvale Chamber of Commerce. The project encouraged commerce and industry to hire potential dropouts from high school and directed its special efforts toward those youngsters who most needed help. He has been involved in other capacities with the Sunnyvale Chamber of Commerce and has also served as metro chairman for the National Alliance of Businessmen in Santa Clara County. He is chairman of the U.S. Industrial Savings Bond Campaign in Santa Clara County and is also a director of the Santa Clara County United Fund. He has also been a fund raiser for the junior achievement organization in the county. He has also assisted such groups as the Opportunities Industrialization Center, Skills Center, Goodwill Industries, and Hope for the Retarded.

I know that Mr. Moore will be sorely missed by his associates, but I am sure that we will continue to see him involving himself in community work. I must commend Mr. Moore for his past efforts and I join his friends, family, and associates as well as the entire community in wishing him well in his much-deserved retirement.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF ORDER OF AHEPA

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, this week the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, the Order of Ahepa, celebrates its golden anniversary. At this appropriate time, I would like to express briefly my gratitude to AHEPA for its countless contributions to society at home and abroad.

Through the able leadership of Supreme President Sam Nikis, whom I am honored to have as a member of my constituency, and with the assistance of the officers of the two St. Louis chapters, Ollie S. Aslan and Alex Tsimires, presidents, George Margos and Chris Magdalin, vice presidents, George J. Bouras and Petro Harakas, secretaries, James Tschlis and Pete Panos, treasurers, AHEPA has continued its fine tradition of patriotism and humanitarianism.

The list of AHEPA's good works could go on and on. AHEPA's worthy causes cover a broad range on the national and international level from hospitals, aid to disaster victims, orphans and refugees, scholarships to needy students and memorials to some of those who have exemplified AHEPA's purpose. On the local level, AHEPA chapters are responsible for numerous civic activities for the betterment of their communities.

It is with great appreciation that I bring this to the attention of my colleagues today. It is because of such fine organizations as AHEPA that the spirit of brotherhood remains a part of the American scene.

WAYNE GUTHRIE WRITES ON MEANING OF FOURTH OF JULY

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, my good friend Wayne Guthrie of the Indianapolis News wrote the following in the News on July 4, 1972. I am happy to include it in the RECORD:

4TH ALSO HONORS TODAY'S PATRIOTS (By Wayne Guthrie)

Since childhood many Americans have thought of Independence Day, which for many years they knew only as the Fourth of July simply in terms of jollification.

They have been wont to regard it solely as a time to boast of what our forebearers did and to give vent to their feelings in celebration, such as speeches, parades, martial music, song, flag waving, fireworks, picnics, shouting or pleasurable entertainment.

That was fitting, of course, because Americans have a right to be proud of their heritage and their freedoms, liberties and opportunities that are the envy of the rest of the world.

But somehow, one can't shake the feeling that the times and existing conditions in America and the rest of the world call for something more than that. It is a feeling that if we be content simply to spend our energy, talents and substance in jollification and entertainment we would not be true to those colonial forebears who risked their all, including their lives, to give us the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution or to those men and women who, in every age since, have taken the same risks to defend, protect, preserve and perpetuate the countless blessings with which those two great documents have endowed us.

In other words, let us not forget the patriots of today—in the armed services, in the official position, in civic life and in the daily mart—who have consecrated their lives, actions, thoughts and services to the task of preserving and perpetuating the freedoms and blessings we enjoy as a free people but, alas, too often are prone to take for granted.

Our heritage came from people in whose hearts and souls burned a belief in social freedom, dignity of the individual, independence of action, personal freedom, civic responsibility, obedience to law and constituted authority and spiritual dedication that astonished a world that scarcely could believe what it heard and saw.

They gave us a government in which the highest officeholder was considered the servant of the people—not the reverse—with an obligation to report to them on and be responsible for his acts.

It was a nation giving just courtesy to those chosen to serve or represent the people but never relinquishing power over them or exalting them above their office.

Obviously they did not think the time ever would come when conditions and affairs would become so complex that actually there would be a tendency to relax or let go of their original conception of dignity, liberty and responsibility.

Nor, did they dream that in the future

there might develop a trend toward letting powers and forces that should be the servants become the masters and take over the power and right to think, plan and decide for the people and to tell them what they must do or not do.

Many who see such inclinations as fraught with grave peril, if permitted to continue and grow unchecked, feel it is high time people resolve that not one fragment be removed from the bedrock which supports our great heritage.

They are concerned that we not sit nonchalantly by and permit a Federal bureaucracy in Washington to usurp the powers originally meant to be vested exclusively in the states or to reach the point where each citizen loses his or her identity and becomes simply a number in a vast computer.

They fear the ever-creeping and widening paralysis of paternalistic welfare, however well-intentioned, which guarantees every person a living from the cradle to the grave without turning a hand, could destroy the basic principles on which our forebears established this nation—industry, self-reliance and initiative.

Mindful of what happened in the wake of World War I when we lived up to our pledge of disarmament while other parties to the agreement, to the contrary, increased their military and naval might, many folks are concerned that we do not fall into that or a similar trap again in any agreement with Communists who have a record of not keeping promises or pledges.

MARYLAND FAMILY AIDE PLAN

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday we passed in the House H.R. 15657, legislation to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act. This bill is designed to continue on-going programs, as well as to develop new and expanded services for the elderly. One of our deepest concerns is that our older citizens be able to continue to lead productive lives in dignity and comfort during their retirement years. The isolation of older Americans from the rest of the community is a shameful waste of one of our Nation's greatest resources.

I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to a program of useful employment for older citizens which has been in existence in my district since 1966. Part of the Over-60 Counseling and Employment Service of the Montgomery County Federation of Women's Clubs, which is aided by grants from the Montgomery County Council and under title III of the Older Americans Act, from the Maryland Commission on Aging, this is a family aide program which trains and places older women in full or part-time jobs as companions for the elderly or as "mother substitutes" for young children. The family aide program has been so successful to date that it has just published a "how-to" booklet on organizing and operating this type of community outreach program to assist those who wish to establish such a service in their locality. A report on the activities of the project, from the July 1972 issue of "Aging" follows:

MARYLAND FAMILY AIDE PLAN PUBLISHES "HOW TO" BOOKLET

Because inquiries have been received from agencies and individuals in 36 States, a how-to-do-it booklet has been issued on how to organize and operate a family aide program employing women over 50.

Entitled *Good Neighbor Family Aide Program: Outreach to the Unreached*, the 30-page booklet was written and edited by Emogene Kirk Baxter, who was one of the founders in 1961 of the Over-60 Counseling and Employment Service of the Montgomery County, Md., Federation of Women's Clubs (*Aging*, Mar. '71, p. 10) and who was instrumental in setting up the family aide program in 1966.

The family aide project is a part of the Over-60 program, which is aided by grants from the Montgomery County Council and, under title III of the Older Americans Act, from the Maryland Commission on Aging. It trains and places older women in full or part time posts as companions for the elderly or "mother substitutes for the young."

From June 1966 to September 1971 the program trained 215 home aides, 167 of whom are working. During that period 6,000 requests were received for such workers, 60% of them for women to act as companions to the elderly.

During the last 3 months of 1971, a stepped up program trained 243 aides, of whom 132 now are working, 107 of them as companions to the elderly. During the same period 435 requests for aides were received, only one in four of which could be filled.

The training course of 12 hours—3 hours on each of four successive days—is given by experts, including Red Cross nurses, a home economist, and a psychiatrist. After graduation, for pay of \$1.60 to \$2 an hour for part time work, the aides may assist with feeding, bathing, planning and preparing meals, shopping, and tidying a client's quarters. They are not required to do heavy housework or laundry.

General Federation Clubwoman, official GFWC magazine, carried an article on the program in its April issue.

"Goals of the program are to meet two crucial needs," says Mrs. Baxter. "To provide a source of help in the private home and to provide a job opportunity for the older woman for whom job placement in the business world is very difficult because of her age."

Designed to assist those who wish to establish such a free community service, using the cooperation of both voluntary and official agencies, the booklet discusses program components, training methods, obstacles to be overcome, and even furnishes sample forms essential to operation.

The manual is free, but for postage and handling a fee of 35¢ a copy is charged. It is available from the Over-60 Service, 4700 Norwood Drive, Chevy Chase, Md. 20015.

CONGRATULATIONS TO AHEPA

HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the many Members who have taken special occasion to note the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, the fine group known around the world as AHEPA.

This is a fraternity of good fellowship with an enviable record of accomplishment in the fields of education, charity,

and civic improvement. When disaster strikes, AHEPA is ready to help the victims through the generosity of its members. When a civic improvement needs organized working support, the city can count on the people of AHEPA.

But, first and foremost, the objective of this organization is to "promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America." The members of AHEPA are foremost among the groups who know the value of American citizenship and appreciate its privileges.

They are all of the order of Americans on whom we can rely under all conditions. They never fail to carry their share of the load. Our country can never have too many like them.

Congratulations to them all and best wishes for another successful span of 50 years.

NEWS BULLETIN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD the July 24, 1972, edition of the news bulletin of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. I take this action to help my colleagues be informed of developments across this land preparing for our 200th anniversary in 1976. The bulletin is compiled and written by the staff of the ARBC Communications Committee. The bulletin follows:

In a Press Conference at ARBC Headquarters on Thursday, July 20, Chairman David Mahoney with Coins and Medals Advisory Chairman, George Lang, announced that as of Mid-July 665,900 PNC's have been sold through the U.S. Mint with a gross of \$3,165,000 and a return of approximately \$2,365,000 in net revenue to the ARBC. Chairman Mahoney told the assembled press, "While our appropriation pending in Congress is a prerequisite to State Commission grants, staffing, implementing and organizing, the funds derived from the sale of this item and other planned commemorative medals will allow us to finance many other special projects without asking the taxpayer to pay for the entire Bicentennial."

George Lang, Chairman of the ARBC's Festival USA Committee, has announced that the Committee's three Advisory Panels on the Performing Arts, the Creative and Visual Arts, and an Invitation to the World Panel held meetings at ARBC Headquarters last week and have submitted specific recommendations to the full Committee regarding the arts, travel and hospitality for the Bicentennial. The Panel's recommendations will now be channelled through the full Festival USA Committee.

The next meeting of the ARBC Executive Committee will be on Monday, July 24, 9:00 a.m. at ARBC Headquarters in Washington, D.C.

Clifford M. Clarke, vice-chairman of the Georgia Commission for the National Bicentennial Celebration was elected chairman of the Bicentennial Council of the 13 Original States at a recent meeting in Princeton, N.J. Gov. William T. Cahill opened the meeting with a call for restoring America's "Spirit of '76" as the major Bicentennial goal. The council voted to recommend to

the ARBC that the song "America the Beautiful" be adopted as the official Bicentennial hymn.

Our ARBC Commission Member Thomasine Hill will be keynote speaker at the National Student Council's National Leadership Training Conference held in Hot Springs, Arkansas, July 23 to 28. The National Association of Student Councils (NASC), the only national youth organization representing student leaders in America's secondary schools (32,000 schools), and the National Honor Society is sponsoring the leadership conferences as a forum for exploring the meaning of leadership and its techniques. Miss Hill challenged the delegates to realize their positions of leadership during the time of the Bicentennial. She urged them to become Bicentennial communicators and to carry the message back to their schools that there is to be a national renaissance between now and 1976 and that students, as the Citizens of Century III, should be in the forefront.

Mr. James Biddle, Chairman of the ARBC Heritage '76 Committee opened a two-day "think tank" Heritage '76 Advisory Panel meeting July 18 & 19 stating that the three panels, Historic Conservation, Commemoration and Convocations and Publications and Research had assembled to review proposals for recognition by the ARBC that relate to the heritage area and to offer comments and advice to the Commission. Mr. Biddle told those assembled, representatives of major national heritage societies and organizations, that the ARBC looked to them for guidance in setting guidelines for the next 4 or 5 years. He suggested that they should bring to their individual sessions their own organization's ideas for the Bicentennial and devise the mechanisms which might be established through which those ideas might be translated into ARBC programs.

John C. Chapin, Chairman of the Philatelic Advisory Panel has outlined the Panel's broad program of Bicentennial awareness being generated throughout the channels of the philatelic and non-philatelic communities. He commented at the Panel's quarterly meeting held at ARBC Headquarters July 17 that the group's awareness campaign is moving simultaneously on several fronts: through stamp shows, organizations and stamp clubs, department stores, overseas, and the planning for the next series of Bicentennial stamps.

Rep. Thomas Downing was the guest speaker at the York County (Va.) Fair on July 3. Congressman Downing commented that the battlefield where British General Cornwallis was defeated during the American Revolution should have a permanent monument. He joined those recommending a cyclorama so that visitors could more easily grasp the significance of that decisive battle.

At the first meeting of the Wisconsin ARBC, Governor Lucey stated, "Our Bicentennial celebration should not be a mere spectacle of form or a mere commemoration of dust, but a reaffirmation of the living spirit and timeless vision of the revolution." In an editorial, the Madison Times commented, "The guidelines set forth at its first meeting will serve the Commission well. It is not merely to be a commemoration of the past, but a chart as well for the future."

In an interview with the New Brunswick (N.J.) Home News, Dr. Richard P. McCormick (ARBC Commission Member) said the Commission's job "is to create an awareness about the Bicentennial. We must make this observance nationwide in scope, and not just on the Eastern seaboard. McCormick added, "If there's going to be a successful Bicentennial, it's not going to be done by the Commission, but by the thousands of communities across the nation."

The Gallup, N.M., Inter-Tribal Ceremonial Association suggested that New Mexico de-

velop three U.S. Bicentennial centers for each of the state's three cultures. The Association sent a request to Gov. Bruce King proposing one Bicentennial center for Spanish-American culture, another for Indian and a third for Anglo.

Rock Island County (Ill.) recently formed a new chapter of the Illinois Bicentennial Commission, and Otto Schweinberger, Dean of Community Relations at Black Hawk College, was named Chairman. Schweinberger assured the persons present that all community, industrial, fraternal, educational and minority groups would be invited to participate in the group's programs.

Dr. J. Duane Squires, Chairman of the New Hampshire ARBC, recently filed a report with Gov. Walter Peterson. In the first two years of its existence, the N.H. ARBC has formed task forces to organize an observance of the seizure of Fort William and Mary; to plan for a fitting commemoration of New Hampshire's important part in the Battle of Bunker Hill; for an observance of the anniversary of the state's first constitution; and to plan for an appropriate observance of New Hampshire's vital part in the victory at Bennington.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN MISSISSIPPI

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the industrial development of the State of Mississippi has been important to the building of a strong economy and a better future for all people of our State. For such industrial growth to occur it is necessary to provide trained manpower. The development of an outstanding vocational and technical training program in Mississippi has made a significant contribution in providing the manpower and stimulation for rapid industrial growth.

Mississippi is proud to be one of the Nation's leaders in vocational and technical training programs. Under the direction of Dr. Garvin Johnston, State superintendent of education, and Troy V. Majure, director of vocational education, Mississippi's vocational education and technical training programs have continued to expand and contribute greatly to the economic development of our State.

The success and importance of Mississippi's vocational and technical training programs was the subject of a recent article in the Changing Middle South magazine and has been reprinted in the Mississippi Vocational News. I include a copy of that article in my remarks:

SATISFACTION GUARANTEED

(NOTE.—The following article was mentioned in the May issue of this publication. It appears in the current issue of "The Changing Middle South". Many people have requested a copy of the story to see what others are saying about vocational education in Mississippi. For the many who have requested a copy of the story, we re-print the article in its entirety.)

"The best we've found . . . Overly impressed with your efficient and competent manner . . . They're progressing at a fast rate . . . We're impressed with their atti-

tude and willingness . . . Your help will greatly reduce the problem."

Obviously, the above comments are from satisfied customers, all. They are unsolicited and emanate from the offices of Mississippi manufacturing executives who are praising their individual experiences with the vocational and technical training programs offered by the Mississippi State Board of Education through its division of vocational-technical training.

These, and scores of other Mississippi industrialists, have discovered the solution to one of the thorniest problems faced by manufacturers anywhere: the problem of training new manpower to staff a newly established or expanded manufacturing plant and, when trained, the problem of re-training this manpower to keep abreast of the newest technological improvements in machinery, equipment, materials and techniques.

Best of all, Mississippi manufacturers have found that all this can usually be accomplished at little or no cost to them inasmuch as local, state and federal funds are available to underwrite the cost of training for employees in new or expanding Mississippi manufacturing and processing plants. A large number of Mississippi plants are currently taking advantage of this program, including such bluechippers as Ingalls Shipbuilding Division of Litton Industries, St. Regis Paper Company, Baxter Laboratories, Inc. and American Bosch Electrical Products, to name a few.

The Magnolia State probably has the most unique vocational-technical administrative setup of any in the nation, for the 23 vo-tech training centers in Mississippi are lodged in the state's public junior colleges, located strategically throughout the state. Every county in the state is in a junior college district and junior college administrators long have boasted that any student can attend the JC nearest him by day and sleep in his own bed that night.

Mississippi got a head start on most of the states when, in 1963, Congress passed the Vocational Education Act making federal funds available for the establishment of vocational education training centers. Mississippi education officials reasoned that the JC's would be ideal as vo-tech centers inasmuch as they already had a built-in administrative organization. Further, in every case, existing junior colleges had land available on their campuses for the construction of vo-tech shops, labs and classrooms. Thus, Mississippi was "in business" from a vo-tech standpoint, while many other states were shopping for land and rounding-up administrative personnel to staff their institutions.

For the 1971-72 school year there are more than 29,000 industrial trainees enrolled in these vo-tech centers preparing themselves for gainful employment in Mississippi manufacturing plants.

These modern vo-tech educational facilities—significantly, none were in existence prior to 1963, so the buildings and equipment are first rate—currently offer more than 100 different occupational training programs.

Each of the 23 vo-tech centers operates independently, but all perform, essentially, the same basic function in catering to Mississippi industry. Each of the centers offers to provide programs for preparatory skills for employees of newly established manufacturing plants in the district in which the JC is located. This is called startup training. Additionally, each of the centers is equipped to offer programs to provide rapid re-training of workers in existing plants to meet their changing needs. Further, the centers provide courses—usually when ten or more persons request a course—designed to upgrade the skills of already employed workers.

Under the guidance of Dr. Garvin H. Johnston, state superintendent of education, and Troy V. Majure, director of vocational education, Mississippi's vocational-technical

training centers have demonstrated to industrial leaders from within and from without the state their firm commitment to train the state's industrial workers. This means that the vo-tech centers will assist new and expanding industries in the recruitment of labor, counsel with the manufacturer in developing meaningful training programs, then train the applicants utilizing the standards established by the employer.

Furthermore, these applicants can be trained on the vo-tech center's premises using state-furnished equipment, if available, or on the plant site using the manufacturer's equipment and material. One of the centers, Hinds Junior College's Jackson Center, even goes an extra step in this regard. This center, now in its third year of operation, has provided in its gleaming new facility a 6,400-square-foot room which is dedicated and set aside expressly for industry's use. A new industry can establish special training programs in this room, move in its own specialized machinery and tailor its courses of instruction to its own specifications and needs. Several training operations can be carried on in this room at the same time, each representing a different industry. Here, as throughout the JC vo-tech system, instructional costs are paid by the local community and reimbursed by the state. In some cases, the locating industry furnishes its own instructors, who then become temporary faculty members of the junior college.

In addition to the vocational-technical facilities at the state's junior college centers, Mississippi recently has constructed, equipped and staffed 28 area county vocational training centers for the state secondary schools, with 10 more in various stages of construction. These facilities are being utilized in the same manner as those at the JC centers, and many thousands of high school students and adults are equipping themselves for good paying jobs.

At present the State of Mississippi is utilizing a number of federally funded programs which are helping manufacturers find and train industrial workers. The Manpower Development and Training Act provides funds for initial and turnover work forces for institutional training and for on-the-job training. Trainees under MDTA projects can receive stipends while training, and employers utilizing the on-the-job training concept can be reimbursed by the U.S. Department of Labor for a portion of the wages paid to its trainees. The JOB 70 program for expanding industries, which provides supportive training, orientation and counseling at no cost to the employer, is coordinated through the Mississippi Employment Service and the Vocational Education Division.

It should be pointed out that Mississippi's vocational-technical training centers, both those ensconced on the junior college campuses and those located in the state's secondary schools, are not established solely to provide employees for new and expanding industries. The more than 100 programs currently being taught at the centers run the occupational gamut from Airplane and Engine Mechanics to X-Ray Technology. In between are comprehensive programs for such trades and occupations as Commercial Art, Data Processing, Dental Assistant, Electronics Technician, Fire Service Technology, Horticulture, Law Enforcement Technology, Registered and Practical Nursing, Operating Room Assistant, Tool and Die, Television Production, and even such obscure occupations as Horology and Saw Filing (an absolutely essential calling in the timbered regions of the Magnolia State).

While Mississippi already can claim one of the premier vocational-technical educational programs in the United States, there's a movement afoot there to cement its position in this field and place even greater emphasis on occupation-oriented education.

This new and unique concept, which edu-

cators have dubbed the "Career Centered Curriculum," got its start in Mississippi when the Jones County School system undertook the pilot program at the beginning of the 1970-71 school year. The program has met with such success that it has expanded into six other school systems for the current school year.

Basically, the program is designed to teach every child in the school system, beginning in the first grade, everything that it is possible to teach about the world of work—the skills required, the financial rewards, the place in society of the occupation, the advantages and drawbacks and the personal traits required of a particular occupation.

As put into practice in Jones County, the program consists of a course of study beginning in the first grade and continuing through the twelfth. Grades one through six are devoted to teaching the child to become aware of the world of work. Reading, writing and arithmetic are taught through study of various occupations rather than reading about Dick, Jane and Sally.

Beginning in the seventh grade, the student enters an in-depth survey of the world of work, and the eighth and ninth grades are devoted to an intensive occupational orientation program where the students are exposed to as many occupations as is possible. This is accomplished through team teaching, field trips, films and other teaching aids, all pointing toward helping the child make a meaningful choice of an occupation.

Tenth grade students in the Jones County program are taught the basic principles and skills of a cluster of occupations in which they show an interest, and in the final two years of high school the students are transported to a central vocational complex where they are taught and drilled in the occupation they have selected.

Upon graduation from high school the Jones County student has a choice of continuing his education in a four-year college, going into employment, or entering Jones Junior College for more specialized study in trade or technical courses.

At the completion of the first full year of the program, Jones County educators and school patrons alike, were enthusiastic about a curriculum which will enable any child in the system to complete his high school education with a saleable skill or have the preparation for further academic education in college.

One thing is certain: With its splendid system of junior college and secondary school facilities for vocational-technical training, and with educational concepts like the Jones County program, Mississippi has a head start on the rest of the nation in preparing its young citizens to meet the challenges of this century, and, perhaps, the next.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, since the passage of Public Law 86-90 in 1959, the third week of July has been observed as Captive Nations Week.

The intent of the act is to draw our attention to the plight of millions of individuals less fortunate than ourselves, who are prisoners to the enslaving tentacles of communism. Captive Nations Week provides us with an opportunity to proclaim our solidarity with the people of the world's captive nations.

These nations and their citizens did

not see their Communist regimes come to power by legal or democratic processes. The Soviets invaded these nations and claim them by brutal force of arms. We must not forget this.

While we must leave no avenues unexplored in the search for a lasting peace, we must keep in mind the facts of oppression. The Hungarian revolution, the invasion of Czechoslovakia, the riots in Poland and Lithuania, and the cultural repressions in Ukraine are all examples of the tragedies bred by Soviet tyranny. If we are to find peace it will have to be accompanied by freedoms for our fellow individuals in the captive nations.

Let us not allow ourselves to forget these strong-willed people who look to us for support.

DR. J. H. JACKSON'S PEACE PLAN FOR THE VIETNAM WAR

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, based upon the recommendations of 6 million members of the National Baptist Convention, USA, Inc., Dr. J. H. Jackson, its president, has written a peace plan for the Vietnam war. I believe that his plan deserves unqualified attention—in the White House, in Congress, and in Paris.

Dr. Jackson is a distinguished and brilliant member of the American religious community. His clarity of thought and his overriding compassion are seen in his peace plan. The plan was sent to President Nixon; Premier Kosygin; Prime Minister Trn Thein Kheim of South Vietnam; and Prime Minister Pham Van Dong of North Vietnam.

Its six principles do not contain moral judgments of any sort. It is not Dr. Jackson's purpose to blame either side; instead he creates a fabric of peace woven from the fibers of war-weariness and the need to rebuild two countries that have been utterly destroyed by war.

Perhaps the central theme of the plan is that people are capable of self-determination—they do not need a superpower to dictate what they should want from life. Dr. Jackson also believes that the people in Indochina genuinely want peace or, as he puts it, "bread instead of bombs and bullets."

Dr. Jackson's peace plan for the Vietnam war has my full endorsement. I urge my colleagues to stand with me behind his humanistic plan.

The full text follows:

THE J. H. JACKSON PEACE PLAN FOR THE VIETNAM WAR

(Drawn April 27, 1972 and Announced to the General Public in an Address at Las Vegas, Nevada, Friday Evening, April 28, 1972.)

INTRODUCTION

A military victory of North Vietnam over South Vietnam would still leave North Vietnam related to the surrounding nations as she is now. She would still be dependent on the more powerful nation as she is now.

If South Vietnam should conquer the North by the strength of allied forces, the

South would still be a dependent country relying upon her stronger allies. The economic strength of Russia and the United States would not be materially increased by the military victory of either of the Vietnams, but would in some cases remain an economic burden to be borne by either one of the two great powers. It is not enough to sit in judgment on the persons involved in trying to settle the Vietnam question. It is not sufficient to blame any one statesman or leader for the complex and complicated conditions that have made the Vietnam question a national and international one. There is a responsibility that the heads of the respective governments must carry. There is also a responsibility that citizens ought to take in trying to create an atmosphere in which an open and frank discussion can take place, and any conference on peace may have a fair chance of succeeding.

I therefore wish to offer a plan for peace that could bring the Vietnam war to an immediate end and save further loss of human life and property. It is a plan that rises above conflict and does not destroy the autonomy of either one of the Vietnams, but would leave open the door for future unification of the country and the people.

The following are the principles of the Plan:

I. Permit and encourage all of the people in South Vietnam who believe in, and who have accepted the ideology, the philosophy and practice of the government of North Vietnam to be located in, and become a part of North Vietnam.

II. All people in North Vietnam who have embraced the ideology and philosophy of the government of South Vietnam should be allowed to go to South Vietnam without opposition or hindrance.

III. We suggest that Russia and all of the supporting allies of North Vietnam would encourage the government of said country to accept the peace principles offered in Articles One and Two.

Then petition Russia to aid North Vietnam in acquiring all the needed agricultural implements and all of the necessary equipment to improve the life both in the rural areas of the country as well as in the villages and towns. Let there be tractors and plows made available instead of tanks and guns. There should be more bread instead of bombs and bullets.

IV. We would petition the United States of America to do in South Vietnam what we would request of Russia in the Article above.

V. Let all prisoners of war be released immediately and returned to their families and their homes.

VI. Let there be open friendship between North Vietnam and South Vietnam in spite of the differences in ideology. And if they choose to win, or try to win one another to their ways of thinking, let them do it by discussion, friendly debate, goodwill, and fellowship. For we must remember that a nation in reality, is based on, and held together by the ideology that its peoples embrace and not by the landed areas alone that they occupy, the language they speak, or by the color of their skin or the texture of their hair.

The big powers must remind themselves that the fires of war started by igniting the fields and homes of weaker nations (militarily), and fed by the broken bodies of the old and the young among them, if not checked, are sure to spread to the shores of the greater powers.

In the name of humanity, and for the welfare of the innocent, and for the protection of all the nations of the world, we urge that the ideas and attitudes expressed in this plan will become a part of the thinking of all the parties involved.

This Peace Plan was written by Dr. J. H. Jackson, President of the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., based on peace principles that had been adopted by the six mil-

lion member organization in several of its past annual sessions.

Copies of this Plan were sent to the following persons on April 27, 1972:

President Richard M. Nixon, USA.
Prime Minister Alexei N. Kosygin, USSR.
Prime Minister Tran Thein Kheim, Republic of South Vietnam.
Prime Minister Pham Van Dong, People's Republic of North Vietnam.

ORDER OF AHEPA CELEBRATES ITS GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. RAY BLANTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the Order of AHEPA was founded July 26, 1922, and now, as the order prepares to celebrate its golden anniversary, it is well for us to recognize the achievements this civic fraternity has already performed and its bright future as well.

AHEPA is an acronym for American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association which from the first chapter in Atlanta, Ga., has grown to 430 chapters in 49 States, Canada, and Australia. National AHEPA offers its members everything from a sports program and insurance, to numerous civic projects such as scholarship funds and relief aid to disaster areas. The order also maintains a number of hospitals, schools, and memorials in America and Greece, and in addition, the local chapters have numerous projects of their own. Such activism has attracted a large membership over the past 50 years including such famous men as Presidents Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman, Vice President SPIRO AGNEW, and many Cabinet members, U.S. Senators and U.S. Representatives.

The purpose and true worth of the Order of Ahepa is spelled out in the nine objects of AHEPA which serve as philosophical guidelines which the group tries to instill in its members. The nine are: First, to promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America; second, to instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government, and in the recognition and respect of the inalienable rights of mankind; third, to instill in its membership a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship; fourth, to encourage its members to always be profoundly interested and actively participating in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor; fifth, to pledge its members to do their utmost to stamp out any and all political corruption, and to arouse its members to the fact that tyranny is a menace to the life, property, prosperity, honor, and integrity of every nation; sixth, to promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic culture; seventh, to promote good fellowship and endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense; eighth, to endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence, and helpfulness; and ninth, to champion the cause of education and to maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

Truly this worthy organization has made itself a friend to both its members and the public. In viewing the growth, accomplishments, and purpose of the Order of Ahepa in its first 50 years I sincerely wish this group continued growth and enthusiasm.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. JOE D. WAGGONER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1972

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, on this 14th celebration of Captive Nations Week it is perhaps very significant to look back over the past few weeks. What I refer to precisely are the President's recent efforts in foreign policy as manifested by the trips to Peking and Moscow. These have inspired a great deal of comment and debate, but one can only speculate as to what will be their effect on our commitment, which we today affirm anew, to sustain the hope of freedom for the more than 100 million people in some 30 captive nations throughout the world. We can only hope to benefit from what appear to be improved communications. At the same time we must be extremely careful not to offer our complicity to the subjugation of those who are currently oppressed in exchange for the right to free communications with their oppressors. This annual Captive Nations Week is held in order to inspire in all America and the world the recollection of our commitment to this principle.

We are forced to remind our fellow Americans, because whether we take for granted those freedoms provided by the bill of rights or become concerned with the so-called oppression within the United States itself it is all too easy to forget those who not only lack the same advantages but also lack the opportunity to complain about their absence. It is our obligation to keep in mind those who are less fortunate even to the point of not knowing of the freedoms they lack. We must sustain our efforts to bring unbiased information through media like Radio Free Europe to those who have no opportunity to obtain it otherwise. But, primarily we must keep in mind the plight of these captive peoples in order that we may do them justice when the time arises.

We remind the rest of the world that they may know our resolve to assist such peoples in any way possible. It must be common knowledge in order that all oppressors know that regardless of what turn our foreign policy may take the citizens of the United States will retain their commitment to those peoples who are denied the freedom we hold so dear.

If we can be reasonably certain that we can assist them in attaining such freedom by improving our relations with Red China and the U.S.S.R. then perhaps we should explore that possibility. But, if we choose that course we must do so with a complete sense of determination to aid the people of the captive nations, not compromise them. We must do it with one fact firmly in mind. That our

strength is our freedom and today we acknowledge our obligation to make every effort to let others share in it.

NURSING HOME SAFETY

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on August 6, 1971, President Nixon addressed the Nation about the problems of fire safety in our country's nursing home facilities. In that address, the President stated his intention that Federal funds not be used to subsidize substandard nursing homes. In the words of the President:

But let there be no mistaking the fact that when facilities fail to meet reasonable standards, we will not hesitate to cut off their Medicare and Medicaid funds.

In response to this mandate, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recently denied Federal subsidies to 579 skilled nursing homes throughout the country. These homes have either been decertified or have withdrawn from the medicaid program entirely because of their inability to meet tough Federal fire safety standards.

The Cincinnati area was affected by the closing of five nursing home facilities, four of which are in my own congressional district. Nevertheless, I believe the recent action by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is a necessary step to insure that nursing homes all across the country provide adequate safety measures for the elderly who reside there.

I support the action of the President, and the action of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Furthermore, I call upon the Congress to enact three bills on this subject which I introduced on February 29 of this year. These bills would require all nursing home facilities to meet the same Federal fire safety standards, these bills would permit Federal loan guarantees to those facilities which require funds to install adequate fire safety devices, and these bills would insure that no Federal funds are awarded to contractors for the construction of nursing homes unless these facilities are built in conformity with the same Federal fire safety regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article appearing in the Cincinnati Enquirer regarding the decertification of five skilled nursing homes in the Cincinnati area be printed in the RECORD at this point:

FIVE AREA NURSING HOMES DENIED MEDICAID FUNDS

WASHINGTON.—Five Cincinnati area skilled nursing homes were listed Wednesday among the nation's such facilities denied Medicaid funds for alleged failure to meet tough new federal safety and care standards.

The homes were identified by the Ohio Welfare Department after John G. Veneman, under secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), released a breakdown showing 39 of the facilities decertified in Ohio by state investigators.

Cincinnati area homes listed by a state welfare spokesman are Avon Convalescent Center, Inc., 6922 Ohio Ave., Deer Park; Restview, 3550 Washington Ave., Avondale; Vivian D. Tepper Nursing Home, 3103 Fairfield Ave., Evanston; Madeline Marie Nursing Home, No. 1 Upland Place, Walnut Hills; and the Extended Care Facility of the Middletown Hospital Association, 105 McKnight Dr., Middletown.

The state spokesman said the Vivian Tepper Home went out of business after it was decertified last November. Veneman's breakdown showed that counting those which voluntarily withdrew from the Medicaid program, 579 homes had dropped out since the new standards went into effect last November 30.

"Although the president has exercised bold leadership, frontline responsibility for nursing homes under the law still rests with states, local governments and nursing home operators," Veneman said after he and his aides met with President Nixon to review program in the drive for improved care of the aged poor.

He said new federal standards for intermediate care facilities will be announced soon. "We are also developing joint Medicare-Medicaid regulations that will simplify and standardize the program for long-term care facilities," Veneman added.

ORDER OF AHEPA

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the order of AHEPA has long been one of America's outstanding organizations. In fact, the 26th of this month marks the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association in Atlanta, Ga. From that setting, the organization expanded to the point at which today, comprising 430 local chapters, it spans 49 States, Canada, and Australia.

A nonpolitical, nonsectarian organization, AHEPA stipulates that its members be men of good moral character who are citizens of the United States of America or Canada, or who have declared their intention to become citizens. Its objectives include the promotion of loyalty to the United States, the instruction of its members in the fundamental principles and tenets of government, and the hope of endowing its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, and mutual benevolence.

Mr. Speaker, AHEPA does not do mere lipservice to these goals: It has relieved victims of hurricanes, floods, earthquakes; it has provided scholarships to worthy students; it has hospitals in Athens and Thessaloniki and seven health centers in Greece. During World War II, AHEPA was an official issuing agency of the U.S. Treasury, effecting the sale of \$500 million in U.S. war bonds.

On this, its golden anniversary, it is only fitting that we extend our best wishes to AHEPA. Such organizations, by setting humanitarian goals and high standards for membership, have helped keep America strong and great through some of the most troublesome years in its history. In the atomic age, we espe-

cially need responsible men to be active through such organizations, for it is they who have the willpower and determination to make this a better world. So, not only should we commend AHEPA for its past achievements, but wish it well in its future endeavors.

IRISH-AMERICAN JAILED

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express to the House and its Members my distress over the jailing of Thomas Laffey, an Irish-American and a constituent of mine.

Mr. Laffey, and four other Irish-Americans, were jailed in Fort Worth, Tex., for refusing to answer questions from a grand jury concerning alleged gun-running to Northern Ireland.

Not only were they jailed, but in addition bail was denied—although they have been accused of no crime.

In short, Mr. Speaker, accused slayers can walk out of jail on bond; alleged bank robbers can be set free; those charged with having committed sex crimes can be released, but these five Irish-Americans can be kept in bondage simply because they refuse to answer a grand jury in Texas.

In protest of this fact I had asked the Attorney General of the United States for permission to go to Fort Worth to see and to visit with Thomas Laffey. That permission was denied. Mrs. Laffey had asked that I go to make sure that her husband and the other men were being accorded their rights under the Constitution, but now the assurance she had sought cannot be given by me.

Mr. Thomas E. Marum of the Justice Department had told my office that I would not be allowed to see Mr. Laffey because of a contractual arrangement with the Tarrant County, Tex. officials. He did say that if I wanted to go anyway, the sheriff of Tarrant County would be happy to show me around the jail, but that I would not be allowed to see Mr. Laffey.

The sheriff's offer was not enough, for my interest lies not in seeing his jail, but rather in seeing my constituent. I believe that I should have that right, as indeed I believe every Member of this body should have that same right under similar circumstances.

My concern in this matter, Mr. Speaker, is very great and it has in no way been lessened by the Justice Department's refusal.

I make no judgment, Mr. Speaker, as to the guilt or innocence of Tom Laffey, but I do judge the Justice Department guilty of having made a most unwise and unwarranted decision—and perhaps even an unlawful one.

What must be remembered is that Thomas Laffey has been charged with no crime, has been accused of no wrongdoing, has not been implicated in any unlawful activity, save that of refusing to answer questions from a grand jury.

The treatment thus far received by Thomas Laffey and the other men is not unlike that meted out to those held in the internment camp of Northern Ireland, a camp that I recently visited under an assumed name in order to see for myself what manner of justice the British give out.

The circumstances surrounding both the proceedings and the sentencings in this case seem somewhat suspect to me. While I am not willing to charge, as some have, that a conspiracy is involved, I do feel that a better explanation by the Department of Justice is in order. These men are entitled to the full protection of the law. If guilty, they should be given a definite sentence. If innocent, they should be freed. In any event, they deserve justice in the American tradition, not a new form of justice that seems to be restyling our rights as Americans.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that by bringing this matter before the House some form of justice may be realized. It appears that the effort by the Justice Department to change the proceedings to some locale where little note would be taken have thus far succeeded, but the larger question of whether justice has been served is very much open.

THE 22D BIENNIAL NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, my colleague from the state of Hawaii, the Honorable Spark Matsunaga, called for a special order to allow the Members of the House the opportunity to take note of the 22d Biennial National Convention of the Japanese American Citizens League here in Washington. I want to take this opportunity to add my comments to those of my colleagues and to express my appreciation for the JACL and for those American citizens of Japanese descent. Several members of the JACL from San Jose were in attendance at the convention: Richard and Barbara Tanaka, Kathy Taoka, Sharon Uyeda, Dr. Tak Inouye, Stan and Virginia Tanaka and, of course, Mayor Norman Mineta, his wife, Mae and son, David.

Japanese American citizens have played a vital and important role in the positive elements of our national culture since their arrival as a group on the American continent. It has been just recently, however, that barriers have begun to fall and members of this important ethnic group have begun to take a powerful political role here on the mainland. That Mayor Mineta was the keynote speaker at the convention banquet is, I feel, a significant event. Mayor Mineta is the first American of Japanese descent to be elected mayor of a major American city on the mainland and, as all those who are familiar with California know by now, he has done a magnificent job in giving San Jose progressive and intelligent leadership.

Our country has come a long way since those dark days of World War II, when loyal citizens of the United States, who happened to be of Japanese descent, were summarily rounded up and interned in concentration camps. In fact, Mayor Mineta himself was the victim of this discriminatory action. No other ethnic group in our country has been so treated and it is to the eternal credit of Japanese American citizens and our good fortune that these citizens did not choose the path of bitterness and hatred for this vile act, but instead dedicated themselves to proving their outstanding patriotism and loyalty as a group.

By their lives, Japanese American citizens have made the motto of the JACL live, "Better Americans in a Greater America." These citizens have taught us the true meaning of loyalty to one's country and good will toward their fellow man. The dedication of Japanese-American citizens to democracy serves as a model for us all. Their tolerance of the shortcomings of their fellow citizens in the pursuit of the ideal of a democratic society can only be admired.

The repeal of the Emergency Detention Act of 1950, which I cosponsored, had the strong support of the Japanese American Citizens' League. Naturally, the memories of the detention camps during World War II spurred the group to forceful action on this issue.

The horror of the wartime concentration camps has enabled Japanese American citizens to more clearly understand the nature of political and racial prejudice, but it has led them not just to be concerned with the protection of their own ethnic group. Through this tragic experience, I believe that Americans of Japanese descent have come to understand and value democracy and liberty perhaps more than any other ethnic group in our country. The JACL is in the forefront of the fight to preserve the liberties of all Americans as outlined in the Bill of Rights. Significantly, they have been active in their opposition to certain actions of the House Internal Security Committee and the Subversive Activities Control Board.

I want to join my colleagues who spoke so eloquently on the 29th of June in saluting a group of Americans who were the victims of blatant repression and to honor this group of Americans who have such an outstanding record of citizenship and contributions to our country.

LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of all Members the following summary and transcription of a broadcast involving Mr. Ray Denison, an AFL-CIO legislative representative, and expert in the field of international trade. Mr. Denison's points are compelling and in essential agreement with what I have been saying about the subject for the past several years. They deserve special consideration from each Member.

The news item follows:

LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE

Growing numbers of U.S. corporations are exporting not only their factories to low-wage countries, but also the newly-developed methods and technology that would boost the productivity of American workers, an AFL-CIO spokesman declared today.

Denied "new technological equipment" developed in U.S. laboratories, "the United States worker, regardless of how much he wants to increase his output during an eight-hour day, is simply unable to do so," declared AFL-CIO Legislative Representative Ray Denison, on the network radio interview Labor News Conference. He said that "many experts in the field" hold that view, pointing out that one recently wrote Senator Vance Hartke (D-Ind.) that "the United States has exported so much of its technology to Japan, that Japan has bought one of the most incredible technological bargains in history . . . with 90 million Japanese, using \$10 billion worth of U.S. technology, for which they paid only \$1 billion."

Denison laid major blame for the worsening U.S. position in international trade on outdated U.S. policies and laws—including tax incentives—that encourage U.S. companies to maximize their profits by manufacturing in low-wage countries, then they ship that production into U.S. markets and sell it here at high prices that reflect America's high standards of wages and working conditions. He turned aside the contention that imports mean lower consumer prices.

"They usually mean that the retailer and the importer receive a much higher markup—a much greater profit," he declared, "but the customer in the store pays virtually the same price he would have paid, if the product had been made in the United States." He cited the example of side-by-side displays of mens' shirts made in Taiwan and Korea—where wages are as low as 15 cents an hour—with shirts made in the U.S., yet all three selling at just about the same price.

Denison warned that outdated U.S. overseas trade and investment policies have already wiped out nearly a million American job opportunities—at a time when unemployment hangs at 6% nationally, and as high as 18% in such hard-hit areas as New England. He renewed the call for passage of the Burke-Hartke Trade Bill, stressing that its three-pronged approach of "taxation, capital control and quotas on imports" is the only effective way to deal with the mounting problem.

Reporters questioning Denison were James Flanigan of Forbes magazine and Paul Steiger of the Los Angeles Times' Washington bureau. The AFL-CIO produced interview was broadcast Tuesday at 9:35 p.m. (EST), over the Mutual Broadcasting System.

LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE—MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM

Subject: Updating US Trade and Overseas Investment Policies

Guest: Ray Denison representative of the AFL-CIO's Department of Legislation

Reporters: Paul Steiger of the Los Angeles Times Washington bureau James Flanigan, Washington correspondent for Forbes magazine

Moderator: Frank Harden

MUTUAL ANNOUNCER. The following time is presented as a public service by this station and the Mutual Broadcasting System.

HARDEN. Labor News Conference. Welcome to another edition of Labor News Conference, a public affairs program brought to you by the AFL-CIO. Labor News Conference brings together leading AFL-CIO representatives and ranking representatives and ranking members of the press. Today's guest is Ray Denison, a legislative representative for the AFL-CIO.

Evidence that United States overseas trade and investment policies are badly outdated by the realities of today's international trade continues to mount. Between 1966 and 1971, nearly a million American job opportunities vanished, as U.S. firms shifted production to low-wage foreign countries and imports flooded U.S. markets. Last year, the U.S. suffered its first trade deficit in nearly 80 years—and the gulf between U.S. imports and exports continues to widen. The AFL-CIO is convinced that thorough overhaul of present U.S. trade and investment laws—including the tax laws—is one of the most urgent tasks facing the nation. Here to question Mr. Denison about America's worsening world trade problems, why the labor movement believes that the Burke-Hartke bill now before Congress is the best solution to those problems, and changes that Congress will adopt the measure this year, are James Flanigan, Washington correspondent for Forbes magazine, and Paul Steiger of the Los Angeles Times' Washington bureau. Your moderator, Frank Harden.

And now, Mr. Flanigan, I believe you have the first question?

FLANIGAN. Mr. Denison, the Burke-Hartke bill has aroused a great controversy, especially among businessmen. What are labor's principal objectives in supporting this bill?

DENISON. Well, we think the bill is a much-needed remedy for many of the economic woes confronting the United States today.

As you know, we have had 6% unemployment for a considerable length of time.

We are not developing new industries in this country—we are not developing new technology. Rather, much of this is developing abroad—primarily, with United States ownership and control.

So, what is happening to the United States is that a great deal of our productive capacity is going abroad—and both American corporations overseas and those of foreign nations—the Common Market and Japan, in particular—are sending huge amounts of goods into this country, which is seriously affecting our domestic production.

In the face of this, the Burke-Hartke bill attempts—through three specific procedures—taxation, capital control and quotas on imports—to deal with this problem.

The solutions, we believe, are in the Burke-Hartke bill, and that's why we support it.

STEIGER. Mr. Denison, do the quota provisions in this bill mean that consumers would have to face shortages of things like Sony television sets and Volkswagens if the bill were enacted?

DENISON. A base period of 1965–1969 would be established, and the volume of goods coming into this country during that period would be established as a minimum for importation.

That would allow the badly effected U.S. industries to recover.

However, there are certain flexibilities in this quota aspect—such as voluntary agreements—which could involve the automobiles you speak of.

There are provisions that if a commodity is not manufactured or grown in this country, it would not be subject to the quotas—for example, bananas.

Also, if the final form of the product could not be made in this country without importation of a part, then it would be allowed in.

So, I cannot say that by enactment of the bill, goods would be cut off, or that anyone would be denied some of the imported products he has today.

The purpose is to get U.S. manufacturing on its feet and restore jobs in the United States.

FLANIGAN. Well, imports are traditionally thought to keep the price levels down on goods in the stores. I believe you debate this and say that they don't keep price levels down. But would we—if we had these quotas—be faced with television sets that

cost \$750, because they were produced domestically?

DENISON. No, I don't think so.

We believe—we would hope, at least—that we still have a competitive society here in the U.S.—that "Company A would compete with Company B," and seek to put the product on the shelf at the lowest possible price.

Now, if they're not doing that, and they get into administered prices, or price-rigging, then, I think, they're in an area that could be in violation of the law. That would happen whether you have imports or not.

But actually, as to the matter of imports, our studies indicate that imports, by themselves, do not mean lower prices. They usually mean that the retailer and the importer receive a much higher mark-up—a much greater profit—but the customer in the store pays virtually the same price he would have paid, if the product had been made in the United States.

I think that if you go into the stores these days and look at men's shirts, for example, you will find shirts—side by side—made in Taiwan, made in Korea, made in the United States—and all retailing at just about the same price.

It merely means that the retailers are making more on the foreign-made shirts.

STEIGER. Mr. Denison, Arthur Burns, the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, in a recent letter, objected to the tax provisions of the Hartke-Burke bill, on the grounds that they would, in his words, "eliminate the neutrality of the present tax system, as it regards foreign investments by domestic corporations." What's your view on this?

DENISON. Well, we think that far from being "neutral," the present tax provisions are certainly an incentive for an American corporation to go abroad.

What you have is a far better tax position for a corporation doing business in Italy, let us say—where it receives a tax credit—than doing business in Indiana, where it receives only a tax deduction for the same amount. And, as you know, a deduction is far less desirable, from a corporate standpoint, than a tax credit.

We don't think there is a "neutral" position at all, when you give that kind of advantage to a corporation.

FLANIGAN. The tax issue—where you're comparing a credit abroad to a deduction at home—seems to be, at least to a business observer, the strongest issue labor has. Yet it doesn't seem to be the one that you're pushing the strongest. Why would that be? Is it because it's too hard to understand?

DENISON. Well, it's always interesting for us to learn what observers tell us we are doing, because we're pushing each aspect of this bill equally hard.

It's also interesting to hear United States corporations tell us we're anti-multi-national. We're not.

It's merely that the multi-nationals have screamed the loudest, apparently because they have felt the sting the greatest.

Perhaps the corporations are merely indicating that there are areas of the bill in which they feel they're most vulnerable. And, indications to date certainly are that in many parts of the Administration—in many parts of the Congress—and among economists and academicians—there is strong feeling that this is an area—the tax area—that does need to be remedied immediately.

The debate still goes on over other provisions of the bill. But there seems to be rather broad feelings that this is one area that needs legislative attention.

Perhaps that's why the corporations are showing such great sensitivity.

STEIGER. Mr. Denison, opponents of the bill contend that by erecting quotas we would, it is true, protect some domestic jobs. But we would be losing the jobs that result from

increased exports by the United States, because other countries would react by erecting new quotas and other trade barriers of their own. What's your view of this?

DENISON. Our view of this is the same as the President of Dupont, who said, sometime back. "The world is always in a trade war."

We feel that a trade war goes on, whether there's a Burke-Hartke bill or not. The fact is, at this moment, nations all over the world are erecting barriers to United States exports. They erect them on the basis of their own personal self-interest. If they feel they want a U.S. product, they will import it. If they feel they do not need it anymore, or it competes with something that's developed locally, they will halve imports of that product.

India, for example, recently added 100 items to its "forbidden list." Those items are now either grown or manufactured in India, and therefore, they're no longer allowed to be imported into the country.

Preferential agreements are being made within the Common Market all the time. North African nations are being given advantages, in citrus fruits and agricultural products, over American goods. The Japanese are also very quick to impose non-tariff barriers whenever they see that a particular U.S. export is, in their estimation, not to their advantage.

So, while the Burke-Hartke bill does establish specific quotas on imported goods, these things—quotas and similar non-tariff barriers—are being imposed all the time by nations throughout the world.

Opponents of the bill argue that somehow, we have free trade in the world today, and that this bill will stop that and inhibit U.S. exports. That is just simply not true.

Those nations will continue to buy our goods as long as they need them, and as long as they're cheaper than elsewhere.

But, when that situation changes, they will stop buying our exports.

FLANIGAN. On just that point—about being in a constant trade war, and that other nations will buy our goods when they're cheaper—the business producers in this country say that their main problem—or one of their main problems—is labor productivity. They keep talking about productivity as if this is pricing us out of the market. I know you have a contending position on that. What about the business charge on labor's productivity in the American economy?

DENISON. First of all, the United States has never been able to compete with low-wage foreign nations.

We have never been able to compete with Hong Kong labor, Singapore labor, Taiwan labor. We never have and we never will be able to compete with it.

We'll never be able to work for 15¢ or 20¢ an hour.

And we never expect to.

We have a high standard of living. We buy the goods. Workers in Hong Kong cannot buy color television sets—we in the U.S. buy them—where people make sufficient enough wages to enjoy these products.

So the problem of high wages has always been there. Yet, that is our very wealth.

On the matter of productivity, the problem is very simple. If the new technology, and the highly efficient machinery, and methodology are exported—as they are developed in the laboratory—then the United States worker, regardless of how much he wants to increase his output during an eight-hour day, is simply unable to do so, if he doesn't have the new technological equipment to work with.

This is pointed out by many experts in the field, one of whom recently wrote to Senator Hartke (D.-Ind.), pointing out that the United States has exported so much of our technology to Japan, that Japan has bought one of the most incredible technological bargains in history, and consequently, the

opponents of the bill in this country like to blame the unions for the problems.

He said—and this is a quote—"In Medieval Europe, witches and devils would have been singled out, and in the Soviet Union, it would have been capitalist counter-revolutionary forces of reaction. So I suppose, this economist says, "Mr. Meany and his men will just have to accept the scapegoat's role. This, despite the fact that wages in the U.S. have risen at less than half the rate of Japanese or German wages in the past decade. It is foreign productivity," he says, "which has overtaken us—a term which simply translates into 90 million hard-working Japanese, using \$10 billion worth of U.S. technology for which they paid only \$1 billion. The fault, Dear Brutus, lies not in our unions," he says, "but in ourselves."

I think that's very appropriate in this whole argument of technology and productivity.

FLANIGAN. Well now, Burke-Hartke would set up controls on the export of technology. This seems to me to be somewhat untraditional. If you invent something, you can go ahead and license it, or get paid for your patent or something, when somebody uses it. How would these controls work and, why are they desirable?

DENISON. I think they're desirable because we have to think in terms of national well-being, not merely in terms of one individual's profit, or one corporation's profits—particularly when those corporations have no allegiance whatsoever to the United States.

The Ford Motor Company, for example, now says that it is not an American company, it is a multi-national company. So, therefore, if the Ford Motor Company develops a particular patent and exports it abroad, it is for that corporation's own profit, not for the well-being of the United States.

All the bill says on that is that it is possible to restrain the export of either capital or technology, where it would adversely affect employment in the United States. If it does not adversely affect employment in the United States, there would be no restraints whatsoever.

This is not unique. It's going on in many of the Western European nations today. Furthermore, we have the same thing taking place now in capital controls. When you send your money abroad, you're also able to buy technology and productivity. And recently, capital controls were put on in West Germany and Switzerland, and they're now thinking of doing it in Britain and other nations. The dollar is taking a beating around the world, as you know, and much of the blame is being put on multinationals. They're saying that these corporations are speculating with the dollar; they're driving it down for their own particular advantage.

This is a case in which international speculation in money is hurting the United States. We say the same thing applies to the export of technology and productive means.

STEIGER. Isn't there a danger that if we attempt to control the spread of technology, we may ultimately suffer a brain drain? In other words, if we can't export the technology, our scientists might be lured abroad.

DENISON. Well, I think something like that is happening anyway.

As a matter of fact, not only are some managerial people lured abroad, as they set up production abroad—but as you know, there's a tax break if you stay out of the country 17 of 18 months. So the United States government—you and I—are subsidizing some of the exports of managerial, technical and research personnel.

But, beyond that—actually—I think the opposite is more likely to happen. If they can find low-cost production workers abroad—in Taiwan, and Singapore and Hong Kong—they can also find low-cost engineering personnel abroad and they are doing so.

I know of instances where engineering on American projects in the Middle East is being done in England and in Japan, because engineers are a lot cheaper abroad than they are here.

STEIGER. It's been argued that as our exports increase, the jobs that we lose to imports will be made up by increased jobs in export and export-related industries. The problem is, in many cases, these jobs may be service industry jobs, rather than production jobs. What's wrong with this?

DENISON. Well, first of all, you don't automatically develop more jobs with more exports.

You have to look at the animal. In exporting grain, you don't have as many workers involved as you have in exporting radios, let's say—a manufactured product. The dollar volume doesn't really have any relationship to the number of jobs involved.

But, secondly—you talk about a service economy—some economists today, and academics, feel that the United States can become a service nation. We heard that argument after World War Two, when in the maritime industry, we were told that the United States is not a service nation—we're a manufacturing nation—and, therefore, we should give up our merchant marine to those nations that deal in services.

We did—and we do not have a merchant marine in this country today.

Now we're told that we should not be a manufacturing nation, we should be a service nation. So we look at the services they're talking about. Take, for example, the punch-cards in IBM computer operations, are certainly a "service." Yet, throughout the United States, tapes are put on 747 airplanes every night, and flown around the world—to Bombay—to Hong Kong and elsewhere—where the service operation—the punching of the cards—is done by low-paid workers.

These cards are then re-imported into the United States and the operation is completed.

There is a service industry that we are already in the process of exporting.

Secondly, I'll give you another case in point. British Overseas Airways Corporation recently called in the heads of Trans World Airlines and Pan American and told them they were not going to restrict their landing rights in Great Britain, but they thought it would be a good idea if they curtailed their flights into that country. The American airlines got the point immediately; they reduced their flights. BOAC took up the flights that had been cancelled. As a result, you now have more BOAC flights running into the United States than do Pan Am or TWA.

That is a service industry.

Yet, Great Britain decided it was to its advantage, in this service area, to restrict the servicing operations of another nation, and they did so in its own self-interest.

So, we can't just say that we're going to become a service industry nation. The course of events will be just as compelling as it is in the manufacturing area. Nations will continue to operate in their own self-interest, corporations will do likewise—unless there is some restraint.

All we say in this bill is that decisions are going to be made as to what kind of a nation we're going to have.

The question is whether the United States Congress makes these decisions, or multinational corporations make the decisions, or foreign nations make the decisions.

We believe that it's in the United States best interests for the Congress to make decisions in an area that we feel will best serve the American working man and the consumer.

FLANIGAN. The American working man—how many jobs have been lost because of foreign investments, do you estimate? And, is American labor—its rank-and-file—up-arms over this issue—will it become a major issue in the Presidential campaign.

DENISON. Well, first of all, we estimate—

and this is based on Labor Department figures—we estimate that nearly one million job opportunities have been lost as a result of imports into the United States, and the export of U.S. technology. This is shown most heavily in electronics, footwear, apparel and many similar industries.

We do not make radios, we do not make bicycles; we do not make many, many manufactured items—office equipment and so forth—in this country. The job losses are severe. In some parts of New England, we are suffering as much as 18% unemployment. Our members are very much involved in this, and they are very much concerned.

We've established a task force.

We're undertaking teach-ins throughout the country.

We've established regional staff to help educate affiliates of the AFL-CIO and member unions about these problems.

As time goes on, the effects of this problem will be felt, more and more, in the communities, and we feel that there will be even more interest and knowledge on the part of our members on this subject.

Yes, we do feel it will be an important issue at the conventions and in the elections.

For example, in the Democratic Platform, there is an item that says we will require U.S. corporations producing commodities outside the country for consumption here to pay duties high enough to prevent unfair competition for domestic producers.

We do not agree totally with that statement but we feel they're at least looking in the right area.

There is a real problem in U.S. corporations operating outside the country. And something must be done to halt it.

HARDEN. Thank you, gentlemen. Today's Labor News Conference guest was Ray Denison, a legislative representative for the AFL-CIO. Representing the press were Paul Steiger of the Los Angeles Times' Washington bureau and James Flanigan, Washington correspondent for Forbes magazine. This is your moderator, Frank Harden, inviting you to listen again next week. Labor News Conference is a public affairs production of the AFL-CIO, produced in cooperation with the Mutual Broadcasting System.

MUTUAL ANNOUNCER. The preceding program time was presented as a public service by this station and the Mutual Broadcasting System. The opinions expressed are solely those of the participants.

LABOR SHORTAGE ADDS TO SOVIET FARM PROBLEM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, when the announcement was made 2 weeks ago of the massive Soviet grain purchase from the United States, it should not have come as a surprise to anyone who was aware of the major complications facing the Soviet agricultural sector.

A column by Dumitru Danielopol, the distinguished international correspondent of the Copley Press, in the July 8, San Diego, Calif., Union, painted in a very timely manner what I believe to be a very accurate picture of the Soviet agricultural situation.

The editorial follows:

LABOR SHORTAGE ADDS TO SOVIET
FARM PROBLEM

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

Who's going to feed Russia 10 years from now? Uncle Sam?

New Soviet agriculture reports provide an interesting backdrop to the recent summit conference. Collectivized Soviet farm production has been sputtering for decades. Now it is faced with a labor shortage.

The Kremlin is already dicker for large quantities of grain and soy beans from the United States. It faces increasing consumer demands.

The prospects are nil for agricultural self-sufficiency in the near future.

"If during the ninth five-year plan (1971-1975) the birth rate doesn't increase, after 1985 we can expect not an increase but a decline in the quantity of labor," says Dr. E. V. Kasimovsky, director of the central research laboratory for labor resources of the U.S.S.R.

Between 1960-1970 the natural increase of population has declined by half from 18 per thousands to 9 per thousand, he pointed out.

This is due to drab conditions, a low standard of living, poor housing, heavy work for women, etc.

The shortage of labor in some sectors is already acute, says the Russian demographer, in the Russian Soviet Republic. For instance, only 50 per cent of the jobs offered women in domestic work or on private agricultural plots were filled. In 52 towns studied, 24 had a shortage of men workers and 28 a shortage of women workers.

The 24th Communist Party Congress in 1971 took note of the situation with increased child allowances, increased leave pay to mothers to nurse sick children, full maternity benefits to working mothers, more nurseries and kindergartens, etc.

Such steps help, but there also is increasing knowledge of contraception in the U.S.S.R.

What worries the Kremlin most is farm population.

During the '60s the rural population of working age fell 21 per cent but the decline in the 20-34 age group was 41 per cent, and in the 20-29 group it was 52 per cent. In some Soviet republics the average farm age is already 50.

The swing away from the farms is noticed, too, in Western Europe and the United States, but the free enterprise countries have been able to streamline their agriculture and supplement manpower with machinery. This has not been the case in Communist countries.

Moscow faces the prospect of more food imports, rising consumer demands west of the Urals, unfilled resource goals, a prolonged border confrontation with China and an over-taxed heavy industrial complex.

ADVOCATES POLL FAVORS NATIONAL PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, for some years now I have had legislation pending to provide for a national presidential primary. I believe that only through this system can we eliminate the high possibility for bloodshed and future assassination attempts on candidates for national office in the United States. In addition, a national presidential primary would force the candidates to make greater use of the television media, improve their rhetoric and bring campaigns up in the level of issues. The weekly public affairs program on the Public Broadcasting Service, "the Advocates," asked in a poll how people feel about a national presidential primary.

Forty-nine percent voted for adopting a national presidential primary, 40 percent were opposed, and 1 percent expressed other opinions. In my home State of Florida, 97 were for the national presidential primary and 35 were against it—almost three to one.

At the present time 22 States are holding separate presidential primaries which fact has greatly expanded the time that candidates are required to spend seeking nomination for the Nation's highest office. The current procedures forces candidates into close contact with thousands of individuals in potentially dangerous situations. The assassination attempt on Gov. George Wallace further points up the need to get presidential and vice presidential candidates off the streets and encourage them to use the media. A national primary should improve campaign rhetoric by bringing to the surface important national issues for serious consideration.

The convention system for electing presidential and vice presidential candidates has become antique. The people of the United States are fully able to directly elect their parties' candidates for President and Vice President. This should not be denied them in the future.

It is good that the Public Broadcasting Service has brought the urgent need for this legislation so clearly into focus.

AHEPA'S GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, The American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—AHEPA—is celebrating its golden anniversary this week. I am proud to take this opportunity to remind my colleagues and the wide readership of the RECORD of the ideals and outstanding contributions of this organization.

AHEPA was founded in Atlanta, Ga., and has completed 50 years of service to the community and the country. The members of AHEPA are men from all walks of life; all must be men of high moral character, dedicated to the common goal of good fellowship and common understanding. Ahepans have joined for the improvement and betterment of our social, moral, and family life, and they are recognized as men devoted to civic responsibility—model family men and good neighbors.

The members of AHEPA should take justifiable pride in AHEPA's record of accomplishments—as champions in the cause of education through the granting of numerous scholarships; in their relations with less fortunate people, bringing them relief through their own "People to People" program; and as supporters of community undertakings, giving generously of their time, talents, and financial support for the purpose of civic improvement.

I commend the AHEPA family for carrying out the objects of their organization, which are:

1. To promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America.
2. To instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government, and in the recognition and respect of the inalienable rights of mankind.
3. To instill in its membership a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship.
4. To encourage its members to always be profoundly interested and actively participating in the political, civic, social and commercial fields of human endeavor.
5. To pledge its members to do their utmost to stamp out any and all political corruption; and to arouse its members to the fact that tyranny is a menace to the life, property, prosperity, honor and integrity of every nation.
6. To promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic Culture.
7. To promote good fellowship, and endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense.
8. To endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence and helpfulness.
9. To champion the cause of Education, and to maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

I am proud to represent in the Congress such outstanding members of the local chapter of AHEPA as Dr. Christos A. Hasiotis, president; George A. Batsos, vice president; Peter E. Chaggaris, secretary; Michael J. Vrotsos, executive secretary; and Fred Vallakis, treasurer. Boston also takes special pride in Mr. Peter Agris, a current National Officer heading the AHEPA educational foundation, and Mr. George Demeter, a former supreme president of AHEPA.

I join with all the friends of AHEPA in the Ninth Congressional District and the world to pay tribute to such outstanding personalities and to wish AHEPA many more years of achievement as they make their contributions to the betterment of American life.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF THE ORDER OF AHEPA

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the golden anniversary of the Order of Ahepa. The word AHEPA is an acrostic, and is derived from the first letters of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association; the order is a fraternal organization, and is nonpolitical and nonsectarian.

During the past 50 years, the order has contributed to many worthy national and international causes, including AHEPA Hall for Boys at St. Basil's Academy and the AHEPA School, both in Garrison, N.Y., relief of Florida and Mississippi hurricane victims, and earthquake victims throughout the world, to mention a few.

Under the leadership of Sam Nakis, the supreme president, the order extends to 49 States, Canada, and Australia, with 430 local chapters. The San Fernando Valley chapter, in my congressional district in California, is under the

capable leadership of President Pete Liaros, Vice President Gus Lymberopoulos, Secretary John Gianakos, and Treasurer Pete Koustas.

I am particularly proud of the San Fernando Valley chapter, as they have clearly shown what an organization with a purpose can do. They have a loan scholarship program, with awards of up to \$250 that go to deserving youth who would otherwise not be able to attend school. They have an ongoing book donation program with the California State University at Northridge, and recently, they have embarked on their most ambitious program to date. They are assisting the Guadalupe Home for Boys in Yucaipa, Calif.; the home attempts to give wayward boys a new start in life, and the Order of Ahepa, San Fernando Valley chapter, is helping to make that possibility a reality.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in hearty congratulations to the Order of Ahepa on their golden anniversary.

FORCED BUSING

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the problem of forced busing looms heavy over the Detroit metropolitan area. As September approaches, hundreds of thousands of Detroit area parents are anxiously awaiting the outcome of litigation which will decide whether or not their children will be bused across school district lines this fall.

As my colleagues will recall, Congress recently passed the so-called Broomfield amendment which delays court ordered busing pending the exhaustion of appeals, all the way to the Supreme Court if necessary. Despite some efforts to discredit the applicability of this legislation to the present Detroit case, the President, and more recently the Department of Justice, have given their full support to the Broomfield antibusing bill. David L. Norman, Assistant Attorney General of the Civil Rights Division has said that in short it is the position of the Justice Department that this law will affect the Detroit controversy.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to clear the air, in an effort to clarify this crucial issue, I have sent the following Washington Report to the people of Oakland County. Its purpose and intent is to bring my constituents up to date on the status of the Detroit busing case. At a time when confusion and anxiety seems to be at a premium, I feel this report is of the utmost importance. The text of my statement follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 16, 1972.

DEAR FRIEND: During my 16 years in Congress, I can recall no other issue that has touched the lives and emotions of the people I represent in Oakland County more deeply than the threat of forced school bussing.

Because of my involvement in the fight to halt forced bussing between Detroit and the suburbs this fall, I thought you would like to have this report on the progress of legislation and court actions aimed at preventing it.

Federal Judge Roth is acting in defiance of the President of the United States, the U.S. Congress and the majority of the American people and he ultimately will be halted by a higher court. I am confident of this because on June 8th the Congress approved my bill, the so-called Broomfield Amendment, to take away the power of Federal judges to implement bussing orders while the case is under appeal. This bill was designed specifically for the situation in Detroit and the debate recorded in the *Congressional Record* clearly indicates this. The Detroit case is being appealed and I am convinced the U.S. Supreme Court will rule Judge Roth's order unconstitutional. There will be ups and downs as the case progresses through the appeals courts and there is a good chance the Sixth U.S. District Court of Appeals in Cincinnati, because of its liberal make-up, will uphold Judge Roth. *But the only really important ruling is that which comes from the U.S. Supreme Court and that ruling, I believe, will halt bussing between Detroit and the suburbs once and for all.*

The appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court is now being pursued actively by the U.S. Department of Justice following President Nixon's order that the Department deploy its full resources to implement the Broomfield anti-bussing amendment. The Justice Department deserves our praise and full support in the case it is presenting.

While these efforts can provide relief for the Detroit area, we desperately need further action in Congress to approve President Nixon's proposal for an 18-month moratorium on all bussing orders and a \$2 billion program of aid to the poorer school districts, both of which I fully support.

As one of the earliest signers of the discharge petition for approval of a Constitutional Amendment to halt forced bussing, I believe we must continue to press for its approval as a long-range guarantee against forced bussing of any sort.

There is, however, no way a Constitutional Amendment could be approved in time to affect the Detroit situation this fall. It probably would take a minimum of two or three years to get final approval since a Constitutional Amendment requires approval by two-thirds of both the House and the Senate and ratification by three-fourths of the state legislatures. That is why my amendment is so critical as a means of halting bussing this fall in Detroit.

Judge Roth's action points up the need for Congress to take a new look at the lack of restraint we now have on Federal judges who are appointed for life. The Constitution deliberately separated the branches of government and gave legislative powers *only* to the Congress. If judges want to be legislators they should be required to take off their robes and run for elected office. I have introduced legislation providing for mandatory retirement of Federal judges and Congressmen at age 65. In addition, Congress should give consideration to requiring Federal judges to be reconfirmed every 10 years by the U.S. Senate.

Steps like these would require Federal judges to stay more closely attuned to the will of the President, the Congress and the American people and would eliminate the arrogance of power that we are now witnessing. Congress is guilty of the same sort of arrogance when it talks about curtailing inflation but continues to amass a Federal deficit in the neighborhood of \$30 billion a year. Already this year, with the fiscal year just two weeks old, Congress has exceeded the President's budget by almost \$7 billion! We need legislation requiring that any new spending bill be accompanied by a revenue-raising measure to pay for it. That would enable the American people to know the price tag of every new program before it is approved and to judge for themselves whether it is worth the cost.

Thousands of Oakland County residents responded to my special Hotline Poll on Vietnam in May, and more than 84 percent said they favor a complete withdrawal of U.S. forces within four months of a ceasefire and agreement on return of U.S. war prisoners. As a ranking Member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, your prompt response to this poll is most important and helpful. I assure you that I will continue to support that course of action in Vietnam. I am convinced we may even be able to advance that timetable and be out of Vietnam totally within 60 days of a ceasefire and agreement on return of our prisoners.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD,
Member of Congress.

THE ORDER OF AHEPA

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on July 26, 1972, the Order of Ahepa will celebrate its 50th anniversary. For Greek-Americans, this occasion is one of particular importance. As their native land continues to be ruled by a dictatorship, this group of citizens devotes itself to the principles of freedom, democracy, and the betterment of life.

Today, I would like to share the nine objectives of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association with the other Members of this Chamber.

First. To promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America.

Second. To instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government, and in the recognition and respect of the inalienable rights of mankind.

Third. To instill in its membership a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship.

Fourth. To encourage its members to always be profoundly interested and actively participating in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor.

Fifth. To pledge its members to do their utmost to stamp out any and all political corruption; and to arouse its members to the fact that tyranny is a menace to the life, property, prosperity, honor, and integrity of every nation.

Sixth. To promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic culture.

Seventh. To promote good fellowship, and endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense.

Eighth. To endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence, and helpfulness.

Ninth. To champion the cause of education, and to maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

The community spirit and devotion to one's fellow man, reflected in this creed, are commendable and worthy of note.

I salute the Order of Ahepa on its 50th

birthday and wish it many more years of service to the community.

TO LIVE AND LET LIVE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the issue of the sanctity of human life which comes before this House in a variety of ways is one we are going to have to face in its fullest, broadest significance. I believe the following statement by Mike Tungsten, director of the Christian Culture Society organized in the State of Indiana, will help us to do this. It is entitled "To Live and Let Live."

We may think that abortion and contraception are new issues, but in truth they are as old or older than civilization, as "To Live and Let Live" clearly demonstrates. Even well-meaning people who oppose abortion often tend to think that the fight to preserve the life of the unborn child can and should be confined to legal action preventing his killing in the womb. Not so. For a society which does not accord rightful value to human life—particularly to the creation of new human life—will not grasp the full extent of the evil of abortion so long as its general perception of the value of human life is distorted. That is why the issue of government-assisted, government-encouraged artificial contraception cannot be so completely separated from abortion as many would have us believe. The contraceptive mentality engenders abortion as a "fallback position" when contraceptives fail. The pressure for abortion will continue so long as the contraceptive mentality is regarded as praiseworthy and fashionable.

"To Live and Let Live" is one of the most effective challenges to the antilife movement in our country today that I have seen. I urge your closest attention to it.

The statement follows:

TO LIVE AND LET LIVE

"Man is the most holy of God's creation, yet no beast surpasses his cruelty."

The birth of Christ is a perfect proof of man's value. There are thousands and more stories about man's greatness, and his heroic deeds. Unfortunately there are also too many that horrify.

In Dante's *Purgatorio* Canto 17 we read that Tereus had raped his wife's sister, Philomela. So Procne, his wife, revenged her sister and herself. She killed her six year old boy, Itys, and served him for dinner to her husband, Tereus, who didn't know that he was eating his own child. Ovid, who is telling this tale, shows us next to the reason for revenge, above all the heartless destruction of the child when we learn that the boy called out "mother, mother" and clung to her neck. In this story Procne does symbolize every woman who kills her own child. Infanticide is still a continued crime. Although Birth Control and Infanticide are in many cases closely related, it must be said that Infanticide is always murder, whereas Birth Control may in one case be wrong, and in another case may be right. Let us say the regulating—the spacing and numbering of children in the family—without violating

our Christian morality, is a wise and good birth control; whereas harmful artificial birth prevention must be considered criminal.

Artificial birth control is not something new, it has and always will exist. It is morally wrong, and always will be wrong. In our modern day thinking, we often hear pseudo-intellectuals ask "what does determine wrong from right?" Such thought is plain stupid. Something is either right or wrong for the same reason three plus three is not seven.

Long before the Christian era, the Egyptians used among several other methods, honey and sodium carbonate to be placed in the vulva. In the Hippocratic writings we find mention of a certain drink that was used to prevent conception. In the earlier days of Christianity, Pope Calixtus had part in the first controversy over contraception. In medieval Europe information was gained on contraception from the Arabs, through the first European medical school funded in the eleventh century at Salerno.

You see, the birth of a child is rather an inconvenience, therefore, it is often out of zeal for wealth than for the discomfort of being poor that birth control is practiced.

We know God's will in this matter through the revelation which closed with the Apostles. Artificial contraception and infanticide are a direct offense to God. Procreation is a divine command. Therefore, the beautiful purpose of sex was given prudent laws to protect such a sacred gift. That is why this miracle of life demands a code of morals to respect the right and dignity of every individual.

Infanticide is a highly profitable business; often with many political gains. Most scandalous of all is the use of tax money to secure the murder of innocent babes, and the destruction of true morality by a society that advocates cultural progress. This falsified morality changes the instinct and desire for normal reproduction to lust, and the act of genuine sexuality is profaned. The marriage partner and unmarried alike, are degraded to prostitutes. Sex loses its divine notion, and its attitude of maturity, in exchange for a leisured activity. It is placed in the same category as other purely recreational things, and it fails to recognize other people as truly human persons. It sees them simply as objects of enjoyment such as boats, sports cars, etc.

Premarital and illicit intercourse is making demand from our modern society to be listed among the virtues of good morality, provided pregnancy is avoided. Chastity, the control of man's honor and self-respect; and, self-donation, the prerequisite of true love, are called out-dated and old-fashioned. Remember that whatever was immoral yesterday is not moral today.

The atrocious doctrine of Thomas Malthus, expounder of the theory of population, was the foundation of our unnatural methods for diminishing the population of the human family. The germs for this ugly disease are labeled today under attractive names through twisted philosophies. Here humans are reduced to a status of ordinary animals. Marital infidelity is promoted. Husband and wife lose the admiration and mutual respect for one another. The unmarried and young build characters most destructive to all future loyalty; and loyalty is so indispensable in marriage. All that is dignified and spiritual is placed beneath material and biological matters. It is a disease that influences, with all the horrible consequences, the social, family and religious life of every individual. Sex is a biological urge, not a necessity; and, although we may never suppress the desire of sex, we must always control it. We must always condemn the ways of the puritanical fanatic or the oversexed lunatic—both extremes cause destruction of peaceful living.

Eternal God was, is and always will be Creator and Master of everything, whether

we mortals believe it or not. Man created nothing and never will, but by the grace of God he will continue to discover through the span of time, treasures hidden in the marvels of creation. In 1930 Prof. Ogino of Japan, and Dr. Kraus of Austria independently of one another, discovered the fertile and sterile days of a woman's menstrual cycle, called "the natural rhythm." Since that day other discoveries have been made, and it is positive that more will be in the future. Although the dogma of procreation will never bend to adjust to the discoveries, yet new ways may be utilized as long as they can fit in with the unchangeable Divine Plan. God is not a tyrant, but Love and all Goodness.

We hear the loud voices announce the holocaust of overpopulation. Lately, it is true, the historical balance between births and deaths has been drastically altered, but some are using that observation for their own advantage and often with ulterior motives. They are trying to push the people into fear and panic. Let us not be too worried even if this is an age of amateur prophets. Their constant predictions are so numerous that we do not have time to realize that their evaluation of yesterday did not come true today.

In 1948-1949 the Parliament in England sought immigrants from southern Europe, and tried to subsidize large families because the British Isles were underpopulated, and there was fear for a labor shortage. Without government meddling, the population has increased and there is, in fact, a labor surplus.

Nobody but God knows how many people will be alive about ten years from now—not any more than they know how many tornadoes or hurricanes there will be in that time. If we pay attention to the results of all those worthless and expensive surveys, we will find ourselves lost in a labyrinth of contradictions. The question about population is not that there are too many babies, but rather that there are not enough. Not the unborn children, but the living are the cause of our failures. For one thing, the matter of enough food production of the world's population is not as great a problem as in the uneven distribution. The poor themselves had never control over the factors causing their poverty. Besides, even today a great number of our people, under the banner of false charity, are making fortunes on the existence of the poor.

Elimination of babies to erase hunger will not solve the problem, but make the situation worse. The world itself can support ten times the number of people already here. If necessary, more discoveries would make it possible to take care of even larger numbers. Just because we cannot understand that, does not mean it is impossible. Everything in our temporal stay here on earth was not intended to be understood. We would not enjoy the great discoveries if the genius of the past had been listed among the unborn. If more people were born, perhaps some of them would be able to remedy our difficulties.

Of course, it is not wrong to have just a small family; sometimes it is advisable. But neither is it wrong to have a large family. The size of a family should be decided upon by each individual family and no one else. Every man receives his right to life from God and from God alone—not from man or society. The inviolability of innocent human life is a demand of Divine Law, never to be changed by the state—not even by the Church.

Great generations in the past have well managed their survival without scientific control. History also proves that large families were not always poor, and that small families were not always rich. Often sickly and poor people have accomplished most of our glorious past. Many times healthy and very wealthy persons have destroyed more than contributed to our future. Riches often

hide much misery, and poverty has sometimes struggled to great success. Destitution is very deplorable, but it is caused by other reasons than numbers of people.

Artificial birth control leads to grave injustices, murder, and all the miseries of a decaying society. It is a danger to every freedom of our democratic institution. I am afraid that infanticide will be a death sentence for the undesirables, and a dictation of who will or will not have children, and it will be a shield to cover a multitude of crimes. Then again, who is the almighty person to play God and to say who will or will not live? Our new morality is not new at all, but is as old as man himself. If there is any doubt about this, just check the history of every generation or nation before its downfall. At one time, the state in Greece decided whether a child should live or die, and we find similar examples elsewhere. The wanton sacrifice of infant life is probably as general today in China and other countries as it was in ancient Greece and Rome. In the past our courts have several times ruled that the unborn child was a life where questions of compensation for accidents were brought to a legal test. Now the same authorities allow us to murder the unborn. The peace makers curse our brave soldiers, they show us the cruelty of killing and yet at the same time they demand laws to murder innocent life. This crime is more revolting than that of Herod because it is committed against our own flesh and blood.

Deep down man is always the same; he is inclined to the same old vices and as ever he has to struggle very hard to behave well. Everyone knows that the modern world searches for material pleasures and comforts. Wealth and fame are not in themselves evil, but sometimes they do strange things to people. The value of man is not what he has but what he is.

To think that the possession of beautiful cars and other luxuries always represent advanced culture, is as foolish as an illiterate who buys a pair of glasses and expects to be able to read them.

Of course, man is justified in striving for comfort, but he will never make a heaven out of this world. Every tomorrow depends on the today's decision between good and evil. Sometimes intelligent and educated people become so intoxicated with materialism and greed, that they become ignorant. There is no person more stupid than he who thinks to be everything—to be God.

"Man is born to serve God and to die—to pass for reward or punishment into Eternity."

SIMON BOLIVAR

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the birthday of one of the world's great leaders—outstanding in his efforts to liberate Northern South America from Spanish imperial control.

Simon Bolivar, South American soldier and statesman, is honored in the minds of all who love freedom and seek to keep it. As a Venezuelan revolutionary he fought for independence—his first important essay on independence, the "Cartagena Memorial," is a clarion call to Venezuela to find her freedom—to fight for it until acquired.

Born 189 years ago in Venezuela, Simon Bolivar spent virtually his entire 47 years in the service of his fellow-man—a life marked by the heights of

success and the depths of despair, as Bolivar pursued his dream to realization.

Patriots like this deserve our attention and our salute on the day of their birth.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF ORDER OF AHEPA

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, on a percentage basis, there are probably a very small number of Americans of Greek ancestry in my congressional district. The numbers, however, are more than compensated by the quality. With no exceptions in my knowledge the children of Greece, whether naturalized in this country or second generation, have proved themselves to be U.S. citizens of uncommon patriotism and devotion to our country. They also are dedicated and contributing members to their own communities.

Fifty years ago, AHEPA, an acronym for American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association was founded in Atlanta. Although its membership is oriented to Americans of Greek ancestry, its rolls are open to all. Its many charitable, educational, civic, and athletic contributions are legend.

The official objects of AHEPA are as follows:

First, to promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America.

Second, to instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government, and in the recognition and respect of the inalienable rights of mankind.

Third, to instill in its membership a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship.

Fourth, to encourage its members to always be profoundly interested and actively participating in the political, civic, and social, and commercial field of human endeavor.

Fifth, to pledge its members to do their utmost to stamp out any and all political corruption; and to arouse its members to the fact that tyranny is a menace to life, property, prosperity, honor, and integrity of every nation.

Sixth, to promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic culture.

Seventh, to promote good fellowship, and endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense.

Eighth, to endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, and mutual benevolence and helpfulness.

Ninth, to champion the cause of education, and to maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

This month, on the 50th anniversary of the founding of AHEPA, we salute this excellent organization and its supreme president, Sam Nakis.

In Oregon, we have an active AHEPA chapter: Its officers are: William Skour-

tes, president; Nick Karafotias, vice president; Basic Gortisan, secretary; Costa Couris, treasurer; current district lodge, Bill V. Aspros, lieutenant governor; George Anasis, treasurer, and Dr. N. S. Checkos, past national supreme lodge.

To our Oregon members, I give my salutations and congratulations on this golden anniversary.

BEST WISHES TO AHEPA ON ITS GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity to extend best wishes to the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association as it celebrates its golden anniversary.

This outstanding organization was founded in Atlanta, Ga., on July 26, 1922, and has grown until today it includes 430 chapters in 49 States, Canada, and Australia. During these 50 years, AHEPA has been outstandingly successful in its goals of promoting the highest qualities of good citizenship, loyalty to country, and respect for human rights. It has dedicated itself to many humanitarian causes and has shown its commitment to a better society through its financial contributions for disaster relief, war orphans, hospitals, educational institutions, and patriotic causes.

Five of our outstanding young Members of the House belong to the association, Representative JOHN BRADEMAs, Democrat, of Indiana; Representative NICK GALIFIANAKIS, Democrat, of North Carolina; Representative PETER N. KYROS, Democrat, of Maine; Representative GUS YATRON, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; and Representative PAUL S. SARBANES, Democrat, of Maryland; and they bring credit upon it.

In addition, I wish to pay tribute to the outstanding citizens of my State of Oklahoma who among their other civic activities are currently serving as officers of AHEPA:

LIST OF AHEPA OFFICERS

LOCAL CHAPTER OFFICERS

Chris T. Papahronis, President, Oklahoma City.

John T. Samaras, Vice President, Oklahoma City.

Vlassios A. Mihas, Secretary, Oklahoma City.

Pete Paschal, Treasurer, Oklahoma City.

Nick C. Costa, President, Tulsa.

George Thomas, Vice President, Tulsa.

Nicholas T. Kondos, Secretary, Tulsa.

George Hlepos, Treasurer, Tulsa.

CURRENT DISTRICT LODGE OFFICERS

S. J. Sakelaris, Lt. Governor, Tulsa.

George Phillips, Advisor, Oklahoma City.

PRESS NATIONAL OFFICERS

C. R. Nixon, Past Supreme Lodge, Tulsa.

I am certain that these past 50 years of service to society and mankind are but a prolog to a future of even higher accomplishments for the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association. To AHEPA's many fine members

throughout the country, I extend my appreciation and thanks for their many good works.

CAREERS IN ECOLOGY

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, much attention has been given to the protection of our environment in Congress through the enactment of legislation and the efforts of all Americans, we have begun the fight against all forms of pollution and have begun to reorder our lives to live in accord with nature.

Since the inception of pollution control programs, the need for qualified specialists in the field of ecology has greatly increased. Men and women are needed to lead the new antipollution programs and to continue research into the control of pollution and the eventual elimination of it. The following article by Odom Fanning from Catalyst for Environmental Quality outlines the opportunities now available in the environmental fields.

Only through the continuing efforts of individuals, both specialists and laymen, will our goal of a clean, safe, and healthy environment be achieved.

The article follows:

BE AN ECOLOGIST AND PUT IT ALL TOGETHER

(By Odom Fanning)

Environmental management may be the top growth industry by the end of this decade. If present trends continue, we will need, by 1980, more than half a million new scientists, engineers, social scientists, lawyers, technicians, and aides in such disciplines as geology, meteorology, oceanography, forestry, wildlife conservation, recreation, architecture, environmental engineering, industrial hygiene, and many more. A growth industry requires a pacesetter. In the case of environmental management, the pace is now being set by the ecologist.

Many young persons say they want to be ecologists. This is not surprising. It's the now thing. It's the future of their earth. It's meaningful; they can make a contribution to society today while helping to shape the society they want for tomorrow. It's challenging; the ecologist must find answers and then apply them, his science deals with real-life problems—not in the old-fashioned piecemeal way but in an integrated way. It deals with the whole man in his whole environment.

Ecology is a small but rapidly growing field. Three years ago, the Ecological Society of America had only 3,200 members. Today it has 4,800. By 1980, its membership should be tripled, to at least 14,400.

WHAT AN ECOLOGIST DOES

The environment as a whole includes both living and non-living processes. The Ecological Society of America (ESA) says, "The field of ecology—involving the functioning organism on the one hand and influencing environment on the other—is often called the science of the interrelationship of nature."

Ecology deals with such matters as: changes in plants and animals, changes in relationships of plants and animals (including man), and structure and function of ecosystems.

ESA adds, "Ecologists are scientists who put together pieces in our jigsaw puzzle picture of the world."

As an ecologist you might be a university

professor of biology, sociology, public health, economics, urban and regional planning, biostatistics. Or you might be in another of a wide range of fields. During the school year you might spend 70 per cent of your time teaching, 20 per cent on your own research projects. The remaining 10 per cent might be devoted to administering projects; writing proposals, papers, and reports; reading scientific literature; referring journal contributions by others; corresponding with other workers; or attending scientific meetings. In the summers you probably would be employed in some phase of the International Biological Program (IBP).

Launched in 1967, and originally scheduled to be concluded in 1972, the IBP has been extended until July 1974. The United States is one of 60 nations participating in coordinated activities under the theme, "Man's Survival in a Changing World." The National Science Foundation is the Federal lead agency. The National Academy of Sciences is the coordinating body.

In the U.S., IBP ecologists are pursuing two lines of inquiry. One is the IBP Environmental Program, based at the University of Texas, which involves cooperating scientists scattered throughout southwestern U.S., Hawaii, several Latin American countries, and elsewhere. They are working on such problems as airborne diseases and allergies, understanding ecosystems, and preserving the quality of the environment. The other part of the IBP is the Human Adaptability Program, based at Pennsylvania State University. Its works on the biology of human populations at high altitudes (above 10,000 feet) may eventually afford ways to protect all of us from degenerative cardiovascular diseases. Other ecologists in this program are comparing diets of different populations and studying the nutritional status of Eskimos in North America.

Ecologists with specific experience are sought by ACTION (the Peace Corps) and the Smithsonian Institution. As an ACTION volunteer you might be assigned to study the "Crown of Thorns Starfish" which are destroying the coral reefs of Western Samoa. If you're an entomologist you might be assigned to survey and control insects infesting tomatoes and watermelons in Tonga. If you're a mammalogist, you might help develop a preservation program for the Tamaraw—a work animal related to the Asiatic Water Buffalo, and an endangered species in the Philippines.

JOB PROSPECTS

Manpower authorities foresee an end to the current surplus of scientists and engineers, and predict more jobs in their fields than persons to fill them by 1975-80.

All disciplines in environmental management, including ecology, should benefit from this demand, already accelerated by the public interest in, and demand for, environmental improvement programs. Ecology, as the smallest of the fields of environmental management, should get concentrated attention. (The other fields are earth sciences, resources and recreation, environmental design, and environmental protection.) Ecology is neither cyclical nor overcrowded. Fundings for projects involving ecology should continue, if not under the IBP then under a successor program.

An ambitious new institution, which will provide direct employment for increasing numbers of ecologists and indirect stimulation of other employment, is The Institute of Ecology. TIE was launched in 1971 after several years of study by the Ecological Society of America. Fifty universities and other organizations of North, Central, and South America are TIE's founding members. Eventually the Institute will consist of a central headquarters research center with a network connecting it to universities which will cooperate in large-scale ecological studies.

Neither the U.S. government nor any scien-

tific society, such as ESA, has published manpower projections for ecology. On the basis of my studies, I project a three-fold expansion of professionals in the field—from today's 4,800 to 14,400 or more by 1980.

One of the factors in my projection is the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, particularly its Section 102(2)(C), which requires "108 statements." Such a statement provides a detailed analysis of environmental impacts of a proposed governmental step. The Federal government is required to prepare and use such statements in agency review processes before taking any major actions which "significantly affect the quality of the human environment." In the first two years the law has been in effect, Federal courts across the country have heard more than 60 cases and rendered decisions which prove that the "102" provisions are court enforceable. Ecologists filed many of those cases and acted as expert witnesses in others.

WOMEN WELCOME

Opportunities for women ecologists are almost unlimited.

Rachel Carson, who was an ecologist, is widely credited with having launched the contemporary environmental movement with her book *Silent Spring*, published in 1962.

Today one of the most distinguished American ecologists is Dr. Ruth Patrick. She is a member of the National Academy of Sciences, an authority on limnology (fresh water studies, and the director of the Department of Limnology at the Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences where she has a staff of 70 men and women. In addition, she is a consultant to Dupont, responsible for assessing the ecology at the sites of existing or proposed chemical plants, and for developing water treatment and waste disposal facilities.

Another woman ecologist, along with four women scientists, spent two weeks in a habitat at the bottom of the Caribbean Sea in the Tektite II experiments in 1970.

EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS

Many people think of ecology as a branch of biology. The classical ecologist always had biology at the core of his education and experience. But no more. Today sociology, anthropology, and economics are more important in the education of an ecologist than are the physical sciences.

If you were plotting an eco-education network, you would include biological sciences, of course, but you also would include environmental health, social sciences, and physical sciences, with intricate circuits connecting all points in the net. Not one of these is more important than the others.

Undergraduate training in ecology should include a balanced curriculum of biological social, and environmental health sciences. During the first two years you should take introductory courses in biology, chemistry, calculus, sociology, and physics. Major courses should include genetics, physiology, ecology, demography, economics, anthropology, epidemiology, limnology and water quality, and oceanography. Allied sciences should include a course in geology, one in biostatistics, and one in a computer science. Depending upon the individual student's interests, he undoubtedly will take additional courses in chemistry, sociology, health sciences, or biology.

Some graduate work is desirable, but not essential, to work in ecology. Study through the M.S. or M.A. degree is common. To be a leader, a Ph.D. is regarded as necessary.

There are many excellent universities and colleges which offer ecology as a major specialty. The outstanding ones are: California (Berkeley), Colorado State, Cornell, Duke, University of Georgia, Michigan, Michigan State, Minnesota, North Carolina (Chapel Hill), Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oregon State, Tennessee, Washington, Wisconsin (Madison), Yale.

EARNING POWER

Universities are "home base" for at least 80 per cent of all ecologists today. As an instructor or assistant professor, with a B.S. or M.S. and having a contract with a large university, you might receive \$7,000-\$9,000 per nine-month year. As a Ph.D., you might be an associate or full professor at \$10,000-\$18,000; a rare few earn \$22,000 or higher.

The estimated 5 per cent of ecologists who work for industry earn 30-60 per cent more at any level of education and experience.

Our most reliable salary figures are for the estimated 15 per cent of ecologists who work for the Federal government. At the starting point, with a B.S. and limited experience, you would be on a par with your colleagues at universities, earning \$7,319-\$9,053. With an M.S. and several years experience, your salary could be \$11,046-\$13,309, beginning to outdistance ecologists on campus. With a Ph.D. and a growing professional reputation, you could advance to a supervisory position commanding \$15,866-\$25,538.

While the prestige is greater in a full professorship, the salary is higher in industry or government.

HELP YOURSELF

The best-laid plans are those you make yourself. If you want a career in ecology, read everything about it you can find. Consult the quarterly indexes of *Science* magazine, the weekly journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, usually found in large school or public libraries. Ask your library to order the paperback "Concepts of Ecology," by Edward J. Kormondy, published by Prentice-Hall, 1968. Ask your guidance counselor or science teacher for other leads to self-education.

After you've done such "homework," write to several universities and request catalogs and bulletins about ecological studies. If one or more interest you, write to the appropriate department head and request an appointment to visit, see the facilities, and have an interview with him or some other faculty member.

Finally, you may address specific questions to, or request a vocational guidance publication from, the Ecological Society of America. Write its secretary, Dr. J. Frank McCormick, Professor Ecology and Botany, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514.

By such steps you can be launched on an exciting career as an ecologist—the preeminent catalyst for environmental quality.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, summer is traditionally the season when many American families pack their campers and take to the roads and parks of this great land. Exploring from coast to coast, millions of Americans enjoy the great natural beauty of our bountiful country.

I bring this to the attention of my fellow Representatives, not to promote vacation travel, but to point out that we are not captives in this country as are millions of people now living under Communist domination. Last week as in past years we remembered these fellow human beings during "Captive Nations Week."

We often take our freedom for granted

in this country. From birth, we are free citizens, free to travel where we please, free to speak our minds about the operations of our government and free to worship as we desire. These, of course, are only a few of the many freedoms we enjoy each day.

From time to time, I think it is necessary to reflect on the opportunities we have in America and to sympathize with those in the captive nations who live under tyranny and enjoy no freedoms at all.

Life is a precious commodity and one of the values which makes it precious is the capability to make decisions, free and unencumbered by the political machinery of a dictatorial state.

But that is what the people in the captive nations are faced with each day. Their work, their recreation and their private lives are controlled in such a manner that they are restricted in all aspects of their lives. It is a way of life contrary to the natural freedom all human beings are guaranteed at birth. It is a way of life Americans have found intolerable since the beginning of this Nation almost 200 years ago. And it is a way of life all Americans should detest.

Today, millions of people, including the Soviet Jews, the Latvians, Lithuanians, Hungarians, Czechs, Poles, and others in the rollcall of captive nations, suffer each day under the unyielding grip of a few powerful men.

As Americans start out on their summer vacations, it would be well if they paused for a moment and remembered these captive people with the hope that some day all the peoples of the world shall be truly free to enjoy the fullest benefits of life.

We have remembered and honored the people in these captive nations for many years. Let us pray that in the near future we will be able to help them celebrate their freedom with the same respect and honor we have shown in commemorating their enslavement.

AHEPA'S GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in Atlanta, Ga., on July 26, 1922, the Order of Ahepa was founded to promote an appreciation of the privileges of citizenship, and encourage active participation in the political, social, and civic fields of human endeavor. AHEPA, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, is this year celebrating 50 years of service and accomplishment on the local, national, and international level. As a nonpolitical and nonsectarian organization, AHEPA has fought for the freedom and self-respect of minorities in Greece and Cyprus, and has always been willing to aid victims of disaster, both here and abroad. AHEPA also provides help to noncitizens in attaining full U.S. citizenship and in realizing the responsibilities and obligations that go with it.

As a member of the Springfield, Ohio, chapter of AHEPA, I have come to appreciate the contributions of this fraternity even more. The members include businessmen, educators, farmers, and laboring men—all with the common goal of helping others. More than that, though, the Order of Ahepa is a family fraternity, with numerous programs of fellowship and relaxation for all members of the family.

Education—by means of scholarship and donations—civic participation, fellowship, sports programs, disaster relief—these are all part of the work of AHEPA. On its golden anniversary, it is appropriate for many Americans to congratulate AHEPA on its 50 years of service and to wish it the best of luck and good wishes for the next 50 years.

RESEARCH NEEDED ON CRIB DEATH

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Indianapolis Star of July 21, 1972. Mrs. Choate has eloquently spelled out the need for further work to discover the cause of this overwhelming tragedy.

The article follows:

MEDICAL MYSTERY: RESEARCH NEEDED ON CRIB DEATH

(By Judith Choate)

There is no greater miracle than the birth of a perfect child. Cigars are passed out by proud papas; dreams bloom on mama's face. Life begins!

The trip home from the hospital sets the precedent for "firsts" entered in the baby book: first car ride, first bath, first smile, the longed-for first full night's sleep.

We had hit all these milestones, and more, when, on a March morning in 1965, my three-year-old son and I began our day with a quiet peek at "our baby." With three words—"Robbie looks funny"—I learned how abruptly this perfect miracle could end. My thriving, beautiful five-month-old son lay dead in his crib.

No warning sickness, no struggle, no cry; a quiet death had come.

A quiet death came in this country for Robbie and 10,000 other Robbies that year. And for 10,000 apparently healthy babies every year—before, since and to come—life is over before it has begun.

Robbie was a victim of the Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (SIDS or also called "crib death"); a disease neither predictable nor preventable that is, after the first two weeks of life, the No. 1 cause of infant death in the United States. A disease that in its silence and unpredictability takes an incredible toll on the lives of surviving family members.

The death of any child is heartbreaking but no other disease leaves, in its wake, such guilt, self-doubt, incrimination, psychosis and charges of criminal neglect. Yet, every day, 30 to 35 families in this country suffer not only the loss of a loved infant but agonize over their own feelings of responsibility for it, accusations of infanticide by neighbors and relatives, ignorance from their physicians, suspicion by legal authorities and, often, they are never told why their baby died.

With one exception, our cases was "classic." On March 15, Robbie was a gurgling, cheerful bright new member of our household; loved and cherished, put to bed with a full tummy and a comforting burp. His death came some time during his normal nighttime sleep, discovery at 6:30 in the morning. However, unlike most families who are faced with the death syndrome, we were aware of "crib death" and of a foundation begun by parents of a lost child.

We immediately called our pediatrician and the Fire and Police Departments' resuscitation units. We knew it was useless but felt we had to try to revive our son. And, indeed, he was pronounced dead by his pediatrician—the very same doctor who, the week before, had pronounced him "a perfect baby."

His body was left in our apartment, in a closed bedroom, with a policeman in attendance until the mid-afternoon at which time a medical investigator from the medical examiner's office observed the body and interviewed us. We were asked such questions as "How many times did you hit the baby?" "Did your other child choke or in any way abuse the baby?" "Did you let your dog bite the baby?" If we had not been aware of SIDS and confident that we had done absolutely nothing wrong, one can imagine the guilt and self-accusation such questions would have brought into our lives. In this way, our loss differed from that of thousands of other families across the country, families who live for months and, sometimes years, with torment over the death of their baby.

I began my work with the National Foundation for Sudden Infant Death, Inc., one week after the death of my son. In the seven years that I have been involved, national awareness about the magnitude of the problem has increased greatly; however, families are still sometimes faced with criminal charges, still faced with lack of autopsy and still faced with long months of waiting to be told why their baby died. We still do not know the cause of the Sudden Infant Death Syndrome but we do know that SIDS families are not criminals.

The National Foundation for Sudden Infant Death proposes a standardized procedure in every community in the United States for the humane handling of cases of infants who die suddenly and unexpectedly; a method that is both compassionate and medically sound. Autopsies must be performed and parents promptly informed of the results. The criteria for the diagnosis of SIDS should be disseminated to coroners and medical examiners throughout the country and the term, "Sudden Infant Death Syndrome," should be utilized. Every family should receive authoritative information about SIDS from a health professional who is both knowledgeable about the disease and skilled in dealing with characteristic grief reactions. These services should be available to every family regardless of financial status or type of medical care.

HEROIN TRAFFIC

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to call to the attention of my colleagues and the American public the growing threat of heroin traffic coming into this Nation from Southeast Asia.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I renew my charge that the administration continues

to give the public rosy reports of cooperation from foreign governments on this critical matter. Yet, when I and other of my colleagues have investigated the problem, we have discovered that the heroin traffic is increasing with, in numerous cases, the active protection of high officials in the nations involved.

Today's New York Times carries a story by Seymour Hersh, based on a report to a Cabinet-level task force, which substantiates the charges which I have been making.

I have formally requested that the Department of State make this report available to the Congress forthwith. If the report is not forthcoming, I shall introduce a resolution of inquiry which would require the Department of State to transmit this document to the appropriate committees of the Congress.

As my colleagues are aware, the Foreign Affairs Committee, based on information which I obtained, has already adopted a cutoff of aid to Thailand because of its major role in the international traffic in narcotics. I feel sure that the contents of this report will confirm the decision of the committee to pass my amendment.

At this point in the RECORD I should like to include the New York Times article:

NO HOPE OF HALTING ASIAN DRUG TRAFFIC
(By Seymour M. Hersh)

WASHINGTON, July 23.—A Cabinet-level report has concluded that contrary to the Nixon Administration's public optimism, "there is no prospect" of stemming the smuggling of narcotics by air and sea in Southeast Asia "under any conditions that can realistically be projected."

"This is so," the report, dated Feb. 21, 1972, said, "because the governments in the region are unable and, in some cases, unwilling to do those things that would have to be done by them if a truly effective effort were to be made."

The report, prepared by officials of the Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department and the Defense Department, noted that "the most basic problem, and the one that unfortunately appears least likely of any early solution, is the corruption, collusion and indifference at some places in some governments, particularly Thailand and South Vietnam, that precludes more effective suppression of traffic by the governments on whose territory it takes place."

The report sharply contradicted the official Administration position and Government intelligence sources say its conclusions are still valid today. In May, Secretary of State William P. Rogers told a Senate subcommittee that "we think all the countries are cooperating with us and we are quite satisfied with that cooperation."

Similarly, Nelson G. Gross, Senior Adviser to the Secretary of State and Coordinator for International Narcotics Matters, testified before Congress in June on the subject of narcotics smuggling that "the governments of Thailand, Laos and Vietnam have already joined us in the fight and, while we have a long way to go, we feel that during the past year some real progress has been achieved."

All officials concerned with the drug problem acknowledge that the United States agencies, under personal prodding from President Nixon, have begun an intensive effort to stem the international narcotics traffic. But critics contend that the effort is far less effective today than Administration officials say it is.

* * * flow of narcotics are Representative Robert H. Steele, Republican of Connecticut,

CXVIII—1584—Part 19

and Alfred W. McCoy, a 26-year-old Yale graduate student who has written a book on narcotics in Southeast Asia. The New York Times reported Saturday that Mr. McCoy's allegations concerning the C.I.A. and the drug traffic had been the subject of an intense and unusually public rebuttal by the agency.

The Cabinet-level report, made available to The Times, buttressed many of the charges made by the two critics, particularly about the pivotal importance of Thailand to the international drug smugglers. Thailand is also a major Air Force staging area for the United States.

In a report on the world heroin problem last year, Mr. Steele wrote that "from the American viewpoint, Thailand is an important to the control of the illegal international traffic in narcotics as Turkey. While all of the opium produced in Southeast Asia is not grown in Thailand, most of it is smuggled through that country."

Mr. Steele's report, filed with the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, noted that many American citizens had established residence in Bangkok, and had moved into the narcotics trade. The report added that the inability of the United States to have a few notorious smugglers deported had led some intelligence officials to conclude that the men were paying Thai officials for protection.

Mr. McCoy said in testimony before Congressional committees last month that hundreds of tons of Burmese opium passed through Thailand every year to international markets in Europe and the United States and that 80 to 90 per cent of the opium was carried by Chinese Nationalist paramilitary teams that were at one time paid by the C.I.A.

There are a number of opium refineries along the northern Thai border, he said, and much of the processed high-quality heroin is shipped by trawler to Hong Kong.

"Even though they are heavily involved in the narcotics traffic," Mr. McCoy testified, "these Nationalist Chinese irregular units are closely allied with the Thai Government." He said that Thai Government police units patrol the northern border area and collect an "import duty" of about \$2.50 a pound of raw opium entering Thailand. All this activity, he said, is monitored by United States intelligence agencies.

THAI-U.S. AGREEMENTS CITED

Mr. Gross, the State Department's adviser on international narcotics, said in his Congressional testimony that "during the past year the Thais have increased their efforts in the drug field with United States and United Nations assistance." He cited two agreements, signed in late 1971, calling for more cooperation and more long-range planning between Thai and United States officials to stamp out the trade.

"Based on all intelligence information available," Mr. Gross testified, "the leaders of the Thai Government are not engaged in the opium or heroin traffic, nor are they extending protection to traffickers." He added that the top police official in Thailand had publicly stated that he would punish any corrupt official.

The cabinet-level report, submitted to the Cabinet Committee on International Narcotics Control, asked "highest priority" for suppression of the traffic by Thai trawlers, noting that each trawler "would represent something like 6 per cent of annual United States consumption of heroin."

The report said that the trawler traffic should have priority because "it is possible to attack the Thai trawler traffic without seeking the cooperation of Thai authorities and running the attendant risks of leaks, tip-offs and betrayals."

After such a seizure, the report said, the United States Embassy in Bangkok could "repeat with still greater force and insistence the representations it has already often made to the Government of Thailand" for more

effective efforts "to interdict traffic from the north of Thailand to Bangkok and also the loading of narcotics on ships in Thai harbors."

At another point in the report, a general complaint was voiced. "It should surely be possible to convey to the right Thai or Vietnamese officials the mood of the Congress and the Administration on the subject of drugs," the report said. "No real progress can be made on the problem of illicit traffic until and unless the local governments concerned make it a matter of highest priority."

Representatives Steele, Lester L. Wolff, Democrat of Nassau County, and Morgan F. Murphy, Democrat of Illinois, have sponsored legislation that would cut off more than \$100-million in foreign aid to Thailand unless she took more action to halt the production and traffic of heroin. Their measure cleared the House Foreign Affairs Committee on June 21 and is included in the Foreign Assistance Act, now pending.

During a Congressional hearing into drug traffic last month, Representative Wolff disputed the Administration's contention that it was making "real progress" in stemming the narcotics flow and said, "we think the trade has got so much protection in high places in Thailand that the Administration is afraid they'll tell us to take our air bases out if we put too much pressure on them."

A TRIBUTE TO AHEPA

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to pay my respects to the Order of Ahepa—a fraternal organization of the highest caliber—which this month celebrates its golden anniversary year.

The order represents the spirit and the wishes of the Greek-American community of North America, in matters concerning the welfare of all mankind.

Its purposes are in every respect beneficial to our national designs and deserving of our praise.

As a philanthropic body, AHEPA has contributed to the relief of victims of disaster—both natural and man-made—throughout the full course of its existence. Persons rendered homeless by flood, hurricane, and the blight of war, have turned for assistance to AHEPA, which has always responded with genuine concern.

Under the authority of AHEPA, schools have been constructed to further education in the United States and Greece as well and a program established providing for an educational journey to Greece by deserving American students.

Deeply patriotic, AHEPA was responsible, during World War II, as an official issuing agency of the U.S. Treasury, for the sale of \$500 million worth of war bonds.

In the war against the ravages of disease, AHEPA has contributed to the construction and operation of hospitals, health centers, and medical research centers in both Greece and the United States.

It is a special pleasure for me to call to the attention of the Congress the services of one of my constituents, George I.

Bourney of West Hempstead, N.Y., as supreme trustee and second vice chairman of the order, as well as those of the president, secretary, and treasurer of the Hempstead chapter, Constantine Psillis, Chris Constantine, and John Piniat. All have worked hard in the interests of AHEPA and in so doing have served the interests of America as well.

It is a matter of the greatest pride on my part to recall my designation as the honor guest of the Theodore Roosevelt Chapter No. 170 of the Order of Ahepa, Hempstead, N.Y., at the 20th AHEPA national banquet held last March in Washington. The banquet was in honor of the U.S. Congress, and I was proud, indeed, to have represented my constituents on that occasion.

In all it has accomplished over the past 50 years, AHEPA has won the respect and good wishes of everyone familiar with the facts and concerned for the welfare of our country and the world.

ORDER OF AHEPA GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the Order of Ahepa, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, has a special anniversary this month and I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to this fine organization and its membership as they mark their golden anniversary on July 26, 1972.

The members of the AHEPA are men in all walks of life. They may be businessmen, professional men, educators, laboring men—but all are men of good moral character with a common goal of good fellowship and common understanding.

The Order of Ahepa has contributed financially to many causes during its 50 years of existence, on both a national and international level. These contributions are in addition to the many local programs under the direction of the local chapters. Local AHEPA chapters have always given generously and vigorously supported local community undertakings in the fields of education, charity, and civic improvement.

Members of the AHEPA can take pride in their accomplishments during the past 50 years. They have championed the cause of education and have always been ready to aid victims of disaster both here and abroad.

I am especially proud of the active membership of AHEPA in the Second Congressional District of Utah, which I represent. Sam N. Anton is president of the Salt Lake City Chapter and Andrew L. Satupis, also of Salt Lake City, is the current lieutenant governor of the district lodge.

No organization or fraternity can claim any better ideals. The Order of Ahepa has made invaluable contributions in almost all phases of American life. I salute the members of this fine organization for their contributions during the past half century.

REACH—ANOTHER KIND OF GRADUATION

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe that community-level drug rehabilitation programs offer the best solution to one of our Nation's most urgent problems. One of the more effective of these has been the REACH program, organized 2 years ago in Fairfield, Conn. Following is an excellent article by Ruth McDermott, managing editor of the Fairfield Citizen, discussing REACH's activities:

REACH—ANOTHER KIND OF GRADUATION (By Ruth McDermott)

In a week of graduations, of caps and gowns and citations, academic marches and recessions, a quieter ceremony was held in Fairfield marking the successful completion of another kind of course of learning as six young men and women were graduated from the REACH program.

REACH differs from most of the academic institutions that had commencement exercises. What its class of '72 had learned didn't come primarily from books, it came from a living experience and essentially the lesson learned was that an alternative life-style existed to the one they had chosen before they came there; that it was a better life and that pursuit of it was worth giving up drug dependency and other self-destructive habits of body and mind they had settled on as a way of making it in what they pretty universally had considered a hostile environment.

REACH was started in Fairfield two years ago to meet a growing drug-abuse problem among young people and it had a tough time proving its worth. This was when the entire drug picture was newer and very confusing to most people. Why drug dependency habits arise in so many young people may be just as much as an enigma today but the fact that there is a problem has certainly become more accepted as has the fact that facilities like REACH are of value in combating the drug abuse. This is reflected concretely in the town of Fairfield's appropriating money for REACH in its budget.

REACH has had its moments of trial and error like all other agencies groping first to understand the anatomy of the drug abuse problem and then take steps to combat it. The fact that its staff had deemed this graduating class (actually the 2nd, one person graduated last year) ready to leave the facility demonstrates that, at least in its own eyes, it has evolved a course of action that has yielded results. Results to them meaning the young person has demonstrated his or her ability to assume a life-style that is interesting and challenging enough to pursue without the use of drugs as a crutch.

Two of the six of the '72 graduates are Brad Bratchell and Leslie Martin and we asked them what had brought them to REACH and why they thought they were ready to leave its protecting arms. Two of REACH's directors sat with us also and told us how the facility had changed from the days when it started and why the changes were significant. They are Ray Wilson, an ex-addict who is REACH's co-director and has been for two years and Diane Bluett, a trained social service worker who has been on the staff for one year.

Diane thinks that the problem is primarily psychological and that the drug abuse habit is merely a symptom; REACH obviously can do nothing about the availability of drugs, it can only treat people who avail themselves of it.

"Drugs aren't the real problem," she said. "It's what's under the surface of one's personality. Problems can show themselves in different forms but the result is a defect in attitude and that is really what REACH concerns itself with."

This appraisal gains credence when one considers that though Leslie was on drugs when she came to REACH; Brad wasn't. What they had in common was unhappiness and a feeling of alienation from family, friends and society.

"A friend brought me down here," Leslie said, "when I was a junior at Ludlow. I started smoking marijuana in high school and at 16 I started on speed. I guess I got on it because I wanted to be part of something I never was before. I come from a big family but I was always really lonely."

"When I was a sophomore I found a circle of friends who were getting high and I wanted to be accepted by them so I started too. If they were doing anything else I probably would have done the same thing; but this is what they were doing."

"When I came here (to REACH) I didn't feel like I had a problem but just being here, I realized getting high wasn't the answer."

Brad was an only child and lonely too. "One day some friends said come down to REACH and meet some girls and I've been here since. That was in July of '70 when I was 17."

"The first day here," Leslie said, "I got the impression of a lot of people running around looking happy . . . there was a lot of talk among us about our feelings which was pretty new to me. Then we developed the core family idea and there was a lot of confrontation."

Ray Wilson explained the core family. "The program used to be rather loosely structured. But remember, REACH started as a Hot Line concept, a stop gap for kids who were desperate. This served the purpose then but as we developed we realized something more substantial, more structured was needed and we developed the 'Core Family' idea. The emphasis changed from people calling in and stopgap measures to people in our program and a permanent design for living."

"Once the structure came," Diane said, "goals came with it. The idea of the core family as Ray and John Foita developed it was to create a family environment, sort of a surrogate family here at REACH. The first 12 hours a day in fact, taking on responsibility here, both of physical work which was the building and maintaining the inside and outside of this building and the mental and emotional work of seminars, encounter groups, letting the meaning of being part of a family infiltrate, learning to set and meet goals both as individuals and as a part of the group, learning to be honest and open with oneself and with each other."

A crucial thing about the core family program was it was in effect a workshop. Leslie and Brad and all the other members of it lived at home, went to school and did all the other "outside" things with REACH being their base. They learned the crucial attitudes there and went into the outside world to practice them, for that is where they would have to live their lives.

And as Ray said, "just getting to be part of the core family was meeting a goal for you had to earn it. We used to say 'no free lunch'. That had to be earned. A theory being that learning to live within it, to develop mutual love and respect for fellow family members, to learn to do your share of a common purpose, a common job, was to learn how to live outside this family too."

"This isn't a residence," Ray said. "The idea was to spend a lot of time here at REACH at commitment without effort is impossible. We had to make life here desirable enough to give up drugs and apathy for."

Gradually the proportion of time changed; less time in REACH, more time outside. This is the essence of the core family program.

The success each one finds there is the measure of transference they can make to an independent life outside REACH. That is what Leslie and Brad achieved.

Some of the group projects during their time and continuing were managing hotdog stands such as they set up for the Outdoor Art Show recently, organizing Red Cross blood banks and now the coffee house that occupies a building of the Fairfield Railroad station. This coffee house as a matter of fact represents another step for REACH.

The program is now divided in two; to deal with heavy drug users and the more casual users. They feel they can have a more successful program separating the two. REACH will remain the structured core family and the coffee house the preventive and educational level. It will be open seven days a week and be self-supporting, "we hope" Diane said. "It won't be only a place you can always come to," she added. "We are working toward setting up workshops in arts and crafts, a photo shop, a leather shop, a drama group related to life today, we are even ambitious enough to be planning high school equivalency tutoring and hoping to get professional teacher volunteers to help us with this."

Graduates Leslie and Brad aren't leaving REACH entirely, they are moving to staff now and will both be working at the coffee house all summer. Brad is going to continue at the University of New Haven in the fall. He will be a sophomore and hopes to become a lawyer some day. "A storefront lawyer. I would like to work for a program such as REACH or any other social work agency."

Leslie has had one year at the University of Rochester and thinks another year out in the world working and being with people will help her figure out what she really wants to do before she goes back to school again. But she definitely intends to go back and get her degree and "work at something that has to do with people."

Both leave REACH with something they didn't have before. A feeling of love for the people they know and a feeling that they are stronger people than they were and more able to confront life on whatever terms it offers itself than before they found their way there.

LETTER TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, since I have no longer the honor of representing the people of Lenawee County, I have today sent the following letter to my constituents in that area:

DEAR FRIEND: Because of the recent Congressional redistricting, I will no longer have the honor and privilege of representing my friends in Lenawee County. During the past six years, my wife, Olga, and I have developed many warm friendships with our friends throughout Lenawee County and we will miss them. The new redistricting plan places the County of Lenawee in the 4th Congressional District which is represented by Congressman Edward Hutchinson.

Since 1967, I have had the honor of serving Michigan along side of the Honorable Ed Hutchinson of the 4th District. I know him as a man whose judgment and experience will serve Lenawee County well.

Ed Hutchinson came to Washington in 1963 after serving five terms in the Michigan State Senate and two terms in the State House of Representatives. He also was a vice-president of the 1961-1962 Michigan Constitutional Convention. He is a man who has served the public for more than a quarter of a

century. Congressman Hutchinson and I have not always been in total agreement but I know that he has voted his political convictions only after the most careful study; in other words Ed Hutchinson does his homework.

When the 93rd Congress convenes, Ed Hutchinson will be the ranking Republican member of the Judiciary Committee and, if this body should be reorganized by the Republicans, will accede to the Chairmanship of that Committee. It is an interesting point of history to note that only one other member of Congress from Michigan has reached the top of the Judiciary Committee. He was the late Earl C. Michener, of Adrian in Lenawee County, who represented the 2nd District for 30 years until his retirement in 1950. Representative Michener was Chairman in the 80th Congress.

In the coming months I am sure you will get to know your new Congressman and hopefully will develop the same close relationship with him that we have had in the past.

With warmest regards, I am,

MARVIN L. ESCH.

ORDER OF AHEPA CELEBRATES GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, in Jacksonville, Fla., which I represent in the Congress, the Order of Ahepa is celebrating its golden anniversary during 1972. The organization was founded in Atlanta, Ga., on July 26, 1922. Nationally, the organization has made many contributions for the betterment of American life and certainly should be recognized at this time.

Our American democracy finds a natural kinship with those of Greek descent who founded the AHEPA fraternity, rooted in the spirit of the democracy of ancient Greece.

The organization promotes and encourages loyalty to the United States of America and instructs its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government, and in the recognition and respect of the inalienable rights of mankind.

The organization instills in its members a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship and encourages them to be profoundly interested and actively participating in the political, civil, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor.

The organization has organized like-minded people to provide relief for Florida hurricane victims, flood victims in Mississippi, and, in general, needy persons around the world. Jerry Felos and Sam, his brother, both of Jacksonville, have been among my very closest friends throughout my life and I know how much AHEPA has meant to them as they work together for the betterment of mankind.

Several outstanding Americans have been members of this organization and the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt became a member while still Governor of New York and maintained his membership faithfully. Former President Harry S. Truman is a member of the AHEPA.

U.S. Vice President SPIRO AGNEW is also a member.

The AHEPA chapter in Jacksonville and the other chapters around the country can be duly proud of their record in 1972, as they celebrate their 50th anniversary.

OUR NATIONAL ENERGY CRISIS

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD excerpts from a speech made by the president of the National Coal Association to the 20th Annual Conference of the Great Lakes States Industrial Development Council. In this speech, Mr. Bagge discussed our vulnerability to having petroleum imports cut off and the mounting trade deficit we are now experiencing from our current petroleum imports.

The excerpts of the speech follow:

EXCERPTS OF AN ADDRESS BY CARL E. BAGGE

A few years ago . . . it would have been a ridiculously simple question to ask, what are you going to do for energy? Today the answer is not quite so simple. Despite the fact that the U.S. was blessed with an abundance of all types of fuel including coal, oil, oil-shale, gas and uranium we have so mismanaged our fuel and energy utilization that only coal remains abundant. Its use in its natural state is being outlawed by environmental constraints, and technological developments to improve its usability have been thwarted by legislative neglect. As General George A. Lincoln, the head of our Office of Emergency Preparedness, said, "Coal has been our most ignored resources."

Today the nation is in what I fear are only the opening stages of an energy shortage and almost complete dependence on the use of foreign fuels. Already the United States imports about 8.5 percent of its fuel requirements. Our nation imports a quarter of the petroleum it consumes, and both the total amount and the percentage of imports are increasing. This is, or should be, a matter of considerable national concern, because we are already running a sizable deficit in our balance of trade, and the continuing drain of dollars for imported fuel is one of our biggest expenditures.

Perhaps more critical is the fact that the friendly nations of the Caribbean which have been supplying most of our oil imports are now producing at or near their capacity, and in addition, their oil is high in sulfur. Today's demand is not only for more petroleum in all forms, but, under the strictures of air pollution control, for residual fuel oil which is low in sulfur—and that low-sulfur oil must come principally from the Middle East.

The nations of the Middle East are politically volatile, and their record of friendship for the United States in recent years does not give us much confidence. Moreover, they are already engaged in supplying oil to Europe and Japan so that we are truly buying oil in a seller's market—and any newspaper reader can find recurrent signs that the Middle East governments are missing no opportunity to increase prices and demands more control over oil production in their territory. . . . We are increasingly placing a vital part of our energy supply at hazard, in a position where we may no longer control our own destiny.

As in the case of oil the supplies of natural gas are critically short. Under a misguided policy we have for more than 17 years im-

posed a stringent federal controls on the price which producers may be paid for natural gas in the field. Though the policy was intended to protect the consumer against unjustified price increases, it has had the effect of keeping prices artificially low, discouraging exploration and development of new gas fields, and encouraging the use of this premium fuel for inferior uses. Trillions of cubic feet of gas, for example, have been burned under utility boilers in lieu of coal, and that gas is not available now to the household consumers who need it. . . . Today in Washington and Pittsburgh plus many other great cities, gas distributors can accept no new customers, not even new homes.

In my six years as a member of the Federal Power Commission, I reluctantly enforced this irrational price policy while submitting and arguing for federal legislation which would decontrol the field price of new gas and thus encourage new discoveries. The self-defeating policy of field price regulation led to other complications for of course as federal law, it applied only to gas entering interstate commerce.

I recall that after the Permian Basin decision, which was the commission's first attempt to set field prices on an area basis, we had allowed a price of 16.5 cents per thousand cubic feet for gas from west Texas to supply a pipeline for the Chicago area. In short order, however, a competing pipeline was built entirely within the boundaries of Texas and hence not subject to the Permian Basin order which began siphoning off that gas for the chemical industry of the Texas Gulf Coast. Under the impetus of higher price, the producers found and sold more gas, but actually less and less gas was committed to the interstate market. The producers could sell it for use within the state for more than they could get from interstate pipelines.

Ultimately, a pipeline in dire need of gas for the Chicago market was forced to buy Permian Basin gas at a premium from the intrastate line—a price of 12 cents per thousand cubic feet over the maximum it could pay the original producers.

This is only one example of the irrationality of wellhead price control. . . . There are many other instances of how the forces of the marketplace ultimately overcame the strictures of price regulation—but forced the consumer to pay more than he likely would have without the misguided effort of price control.

The shortage of gas has, somewhat belatedly, launched a search for new or substitute supplies. The logical first place to inquire was Canada, which is already the source of about 4 percent of our gas supplies. However, Canada's National Energy Board has decided that Canada does not have a great deal of gas in excess of its own future needs, and the board has voted, at least for the time being, to allow no additional sales to the United States.

Another possibility is to import liquefied natural gas from abroad, principally from Algeria. Several proposals for large-scale LNG shipments are now being considered. The Federal Power Commission in a landmark ruling this month authorized long-term LNG imports but said it will not assume jurisdiction over them until they move in interstate commerce. These imports may be necessary for a time, but they give rise to the same dangers as do imports of petroleum—indeed, they compound the hazard, for they could multiply the drain on our balance of payments and make even more of our critically important energy supply subject to foreign cutoff.

Another alternative proposed by several major pipelines is to make synthetic gas from naphtha. But the logic of using one scarce fuel, oil, to produce another does not stand

close examination and since either the naphtha or the crude oil from which it is derived would have to be imported, this seems a dubious expedient as a large-scale, long-term solution.

So we are in trouble with our energy-producing fuels. Some projections indicate that in a few years we will have to import more than half of the fuels we consume as liquid and gases to heat our homes, run our automobiles, and operate industrial processes for which fuel in these forms is so critical. We will, unless we take prompt action to prevent this situation by recognizing that our one remaining abundant fuel resource, coal, can be the source of all fuel forms necessary.

The best alternative source of gas is synthetic gas from coal. You have probably heard of this prospect, or more likely you have heard of only half of it.

The half that has received the most attention is the conversion of coal to pipeline-quality gas, comparable to natural gas. At least four processes to accomplish this are now in the pilot plant stage. Here in Chicago, the pilot plant of the Institute of Gas Technology has already been operating. In Rapid City, South Dakota, Consolidation Coal Company's SO₂ acceptor process is expected to start up this spring, operating on lignite. The National Coal Association's research affiliate, Bituminous Coal Research, Inc., has signed a \$24 million contract to build and operate a pilot plant near Homer City, Pennsylvania, under auspices of the Department of the Interior's Office of Coal Research, which is also sponsoring the two processes previously mentioned. In addition, the Bureau of Mines is building a pilot plant at its own research facility at Bruceston, Pennsylvania.

All four of these processes aim at a product comparable to natural gas, with a heat content of 900 or more Btu per cubic foot. The engineers and researchers tell us that if all goes well, commercial plants employing one or more of these processes will be ready about 1980. They will each produce at least 250 million cubic feet a day, and consume six million tons of coal a year. To be commercially feasible they will probably be mine-mouth plants located in the West, where they can be supplied by large tracts of strip-able coal.

However, the gas produced by these plants will not be inexpensive. Its cost is expected to be competitive with other substitutes for domestic natural gas—LNG, Alaskan gas, or synthetic gas from naphtha, but probably out of range for industrial and electric utility use so long as another energy source is available.

And in fact there is a likely substitute—another kind of gas from coal. This is low-Btu gas, with a heat content of about 200 Btu per cubic foot. A non-polluting low-Btu gas can, it appears, be produced in simpler and less expensive equipment than that required for the pipeline gas process. It would not be economical to move low-Btu gas by pipeline—you would have to move several times the volume for the same heat content as natural gas, and of course it could not be mingled with natural gas in the same line. So the logical way to use the process is to install the gasifier at an industrial or electric utility plant and haul the coal there by conventional means. This also eliminates the need for a large mine-mouth block of committed coal reserves, and would be a natural use for the substantial but scattered reserves of Appalachia and the Midwest.

Low-Btu gas can be used in conventional boiler equipment without air pollution. But more importantly, it seemingly opens the door to a new power generation process—the combined cycle system—which has an indicated efficiency of about 55 percent instead of the 38 percent which is a good rating for modern conventional generating stations. In the combined cycle system, low-Btu gas

from the gasifier is burned in a gas turbine which spins a generator, and the exhaust gases are passed through a boiler where they make steam for a second turbine and generator.

Though it has been a long struggle, government and industry backing for research in pipeline-quality gas from coal has now reached a substantial level. However, there has been little funding for research in low-Btu gas until this year's budget included for the first time a \$33 million item for a study of the process. We in the coal industry think this small beginning needs to be drastically increased, and we invite your support for the project.

It seems to me that the low-Btu gas process, with or without the combined cycle, has many attractions for industrial development in the Great Lakes states. Because sulfur and other impurities can be scrubbed from the gas as it is produced, and some recovered as salable products, it offers a fuel which can operate within the limits of air pollution control restrictions even in new plants. It thus could use the high-sulfur coals of the Midwest which are rapidly being regulated out of the market in many of our metropolitan areas.

In talking of the gasification prospects for coal, quite obviously I have been dealing in futures. There is a long lead time between having a process on the drawing board, or even at the pilot plant stage, and having gas in commercial quantities at the burner tip. Any realistic appraisal of the timetable shows that it will be about 1978 or 1980 before gas from coal, either low or high Btu, begins to make an appreciable impact on our national supply. For the next half-dozen years, that brings us back to our original question: What are we going to use for energy?

That is not just a rhetorical question. Air pollution control regulations in many states and cities are so stringent that the high-sulfur coals which make up most of the reserves in the East and Middle West are being squeezed out of the market. They cannot be used in existing plants in many areas. The federal air quality criteria for new plants now call for standards equivalent to the use of seven-tenths of one percent sulfur coal. That means nearly all steam coal east of the Mississippi is ruled out of new plants unless something is done to reduce the sulfur oxide emissions.

Fortunately, something is being done. Work on SO₂ removal equipment has gone forward for several years, and a number of processes are now in the full-scale demonstration plant stage. The manufacturers are willing to sell full-scale equipment now for later delivery—realizing the risks of any pioneering process. Although the technology is not fully proven, it is fair to say that if you are making the basic decisions now about your next electric generating station you can plan to include equipment for SO₂ emission control. Sulfur dioxide removal is probably not the ultimate answer to the need for both energy and clean air, but it promises to be one of the best answers available now.

We in the coal industry are in no position to gloat about the environmental problems of atomic reactors. We do think that if Congress grants atomic power a partial exemption from the National Environmental Protection Act, on the argument that electricity from nuclear plants is needed, at least an even break should be given to fossil-fuel plants also, since their environmental effects are known and any pollution damage they cause is not permanent.

However, there is a more serious question which utilities should weigh carefully before deciding to buy nuclear reactors. It is the same question which I posed several times in my remarks—What are you going to use

for energy? Our supplies of low-cost uranium are critically low—so low that President Nixon has authorized accelerated research to develop a fast-breeder reactor which will make more efficient use of our limited fossil fuel supplies. However, the most optimistic target date for a breeder demonstration plant is 1980, and it will be at least 1990 before the fast breeder can begin a major contribution to the national supply of electricity. Commonwealth Edison and the Tennessee Valley Authority have been named as the agencies to build and operate the first pilot plant, but the history of the present light-water reactors demonstrates there can be many delays between the first pilot plant and commercial operation of a number of full-size installations.

So long as we are back at our original question—What are we going to use for energy?—let us reconsider the options available.

If you are counting on additional supplies of domestic natural gas, you are taking a long chance. It is time, as I as a FPC commissioner and the coal industry have advocated, to end wellhead price controls, at least for new gas, in order to encourage exploration and development of new gas reserves. However, I do not hold out this measure as a panacea. It will help, but it will not long allay the shortage of natural gas. While there is more gas to be discovered, given the proper incentives, the national demand for gas will absorb all the gas the industry can discover and produce.

If you plan to use imported oil, you will be relying on fairly unreliable sources, with the growing possibility that the United States for its own economic and political wellbeing must consider restricting those imports. The same considerations will apply in time, I believe, to imports of liquefied natural gas or imported feedstocks for synthetic gas.

If you are depending on atomic power keep in mind the inhibitions of fuel supply which cloud the future of atomic energy. I hope the United States can develop the fast breeder reactor to commercial scale and bring it into operation without undue delay, for in the long run this nation will need all the sources of energy it can get. But realistically, the time when the fast breeder will be available is a long way off, and prudent stewardship of our uranium resources should require that we slow down the wasteful use of our low-cost uranium in the present inefficient light-water reactors.

If there are supply problems with oil, gas and atomic energy, that leaves only coal. There are problems in using coal, too, but not the problem of adequate supply. The Nation has one and a half trillion tons of coal in reserves already mapped and explored, or nine times as much energy as in all other fuels combined. And geologists estimate that an equal amount remains to be discovered.

The main problem in using coal is how to burn its high-sulfur varieties within the increasingly strict air pollution control requirements. This was a major factor in reducing the amount of coal consumed in the United States last year. However, existing equipment can control dust and fly ash from coal combustion to an efficiency of more than 99 percent, and the technology to remove sulfur oxides from the stack gases of large industrial and electric utility plants can be ordered now.

Also in the offing is the technology for producing low-sulfur fuels from coal. These include the production of low-sulfur oils as in a process being researched by Consolidation Coal Company.

Still another method for producing a sulfur-free fuel from coal now entering the pilot plant stage is the solvent-refined coal process developed by the Pittsburgh and Midway Coal Mining Co. under Office of Coal Research contract. This process yields a fuel,

free of ash and sulfur, which can be handled as a solid or a low-melting-point liquid.

And finally, if government and industry combine in pushing an expanded research and development program in low-Btu gas from coal, I am confident that process will be commercially available late in this decade, allowing high-sulfur coal to be converted at the plant site for use as a boiler fuel or in the combined cycle. In the same time frame, pipeline-quality gas from coal should become available in the Great Lakes states as residential fuel, though as I said, there will probably be little or none to spare for industrial accounts.

Thus, in relying on coal for industrial expansion in the Great Lakes states, you will have a steadily widening range of options—use of low-sulfur coal for the next few years, then use of any grade of coal processed to a low-sulfur fuel, stack gas SO₂ removal, and then clean synthetic gas from coal. The further you plan ahead, the wider will be your choice.

As more sophisticated and pollution-free methods are developed to produce energy from coal, the Great Lakes states will be in a favorable position to use them in industrial development. You are strategically located to tap the great coal reserves of your own region, of other Midwestern states, of Appalachia, and even the vast resources of the West.

But I would not mislead you into thinking that this devoutly-desired outcome of abundant clean energy from coal will arrive unbidden and unassisted. It will require an enlarged and diligently pursued research program, and then a very large investment in plant and equipment to bring these new processes to market.

But the effort will require even more than diligence and dollars. The investments in new processes will not be made, certainly not in the time and scale necessary, unless we have a firm national energy policy which declares that this Nation will place its prime reliance on domestic fuels.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF THE ORDER OF AHEPA

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to join with our colleagues in paying tribute to one of this country's most distinguished and outstanding fraternal service organizations—the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, more commonly known as the Order of Ahepa.

Founded on July 26, 1922, AHEPA now has some 430 local chapters in 49 States, Canada, and Australia. A nonpolitical, nonsectarian fraternal organization, the Order of Ahepa has contributed to many worthy causes and has supported numerous vital projects during its 50-year history. It has provided relief and assistance to victims of natural disasters—hurricanes, floods, and earthquakes—not only in many locales in this country but in Greece, Turkey, and Ecuador as well. It supports a number of hospitals, health centers, and a shelter home in Greece and maintains an academy at Garrison, N.Y. The order's efforts in actively supporting education and cultural development and in promoting better international relations through a people-to-

people program are particularly commendable.

AHEPA's public service, at home and overseas, has embodied the highest ideals of the Hellenic tradition. Furthermore, through countless ways the order has maintained the rich cultural heritage of the Greek people, at the same time, strengthening the bonds between the peoples, spirit, and traditions of Greece and America. Especially noteworthy is this organization's efforts to involve young people through the Son's of Pericles and Maids of Athena. In addition, the Order of Ahepa has given generously and energetically to local community undertakings in the area of education, civic improvement, and community service.

It is indeed appropriate that we pay this well-deserved tribute to this fine organization and its many members who are dedicated to good citizenship, public service, and compassion of the fellow man. The Order of Ahepa has achieved 50 years of solid accomplishments and exemplary contributions and we are certainly fortunate to have such an organization in this country. I commend it for its fine work and wish it continued success and growth.

NEWSMEN HIT GUILD'S McGOVERN STAND

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the American Newspaper Guild's endorsement of GEORGE McGOVERN for President has caused consternation among members of the Washington press corps. It is particularly noteworthy that around 300 of them have taken an ad in the Washington Post to protest their union's action. They said:

The Guild has no business interjecting its members into a partisan political role. Its efforts to do so demean us as professionals whose hallmark is fairness.

For the convenience of my colleagues I include here the text of the advertisement, as it appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, July 23, 1972, with the Post's excellent editorial of Monday, July 24, and an article on the Washington-Baltimore Guild local's formal censure of the way the endorsement was rushed through the Guild's international executive board:

[An advertisement from the Washington Post, July 23, 1972]

We the undersigned members of the working press hereby disavow and publicly disassociate ourselves from the endorsement by The Newspaper Guild (AFL-CIO) of any candidate for any office at any time or place.

We make this disavowal in response to the recent endorsement of the Democratic nominee for President of the United States by Charles A. Perlik Jr., the president of The Newspaper Guild.

We in the news business have an obligation to inform the public. The fulfillment of this obligation depends on maintaining credibility with the public.

The Guild has no business interjecting

its members into a partisan political role. Its efforts to do so demean us as professionals whose hallmark is fairness. It ties us to a political decision we personally may or may not favor.

Organization affiliations for identification only

ASSOCIATED PRESS

Tom Seppy, Harry E. Rosenthal, James C. Munn, Robert A. Daugherty, Margaret Kernodde DeChard, James H. Phillips, Jerry Brown, Harvey Georges, John Duricks, Jack Smith, Lee Byrd, Steve Fritz, Thomas Costas, Donald M. Rohberg, Margaret Scherf.

Michael J. Hughes, Jerry T. Baulch, Janet Stalhar, Michael J. Waters, Edward M. Fishel II, Donald M. Kendall, Tom Freeman, Richard L. Barnes, George L. Gedds, Mike Doan, Robert A. Dobkin, Stan Benjamin, Chick Harrity, Thomas Sheehan, William Gorry, Arthur Janes, Lewis Gulick, Donald Sanders.

UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL

Warren L. Nelson, Rick Taggs, Donald R. Finley, Joseph L. Myler, John F. Barton, Robert M. Andrews, Bill Clayton, Ed Rogers, Dan Rapoport, Dan Phillips, Elmer Lamm, Frank Eleazer, Steve Gerst, Pye Chamberlayne, Howard Fields, Gene Gibbons, Mike Feinsilber, Gene Bernhardt.

BALTIMORE SUN

Peter J. Kumpa, John Carroll, Paul W. Ward, Muriel Dobbin, Oswald Johnston, Bruce Winters, Adam Clymer, Albert Sehstedt Jr., Art Pine, Charles W. Corddry Jr., Paul J. Jablow.

NEW YORK TIMES

Ben A. Franklin, Juan M. Vasquez, David E. Rosenbaum, Laura Waltz, William H. Robbins, John Hemphill, N. W. Keady, Warren Weaver Jr., Robert M. Smith, Edwin I. Dale Jr., Philip Shabecoff, Diane Henry.

Bernard Gwertzman, Jeffrey Sheppard, Jack Rosenthal, Barbara Dubivsky, John W. Finney, Ira Kalfus, John M. Crewdson, Michael B. Lien, Nan Robertson, William L. Brobst, E. W. Kenworthy.

Fannie Jo Hunter, Eileen Shanahan, John Herbers, Harold M. Schmeck Jr., Janet McLean, Dans Adams Schmidt, Francis J. Cunningham, Dana Little, Kathryn A. Welde, Milly McDermott, Robert B. Sample Jr., Richard L. Madden, Judith Cummings, Marjorie Hunter.

WASHINGTON POST

J. Y. Smith, Haynes Johnson, Mary Russell, Eugene L. Meyer, Timothy S. Robinson, William Raspberry, Mike Causey, Jack Elsen, Stuart Auerbach, Victor Cohn, David R. Boldt.

Lakle L. South, J. Paul McCarthy Jr., Robert L. Asher, Don Oberdorfer, J. D. Alexander, Joe Mastrangelo, Roger Wilkins, Lawrence Laurent, Tom Allen, Jean R. Hailey, Hank Burchard.

Eric Wentworth, Alexander D. Horne, George W. Carter, William L. Claiborne, Elizabeth J. Knight, Claudia Levy, Carl Bernstein, Peter A. Masley, Ronald Koven, Norman Driscoll, Douglas B. Feaver, Tom Kelley, B. D. Colen.

Stephen Green, Sunday Orme, Patricia K. Godchaux, Herb Block, William H. Jones, Thomas A. Ginda, Robert J. Samuelson, Philip Greer, Elizabeth A. Williams, William Nye Curry, William B. Pollard III, Larry R. Fox, Joseph M. Boyle, Richard Pearson, Frank S. Joseph, Robert I. Price, Daniel M. McCoubrey, William E. Smart.

William H. Greider, Ron Shaffer, Linda Wheeler, William A. Elsen, Bill Gold, John F. Cullicott, Bob Woodward, Heidi K. Sinick, John Carmody, George A. Kessler, Matthew Lewis, Marilyn Berger, Bart Barnes, Jim Mann, Hal Willard, Walter B. Douglas.

Lawrence E. Tupper, Ben Cason, Andrew Barnes, Robert A. Webb, Lou Cannon, David S. Broder, George Lardner, Jr., Nicholas von

Hoffman, Ken Fell, Donald Smith, Rudy Maxa, Peter H. Harris, Michael E. Hill.

Jeannette Smyth, Martin Weil, John P. MacKenzie, Ellisworth J. Davis, Nancy Scannel, Barry Sussman, Richard R. Crocker, Jim Landers, Patrick J. DeCuzzil, Elsie Carper, Sally Quinn, Laura Quirk, Diana Maxwell, Carrie Johnson.

Leonard Shapiro, Tom Wilkinson, Helen Dewar, Herman Blackman, Thomas O'Toole, Wendy Sigal, Lawrence W. Feinberg, James L. Rowe, Jr., Carole A. Shifrin, Carroll Kilpartick, Allen Scott, Robert F. Levey, Jaehoon Ahn, Irna Moore.

Peter Osnos, George Solomon, Richard M. Cohen, Paul Hodge, Kenneth Weiss, Richard L. Coe, Bob Galano, Naomi S. Rovner, George C. Wilson, Henry Mitchell, John R. Allen, Jean M. White, Donnie Radcliffe.

Christian William, Louise H. Oettinger, William Niederborn, Rob Marmet, Shelby Coffey III, Peter A. Jay, Mary Lou Beatty, Joan Spiegel, Kenneth Turan, Noel Epstein, Paul W. Valentine, Leon D. Dash.

Peter Militus, Donald A. Taylor, Douglas Watson, Kevin Klose, Franklin L. Offutt, John T. Allen, Helen Dewar, Karlyn Barker, Norman Driscoll, Myra MacPherson, Angela Terrell, Diana Maxwell, Richard L. Lyons, Dan Griffin.

WASHINGTON STAR-NEWS

James Doyle, Shirley Elder, Marvin E. Coble III, John Fialka, Timothy Hutchens, Jack Kneece, Roberta Hornig, Ruth Dean, Betty James, William R. Basham, Harold J. Flecknoe, Jackie Bolder, Ellen Perlmutter, Pat Lewis.

Ronald Sarro, Robert A. Berger, John Mathews, Patricia Simmons, Walter Oates, Norbert S. Olshefski, Woody West, Don Youngstrom, John M. Rosson, Oswald Moore, John Scholz, Charles A. McAleer, Lynn Dunson, Nancy H. Beckham, Lee Cohn.

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Don Larrabee, Griffin-Larrabee News Bureau.

Knight Kiplinger, Griffin-Larrabee News Bureau.

David Lynch, Griffin-Larrabee News Bureau. Gene S. Goldenberg, Griffin-Larrabee News Bureau.

Richard L. Strout, Christian Science Monitor.

Warren Berry, Newsday.

Lester Bell, Copley News Service.

Pat Sloyan Hearst Newspapers.

Leland A. Bandy, The State (Columbia, S.C.).

Gerald Parshall, U.S. News & World Report.

Charles Osolin, Winston-Salem Journal.

Mary Paul, Reuters.

Ranjit de Silva, Reuters.

Fred Farris, International Herald Tribune.

Ida Kosciesza, International Herald Tribune.

Robert Siner, International Herald Tribune.

John S. Lang, New York Post.

Helene C. Monberg, Western Newspapers.

Robert S. Allen.

Charmayne Narsh, Reuters.

Nina Totenberg, National Observer.

William McGaffin, Chicago Daily News.

This does not purport to be a full list of those in the news profession who agree with the principles set forth in this advertisement, which has been paid for by those who have signed it.

Most of the foregoing signatories are Guild members. Some are not.

(This ad was arranged by Haynes Johnson and J. Y. Smith of The Washington Post.)

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 1972]

F.Y.I.

The endorsement of Senator McGovern for President by the Newspaper Guild, which was announced at the Democratic Convention by Guild President Charles A. Perlik, has predictably stirred a lot of outcry among parti-

san Republicans (as well as among newspaper people in and out of the Guild). Senator Goldwater, for example, called it "one of the most interesting and least written about stories" of the Democratic Convention. Apparently sensing something furtive or clandestine, he went on to declare that "the public has a right to know a lot more about it."

Well, we would agree with that—although the story was in fact fully covered by this newspaper and many others. Still, newspaper readers have a rightful interest in any open display of political partisanship by an organization composed in part of working reporters and editors and other newsroom employees who are supposed to be objective, fair, unprejudiced and non-partisan in their work. So we would like to talk about this issue today, strictly For Your Information, and also commend to you an article on the subject elsewhere on this page today in which Mr. Ben Bagdikian describes in some detail the process by which the Guild arrived at its decision to endorse a presidential candidate for the first time. You can judge for yourself whether that process was democracy in its purest form. The protest already mounted by scores of Guild members raises at least some doubt about that. But leaving that question aside as an internal problem for the Guild, the question remains whether it was a sensible, useful and—perhaps most important—professional thing to do, even assuming that it accurately reflected the sentiment of the Guild membership. The short answer, in our view, is that it was not.

We would not question the Guild's right, in theory, to endorse political candidates in the same way that other trade unions do. The issue is whether this particular union, representing this particular group of workers, is not obliged, almost by definition, to forego any participation in partisan political processes. We would think it is, and not for the reason that the Guild's endorsement of Mr. McGovern might somehow induce its members to slant their news reporting or editing in favor of the Democratic candidate. The flash flood of petitions signed by Guild reporters in protest of the action taken by their union leadership is eloquent testimony to the integrity of the great body of serious, professional reporters and editors—and especially of those dealing with national politics. As Mr. Bagdikian points out, it is no more reasonable to suspect that these Guild members will be influenced in their work by their union's endorsement of Senator McGovern than it is to suspect that they will be tilted towards President Nixon by the fact that the overwhelming majority of their publishers—the people they work for and who have quite a lot to say about the course of their careers—are generally conservative and, thus, more sympathetic to Republican candidates for President.

In short, it is not the professional news reporters and editors themselves who will be influenced adversely by the Guild's action, and neither is it their product—which can be regularly tested for tilt, in any case, because it is out there, all of it, on display every day. On the contrary, the problem is in the fact that for a newspaper to be effective, it must not merely be fair and non-partisan in its handling of news; it must also appear to be fair. The problem is in the eye of the beholder and that is why anything which offers strong reason to suspect the objectivity of those who handle the news—anything which shakes the reader's trust and confidence—is that much more extra, unneeded freight for any working reporter or editor. It not only robs their work of believability but arouses the suspension of news sources as well. That is why the Guild's endorsement of Senator McGovern, as a practical matter, is so troublesome, not to say reprehensible. For them the Guild's endorsement is an encumbrance they neither need

nor want and it is greatly to their credit that so many of them are moving—by petition or paid ads or local voting in repudiation of their leadership—to shake it off.

McGOVERN ENDORSEMENT BY GUILD HIT
BY LOCAL

The executive board of the Washington-Baltimore Newspaper Guild yesterday formally censured International Guild president Charles A. Perlik Jr. for endorsing the candidacy of Sen. George McGovern (D-S.D.) before both major national parties held their presidential nominating conventions.

At last month's Newspaper Guild convention in San Juan, P. R., the International executive board was authorized to consider endorsing a presidential candidate after both party conventions. But Perlik announced the board's endorsement of McGovern at the Democratic Convention last week in Miami.

Yesterday's local statement, which was passed 9-to-2 after a five-hour afternoon meeting, said, ". . . Perlik ignored the clearly expressed will of the guild convention. . . . This local condemns President Perlik's appropriation of a right not granted by the guild convention."

Reached at his home last night, Perlik said the "technicality" of waiting until after both conventions was a "fairly weak reed" for the executive board to stand on. "There was simply nothing to wait for with the Republican; Nixon's nomination wasn't just conceded but was an actual fact for our purpose." Nixon campaign officials had announced earlier that the President had enough delegate votes to be renominated.

Perlik added that the McGovern endorsement was not made by him but by the entire International board by a vote of 14 to 0.

The Washington-Baltimore Guild, second largest in the country with 1,900 members, is the first local to have formally condemned Perlik. The local's statement supports the union's right to endorse candidates but says Perlik's actions are not binding on members or resources of the local.

MARITIME SHIPBUILDING
PROGRAM

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, the White House announced that on the previous day, June 30, five contracts had been signed for 16 vessels totaling \$660 million and involving \$284 million in Federal Government subsidies. This was represented as the largest group of peacetime contract awards since the inception of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Until July 1, the administration's major shipbuilding program had all of the earmarks of being a dismal failure with very little new ship construction taking place under it.

The serious question that arises now is whether these new contracts are real and binding contracts, or are merely illusory promises which bind only the U.S. Government.

At the White House Press Conference, a Maritime Administration spokesman said, "I have no idea what we will do for an encore." The answer to that question will be intriguing.

There are several things that are most troublesome about the White House announcement, and I intend to ask the

chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, of which I am a member, to hold special hearings concerning this matter. The points which trouble me include the following:

First. The fact, as I understand it, that none of these contracts is actually binding or enforceable. A substantial legal question exists as to whether the mad rush to obtain the extra 2 percent—or \$13 million-plus—in subsidies has produced any binding contracts. It appears that these are one-sided agreements with only the Government being bound and with there being a loophole for the private parties to get out with no penalty. This is an extremely serious matter. I intend to ask the Assistant Secretary for Maritime Affairs to inform me as to whether they consider these contracts binding and enforceable against the parties, or merely illusory. I also intend to ask them to supply me with copies of all legal opinions and rulings the Maritime Administration has obtained from its general counsel relating to these contracts.

Second. The fact that six of the vessels totaling \$382.1 million, and involving \$164.5 million in Federal subsidies, will be too large to serve any American port and therefore will be unable to operate in the foreign commerce of the United States. It is highly questionable, to say the least, whether Congress in enacting and funding this maritime program had in mind the construction of vessels that would not only no. promote our foreign or domestic commerce but would not even operate in such commerce.

Third. The fact that at least six of the vessels also apparently contemplate obtaining operating subsidies that would be paid to companies that have substantial foreign-flag operations. The Merchant Marine Act requires that waivers be given under such circumstances and public hearings have usually been accorded. It is my understanding that no hearings have been held and no waivers granted with respect to these contracts.

Fourth. The fact that the contracts for all 16 of these ships were signed on June 30. If they had been signed a few hours later on the following day, the subsidy would have been automatically reduced under the statute from 43 percent of the total cost to 41 percent. This would have saved the Federal Government, that is, the American taxpayer, over \$13 million in subsidies.

Fifth. The fact that the real owner, as I understand the facts, of three 265,000-ton tankers to be constructed at a cost of \$210.2 million with \$90.6 million in Federal subsidies, is a company whose principal stockholders are not citizens of the United States. This raises serious questions as to whether the provisions of the law have been met and whether it is a purpose of our maritime program to give subsidy of this magnitude to non-American citizens.

Sixth. The fact that the contract for three vessels, totaling \$114.1 million to be built by Bath Iron Works, was signed in a Senate office. Political dividends were obviously intended by the staging of this announcement in this fashion, and this compromises the integrity of the entire shipbuilding program.

To return to the Maritime Administration's question as to what can be done for an "encore," I hope to supply an opportunity to appear before the committee to answer these and other questions which I have concerning the shipbuilding program. On the facts available to me the program seems to create serious questions. The White House may be trying to perpetrate a hoax on the shipbuilding workers of our country and their families, and the administration should be given the opportunity to explain whether there is substance to this program or whether it is merely another political shell game.

MARVIN "LUCKY" MONDRES

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was advised recently that Mr. Marvin "Lucky" Mondres, who has for the past several years served as congressional liaison officer in the U.S. Department of Commerce, is resigning his post to run for Congress from the newly created 13th Congressional District in the State of Florida.

I have known Mr. Mondres and his family for many years. He came to Washington in 1967, shortly after I was elected to Congress. He served most ably in my office as my administrative assistant, but left to accept the position as congressional liaison with the Department of Commerce, from which he is now resigning.

Mr. Mondres is married and has one son and one daughter. He was at one time a resident of north Dade County and also of South Broward County, in the area which now encompasses Florida's new 13th Congressional District. Because of his familiarity with the north Dade and south Broward Counties, he felt disposed to offer himself for public service as a candidate for Congress from his district, despite the sacrifice he must make in resigning from his position with the Commerce Department.

During the many years I have known "Lucky" Mondres, I have watched him accept the various challenges that were from time to time presented to him. I know him for his dedication to his work, his dedication to his friends, I know him as a former Florida businessman, and as a former employee of my office. As a friend, I must recognize that the task he has cut out for himself in running for Congress will not be easy. I feel, however, that the experience as a businessman and that which he has gained while in Washington as well his desire to offer himself for public service, will serve as assets in his quest to represent the people from the new 13th Congressional District of the State of Florida.

I wish him well in whatever his future endeavors may be, and I am sure that there are many Members who serve with me in the House, on both sides of the aisle, who know Mr. Mondres and who have worked with him who feel the same.