

Dyer, George T., Jr.	Hoffman, Robert B.	Maloney, Peter M.	O'Connor, John E.	Sesow, Anthony D.	Turk, Herman L.
Edwards, William R., Jr.	Hogan, Edward J., Jr.	Mann, Horace D., Jr.	O'Connor, Joseph E.	Sewell, Robert L.	Turner, Sherman W.
Eggert, Lowell F.	Holmberg, Lennart G.	Marshall, Robert M.	Oldham, Albert W.	Shaw, John H.	Veach, Clarence E.
Easter, James M.	Hoskovec, William B.	Martin, Alan F.	Orell, Quinlan R.	Sheehy, Eugene E.	Wages, Clarence J., Jr.
Emerson, Jesse R., III	Howard, Albert W., Jr.	Martini, Richard A.	Ortega, Joseph J.	Sheets, Roger E.	Walker, William B.
Englander, Owen	Howe, Richard B.	Mau, George W., Jr.	Osborne, Arthur M.	Shelton, Donald C.	Wallace, Cedric S.
Englehart, Harry J.	Hubbard, Samuel W., Jr.	McCardell, James E., Jr.	Paddock, Charles O.	Shine, Maurice J.	Ward, Conley R.
Farnham, Charles G.	Hull, Fred A.	McCoy, Roy E.	Parcher, Stuart M.	Simons, Donald W.	Warren, Tommy H., Jr.
Feeks, Edmond M.	Humber, Marcel B.	McCrimmon, Douglas R.	Parker, John T., Jr.	Sim, Gelzer L., Jr.	Warthen, Donald
Fenn, Dan E.	Hyde, Robert A.	McCune, Joe D.	Parkhurst, David C.	Slawson, Ralph L.	Wasson, John E.
Ferguson, Andrew C.	Isaacks, Marion H.	McDonald, Raymond T.	Pasantino, Sebastian	Smevov, Herbert W.	Webber, Gene D.
Fernandes, James E.	Jasper, Charles R.	McGathy, Charles L., Jr.	Pattee, Arthur W.	Smith, David G.	Weeks, Alan L.
Finney, Jack L.	Johnson, Frederick C.	McGrath, William D.	Paul, John E.	Smith, John V.	Weeks, Robert H.
Fleeson, Richard J.	Johnson, George M.	McLuckie, James D.	Payne, Douglas W.	Smith, Richard C.	Weishar, Charles F.
Fong, Chong S.	Johnson, Philip E.	McMurtry, Robert A., Jr.	Peebles, Edward M.	Snyder, Fred D.	Westphal, Lloyd M., Jr.
Fraser, Robert E.	Jones, Donald S.	McPadden, Donald F., X.	Peelle, Morris A.	Snyder, James M.	Whitaker, Robert M.
Freeman, Robert W.	Jones, Richard H.	Metzler, Donald M.	Perry, Lowell E.	Snyder, Ned C.	Whitley, Clyde T.
Frick, Joseph F.	Jones, Robert C.	Meyer, William F.	Pohli, Richard R.	Spencer, Robert W.	Wight, Roy R.
Friese, George A.	Kehoe, James W., Jr.	Miller, Richard J.	Polatty, Donald B.	Sperling, David J.	Wilder, William E.
Frost, John F., III	Kellogg, Edward S., III	Mitchell, Joseph S.	Poling, William E.	Stanley, Thomas A.	Wiley, Kenneth R.
Gauthier, John O.	Kelly, James F.	Montgomery, Stephen C.	Pope, Daniel K., IV	Stein, Norman F.	Wilhelmi, Quentin E.
Gavazzi, Robert R.	Kosmela, Walter T.	Moran, Clifford D.	Pressly, George B.	Stevens, Jack D.	Williams, Douglas A.
Geronimo, Eugene L.	Kraft, Frederick W.	Moredock, William J.	Priddy, Clarence L., Jr.	Stewart, Douglas A.	Williams, James G., III
Giovanetti, William C.	Kugler, Kenneth D.	Morford, Dean R.	Prosser, Walter R.	Story, Warren L.	Williams, Louis A.
Glaves, Robert H.	Lage, Robert L.	Morgan, Leroy W., Jr.	Raithel, Albert L., Jr.	Sudduth, Roger M.	Williamson, Robert L.
Golde, Morton	Lamm, William A.	Morgan, Houston M.	Randolph, Joseph L.	Sullivan, Walter F.	Williard, Bobbie D.
Good, Ronald P.	Latham, William B.	Morris, Henry C., Jr.	Reeg, Frederick J.	Sullivan, William W.	Wilson, Donald K.
Gooden, Richard O.	Latta, Robert L.	Mullane, Thomas F.	Rhodes, Randolph L.	Sweet, William J.	Wilson, Edward W.
Graffam, Earl H.	Leblanc, Georges E., Jr.	Muncy, William E.	Ricardo, Benny J.	Tallet, Arthur J.	Wilson, Samuel B.
Gray, Harvey, Jr.	Leedom, Clair E., Jr.	Murray, Joseph E., Jr.	Rich, Richard	Tetreault, Paul J.	Wolf, William M., Jr.
Green, William C.	Lenahan, Robert P.	Mustin, Henry C.	Rilling, Alexander W.	Tompson, Arthur R., Jr.	Wyatt, William C., III
Greive, William H.	Leverone, Robert M.	Nielson, Donald E.	Robinson, Kirby L.	Tolg, Robert G., Jr.	Wynn, Carl E., Jr.
Grich, Richard J.	Lewis, Robert	Nordtvedt, Ernest R.	Rodgers, Thomas A.		Yoder, Dwane F.
Groder, Robert E.	Limerick, Christopher J., Jr.	Norton, Richard J.	Rogers, Robert B.		
Grosshuesch, David K.	Locke, Walter M.	Numbers, Earl W.	Rorie, Conrad J.		
Hamel, James K.	Logan, Wilfred J.	O'Brien, Austin C., Jr.	Rose, William R.		
Hamilton, Leroy A.	Lumsden, Richard E.	O'Connell, John F.	Runyon, Richard E.		
Hannegan, Frank N.	Lyon, Peter W.		Sanders, Ben T.		
Harns, John H.	Lyons, Thomas W., Jr.		Sayer, William D.		
Harp, Robert M.	Mains, Homer O., Jr.		Schaub, John R., Jr.		
Helms, Ronald L.	Mallory, John S.		Schrader, Harry C., Jr.		
Henry, Albert L., Jr.			Scott, Austin B., Jr.		
Herring, Edwin L.			Self, David L.		
Hipple, William J.			Semple, William C., III		

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### POSTMASTER GENERAL REVIEWS GOALS AND PERFORMANCE OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

#### HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, Postmaster General Elmer T. Klassen recently addressed the Sixth Annual Postal Forum on the performance of the Postal Service in the 14 months since it was created, its goals for the future, and its determination to provide efficient service. I believe his remarks are of general interest. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### REMARKS OF POSTMASTER GENERAL E. T. KLASSEN

The U.S. Postal Service began operations on July 1, 1971, as an independent agency of the Federal government.

The 14 months since then have represented the first phase of a new responsibility for the Board of Governors and the Postmaster General.

This new way of postal life is set forth in the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970.

This stewardship requires the mails to be

operated in accordance with a law which holds that the mail service should be paid for by the users of the mail and not by the taxpayers.

This is a little like a new pair of shoes. Because they are new, they occasionally pinch, and cries of protest and distress are clearly heard from many quarters. The truth is that we are passing through a period of necessary—if sometimes uncomfortable—adjustment to the Act's specific goals and requirements.

Nevertheless, the task of Postal Service management is clear. Our lawful duty is to honor the binding provisions of the Act and to pursue the valid objectives and procedures set forth in the Act.

This historic legislation, supported by two Presidents and adopted by both Houses of Congress on a bipartisan basis, is a fair law and fully merits the support of us all—postal management, postal employees, postal unions, postal customers and citizens everywhere.

The more you are familiar with the Act's key provisions, the more you can accurately relate our current programs and policies to the requirements of the law. Remember, these requirements are clear, specific and real. They are binding on all of us.

Here are some of the things we are authorized and required to do:

1. We shall have as our basic function the obligation to provide postal service to bind the nation together.

2. We shall provide prompt, reliable and efficient service to customers in all areas and shall render postal service to all communities.

3. We shall achieve and maintain compen-

sation for our officers and employees comparable to the rates and types of compensation paid in the private sector.

4. We shall put particular emphasis upon opportunities for career advancement of all employees.

5. We shall provide compensation, working conditions and career opportunities that will assure the attraction and retention of qualified and capable supervisory and other managerial personnel, and establish and maintain a program for all such personnel that reflects the essential importance of a well-trained and well-motivated force to improve the effectiveness of postal operations.

6. We shall give the highest consideration to the requirements for the most expeditious collection, transportation and delivery of important letter mail.

There is no question in my mind that the Postal Reorganization Act gives full and careful protection to the legitimate interests of all concerned.

But to carry out these provisions is not easy, and we are constantly encountering new obstacles.

Nonetheless the objectives of the Act are clearly stated and together we must meet them.

Under no circumstances we can stand passively aside or blink at the requirements of the law, and let this opportunity to serve America better—be destroyed by those who would have us retreat into an entangling web of politics, bureaucracy and waste.

As Postmaster General, I intend to put together the best management team we can assemble, and we pledge to work diligently to

give you and all other mail users the kind of good, efficient mail service that you are entitled to have.

This is being done—and at the same time we are eliminating waste and unnecessary manpower costs, as part of our national commitment to learn to live within our income.

I would like to have you go away from this Forum with accurate information on a few key examples.

These fall under four principal headings:

- Better service for postal customers
- Better employment conditions for postal people
- Better facilities and equipment
- Better control over postage costs and rates

#### BETTER SERVICE FOR POSTAL CUSTOMERS

The name of the postal game is service—not lip-service, but actual performance that can be measured and improved as we go along. We can never forget that service is all we have to sell.

We are now operating under a clear-cut service standard for local first-class mail. We have some soft spots—but we know where they are—and we will fix them. Right now, in most locations, we are delivering 95% of local mail, addressed to local destinations, on a next-day basis. This service standard is binding on postal people throughout the country and performance must be improved.

The same goes for *air mail*. We have in operation a service standard that calls for next-day delivery to designated cities within 600 miles, and in some instances for much greater distances, if the air mail is in our hands by 4:00 p.m. For other points our target is delivery no later than second-day.

Our experience shows that we are capable of achieving a 95% reliability rate, when all of our employees give all air mail the right kind of attention. We expect them to do exactly that. And another thing—our test mailing system is now not tamper-proof and will be revised and carried out much more expertly, because I am not going to take any chance that any postal manager or employee will get away with misleading us by giving our test letters faster handling than is given to customers' mail.

Our arrangements for better service for bulk mail and parcels are beginning to show tangible results. Short-term improvements such as fast all-mail trains and new truck-train feeder networks have cut one to two days off the previous transit time. Looking further ahead, you know we have firm construction plans underway that will equip us with a nation-wide system of bulk mail facilities which I will come back to a little later.

We are giving particular attention to parcel post, right now. We have taken a real beating here—as is evident from the fact that we have lost half this business. We intend to be competitive and we are going to do everything we can to get it back.

Special delivery mail service has been highly unreliable for a long time—really a disgrace. So for six months, we have been testing a self-identifying plastic "speedy bag" that keeps specials from losing their way among millions of other pieces of mail. This test program has shown a reliability rate in the high 90's.

We'll have it in use all over the country in October. We do need help, though, to encourage public understanding that specials to distant cities move faster if they are sent air mail. Many seem to think specials automatically go by air—but that's true only if air mail is paid.

We're now working on another promising service improvement program—to make stamp buying easier. It's called "Stamps by Mail" and will permit small purchases to be made with payment by check, and delivery of the stamps by mail. Our tests indicate this

concept to be of real value to the elderly, the handicapped and many others.

From these examples, you can see that we view our operation as *your* Postal Service. We are responsive to customers' needs. We are pledged to provide courtesy, care and reliability.

Above all, we want your ideas, your suggestions, your good advice—even your complaints, where we need to do better or do things differently. To paraphrase the Army: The Postal Service wants to join you—for progress, for improvement, for our mutual ability to make new things happen. Speak up—and we will listen.

#### BETTER CONDITIONS FOR EMPLOYEES

By any impartial standard of measurement, the new Postal Service has brought dramatic improvements to postal managers and employees at all levels.

Our pioneer collective bargaining agreement with postal unions is a model in this field. It includes a fast-action grievance procedure and provision for binding arbitration of unsettled cases. An equally advanced grievance procedure for managerial personnel is also in the final stages of development.

Pay-wise, all levels of postal employees are being given improvements that bring them into line with the private sector.

Postmasters, rural carriers, and all other appointments and promotions are now made on a strict merit basis. More than 6,200 postmasters have been appointed strictly on the basis of merit. Consequently, thousands of other career people have been moved up.

As we go about the tasks laid out for us in the Reorganization Act, we would welcome your help and support in off-setting the wild and unfounded claims made by some people that the mail service is being threatened or impaired.

In general, all the problems we might experience as we go along can be licked, with integrity, and with a willingness by everyone—from top to bottom—to recognize that our mail customers expect the best possible service at the lowest possible costs. This is a responsibility of every postal employee.

#### BETTER FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

The Reorganization Act mandates us to balance revenues with operating costs.

But, at the same time, it gives us help on equipping ourselves with improved machinery and facilities, through access to the money market.

We project \$6 billion in capital funds to be spent in this way during the next five years. This outlay will mean better service, more efficient service. It will permit us to gain better control over costs.

Our bulk mail network is one example. We will spend roughly a billion dollars to complete it by 1975.

We are planning a parallel preferential mail facility expansion program costing four billion dollars over a six-year period.

We will upgrade the work environment in existing facilities at a cost of four hundred million dollars, by 1975. More than 10,000 facilities will be upgraded, and at least 2,000 will be replaced with new ones.

Our whole thrust in this equipment and facilities area is to provide better tools and buildings to work with—to support trained and willing hands with the best management help and technological help that our country can provide.

#### BETTER CONTROL OVER POSTAGE COSTS AND RATES

As I mentioned earlier, the Reorganization Act includes the commitment that the Postal Service should learn to live within its income—to balance annual costs against annual revenues.

Annual revenues must come from postage. Our success in living within our income means relatively stable postal rates.

Escalating costs can only be balanced by rate increases—or from taxpayers' pockets.

We don't want to lose further revenues and more postal jobs by permitting costs and rates to rise uncontrollably. We don't want postal customers like yourselves to turn elsewhere—to competitors—for the services we provide.

We also want to keep our commitment, under the Act, to provide you with competent, economical service. We are determined to comply with the provisions of the Act requiring us to become self-supporting.

Therefore, five months ago, I placed a ban on new hiring, to gain control of our largest cost item: manpower.

Our labor agreement prohibits the layoff of any employee. We have faithfully observed this pledge. We have relied only on attrition, retirements and the like to help reach a better utilization of manpower.

Along with this manpower control program, we asked postal managers everywhere to look for other ways to control annual overhead. Labor and benefits costs us 85 cents of every dollar we spend. That other 15 cents is overhead and we are determined to remove the fat there also.

The hiring freeze and other cost control programs have been carried out with a determination to live up to the requirement that we shall become self-supporting and at the same time provide quality service to our customers.

Prior to the corrective steps we took, our cost estimates and budgets required us to ask for a \$450 million postage rate increase to become effective next January.

Today, the Postal Service is able to bring good news to mail users everywhere.

We will not need to ask the Postal Rate Commission to provide us with that \$450 million.

We can do without it and still do a good job of delivering the mail.

We believe this achievement is historic. It demonstrates that the goals established by the Reorganization Act are reasonable—that they are feasible.

They can be met.

They are being met.

They will continue to be met if we can count upon the determined support and cooperation of all postal people and the cooperation of postal customers, large and small.

To do this is more than a challenge. It is a national obligation.

Let's move forward together—and get it done.

#### SOVIET JEWRY

### HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union cannot expect the United States to pursue a policy of Soviet-American trade expansion while Soviet Jews are being subjected to official harassment, the most recent being the visa fee policy. We must not engage in trade which is financed, in part, with the ransom of educated Jews and I sincerely hope that each of our colleagues will take every opportunity to impress upon the Soviets our sense of indignation and determination to avoid any act that could be construed as compliance with their outrageous visa fee policy.



"THE \$1,000 FOR ALL" IS STILL AN ISSUE

## HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I remember last spring when candidate GEORGE MCGOVERN was seeking the Democratic nomination. He had proposed a \$1,000 for everybody plan.

In recent weeks, I was under the impression from reading the various news accounts that Senator MCGOVERN had relinquished thoughts of \$1,000 for everybody and was submitting a new plan.

Richard Wilson, columnist for the Washington-Star, in an article of Thursday, September 13, says that Sargent Shriver attempted to deny that GEORGE MCGOVERN ever proposed a \$1,000 for everybody plan. According to Shriver, it was just a figure used in a "study paper." Wilson has done a good job of bird dogging and says that Shriver apparently does not believe the literature of his own campaign. The McGovern for President Committee's voluminous summary of "McGovern on the Issues" contains an outline of an "income distribution plan" with an annual payment "that might be as much as \$1,000 per person or \$4,000 for a family of four."

Mr. Speaker, I append the article of Mr. Richard Wilson of September 13, which I am sure many of my colleagues will want to read:

SHRIVER ERRS IN HIS DENIALS OF \$1,000 FOR ALL

(By Richard Wilson)

Vice presidential candidate Sargent Shriver denies that George S. McGovern ever proposed his \$1,000-for-everybody plan, it was just a figure used in a "study paper," according to Shriver.

McGovern's running mate evidently does not believe the literature of his own campaign. The McGovern for President Committee's voluminous summary of "McGovern on the Issues" contains an outline of an "income distribution plan" with an annual payment "that might be as much as \$1,000 per person or \$4,000 for a family of four." Shriver's denial thus takes on the same plausibility as his charge that President Nixon "blew" a chance to settle the Vietnam War.

McGovern speaks no more of the controversial \$1,000 idea, leading to the perhaps erroneous conclusion that he has dropped it. He has not, however, dropped his references to President Nixon's "secret plan" to end the Vietnam war although it is amply proved that Nixon never said he had a "secret plan," in fact had none, and did not pretend to have one.

The only "secret plan" was in the imagination of those who wished to decide Nixon's commitment to end the war, and is now being repeated endlessly in campaign orations, newspaper advertisements and television broadcasts.

William Safire, a presidential speechwriter and tireless researcher of political lore, has exploded the myth of the Nixon "secret plan" in an analysis which defies challenge. Confronted by the analysis, various perpetrators of the myth have admitted their error, but not McGovern.

The source of the "secret plan" myth was apparently Nixon's speech in the presidential primary campaign of 1968 at Nashua, N.H.:

"And I pledge to you the new leadership (evidently a Republican administration) will end the war and win the peace in the Pacific . . ." This statement was translated by reporters and politicians into the idea that a plan existed, although Nixon said he had "no magic formula, no gimmick" and if he did would tell Lyndon Johnson.

He said he had some specific ideas on how to end a war, and "they are primarily in the diplomatic area." That, in the beginning, was the area in which Nixon moved and he sent his representative, Henry Cabot Lodge, to Paris with a new diplomatic initiative that failed.

In September of that year I lunched alone with Cabot Lodge in his suite at the Crillon Hotel in Paris. Lodge said then, and I take the liberty of repeating now, that Nixon's confidence in new diplomatic moves had been unrealistic. Nixon had learned there would have to be much more than that.

The "plan," if it can be called that, which then developed was the unilateral withdrawal of American ground combat forces from Vietnam, at first experimental, and soon becoming irreversible policy.

There is nothing secret about anything Nixon did thereafter. He undertook a combination of military and diplomatic pressures to force Hanoi to a settlement accepting an independent South Vietnam. Military pressure was applied in Cambodia and Laos, through air support of South Vietnamese ground operations, heavy bombing of the North and mining Hanoi's harbors. Diplomatic pressure was applied in Moscow and Peking in direct personal contact with the leaders of Hanoi's main supporters.

Little of that could have been planned in advance. Prince Sihanouk's ouster in Cambodia had not yet created the opportunity for an allied incursion. Hanoi had not yet begun its outright invasion of the South which created the opportunity and justification for heavy bombing and mining the harbors. Chou En-lai and Leonid Brezhnev had not yet agreed to receive Nixon.

On the evidence, the "secret plan" idea falls on its face, joining there on the floor Sargent Shriver's pretense that McGovern never proposed \$1,000-for-everybody.

In point of fact, McGovern has not repudiated \$1,000-for-everybody. This is another journalistic construction on his opening campaign speech in New York but the speech itself can be examined in vain for a direct repudiation.

The idea is still there but obscured now by proposals increasing taxes on the long-term gains of investors in stocks and real property, and of primary concern to at least 30 million such investors.

"Secret plan" there was not, a plan for income redistribution there certainly is. And so the campaign rocks along with somewhat more than its share of hyperbolic nonsense.

ADDRESS BY ACTING FBI DIRECTOR  
L. PATRICK GRAY III

## HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last Friday morning to attend the graduation exercises of the 90th session of the FBI National Academy. The occasion also featured the dedication of the academy's new educational facilities at Quantico, Va., to "the service of the people of our Nation."

The fact that William M. Nail, Jr. of the Asheville, N.C., Police Depart-

ment, a constituent of mine, who was among the 200 graduates, emphasized to me the great service rendered by the FBI by providing intensive training to enable officers to serve more effectively in their home cities, towns, and communities. Studies have shown that public respect for law enforcement personnel rises in accordance with their training and education.

The zeal of J. Edgar Hoover during 48 years as Director of the FBI for professionalism at all levels of law enforcement has improved police procedures throughout the country.

The main address at the graduation exercises, delivered by Acting FBI Director L. Patrick Gray III, was a challenge to better law enforcement through dedication and service. I recommend this address to my colleagues in Congress:

ADDRESS BY FBI DIRECTOR L. PATRICK GRAY III

Mr. Attorney General, General Keller, Dr. Shannon, Captain Jones, distinguished guests, members of the 90th Session, ladies and gentlemen:

This morning we have the honor to dedicate a national educational institution and to celebrate the graduation of the 90th Session of the FBI National Academy.

This class is unique. While it is the 90th Session to be graduated from the FBI National Academy, it is the first class to enjoy the advantages—as well as the disadvantages—of pioneers in these new facilities.

Almost forty years ago, John Edgar Hoover blazed a pioneer trail when he took the first steps to establish the FBI National Academy.

One man and his staff looked to the future and they believed in a concept—the concept that study and training in the police sciences would enhance the professionalism of our law enforcement officers and enable them to serve their communities more effectively.

The student police officers who were members of the First Session could not have been expected to foresee a day when two hundred law enforcement officers from the United States and foreign countries would be graduating from the FBI National Academy.

Nor could they envision the graduates of the 90th Session receiving college credit from one of the Nation's great universities—The University of Virginia—for their studies in the field of law enforcement.

Very few—if any—students at these early Sessions could have visualized the development of educational facilities of this nature or of this magnitude to train law enforcement officers.

Plant, property, and equipment are sufficient to create a magnificent educational institution. Words alone, however, will not suffice to dedicate this Academy to the service of the people of our Nation. To dedicate such an institution, more is required.

Over the years, the staff and the graduates of the FBI National Academy have . . . through their own personal dedication and service . . . breathed life and spirit into the concept advanced so long ago by Mr. Hoover.

The trust and the responsibility were placed in their hands. Throughout the years, the staff and the graduates have poured much of themselves into the work of this great institution. By their conduct in the performance of their duties, they have more than justified the vision and foresight of Mr. Hoover.

In a very real sense, each member of the staff and each graduate has contributed heavily to our presence here this morning. They have raised the FBI National Academy to a place of honor in our society.

In his "Reflections on the French Revolution," that great English statesman, Edmund Burke, wrote:

"I do not hesitate to say that the road to eminence and power, from obscure condition, ought not to be made too easy, nor a thing too much of course. If rare merit be the rarest of all rare things, it ought to pass through some sort of probation. The temple of honor ought to be seated on an eminence."

Ours is a challenging and a continuous experiment in self-government. One cannot read that superb collection of essays recommending the adoption of the Constitution—"The Federalist Papers"—without knowing that the Founding Fathers saw the great blueprint for self-government as a continuous test of the honor and self-control and capability of an entire people.

That challenging thought is implicit in the very first paragraph of the first essay:

"It has been frequently remarked that it seems to have been reserved to the people of this country by their conduct and example to decide the important question whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend, for their political constitutions, on accident and force."

In effect, the Creators of the Constitution were saying to the American people:

"You have built a temple of honor. If you prove you can rule yourselves, you will raise that temple to an eminence which will attract all the peoples of the world."

The whole world, indeed, saw the adoption of the Constitution as a test of man's capacity to rule himself. Many viewed it optimistically. Some did not. As much as 68 years after its adoption, Lord Macaulay set forth his conviction that purely democratic institutions must "... sooner or later, destroy liberty or civilization, or both."

In a letter to an American friend detailing all of his many reasons why he felt this was so, he said:

"There is nothing to stop you. Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor."

He forgot the challenge of honor.

Our entire system of government is founded on a moral basis that predates the Constitution. It is founded on the ideals of virtue, self-control, and honor on the part of individual citizens. It is founded on a respect for the law ... the law, with roots reaching deep into English history.

It is not the Constitution—the written document—that has held the American people together. The American people have held the Constitution together. True, as Macaulay observed, the Constitution laid down the rules for self-government, but it offered nothing to prevent us from indulging in the worst kind of excesses. What has always prevented excesses and has kept us on the road to reach for the stars has not been found inside a document, but inside ourselves.

The field of law enforcement is a microcosm of that which the Creators of the Constitution envisaged.

Is not everything that is required of the American citizen demanded, in an intensified version, of the peace officer? Certainly, Burke's belief that "... the road to eminence and power, from obscure condition, ought not to be made too easy" spells out the route which the law enforcement officer must follow as a matter of course.

None of you, I feel sure, reached your present station in life without effort.

Society expects you to be a philosopher, a sociologist, a criminologist and possessing the nicest sort of sensibilities; yet at the same time you are expected to have the courage and toughness of a lion and deal fairly but firmly with brutes, sadists, and felons of the worst sort who prey upon humanity. This is a rather broad and demanding expectation, yet very real.

Unquestionably, the path of the law enforcement officer is not made too easy. Any person today who does not know that the integrity of the officer—to say nothing of his

life—is at risk day after day after day is living in a vacuum.

The peace officer is the visible symbol of the law. It is in his person that the average citizen first encounters governmental authority. It is in such encounters that the law enforcement officer gives credibility to his own profession and to the idea on which this government was founded.

And the American peace officer measures up to his trust ... not just because it is required of him by the law, but because he is imbued with honor, integrity, and a sense of duty that transcend the law.

I offer my warm congratulations to the members of the 90th Session on completing this training course. During the brief period in which I have served our Nation as Acting Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I have met many peace officers. I have been deeply impressed by their professionalism. I have been even more deeply impressed by the personal qualities, which, almost without exception, they exhibit.

The graduates of the FBI National Academy, in particular, have impressed me as being remarkably dedicated men. I find them imbued with an exemplary sense of duty.

Duty and honor.

They are simple words, but they speak volumes.

No man had a greater sense of duty than the founder of this Academy. John Edgar Hoover looked upon the law enforcement profession as a temple of honor—and he raised that temple until it was, in truth, in Burke's words, "... seated on an eminence."

As we dedicate the FBI National Academy today, we honor the memory of John Edgar Hoover whose tireless effort, superb leadership, and incredible vision are largely responsible for its very existence.

#### CONGRESSMAN FRANK ANNUNZIO ANNOUNCES RESULTS OF CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

#### HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I submit by unanimous consent as official business the results of a poll which I conducted recently to obtain the opinions of citizens residing in selected areas of Chicago, including the 11th Congressional District of Illinois, on issues of national significance under consideration by the Congress of the United States.

We know that the strength of our Government is dependent upon the exchange of views between Government officials and the citizens of America. The congressional questionnaire is one way in which to involve our citizens in the decisionmaking process and I would like to express my sincere appreciation to all who replied.

Twelve questions were asked relating to both domestic and foreign policy issues. These issues covered the economy, health insurance, the Vietnam war, bus- ing, social security benefits, the Israeli-Arab dispute, the tax structure, environmental pollution, revenue sharing, law enforcement, and similar matters.

The volume of response to my questionnaire has been most gratifying. Slightly more than 21 percent of those polled not only replied, but many attached to the questionnaire detailed

letters to explain the positions they took on issues and problems. Others placed cogent and concise remarks on the margin of the questionnaire, and some, I am very pleased to report, took the time to analyze a major pending tax reform bill and let me know specifically, section by section, the weaknesses and strengths of this bill.

All of the questionnaires which have been returned have been tabulated by computer, and the consensus of opinion I have received has been of invaluable aid to me in formulating my position in the legislative considerations confronting us during the 92d Congress.

Before listing a numerical summary of the responses to the questions that I posed, I want to point out some significant reactions to several important issues.

Inflation was listed as the No. 1 problem confronting our Nation, with the Vietnam war listed second in importance, and the law enforcement problem listed in third place.

A total of 81 percent felt that improvement was needed in the President's wage and price control program in order to make it more effective and more equitable. I share this view, and as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, which has jurisdiction over this area of law, I have led the fight to hold oversight hearings on the entire issue with the objective of enacting legislation that would insure that prices are held in line—particularly the cost of rent, food, transportation—and the other essentials which the wage earner must meet despite a paycheck that is relatively frozen.

Seventy-seven percent, or more than three-fourths of those who responded, wanted an end to the Vietnam war, with 48 percent favoring total withdrawal by a fixed date, and 29 percent favoring gradual withdrawal with continued air and sea support for South Vietnam. I have personally supported the proposal for total withdrawal by a fixed date contingent on release of all American prisoners of war by the North Vietnamese. There is nothing to be gained by loss of more American lives in a tragic and futile conflict, and I shall continue to do all that I can in the Congress to help bring about our total disengagement from this war and the safe return of our POW's.

In recent months, the issue of forced busing of schoolchildren out of their neighborhoods to achieve racial balance has been of great concern. Fully 86 percent of those who responded to my questionnaire were opposed to forced busing of schoolchildren. My own position has been against forced busing. During the second session of the 92d Congress, four recorded votes on major bills, five recorded votes on amendments, and 20 unrecorded votes on the busing issue were taken in the House of Representatives. Each time, I voted consistently against forced busing. My position has been reinforced by the responses I have received and, therefore, I shall continue to oppose forced busing whenever legislation relating to this issue receives the consideration of the House of Representatives.



Over and over again, in notes and letters I received, along with responses on the questionnaires, a total dissatisfaction was expressed with our current tax laws. The Ways and Means Committee, which drafts tax legislation, has indicated that broad and extensive hearings will be held early in the 93d Congress on this issue in order that present inequities in the tax structure may be eliminated.

It is my firm conviction that action is long overdue on plugging tax loopholes, such as the oil depletion allowance, and other "special interest" tax breaks which permit high-income individuals and large companies to escape their fair share of taxation. The increased Federal revenues derived from plugging tax loopholes could then be used for more effective pollution abatement, for meeting the educational needs of our country, and for reducing property and income taxes of the overburdened middle-income wage earners. I shall continue my vigorous support of bills in the Congress to correct inequities and abuses in our tax laws.

An overwhelming 88 percent favored automatic adjustment of social security benefits to reflect changes in the cost-of-living index. I supported this proposal when a vote was taken on H.R. 1 on the House floor last year. The Senate is expected to take action on this measure soon. In the meantime, because I felt that there was too much delay on the part of the Senate on passing a much needed increase in social security benefits for our senior citizens, who, too often, are treated as forgotten citizens. I supported a 20-percent increase in social security benefits in order to close the gap caused by the steadily rising cost of living that has taken place since the last social security benefits increase almost 2 years ago. This 20-percent increase has now become public law and will be included in social security benefit checks delivered in October 1972.

As I mentioned earlier, those who returned my questionnaire rated law enforcement as the third most urgent problem facing our country today. They were not concerned with enactment of new laws aimed at reducing crime, but were primarily interested in seeing that the courts strictly followed the laws that have already been enacted. They felt that by so doing, crime would be substantially reduced, because repeat offenders would be taken off the streets and law enforcement procedures would thereby also become more effective. In the days ahead, as I have done in the past, I shall continue to support proposals and programs aimed at achieving these objectives.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a plurality of the citizens who responded felt that the Federal Government was not moving fast enough in pollution control for Lake Michigan and its tributaries including the Chicago River. Seventy-eight percent of the respondents felt that more should be done, and reflecting this view, the House of Representatives recently passed the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, a comprehensive water pollution abatement bill which is far more stringent than any other passed

to date by the House. I was glad to support this bill, and presently, I am actively engaged in trying to secure congressional approval for special authority and funds to insure cleanup of the Chicago River at regular intervals.

It is also of interest to note that of those who returned the questionnaire, 57 percent were men, 36 percent were women, and 6 percent gave no indication of sex. As far as age groups are concerned, the greatest number—46 percent—were in the 45- to 64-age category, and the lowest number—1 percent—were in the 18 to 21 category.

Mr. Speaker, the following is the completed questionnaire tabulation according to percentages:

#### QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

How do you feel about Phase II of the President's wage and price control program? 42 percent support stricter and fairer price controls.

13 percent support stricter and fairer wage controls.

26 percent support both stricter and fairer price and wage controls.

6 percent support the elimination of wage and price controls.

5 percent feel the program is working well.

Do you oppose busing of children out of their neighborhoods to achieve racial balance?

86 percent oppose forced busing.

10 percent do not oppose forced busing.

3 percent are undecided.

Should social security benefits be adjusted automatically according to changes in the cost of living index?

88 percent support the automatic adjustment of social security benefits.

7 percent do not feel social security benefits should be adjusted automatically.

4 percent are undecided.

Would you favor using money set aside under the highway trust fund to improve mass transit systems?

64 percent would favor using this money for mass transit systems.

25 percent would oppose using this money for mass transit systems.

8 percent are undecided.

Which of the following indicates your position on health care?

45 percent support a federal system to provide care for all Americans.

34 percent support a federal system to provide care for major illness or long-term treatment only.

15 percent feel the present system is adequate.

Which of the following best indicates your position toward the Vietnam War?

48 percent support total withdrawal of all U.S. forces by a fixed date.

21 percent support gradual withdrawal of troops with continued air and sea support for the Thieu Regime.

18 percent support continued bombing of North Vietnam and an attempt at military victory.

What policy should the United States take in regard to the Israeli-Arab dispute in the Middle East?

51 percent favor a hands off policy.

35 percent feel we should sell arms to Israel.

5 percent feel we should be more friendly to Arab nations.

2 percent favor active military support of Israel.

Many taxpayers have expressed dissatisfaction with our current tax structure. Which of the following tax reform proposals do you favor?

59 percent support taxing commercial property owned by religious organizations.

36 percent support reducing the oil depletion allowance.

31 percent support taxing interest income from state and municipal bonds.

25 percent support taxing capital gains as ordinary income.

7 percent support the adoption of a national sales (value added) tax.

Do you believe the State and Federal governments are moving fast enough in pollution control for Lake Michigan and its tributaries including the Chicago River?

78 percent do not feel the governments are moving fast enough.

18 percent feel the governments are moving about right.

2 percent feel the governments are moving too fast.

Do you favor an all-volunteer armed force?

57 percent favor an all-volunteer armed force.

28 percent do not favor an all-volunteer armed force.

12 percent are undecided.

Do you favor returning a percentage of Federal tax money to state and local governments for use as they see fit (Federal revenue sharing)?

56 percent favor Federal revenue sharing.

28 percent oppose Federal revenue sharing.

13 percent are undecided.

Which of the following would you rate as 1st, 2nd, and 3rd biggest problems facing our country today (write 1, 2, and 3 indicating choice)?

	Percent		
	1st	2d	3d
Inflation.....	22	16	11
Vietnam.....	17	8	7
Law enforcement.....	13	12	11
Unemployment.....	7	11	9
Pollution abatement.....	6	9	11
Reduce military spending.....	6	7	6
Health care.....	5	7	9
Drug abuse.....	4	8	9
Consumer protection.....	4	4	7
Education.....	3	5	6
Other.....	2	1	2

Sex: 57 percent male; 36 percent female; and 6 percent did not answer.

Age 46 percent are 45-64; 21 percent are 30-44; 18 percent are 65 and over; 11 percent are 21-29; 1 percent is 18-21; and 3 percent did not answer.

## THE NEW POLITICS—AN HISTORIC FIRST

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, manipulating international politics for votes here at home can produce bizarre effects.

Last week at the United Nations, the U.S. Ambassador, George Bush, cast our Nation's second veto in the history of that body to kill a resolution which supposedly called for the immediate cessation of all military operations in the Middle East. This week at a religious rally in Washington, D.C. our U.N. Ambassador denounced a Soviet law that imposes immigration fees on Soviet citizens seeking to flee from Russia.

At about the same time the administration, through our Secretary of Agriculture, is praising itself for credit sales

of grain to the Soviet Union to feed the people of that country. All of this, while we mine the approaches to the Haiphong harbor to prevent the entry of Soviet weapons and food to feed the North Vietnamese military machine which is killing American boys and the sons of our South Vietnamese and South Korean allies.

Yet in Baltimore last week the Soviet frigate *Tovarisch* was made welcome to participate in the anniversary of the American ship *Constellation*. This we are told is but the beginning of the welcome extended to all ships of the Soviet navy and fleet at our various U.S. ports. In fact, to make the Soviet Captain and his crew especially welcome, President Nixon sent his daughter, Mrs. Julie Eisenhower, to participate in the festivities.

All of this we are led to believe is necessary in the name of peace. The American people are told to ignore the constant "hammer and sickle" rattling by the Soviets who claim that we are the aggressors all over the world. At the same time acts of counterterrorism go uncondemned as justifiable revenge or retaliation.

The new politics of people control creates strange situations, but as usual, the American people continue to come last.

I insert several related news articles. The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 11, 1972]

#### UNITED STATES BLOCKS U.N. ANTI-ISRAEL MOVE

##### BUSH CASTS AMERICA'S SECOND VETO

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., September 10.—Ambassador George Bush tonight cast the second American veto in United Nations history.

Bush vetoed a resolution that would have called for the immediate cessation of "all military operations" in the Middle East without relating the Israeli attacks of the last four days to the terrorist attack that took 11 Israeli lives in Munich.

The packed gallery in the Security Council chamber gave a gasp and then broken into muffled applause as Bush cast his vote. The first U.S. veto came on a Rhodesian resolution in 1970.

"By adopting this resolution," Bush explained afterward, "the council would have ignored reality, would have spoken to one form of violence but not another, would have looked to effect but not to cause."

Israeli Ambassador Yosef Tekoah praised the U.S. veto which blocked the adoption of what he called an "inequitable draft."

He said the U.S. action would be "applauded by the people of Israel and peoples who desire to see the end of violence and the attainment of peace in the Middle East."

Tekoah, who issued a statement to the press after declining to participate in the council debate because of the Jewish New Year holiday, said Israel was determined to halt "the barbaric warfare" initiated by the Arab states and waged by Arab terror organizations.

In an earlier round of voting, the Soviet Union and China vetoed a series of amendments proposed by Britain, Belgium, France and Italy.

The four western countries had sought to broaden the resolution before the council to deplore all acts of terrorism and violence in the Middle East.

Like the United States, China had exercised its veto power only once before. Russia, however, ran its string of vetoes to 109.

Referring to the complaint by Syria and Lebanon about Israeli reprisal attacks Friday and yesterday, which the council met to consider this morning, Bush warned that "the fabric of violence in the Middle East is inextricably interwoven with the massacre in Munich."

"By our silence on the terror in Munich are we indeed inviting more Munichs?" Bush asked.

The resolution had been submitted by Somalia, Guinea and Yugoslavia. After voting on it, the Security Council adjourned without setting a date for its next meeting. But no imminent council action was considered likely unless Israel resumed its attack on its Arab neighbors.

Bush, supported by four European delegations, two Latin Americans and Japan, had fought to avoid the veto with a compromise resolution that would have called on all parties concerned "to take all measures for the immediate cessation and prevention of all military operations and terrorist activities . . ."

But the drive fell one vote short of the necessary majority of nine on the 15-nation council, and would have come up against the stone wall of Chinese and Soviet vetoes in any case.

Syrian ambassador Haissam Kelani, the first speaker called by council President Huang Hua of China, charged that the Israeli air strikes on "several areas" in Syria were "without provocation or justification." He said that "many peaceful civilians were killed and wounded."

The Lebanese ambassador, Edouard Ghorra, said that 15 civilians, including 10 children, had been killed in Israeli raids on three Lebanese villages on Friday. He called the attacks "unprovoked by any action from our side in Lebanon."

But reports from U.N. military observers who had toured the three sites indicated that "non-regular forces" had been occupants of a hospital in the village of Rachaiya and a house in Rafid.

Bush denounced Syria for failing to condemn the Munich attack and for continuing to "harbor and give aid and encouragement to terrorist organizations which openly champion such acts."

Bush charged that certain other governments in the area "cannot be absolved of responsibility for the cycle of violence" because of their words or deeds or their silent acquiescence.

It was the first time the United States had gone so far in defending the Israeli position at the United Nations and this was attributed by diplomats to the wide gulf between East and West in their reactions to the Munich disaster, and to American election-year politics.

The final vote on the draft resolution was 13 to one (the United States) with one abstention, Panama. The main Western amendments to insert two references to terrorism into the resolution, each obtained eight votes. One amendment received four negative votes and three abstentions, and the other, seven negative votes.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 18, 1972]

#### "RANSOM" OF JEWS DECRIED—MRS. SHRIVER, BUSH SCORE SOVIET LAW

(By Alice Bonner)

Eunice Kennedy Shriver, wife of the Democratic vice presidential nominee, and George Bush, U.S. ambassador to the U.N., denounced at a rally yesterday a recent Soviet law that imposes heavy emigration fees on Soviet Jews.

The rally, held on the Ellipse, preceded the celebration of Yom Kippur, the Jewish Day of Atonement, which began at sundown yesterday. Park police estimated the size of the crowd at 3,000.

Bush, introduced as official spokesman for the Nixon administration for the rally, said the plight of Soviet Jews "must not be made a partisan issue."

"Your government cares and it acts," he said. The administration has demonstrated

its "commitment to the elimination of discrimination against minorities everywhere," through increased Voice of America broadcasts, more economic aid for resettlement of Jews in America and in many other ways, Bush said.

The ambassador did not acknowledge or respond to the frequent shouts of "Stop Soviet trade!" from the audience during his 30-minute speech. Loud applause answered his concluding statement, "All people should have the fundamental right to emigrate, to go home."

Mrs. Shriver, there to replace her husband, said he was confined to bed with an ear infection. She spoke briefly of the need for "love, wisdom and compassion," regardless of religious faith.

"What an individual has learned belongs to him, not to his government," she said in protest of the Soviet Union's Aug. 3 adoption of a law requiring Jews who wish to leave the country to reimburse the government for their education.

"This persecution must stop," she said. She ended with a prayer in Hebrew "for forgiveness of sins we have committed by being silent on this."

Charlotte Jacobson, president of the American Section of the World Zionists Organization said, "Never again will Jews and those who support us be silent." She deplored the Soviet Union's indifference to the lives of people" and "the selling of Jews in the market place."

The Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington organized the demonstration to protest what it called the "ransom" and "blackmail" of Soviet Jews who want to leave the country permanently.

Moscow announced last month that Jews wishing to emigrate would have to reimburse the Soviet government for their education. A \$1,080 fee for an exit visa would be increased in amounts up to \$25,000 according to the extent and discipline of individual training, it was announced.

Dr. Isaac Franck, the council's executive vice president, called on the demonstrators to bombard the President, their congressmen and senators with telegrams, letters and resolutions of protest.

The Kremlin is "not impervious to the moral, political and intellectual pressures of the world," he said and urged them to send cables of protest to Leonid Brezhnev, Soviet Communist Party chairman.

The crowd stood in the 85-degree heat for over an hour to hear the speakers, then staged an orderly march around the White House and dispersed.

"Jews are not for sale," "Soviet trade not kosher," and "Freedom should be free" were among the slogans on the numerous placards they carried.

Dr. David Korn, Soviet Jewry chairman of the Jewish Community Council said in a telephone interview that he had called Jewish activists in Moscow immediately after the rally.

He said they told him their requests to hold similar outdoor observances for Yom Kippur had been denied, and that four of the leaders had been ordered to appear before the KGB, the Soviet secret police.

[From the Evening Sun, Baltimore, Sept. 6, 1972]

#### IN CAPITALIST BALTIMORE—RUSS SAILORS SPREAD GOODWILL

(By Thomas Hasler)

Armed only with picture postcards of Moscow and their ship's photo, the men of the Russian training ship *Tovarisch* yesterday ventured forth to spread goodwill in capitalist Baltimore.

A burly truck driver stopping for a red light alongside the Russians' tour bus on East Monument street was all smiles and curiosity when out of the blue he received



his little photograph of the vessel, docked out in full rigging.

But totally flustered was Richard Sweiter, a worker at the Pepsi-Cola plant on Falls road, who couldn't recall his address when Chief Mate Valentia Lichansky asked a few questions.

#### QUERIES ON LIFE STYLE

The Russian officer had broken away from the tour group to find out how much Mr. Sweiter earns, what sort of housing he has, and how many hours he works.

Earlier, at official welcoming ceremonies on Constellation Dock, the Russians used a more varied arsenal of goodwill.

As the top officers were introduced, they clapped back at the 1,000 onlookers, a Russian custom Mayor Schaefer said he particularly liked.

And after the speeches, when the gifts were being exchanged, the crowd particularly appreciated the gift of a bottle of Russian vodka—complete with Maryland tax seals—in exchange for a bottle of bourbon.

#### MUSICAL PROGRAM

After the welcoming ceremony the cadets brought on a musical ensemble which wooed the audience with songs of love, the sea, and wide open spaces.

When the old international favorite "Kalinka Kalinka" was played, a few people in the audience really got into the spirit, clapping to its strong beat.

But otherwise the audience seemed restrained in its welcome.

#### SOME SHAKE HANDS

After the ceremonies were over a few people went up to the Russians to shake hands, to get the Tovarish pictures autographed and exchange lapel buttons.

The only actual opposition to the visit came from about 100 pickets led by Dr. Carl McIntire, president of the International Council of Christian Churches, a fundamentalist organization.

Dr. McIntire had brought a bus load of elderly protesters from Cape May, N.J., to join local dissenters in opposing the government's "hypocrisy" in allowing a Soviet visit while at the same time blockading Haiphong harbor.

[From Sea Power, July/Aug. 1972]

#### AN IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW WITH

SECRETARY WARNER

(By Heather David)

Twenty years ago, John William Warner pledged to himself to give seven years of his life to paying back a debt to the Navy and Marine Corps. The new Secretary of the Navy is now three and a half years into realization of his promise, with three and a half to go.

In two two-hour interviews with SEA POWER, his first such sessions with the press since taking the conn as Secretary, Warner made these things clear:

As a staunch advocate of President Nixon's Era of Negotiations, Warner will continue to work with Soviet naval leaders on subjects of mutual interest. He says he has hopes for a future agreement to exchange port visits by Soviet and American warships.

He believes that the U.S. Navy must be kept strong and that the United States must be able to negotiate from strength. But as an official involved in continuing discussions with the Soviets related to the Incidents at Sea Agreement he will not be heard making potentially disruptive statements about the Soviets.

Heather David, former Pentagon correspondent for Fairchild Publications, is cur-

rently freelancing, based in Washington. She is the author of several books including Operation Rescue—the story of the attempt to free POWs in the Viet Nam War. She is currently working on a book on China.

#### HOBOKEN, N.J., IS ON THE MOVE— BOOM SEEN BY REALTORS IN THE "MILE SQUARE CITY"

#### HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Hoboken, N.J., is one of the oldest cities in the United States. Like many older cities, it has problems—serious problems. Many professional purveyors of gloom and doom have predicted a dire future for the city on the Hudson which we in northern New Jersey know as the "mile square city."

Contrary to these predictions, Hoboken is on the move and, in fact, is enjoying a building boom as investors are learning that Hoboken with its location on one of the Nation's great rivers across from Manhattan has great potential.

Mr. Speaker, on September 13, 1972, the Hudson Dispatch, a leading editorial voice in New Jersey, published an excellent article describing the boom in Hoboken. Because I wish to bring this fact to the attention of all Members of the House and Senate as well as decisionmakers throughout the Nation, I insert the article from the Hudson Dispatch immediately following my remarks:

#### BOOM SEEN BY REALTORS IN HOBOKEN

The climate for real estate transactions is improving and should get better in the coming year, says Louis M. Tamarin, president of the Hoboken Board of Realtors.

Tamarin said he and other realtors have great faith in the future of Hoboken. He pointed out that a real boom could result if the John J. Grogan Marine View Plaza would become a reality.

"Regardless," Tamarin said, "the last year has been a very active one. This is evidenced by 90 transactions from one office. And this is an excellent sign for the future."

Tamarin emphasized that optimism among realtors is high because of the construction of the World Trade Center in New York City. He pointed out that the center's completion could mean a great deal to Hoboken which is close to it.

Tamarin said, "Everything is pointing to an upsurge in the real estate field. Realtors are looking forward to the future with anticipation and believe the city is on the move."

The board president pointed to another factor, Washington St., the shopping area as a plus for the future.

#### FEW VACANCIES

"There is only a two per cent vacancy of stores on Washington St., and that's great. The percentage was a great deal higher a few years ago. And this is an excellent indicator of what the future holds," Tamarin said.

The city, according to Tamarin is awaiting federal funds totaling \$22 million for the rehabilitation of buildings. He added that

this program should do a great deal to revitalize Hoboken.

"Another sign is the sale of Todd Shipyards to an oil company. This transaction should bring the city's waterfront alive. And that's what we're talking about—a Hoboken that once again will be vibrant," Tamarin said.

Tamarin also points out that this has been the best time for cooperation from local banks on mortgages and home improvements. He added that in the past these banks did not serve the needs of the community.

"Sales of homes have been extremely active. Most people are buying to build equity for the future. So you can see that these indicators are pointing to a bright future and possibly a new Hoboken," Tamarin said.

#### THE LATE LT. GEN. GEORGE B. SIMLER

#### HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of Lt. Gen. George B. Simler was a tragedy of major proportions. He was rated as one of the most valuable and most capable men in the entire Air Force. Replacements for men like General Simler are not easy to come by.

To Mrs. Simler and other members of the family I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial which appeared in the September 12 issue of the San Antonio Light. It follows:

#### LIEUTENANT GENERAL SIMLER

The Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs was the setting for today's final rites in memory of Lt. Gen. George B. Simler, whose brilliant career ended in a jet trainer crash at Randolph AFB.

The commander of the Air Training Command and his aide, Capt. Gil L. Gillespie of San Antonio, were to be buried in the Academy cemetery.

At 51, Gen. Simler not only had a remarkable service record but was about to be promoted to full general at the head of the Military Aircraft Command.

He had served two tours of combat flying in Europe in World War II, and had escaped after being shot down.

As director of operations of the Seventh Air Force, he flew combat missions in Vietnam in every type of tactical strike aircraft assigned there.

An equally important aspect of Gen. Simler's career—one for which many a young airman is grateful today—was his successful campaign to improve conditions and human relations in the Air Force.

His "Accent on Youth" program resulted in an extraordinary increase in reenlistment because his sweeping, factual investigation had revealed weaknesses that needed prompt corrections.

Before coming to Randolph, Gen. Simler had served as director of operations at Headquarters, U.S. Air Force, and as vice commander-in-chief, U.S. Air Force in Europe.

His career also included three years as athletic director at the Air Force Academy.

The Light salutes this outstanding officer and patriot, and offers respectful sympathy to his family.

## NOW IS THE ACCEPTED TIME

## HON. BILL D. BURLISON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, public education is becoming more and more important in American life. Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., superintendent of schools of New Madrid County R-I Enlarged School District, addressed his teachers on August 24 and used as his topic, "Now is the Accepted Time." The article was later carried by the Portageville Missourian. I would like to bring Dr. Reuter's remarks to the attention of the Members:

Now Is the Accepted Time

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

## INTRODUCTION

As a new school year begins, we must reflect on the past and look ahead to the future. A topic of continuing debate these days is whether the quality of life is improving or deteriorating. A vast range of issues now confronting us bears on the matter, from ecology to crime, from the youth culture to the war.

We live in an age that has been characterized by many titles. It has been called the Atomic Age—the Jet Age—the Space Age—the Computer Age. Each of those titles symbolizes a giant step in science and technology. That is the common characteristic of all those names: they revolve around things, rather than people. Gadgetry is important, but the basic purpose which gadgets must serve is man.

J. Robert Oppenheimer, father of the atomic bomb, once compared the danger of nuclear stalemate between America and Russia to that of two scorpions in a narrow bottle. Each one is wary that the other might strike first unexpectedly and is waiting for a chance to eliminate the dangerous situation.

Treaties to ban the testing of nuclear weapons have been a subject of widespread interest since the middle 1950's. A comprehensive test ban would be a major step toward terminating the strategic-arms race. The largest earthquakes have a body-wave magnitude slightly in excess of 7 and a surface-wave magnitude slightly in excess of 8.5. On the average, there are one or two such earthquakes a year. Underground explosions in the megaton range can have a body-wave magnitude of 6.5 to 7.

One of the great paradoxes of our times is that as the danger of major international wars recedes and the standard of living rises, the level of domestic violence and crime increases at a frightening rate.

People scoffed at the Kerner Commission's prediction in 1968 that we were becoming a divided nation—one black and poor, the other white and wealthy. All the evidence in the intervening four years has only shown this warning to be true.

## A FEW MAJOR CONCERNS

One of the most felicitous developments in recent years has been the Green Revolution. The work of the plant breeders is producing new productive varieties and the use of fertilizers and pesticides have yielded exceptional increases in the production of cereal grains. The Green Revolution sometimes encounters second generation problems. Problems such as susceptibility to new plant diseases requiring new measures to control them and new research to develop resistant varieties.

Having been concerned with ecology for a long time, I should be exceedingly pleased by the sudden rush of interest in the environment. In a way I am, but I am also rather perturbed. I see an enormous amount of busyness and an enormous amount of headlines and an enormous amount of rhetoric, but the only things I don't see are results.

Three critical concerns should be emphasized—early childhood education, education of diverse disadvantaged groups, and programs for career development. In the first area, Israel recently made kindergarten free and compulsory for all five-year-olds. We still have only about three-quarters of our children in America in kindergarten. In the second area of concern, Israel has an especially fine program, too. She has attracted an influx of immigrants from underdeveloped neighboring and distant regions, people whose traditional cultures have placed them at a disadvantage in contributing and competing in a modern technological land. Finally, Israel has done well in the third area. All of their vocational-technical secondary schools are actually comprehensive high schools.

As good citizens and educators, we are also interested in higher education, because quality education is attained only when the input is superior at all levels.

The conclusion of the Jellerna Report, studying the financial status of private institutions of higher learning and sponsored by the Association of American Colleges, has become almost too well-known: "Private colleges and universities are apprehensive and they have reason to be . . . Taken collectively, they will not long be able to serve higher education and the Nation with strength unless significant aid is soon forthcoming."

Of course, we expect great things from dedicated educators like you are. This is the "high road," and not the "low road" as reflected by Keynes. One recalls Keynes's description of Lloyd George: ". . . rooted in nothing; he is void and without content; he lives and feeds on his immediate surroundings; he is an instrument and a player at the same time which plays on the company and is played on them too; . . . with six or seven senses not available to ordinary men, judging character, motive, and subconscious impulse, perceiving what each was thinking and even what each was going to say next, and compounding with telepathic instinct the argument or appeal best suited to the vanity, weakness, or self-interest of his immediate auditor."

## CONCLUSIONS

Most of us are eager to give to our students the best quality of education possible. Two ideas come to my mind at this point.

First, only if we can restore a fervent allegiance to the ethic of the Constitution of the United States is there hope that we might repair the deep divisions, disapprovals, and distrust which have been sown throughout the land by the "if you are not for me you are against our country" rhetoric. Second, in dealing with critics, I think all would do well to keep in mind the words of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, a master of judicial summation. "We must sail sometimes with the wind, sometimes against it," he said, "but we must sail and not drift or lie at anchor."

Finally, according to the Executive Secretary of the California School Boards Association, man is a verb, not a noun. This kind of thinking is going into the making of the new school. Think about it. Man is a verb, not a noun. Then, I stop with this sentence—"Great men," wrote Emerson, "exist that there may be greater men."

## THE CASE AGAINST EXEMPTION OF SMALL BUSINESSES FROM OSHA

## HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have carefully reviewed all the testimony of the hearings before the House Small Business Subcommittee in June as well as the hearings now going on before the House Select Labor Subcommittee on occupational safety and health legislation. I would like to point out to my colleagues that the preponderance of testimony from Members of Congress, small businessmen themselves, as well as that of the larger employers, does not support an exemption for smaller firms based upon the number of employees.

The case against the Findley amendment to the Labor-HEW appropriations bill, exempting firms of 25 or fewer employees, is a strong one. I will be addressing this issue in greater detail tomorrow during the floor debate, but I did want to share with the House some excerpts of the testimony on behalf of small businessmen:

## EXCERPTS OF THE TESTIMONY

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM L. HUNGATE OF MISSOURI, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS AFFECTING SMALL BUSINESS

"It is interesting to note, too, that nearly all of the witnesses testifying before the subcommittee were of the opinion that small businesses should not be categorically exempted from the Act. Everyone agreed that all businesses, both large and small, should provide a safe place for their employees, even those industries with as few as five employees where risk to safety and health is high."

THE HONORABLE JOHN B. ANDERSON OF ILLINOIS

"Safety should be irrelevant to size, and as statistics show, 90% of America's employers employ less than 25 employees, who comprise 30% of the 60-million workers covered under this Act."

THE HONORABLE ORVAL HANSEN OF IDAHO

"As you know, Mr. Chairman, the cut-off level as accepted by the Senate-House Conference was for businesses with fewer than 15 employees. Although the bill was vetoed, there will be an effort to attach a similar exemption to the Labor-HEW appropriation bill, to be considered in the next few days."

The letters which I have received concerning OSHA show that this amendment is very popular in Idaho. On the other hand, most of those who have written me do seem to agree with the primary purpose of OSHA, which is obviously to protect the lives and safety of all of America's 80 million workers. Since many deaths and injuries occur to workers who are employed by small firms with less than 15 employees, to exclude small businesses would defeat one of the major objectives of the Act.

". . . I believe that the proposal to totally exempt such firms is undesirable. The criteria of 15 employees is arbitrary, and if implemented will serve to frustrate the purpose of protecting the lives and safety of American workers. Instead, I believe that we should more objectively and selectively correct the deficiencies in the Act."



MR. STANLEY WARANCH, PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOME BUILDERS

"We are, without reservation, in complete agreement with the objectives of occupational safety and health legislation. We believe every reasonable step should be taken, to assure that the working environment of employees in all industries is as free and clear as possible from hazards to employee's health and safety. We recognize that the Occupational Safety and Health Act should, and does in fact, apply to us, as well as to all other businesses in this country. We do not seek, nor have we ever sought, to exempt light residential construction from the application of the Act. What we do seek is the development and application of standards that properly reflect the hazards and work conditions in our industry."

THE HONORABLE BOB BERGLAND OF MINNESOTA

"A second and equally pragmatic reason for amending the law, is the almost certain resurrection of the Findley Amendment on the Floor of the House when the Labor-HEW Appropriations Bill comes up for a vote. I have talked with a number of our Colleagues on this subject, and it is my opinion that the Findley Amendment will be unnecessary or defeated, provided some kind of relief is granted to small businesses and farmers."

I am opposed to the Findley Amendment in principle. So are most small businessmen and farmers. Everyone agrees that employees should have a safe and healthy place to work—even small shops with only three or four employees, where there is possible high risk, should be covered by the law.

"Categorical exemption will be disastrous for the small business community as well as for the employee safety."

MR. CHARLES A. HAGBERG, ADMINISTRATOR, INDUSTRIAL SAFETY AND BUILDINGS, WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY, LABOR, AND HUMAN RELATIONS

It is wrong, by any means, whether by budget or amendment to the law to exclude any class of worker. All workers should be covered. A study in Wisconsin of how many industries employ 15 or fewer employees indicates that 80% of our workers would not be covered if such an exemption were to be made. If in the budget such an exemption were made for even one year at the federal level to allow small employers to get their house in order it should not be forced upon states that have good coverage and good programs. Federal funds for state programs should not be limited for use where there are more than 15 employees."

THE HONORABLE TENO RONCALIO OF WYOMING

"I want to repeat I will not support an amendment exempting an employer of any number because the philosophy of this law was all employers shall have a safe premises for their employees and none can quarrel with that."

MR. VERNIE G. LINDSTROM, JR., CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL SAFETY COMMITTEE OF THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA

"... I would like to state that the AGC is opposed to the Findley appropriation bill amendment. This bill, as you know, would exclude employers with less than 25 employees from OSHA. Most general contractors have more than 25 employees and would naturally have been enforcing safety as we have for years as I stated in the beginning."

"We do see serious problems, though, with the subcontractor who has less than 25 employees who would not be required under this amendment to enforce safety on the same job where the general contractor would be required to do so."

"... I think that is one of the most hazardous aspects that we have incurred—that you can exempt people because the general contractor on the job is responsible for the general construction on that project, and he has to coordinate all the employees."

MR. BARRY BROWN, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTAL LABOR OFFICIALS

"Using the cost argument principally, there are those who have appeared before you who have contended that because of their small size or because of their previously unregulated industry, they ought to be excluded from the coverage of OSHA. I do not feel that they can justify their request for exclusion. For example, a modular or pre-assembled home—one which is produced in a kind of industrial assembly line setting—will clearly be under the scope of the occupational safety and health law. Thus it would seem unfair to allow a competitor who builds a house in a different way in a different location to escape the provisions of the law."

"Secondly, if a manufacturer which employs 25 employees is caused to guard his machines or to handle his product in a certain way that adds to the cost, it is clearly unfair when a slightly smaller competing employer down the road is not subject to the regulations. I think that whatever is adopted as a federal level of exemption, many of the states will continue to develop and enforce standards that will apply to all employers within their boundaries, regardless of the employer's size or industrial classification."

MR. JEFFERSON D. KEITH, MANAGING DIRECTOR, AMERICAN METAL STAMPING ASSOCIATION

"Another justifiable concern of this industry's managers is the effect the safety law will have upon their ability to compete. This is a highly competitive industry. The difference between a successful quote and a losing quote often boils down to fractions of a cent. As a result, unequal or dissimilar enforcement of this law makes competing even more difficult. This is one of the reasons we cannot support the exemption being proposed for smaller firms."

"Nor can we support the recent Findley amendment, although this gives indications of an awareness of a problem. For that reason we are pleased with it. But I also should point out that many companies in this industry employing over 24 people—up to several thousand in some cases—compete directly with some companies employing less than 25."

MR. JAMES R. TARR, BILLINGS, MONTANA CONTRACTORS COUNCIL

"In our industry we could very easily become a 25 employee or less firm by just piece-working more segments of the projects, and we would not have to comply merely by subcontracting more elements if we so desire."

"And I can assure you that if we have to hire a group of noncomplier to work with us on the same project, it is going to be awfully difficult to have another group that has to comply. It is going to create confusion as to responsibility. Who is going to pay or provide for the handrail or the guardrail or whatever safety device is required? Somebody may be liable—when we get a sum total, maybe there are 150 people on the one project site, and they deserve the protection of the standards."

MR. ELMER A. FIKE, PRESIDENT OF FIKE CHEMICALS, INC.

"A study made in the chemical industry by Gorbell... showed that small plants with less than 200 employees have accident frequency rates ten times higher than operations having 5,000 employees. There are many reasons some of which are given. The small operation does not have adequate financial or personnel resources. The nature of the small business often requires short runs and frequent changes which makes job hazard analysis and correction difficult if not impossible."

In spite of the difficulties that the small business is experiencing, we think it would be a mistake to exclude them from coverage."

I would also like to add to my remarks the

following excerpts of a letter from Mr. George F. Hutter of Hutter Construction Company of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, which I received on August 7, 1972, concerning exemption of small business from OSHA.

"This is very definitely discriminating against large employers and your comments are very apropos that safety and health standards are most important for every employer and every employee, regardless of size, and in an accident or death caused in a small shop due to exemption from these requirements is not in keeping with the overall intent, I believe, that the Congress had in passing this law. If this is put into effect, it would exert an extreme hardship on us as a General Contractor due to the fact that in some cases we will have subcontractors working on our projects who employ less than twenty-five or less than fifteen employees, and it would not be clear to me as to whose responsibility this would be for these employers complying with OSHA requirements. We as general contractors would surely not have to be liable or responsible for the smaller subcontractors of ours who would be exempt by this change in the law."

"I sincerely believe that this exemption which some of the Congressmen are supporting has many more far-reaching consequences than they are aware in several possible hardship cases that may have been brought to their attention. I think that the consequences are most severe and that this particular change in exempting some employees is, as I said before, discriminating and most of all putting the employees of these smaller employers in the same boat as they were before OSHA became law, with minimum or no standards requiring safe places for them to work."

#### SOVIET JEWRY

### HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1972

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with many of my colleagues in the House to protest the restrictive policies against Jews in the Soviet Union who wish to go to Israel. In addition to the usual fee of \$1,000 for emigration permits, the Soviet Union is demanding from \$5,000 to \$37,000 for each Jewish person with a higher education who desires to emigrate to Israel. On September 19, the Supreme Soviet is scheduled to meet to ratify this schedule of fees.

Supposedly, the high fees have been instituted to prevent a "brain drain", but in reality they serve as still another form of prosecution against Russian Jews. The "brain drain" argument can be nothing but an absolute lie when individuals in high positions requesting permission to leave Russia not only are denied this permission but thereafter forced out of their jobs. It is always of interest while Communist countries continue to proclaim their desirability, so many of their people seek to leave. We all know why the Berlin Wall was built. It stands today as one of the greatest monuments in the world to the desire for human freedom.

The right of any person to emigrate should be an inalienable right. This policy by Russia, involving persecution of a people who have borne untold suffering, does little to foster human under-

standing and only serves to deter progress in the world.

#### ANTILIFE MOVEMENT

### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this House I have often spoken out against what I have described as the antilife movement in our country today, most obviously evident in the legislation and rapid increase in the number of abortions, more subtly and perhaps in the long run even more dangerously manifested in the continuing propaganda about a "population explosion" in the United States which Government is supposed to take action to stop.

The more closely this antilife movement is examined, the more frequently the investigator encounters the name, the money, the influence, and in general the "long arm" of what is probably the wealthiest of all American families, perhaps the wealthiest family in the history of the world.

It is, to say the least, disturbing that such a family should be expending so considerable a portion of its energies and almost unlimited financial resources in denying the right to life and in challenging the right of other families to grow.

When a member of this family, who is Governor of the State of New York, vetoed the bill passed by both Houses of the New York State Legislature which would have saved the lives of tens of thousands of unborn babies, Father Albert J. Nevins explained the background in his column published in Our Sunday Visitor. I present his column to you for your most serious and thoughtful consideration.

Wealth is power, and power is wealth. Their misuse has darkened the whole history of mankind.

The article follows:

ODDS AND ENDS

(By Father Albert J. Nevins)

Latest proof. Some weeks ago we wrote a column called "The New Malthusians." In it we documented the closeness of the Rockefeller family to the Planned Parenthood Association, the major contributions made for population control by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Rockefeller Foundation. We showed how President Nixon's Commission on Population Growth and the American Future was headed by John D. Rockefeller III, who is a pro-abortionist, winner of the Margaret Sanger Award and the Lasker Award of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

The Rockefellers are a strange family. They do nothing by accident. They have hired the best brains in the country to control the poor in the interests of the wealthy.

Examine some of the things that they have done. Nelson, who has been elected and re-elected at the cost of more millions than many state budgets, is the political power; his monstrous New York State Mall dwarfs anything the Egyptians could have thought of. David is the money supplier (at interest, of course) as head of the Chase Manhattan Bank; Lawrence plays at conservation, but

his beautification (Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Hawaii, etc.), always winds up with luxurious hotels which the Rockefellers hold until the tax write off ends.

Nelson has long had interests in Venezuela and Brazil—partly due to Creole Petroleum Co., and also due to the opportunity to make more money. He bought the 8,000-acre Hacienda Bolivar and the 20,000-acre Agua Blanca. He began to raise cattle and vegetables, opened a milk company, built the luxurious Avila Hotel (later sold for \$800,000), founded a grocery chain that developed supermarkets all over the country. VBEC (Venezuela Basic Economy Corporation) aims "to monopolize food and its distribution in Venezuela . . . to become dictator of the market," said *El Nacional*, largest Caracas daily. "Why," asked *El Universal*, "does he (Rockefeller) come down here to destroy the small corner grocery?"

Romulo Betancourt, called the best of modern Venezuelan presidents, had this to say about Nelson. "After looking over his vast oil properties in the West and in the East he will return to his office atop Rockefeller Center, to the warm shelter of his home, to resume his responsibilities as a philanthropist and Art Maecenas."

"Behind him will remain Venezuela producing 180 million barrels of oil for the Rockefellers . . . Behind him will remain Venezuela with its half million children without schools, its workers without adequate diets . . . its 20,000 mostly living in houses that the Department of Development states should better be called 'overgrown matchboxes'; Venezuela, with its three million pauper inhabitants, victims of frightful epidemics. Such is the meaning of Rockefeller's exploiting our country with his specious hypocritical maxim."

Besides Standard Oil and Rockefeller Center, the commonly known Rockefeller interests, the brothers have or had (they always know when to get out) interests in North American Aviation, Eastern Air Lines, Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., McDonnell Aircraft, Piasecki Helicopter, N.Y. Airways, Glen P. Martin Co., Island Packers (Fiji), African textiles, housing in El Salvador, Colonial Williamsburg, Phelps Manor, and more sub-companies than this paper has room to print.

The Rockefellers learned their hard lesson in Colorado's Ludlow Mine Massacre. Ever since then they have been public relations-conscious, hiring the best firms to present a philanthropic image to the public.

How come the family will spend millions upon millions of dollars to get Nelson elected governor of the State of New York at an annual salary of \$50,000? Philanthropy? The desire of being useful to the people? Who is kidding whom? We have no evidence of how the New York State bond issues are financed, particularly for the billion-dollar-gulping Mall, but it would be interesting to find out.

Now Nelson Rockefeller shows his love of the poor again and his fearless defense of human life by vetoing the abortion reform law which would have ended New York as the abortion capital of America. The State Legislature, both Senate and Representatives repealed the law that had been adopted in 1970. Cardinal Cooke hailed the Legislature's act: "It was encouraging to see the Legislature recognizing that a government's responsibility is to protect life, not to allow its destruction." But, alas, for the good Cardinal's optimism. The Rockefellers true to form acted through brother Nelson and vetoed the bill. The governor had tried a last minute ploy by saying he would sign the amendment by changing the time of abortions from 24 to 18 weeks. But murder is murder even at one week and the legislature called his bluff. The tragedy is that the governor was not bluffing and he killed the amendment. So New York remains the world's abortion capital, thanks to Nelson A. Rockefeller.

#### OBSERVES 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH MARCH

### HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following:

OBSERVES 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH MARCH

(By Congressman HAROLD R. COLLIER)

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 10, the residents of my congressional district observed the 30th anniversary of the Bataan death march. Thousands of residents lined the route of a mammoth parade in which scores of service, veterans, and civic organizations participated. Included among those taken prisoner were 98 men from Maywood and surrounding suburbs of Chicago.

The harsh and bitter memories of Bataan are doubtless indelibly impressed upon the minds of those who have survived, but for most of their contemporaries recollections of the fall of Bataan have been crowded out by a never-ending series of other episodes, and for the 90-some millions of Americans who have been born since 1942, Bataan may have little meaning. That is why, as your Representative in the Congress of the United States, I have again introduced a measure that would help keep green the memory of the gallant men who gave their lives in the defense of Bataan, as well as express our appreciation of the heroism of those who fought and bled with them.

My resolution calls on the President of the United States to proclaim the second Sunday in September of each year as Bataan Day in memory of the courageous defenders of the Bataan Peninsula and the fortress of Corregidor during the early days of World War II. I am hopeful that it will soon be adopted by both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

I want to narrate the story of Bataan and Corregidor, as well as the events that preceded and followed. To those who lived through those stirring days, this will be a mere rereading of an old chapter from your book of memories, but perhaps it will inspire the young people who will be hearing it for the first time.

America was unable to defend the Philippines, as the treacherous Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, had immobilized her Pacific Fleet and made it impossible for her to get reinforcements and supplies to the 7,000 American and 75,000 Filipino troops that were commanded by Gen. Douglas MacArthur. These forces were concentrated chiefly on the island of Luzon, which was the keystone of the Commonwealth's defense system.

Because of its devastating attack on Pearl Harbor and its highly successful raids on our airfields in the Philippines, Japan had air and naval supremacy. She was all but immune from naval or aerial attack as her troops invaded the Filipino Archipelago. While MacArthur's army could not win and could only postpone the day of inevitable surrender, such delay would help America and her allies by slowing down Japan's advance elsewhere.

The Japanese landed on Luzon on December 10, 1941. Two of their armies which drove toward Manila had as their objective the encirclement of MacArthur's greatly outnumbered units. He avoided the trap by evacuating Manila and withdrawing his forces to Bataan Peninsula. The fall of the Philippine capital took place on January 2, 1942.

The defense of Bataan's rugged terrain began on the following day. Despite the fact



that they were outnumbered by 5 to 1, the Americans and their Filipino comrades were in an excellent position for a prolonged defense of the peninsula.

MacArthur skillfully parried an attack on his right flank on January 11 and the Japanese suffered heavy losses. Eight days later he crushed another attempt to break through his lines. On the 29th, fierce artillery fire broke up headlong Japanese infantry assaults against both flanks simultaneously. On February 2, an invading force which assembled opposite Corregidor was smashed by a sudden bombardment from the fortifications, and the following day small American motor torpedo boats attacked a warship and torpedoed Japanese transports.

MacArthur's lines held from throughout February and March, but the enemy continued to send reinforcements into the region of Bataan. The defenders of the peninsula had suffered heavy casualties, their remaining equipment consisted of a few tanks and cannon, and the men were exhausted by almost 3 months of constant fighting without air support. A few patched up pursuit planes constituted their air force. Even if they had been able to obtain aerial reinforcements, there were no airfields in the Bataan sector, neither were supplies of gasoline, bombs, or other ammunition available. Supplies could not be brought in from outside, as the American fleet was still out of commission as a result of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

General MacArthur was ordered to Australia and Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright succeeded him. Late in March Gen. Tomoyuki Yamashita demanded that Wainwright surrender. The demand was refused and the Battle of Bataan continued.

The Japanese general began the effort to dislodge the defenders on March 28 with a heavy bombardment of the American lines. On the 31st, enemy infantry units, who were protected by a barrage shellfire from offshore warships, forced a breach in the Bataan lines. The gap was widened by tanks, while enemy aircraft harried Wainwright's rear lines and disrupted communications. In the fiercest attack of the campaign, on April 8, waves of enemy shock troops poured through the crumbling defense lines. Wainwright's eastern flank collapsed and on the 9th the Japanese overran the entire Bataan sector.

Of Wainwright's entire force of 43,000, some 36,000 were captured, killed, or wounded in this battle. The general himself, leading a force of 7,000 soldiers, marines, and sailors, along with 3,000 civilian refugees, escaped to Corregidor, which was less than 5 miles away. Gen. Masaharu Homma's 80,000 troops held Manila and the entire rim of Manila Bay.

In a 10-mile triangle left to Gen. Edward P. King, Jr., now in command on Bataan, were 12,500 American officers and enlisted men, mostly army; 66,500 Philippine army men; 6,000 Filipino civilians, employees of the army; and about 20,000 refugees, many of them women and children. Hospitals and aid stations had 24,000 patients and disease was spreading, aided by bad diet and bad water. Food was almost gone. Bataan's defenders had eaten the peninsula's 600 water buffaloes, as well as the 250 horses and 48 mules of the cavalry.

"We have no further means of organized resistance," General King told his officers. He had orders not to surrender, but the alternative was slaughter. The general refused to accept the alternative and 12,500 Americans and 66,500 Filipinos were surrendered to the Japanese.

General Wainwright was determined to hold out as long as possible on the island of Corregidor, but the position of the fortress

was hopeless. It was surrounded by a huge force which was supported by a heavy concentration of air power. There was no hope of reinforcement in men, guns, ammunition, food, or medicine. The exhausted garrison was subjected to daily bombardments. The Japanese attack on the fort began early in May. Corregidor's beach defenses were destroyed by a terrific bombardment from heavy guns emplaced in the mountains on Bataan Peninsula. Enemy landing parties which stormed the fortress captured it in an all-out assault on May 6. After having held out for 26 days, the sick and starving garrison capitulated.

Let us listen to the eloquent words of Gen. Douglas MacArthur:

"Corregidor needs no comment from me. It has sounded its own story at the mouth of its guns. It has scrolled its own epitaph on enemy tablets, but through the bloody haze of its last reverberating shots, I shall always seem to see the vision of its grim, gaunt, and ghostly men, still unafraid."

After the fall of Bataan, nearly 200,000 people were herded together on the lower end of the peninsula—the advancing Japanese army, the defeated American-Filipino army, and thousands of civilians. General Homma, whose bag of prisoners was twice the size he had anticipated, had barely sufficient food, medicine, and transport for his own army and was unprepared for the thousands in the hospitals, for other thousands hardly able to walk, and for thousands who had no food. The Japanese general wanted Bataan Peninsula cleared of his enemies and took care not to ask how it was accomplished.

The first of the survivors began to walk out of Bataan on the morning of April 9. Although they did not know it at the time, they were destined for Camp O'Donnell, which was 65 miles to the north. After the marchers had covered 31 agonizing miles on foot, they traveled 25 miles by rail, and then marched the final 9 miles to their prison.

Many of them failed to make it. Anyone who was caught with Japanese money in his possession was assumed to have taken it from a Japanese he had killed and was himself killed. At one point, nearly 400 Filipino soldiers were marched into the woods, tied together, and beheaded with sabers. The conditions under which the emaciated, hungry, and ill men marched are almost too horrible to relate.

General King estimated that 9,300 Americans had reached Camp O'Donnell by the end of May and that between 600 and 650 Americans had died on the march. Probably 10,000 Filipinos also died, while 6,000 escaped.

Throughout the pages of our history, brave men have written their names in blood so that their descendants could read about their heroic deeds and be inspired to emulate them. Valley Forge, Lake Erie, Chapultepec, Gettysburg, San Juan Hill, the many battles of the two World Wars, and the wars in Korea and Vietnam, are all accounts of brave men who fought to obtain, preserve, and extend freedom. Let us reserve one of the brightest pages for those who fell in the defense of Bataan and Corregidor and thus paid with their lives for the precious time that enabled other brave men to keep the enemy from extending his conquests.

Let us pause on one Sunday afternoon in each and every year to pay reverent tribute to these fallen heroes and to salute those who survived the sieges of Bataan and Corregidor and the infamous death march. How grateful we are that many of them have assembled here today, 30 years after they experienced a living hell. Let us hope that they will have many happy and useful years ahead of them and that the Nation for which they did so much will never forget them.

## WASHINGTON REPORT

## HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD my September newsletter:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman WILLIAM E. MINSHALL)

SEPTEMBER, 1972.

Capitol Hill issues are boiling, heavily spiced with politics, as Election Day draws closer—the economy, tax reform, general revenue sharing, health insurance, welfare reform, school busing, school financing, child development, Social Security and Medicare amendments, housing, mass transit, urban development, crime, gun control, consumer protection, environmental problems, defense spending, arms limitation, amnesty. Final decisions are not expected on all or even many of these issues this year, but Congress will keep them hot on the front burner as the session runs into October.

\$5 billion cut from 1973 defense budget by my Defense Appropriations Subcommittee continues our crusade against waste and over-funding. This latest reduction brings to a total of \$22.6 billion the amount my subcommittee has eliminated from military budgets over the last six years . . . Many billions more will be saved in future, too, because of our insistence that the Pentagon follow the "Fly Before You Buy" concept of procurement that I have long urged. Design, development and competitive testing of major new weaponry will take place before committing our tax dollars to any equipment. No more gambling billions of dollars on unproven drawing-board sketches that resulted in such costly fiascos of the McNamara years as the F-111, the Main Battle Tank and the C-5A.

Having peeled my share of G.I. potatoes, I can sympathize with those who wanted to turn over "Kitchen Police" duties in the Armed Forces to civilians, but not at a cost of nearly \$300 million a year in salaries! I voted to strike these funds from the budget. A little K.P. for our servicemen might at least have the merit of preparing them for the matrimonial front some day, as well as saving taxpayers' money.

Crime and crime again . . . Law enforcement officers at all levels of government are doing an heroic job, yet crime rates continue to rise. There are limits to what even the most efficient, well-funded law enforcement agencies can accomplish when continually frustrated by permissive courts that turn criminals back on the streets. I strongly feel a thorough review of our system of criminal justice must be a first order of Congressional business. Such a review should cover possible revision of laws governing appointment and tenure of judges, modernization of federal and state rules of criminal procedures and laws of appellate review of criminal convictions, parole regulations, and penal reform, including rehabilitation programs . . . The Senate is due to consider a bill to provide compensation, up to \$10,000, in cases where crimes involve injury or death of innocent victims. Similar legislation is pending in the House Judiciary Committee. Seven states already have such laws on their books.

School busing—Although the long struggle over this issue is not finally resolved by the Equal Educational Opportunity Act, it does seek to bring some order out of court-created chaos. The bill stipulates that no busing can be ordered beyond the school closest or next closest to the student's home, and it would permit re-opening of school busing suits in

which decisions already have been filed. I voted for this measure when it passed the House 282-102 in August. It now awaits Senate floor action. At this time it seems unlikely Congress will consider a constitutional amendment to prohibit busing, of which I am an original sponsor, but this may be the ultimate legislative route we will have to take.

Looking at loopholes—"Closing tax loopholes" has much appeal until you examine the bill, now pending in the Ways and Means Committee and endorsed by the McGovern Platform. Here are some of the loopholes this bill would close: the right to deduct interest paid on a home mortgage . . . deductions of state and local taxes unless you can prove them business expenses . . . exclusion of sick pay as a deduction . . . special retirement credits for people over 65 including their right to exclude from taxes the amount they receive if they must sell their homes . . . deductions for child care for working mothers . . . personal exemptions for the blind and aged . . . medical deductions for everyone . . . deductions for losses suffered from fire, accident, flood or other reasons . . . deductions for moving expenses. On the commercial and business level, the so-called "loophole" bill would terminate many of the complex tax provisions that encourage small and big businessmen alike to expand with new stores, new factories, new equipment—all the incentives that build a strong economy and encourage high employment . . . Certainly a review and revision of the Tax Code is overdue, aimed at greater equity for all and including lower property taxes. The meat-axe approach of the "loophole" bill would severely penalize middle-income citizens and would not be good for them—or the nation.

#### IS THE POSTAL SERVICE WORTH FREE ADVERTISING?

### HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, previously I shared with you a typical letter from a constituent complaining about the Postal Service. She said she did not receive her newspapers until "the flies were in them." The newspaper also receive these complaints from their mail subscribers. A friend of mine, Miss Margaret Woolfolk, editor of the West Memphis Evening Times, got her chance to show the Postal Service that she for one did not think they were doing a good enough job to warrant the free public service advertising in her paper.

Miss Woolfolk's correspondence regarding the Postal Service follows:

CRITTENDEN PUBLISHING Co.,

West Memphis, Ark., August 18, 1972.

DEAR BILL: Despite our postal service getting worse and our newspaper subscribers complaining, we are called upon to give advertising to the Postal Service.

While the attached letter doesn't say it's wanted FREE, we are not stupid enough to expect payment. However, just for the fun of it, I've written a letter to Mr. Schorr—copy attached.

Mats and slicks were provided us. We wonder if the Postal Service paid for these or if they were donated, too. If they paid for this material, which will go in the File 13, why

CXVIII—1961—Part 24

can't they pay the newspaper? We give lots of free space to public agencies, but this is too much.

Just wanted to let you know what's going on. Hope to see you soon.

Sincerely,

(Miss) MARGARET WOOLFOLK.

P.S. And—if they don't have funds budgeted for advertising, why do they have a "director of advertising"?

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,  
Washington, D.C., August 15, 1972.  
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

DEAR SIR: The Postal Service will soon begin its 1972 Zip Code campaign. Your help is vital in presenting this material to the American public.

Each year the need for Zip Code increases with the volume of mail we process. This year we anticipate handling more than 90 billion pieces of mail. Each piece that is not Zip Coded requires special handling. As a result, the costs of processing mail are increased, and the entire mail system is slowed down. Your assistance in support of this campaign can help to reduce these costs and smooth the flow of mail throughout your community.

Enclosed for your use are reproduction materials and proofs of Zip Code advertisements in three sizes:

1000 lines—5 columns × 200 lines

600 lines—4 columns × 150 lines

399 lines—3 columns × 133 lines

We hope you will use this material frequently and feel free to call upon us for assistance or additional information at any time. Please consider these ads as a replacement for any Zip Code material you may have retained from earlier campaigns.

Thank you for your help and that of your newspaper. It is greatly needed and appreciated.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. SCHORR,  
Director of Advertising.

CRITTENDEN PUBLISHING Co.,  
West Memphis, Ark., August 18, 1972.  
Mr. JAMES L. SCHORR,  
Director of Advertising, Office of the Postmaster General, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are in receipt of the three Zip Code advertisements relative to the 1972 campaign.

The advertising rate in our newspaper is 11c per line. This would make your 1,000-line space cost \$110.00 per insertion; the 600-line ad, \$66.00 per insertion, and the 399-line ad, \$43.89 per insertion.

Please advise the insertion dates you would like and to whom billing should be made.

Yours truly,

MARGARET WOOLFOLK.

#### MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 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?

#### SCRAMBLING FROM MCGOVERN

### HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is a good time to take a look around at what is happening in the various States on the presidential election front.

Helen Dewar, Washington Post staff writer, has written an excellent article titled, "Scrambling From McGovern," with reference to what is going on in Virginia. According to her report, one reputable poll shows President Nixon leading McGovern by 3 to 1.

In Virginia, the desertions from the Democratic Party have been more formidable than in most States. Former Democratic Governor, Mills E. Godwin, has recruited more than 1,200 members to an advisory committee for the reelection of the President. The most surprising of this was the joining by Sidney S. Kellam, a former Democratic national committeeman who headed up the 1964 reelection committee of President Johnson.

What is surprising is the intensity of the feeling of Democrats in the State for Nixon. A recent poll in the Richmond area indicated even stronger than the 3 to 1 margin for Mr. Nixon as stated above. Some of this has been due to the controversial busing situation existing in and around Richmond.

I attach herewith also an article by Mr. R. W. Apple, Jr., special correspondent of the New York Times of Sunday, September 17, titled, "Even His 'Best State' Wavers on McGovern." It had been anticipated that GEORGE MCGOVERN would have no trouble carrying Massachusetts. In past elections, Mr. Nixon has not done too well in Massachusetts. Polls taken for Gerry Studds, the Democratic candidate for the House of Representatives in the Cape Cod area reportedly show Mr. McGovern behind. In the western part of the state, A. A. Michelson, the political editor of the Berkshire Eagle reported "no sense of buoyancy at all" in the McGovern campaign.

The articles follow:

SCRAMBLING FROM MCGOVERN

(By Helen Dewar)

Even the late Harry Flood Byrd Sr. would have marveled at the way his hallowed old policy of "golden silence" has thrived under George McGovern's presidential campaign in Virginia.

Embellishing upon the silent treatment that Sen. Byrd gave his party's presidential candidates, Democratic regulars—including some prominent party moderates who always used to support their national ticket—are bolting in record numbers.

The situation in Virginia, where at least one reputable private poll shows President Nixon leading McGovern by nearly 3 to 1, is probably more extreme than it is in most other states.

But it is symptomatic of the Democratic nominee's nationwide plight as he struggles to recover the momentum that helped him win the nomination but has since been lost in the Eagleton affair, the nose-diving polls and internal campaign difficulties.



In Virginia, so far, only one statewide elected official has announced his support for the McGovern-Shriver ticket and he is both independent and liberal: Lt. Gov. Henry E. Howell.

U.S. Sen. William B. Spong (D-Va.), who faces a potentially tough race for re-election this fall, claimed fundamental differences of opinion with McGovern on key issues and said he will run his campaign independently of the national ticket.

None of the state's four incumbent Democratic congressmen, three of whom are seeking re-election, has publicly associated himself with the presidential slate.

Four of the 10 Democratic congressional candidates, including Northern Virginia suburban candidates Robert F. Horan in the Eighth District and Harold O. Miller in the 10th, have endorsed the ticket, but only Miller is actively campaigning for McGovern.

Two independents, William R. Durland in the Eighth and Roy White in the Sixth, are campaigning for McGovern but they are considered to have little chance of winning.

With the governorship held by Republican Linwood Holton, the top Democratic state official is Attorney General Andrew P. Miller, and he too has expressed reservations about McGovern.

That leaves U.S. Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. (Ind.-Va.), who is upholding the family tradition of silence.

The Democratic presidential candidate's 1972 campaign in Virginia can be broken down into two periods: the preconvention push for McGovern by many Democratic liberals; and the postconvention flight from McGovern by many party moderates and conservatives.

Although the phenomenon is shared by other states, the peculiarities of politics in Virginia, including intraparty convulsions that have forced temporary realignment of the Democratic and Republican parties, have produced one of the strangest political scenarios of a strange political year.

McGovern was able to capture a solid majority of Virginia's 53 votes at the Democratic National Convention both because of the enthusiasm, hard work and organizing abilities of his own backers and because anti-McGovern forces were unable or reluctant to join behind any other candidate.

People turned out for local delegate-selection meetings in April who had never been seen before at Democratic gatherings. Many of them were recently enfranchised young people. In meeting after meeting, they routed the party regulars and took control.

The McGovern people benefitted from another drive—that of the Virginia Democratic Party's liberal wing to capture control of the party apparatus from the moderate-to-conservative coalition that had held the reins of Democratic power since the demise of the arch-conservative Byrd Organization some years ago.

Together they triumphed. Liberals took control of the party and McGovernites took control of the state's delegation to the Democratic National Convention, giving the South Dakotan two-thirds of Virginia's vote in Miami Beach.

But the delegation was hardly home before the rumbles started. While it was gone, former Democratic Gov. Mills E. Godwin, a Nixon convert, was busily recruiting more than 1,200 members to an advisory committee to the statewide Committee to Re-elect the president in Virginia. Many members were prominent Democrats.

Since the delegation returned, at least 20 of the 105 Democratic members of the General Assembly are openly supporting the Nixon-Agnew ticket. A poll of Democratic legislators showed that more than half of them plan to vote for the President's re-election this fall.

Symbolic of the depth of the defections is Sidney S. Kellam, a former Democratic Na-

tional Committeeman and "boss" of Virginia Beach. Although a key lieutenant of the elder Byrd, Kellam sometimes opposed Byrd's wishes through his loyalty to the Democratic ticket.

But now Kellam has joined Godwin's group and is a member of the national Democrats-for-Nixon Committee, headed by former Treasury Secretary John Connally.

Unlike Kellam, many of Godwin's Democratic recruits have covertly supported the GOP standardbearer during the past five elections, four of which were won by the Republicans in Virginia (the exception being the Johnson landslide in 1964).

But if the extent of open defections is unprecedented, it is "just the tip of a great big iceberg," said one prominent Democratic legislator who, for the first time, is adopting "golden silence" for himself.

Why the massive dive for cover? Politicians cite many reasons—McGovern's stands on defense cuts, the Vietnam war, busing, welfare reform and other issues, as well as anger on the part of party regulars at the liberal takeover of the party. "It's a cumulative thing," said one Democrat, "it was just too much to swallow all at one sitting."

A leading Democrat from the traditionally Democratic First Congressional District (Hampton, Newport News, Williamsburg and many rural counties to the north, plus the Eastern Shore) described McGovern's problems in his area this way:

"We've got an industry that employs 26,000 people (the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co.), and Sen. McGovern wants to cut out the aircraft carriers. That's jobs."

"We're the headquarters for the nation for the Tactical Air Force, and he advocates cutting out nine tactical wings. That's jobs."

"In addition to that, we've got a NASA laboratory and he wants to cut out the space program. More jobs."

"Look across Hampton Roads and you've got the same thing, only it's the Navy over there."

During the 1960 campaign, he said, word got out that John Kennedy favored the Brooklyn Navy Yard over Newport News for construction of ships. "Just like that, he lost the First District."

McGovern strategists in the state say they can counter such talk with plans for conversion of defense-related facilities to peacetime uses, just as they did in his successful California primary campaign.

The First District Democrat is skeptical. "How do you convert the largest private shipyard in the country? They've been trying to diversify for 50 years, but shipyards are unique things. The only things they can convert to are giant turbines for dams, and how many dams do we need?"

As of now, McGovern's Virginia organizers, including Harley Daniels, who is on leave from the congressional staff of D.C. Del. Walter Fauntroy to coordinate the campaign in the state, concede that McGovern began the campaign trailing the President by about 2 to 1.

Discounting the defections, they say they're getting a good initial response from campaign volunteers and anticipate a successful voter registration effort.

"It's been far more successful than I would have anticipated," said Daniels as he said in the statewide McGovern headquarters in Richmond, a maze of rooms atop a small Chinese restaurant.

Daniels drew encouragement from the fact that the Democratic State Central Committee, bucking a long tradition of presidential-year neutrality, endorsed the ticket. Outside of Kellam, he said, the defections haven't hurt. Local chairmen have been chosen in almost all the state's 134 counties and cities—not just names but "good caliber workers," said Daniels.

"Virginia is not a state where the campaign will be made or broken," he added, "but it

is a state where a serious effort will be made."

State Democratic Chairman Joseph T. Fitzpatrick puts heavy emphasis on the voter registration drive, which is being conducted by Jessie Rattley, a black city councilwoman from Newport News. "I felt all along that in any given election the basic Democratic vote is at least 31 per cent," he said. "If our registration efforts are successful, we've got a chance."

Former Del. Edgar Bacon of Southwestern Virginia, the only party moderate in the McGovern high command, said it is "difficult to get the broad-based support that we need" but he says he has found fewer defections among moderates than he originally expected.

If there are any jitters at Nixon headquarters, they are not apparent. But they are aiming not just for victory, but a smashing one. "Anything short of 65 per cent," said a Nixon strategist, "will be an organizational disaster."

[From the New York Times, Sept. 17, 1972]  
EVEN HIS "BEST STATE" WAVERS ON MCGOVERN  
(By R. W. Apple, Jr.)

Boston, September 16.—By all odds, Massachusetts should be Senator George McGovern's best state in the November election—or at least one of his best.

It is perhaps the most liberal state in the country, with both Republican and Democratic parties oriented to the left. It is a militantly antiwar state. It is the home state of the Kennedy's of whose political tradition Senator McGovern partakes.

And it is a state whose voters and public officials—including the Republican Governor, Francis W. Sargent—have never had much use for President Nixon. Mr. Nixon got only a third of the vote here in 1968, and party registration is still running two-to-one Democratic at the moment.

So a visitor is somewhat startled when he is told by Republican and Democratic politicians alike that if the election were held Tuesday—when, in fact, Massachusetts will hold its local primaries—Richard Nixon would probably win.

Nearly everyone, conditioned by Mr. McGovern's smashing Presidential primary victory here last April, expects the Senator to rally sufficiently to win Massachusetts in November. But the fact that even here he is faced with turning a bad situation around provides an insight into the problems the South Dakotan faces nationally.

Representative Michael Harrington of Beverly said today that no single issue had caused Mr. McGovern's predicament. Instead, he argued, Massachusetts voters need to be convinced anew that Mr. McGovern "really knows his mind—that he is competent to run the national government."

Mr. Harrington, a liberal Democrat, detects no passion for the President in his North Shore district. Mr. McGovern is no better than even with Mr. Nixon in his polls, the Congressman said, "because McGovern's campaign has been so confused and contradictory the people who are looking for just one reason to vote for him aren't getting it."

Senator McGovern's local campaign manager, John McKean, does not disagree.

"People's fears have been played upon," he said, "and the candidate has not done a good job of dispelling them. He's got to come in here and change the way people see him—change it back to the McGovern they saw this spring, as the man who would end the war and help them with economic problems, instead of as a man who makes mistakes and can't make up his mind any more."

Mr. McGovern has promised to spend two days here in October—a sign that his staff knows there is work to be done. He will probably emphasize economic issues, which should count for something in a state with

8.3 per cent unemployment and in a city with a property tax that has just been increased by \$22—to \$195 per \$1,000.

The problems are not localized, as far as spot check could determine. Polls taken for Gerry Studds, the Democratic candidate for the House of Representatives in the Cape Cod-New Bedford area reportedly show Mr. McGovern behind. In the western part of the state, A. A. Michaelson, the canny political editor of *The Berkshire Eagle*, reported "no sense of buoyancy at all."

In Dorchester, an Irish working-class area where interviews in April showed surprising McGovern strength, random canvassing Friday turned up six of 15 McGovern voters who said they now favored the President.

There have been some organizational problems, despite an impressive unity breakfast of Democratic leaders two weeks ago Monday.

Jerome Grossman, a leading contributor to antiwar candidates and a strong McGovern backer, has been eased out of the campaign and shows some bitterness. Some McGovern supporters are irritated by the absence of Mayor Kevin White of Boston, who is traveling in Europe with Team Canada—the all-star National Hockey League squad.

Some ethnic politicians are unhappy that Massachusetts' four national committee members now include three Jews and one black.

But such difficulties amount to little, it would seem. Mr. McKean speaks for many when he says, "It's not a question of organization, it's a question of the candidate himself turning this around."

If Mr. McGovern can do so, a Boston Globe poll showing young people here favoring him, 63 per cent to 27, suggests that he has not alienated the big college population. Fund-raising has gone well, including he will have substantial assets, \$2,500 a week from selling campaign buttons. And Senator Edward M. Kennedy has promised to do all that he possibly can.

#### CONGRESS SHOULD EXPRESS REVULSION AT SOVIET ACTION TOWARD JEWS

**HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, today being Yom Kippur, it is fitting to note that tomorrow the ruling body of the Soviet Union meets to ratify a schedule of fees which, in effect, holds to ransom every Soviet Jew who wishes to emigrate.

With a cynical disregard for world opinion, and an even more callous disregard for the welfare and wishes of vast numbers of its own citizens, the rulers of Russia demand that every Jew who wishes to leave the country pay an exorbitant exit fee.

The Soviets, who have denied to their Jewish citizens a cultural and religious life, who have made it all but impossible for most of them to obtain an education and a decent living, who have made it abundantly clear that they have no use for Jews within their borders, paradoxically are now making it almost impossible for the vast majority of Jews to leave the country in which they have become virtual prisoners.

I feel most strongly that this Congress

should express its revulsion at the Soviet action, and should express its views explicitly to the Soviets. The Congress should make it clear to the Soviet rulers that the brutal and restrictive policy about to be made official will cause Congress to examine closely our relations with a country which follows such a policy. The Soviets should be made aware of the fact that their desires for preferential trade treatment by this country and their hopes for extension of commercial credits may well be jeopardized if this unforgivable harassment of helpless Russian Jews continues. It is my hope that the Congress will express this sentiment in the strongest possible terms.

#### THE IMPROVED ORDER OF RED MEN

**HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as we reflect on the events of the past few months, all of us express concern for the future of our country and, indeed, the world.

Will warfare plague mankind as it has in the past?

Will our children surmount the problems which we have failed to eliminate?

As I look to the future, I am optimistic, as I recall those fraternal and civic organizations which have added so much to our society, to our moral fabric, and to our standing in the community of nations.

#### THE IMPROVED ORDER OF RED MEN

One such organization, Mr. Speaker, is the Improved Order of Red Men—a fraternity that I am proud to have been a member of for most of my adult life.

The Red Men and its sister sorority, the Degree of Pocahontas, make up the American origin. These two groups, along with the two junior organizations—the Degree of Hiawatha for the oldest patriotic fraternity of purely boys, and the Degree of Anona for the girls—comprise one fraternal organization called the Improved Order of Red Men.

#### HISTORY

The history of the Improved Order of Red Men is so linked and interwoven with that of the United States of America that one is hardly complete without the other. Our fraternity can claim to have had a major part in building this, the greatest republic the world has ever known.

In the years that preceded the Revolutionary War, patriots found it necessary to conceal their identity and work "underground" to keep their plans and preparations secret in order to establish freedom and liberty for all people living in the Colonies.

Early in 1765, there came into existence, in and around Boston, a number of secret societies known as Red Men, Sons of Liberty, and Sons of Saint Tamani. These patriotic groups met secretly, and

often, they would disguise themselves as red men of the Great Confederation of the Iroquois.

By adopting Indian names as further disguise, these patriotic Americans were able to outmaneuver the authorities of the English crown and lay plans for the forthcoming revolution.

Since our colonial forefathers had firsthand knowledge of the Iroquois League, its mode of government, democratic principles and institutions, they turned to these people for guidance as they organized their secret societies. Thus, it is from this early federation of Indian tribes that the order has derived, not only its customs, but also its ritual, ceremonies, sign language, mannerisms, and tribal government as well.

At the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, the members of these secret societies took up their muskets, and joined the Continental Army to wage an 8-year war for freedom.

Upon the conclusion of the war, the patriotic societies were reestablished, not only in New England but throughout the several States. Then, in 1813, representatives of the various societies met at Old Fort Mifflin on the Delaware River and consolidated all groups under the name of "Red Men."

On March 14, 1835, the Maryland Legislature granted a charter to Tribe No. 1 of the Improved Order of Red Men at Baltimore, Md. This tribe was a forerunner of the order as it is known today. In 1847, under a charter granted by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the first session of the Great Council of the United States was held.

Today, the Improved Order of Red Men, one of the few organizations to attain such an honor, operates under a charter granted by a special act of Congress of the United States. This charter was approved on April 15, 1906, and bears the signature of President Theodore Roosevelt.

#### THE DEGREE OF POCAHONTAS

In September 1885, at Elmira, N.Y., the Great Council of the United States adopted legislation that permitted the establishment of councils of the Degree of Pocahontas, the sister sorority of the Red Men. The Degree of Pocahontas, through its many charitable and civic activities, has brought great pride to the fraternity and brought well-deserved honor and recognition to the membership.

#### PURPOSES OF THE IMPROVED ORDER OF RED MEN

The fraternity is designed with the specific purpose to preserve our Nation, that had its beginning with the patriotic Red Men of colonial days, by defending and upholding the principles of free government so that these principles may be handed down to those who follow the American way of life which has come as a heritage from the past.

In addition, the order perpetuates the beautiful legends and traditions of a vanishing race and keeps alive those customs, ceremonies, philosophies, and beliefs.

Through the Improved Order of Red Men, the members establish and build permanent friendships at regular meet-



ings and at a variety of other fraternal and sociable events.

A prime purpose, also, is to aid and assist fellow members in times of need and to give support to recognized national and local charitable causes.

#### ACTIVITIES

The Improved Order of Red Men is an active member of the All American Conference. The purpose of the conference is to strengthen American democracy and thereby demonstrate its moral, spiritual, and economic superiority over any totalitarian regime, whether it be Communist or fascist.

The Freedom's Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., made a study of various fraternal organizations and approached the order to participate in the construction of the Hall of Patriots Chapel. Recognizing that such a building would honor our patriotic forefathers and knowing, also, that such a structure would reflect the patriotic spirit and dedication of the order, the members contributed generously to this project. On April 29, 1967, the Chapel of the Faith of Our Fathers and Hall of Patriots—magnificently simple in design and construction—was dedicated on Freedom's Foundation's 100-acre American Freedom Center campus on the western edge of Valley Forge State Park. It is a living memorial to American patriots and serves as a symbolic recognition of the order's contribution to the promotion of American ideals and for the preservation of the American way of life.

An annual national pilgrimage is made to the "Faith of Our Fathers Chapel" in the spring each year with services at the large memorial marker.

In addition to the patriotic activities, the membership distributes bumper stickers for automobiles, posters in attractive colors, and eye-catching mottoes to place in public places, all stressing highway safety.

Since the turn of the century, the Improved Order of Red Men has also successfully demonstrated the foresight of caring for orphans without an institution, finding homes for parentless children, as well as retaining a real home life for the children. Brother Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States, recommended to Congress the Red Men's plan for caring for orphans.

Many of the Red Men of the 50 States have as their foremost charity project, the raising of funds for retarded children, mainly for the financing in the field of research. Plans are underway to make this a national charity work for the Improved Order of Red Men. The name of St. Tamina—or Tammany—chief of the Delawares and patron saint of the early patriots, has been written in the Red Men calendar as May 12, St. Tammany Day. On this date each year, funds are raised for the retarded children program.

#### CONSTRUCTION

The League of the Iroquois is considered by some authorities to have been the finest example of a true democracy that the world has ever known. The structure of the Improved Order of Red

Men is that of its predecessor in redmanship. A local unit is a tribe.

A State organization is a State Great Council, the membership of which is composed of past Sachems. The national organization is the Great Council of the United States, the membership of which is confined to past Great Sachems of the State Great Councils.

Great chiefs of State Great Councils and the Great Council of the United States are elected by the accredited representatives of those Great Councils and all are raised to their stumps according to the ancient rites and ceremonies of the "People of the Five Nations." The executive head of the Great Council of the United States is the Great Inchoonee, a title derived from two Iroquoian words "Ongue Honwe," signifying "superior to all others."

#### ORGANIZATION OF LOCAL TRIBES

Tribal chiefs are elected by the membership. The elective leadership of a tribe are: Sachem, senior sagamore, junior sagamore, prophet, chief of records, collector of wampum, and keeper of wampum.

The appointed leadership are: Two sannaps, four warriors, four braves, and two guards.

#### MEMBERSHIP

An applicant for admission must be a citizen of the United States; not under 18 years of age; a believer in a Supreme Being or Great Spirit; of good moral character; sound in mind and body; and have a reputable means of support.

Freedom of thought and action is a cornerstone of the Improved Order of Red Men. It makes no distinction as to creeds, racial heritage, or political philosophies. "As you enter the wigwam, so you depart—a free man." Its membership is drawn from all walks of life. Upon its rolls are names of tillers of the soil, artisans, men of the professions, judges, Congressmen, Governors, and Presidents. The names of Theodore Roosevelt, Warren G. Harding, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt are inscribed thereon.

#### CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, though my duties as a Member of Congress have confined my participation in the Centinella Tribe. I am proud of my membership, and I am proud of the many civic and charitable activities of my brethren in the Improved Order of Red Men.

It is through such fraternal organizations as this that we can look to the future with hope, and with optimism for a better tomorrow.

#### LABOR DAY

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, Labor Day is a very special day in this country, a time

for pronouncing the policy, aims, and goals which are all a part of the labor movement. They are all of great importance to the Members of Congress and also to the people of the United States.

It has given me great pleasure to insert into the Record at this time the text of a very fine address made by president George Meany over CBS on this past Labor Day:

#### LABOR DAY

(Following is the text of a special Labor Day radio broadcast by AFL-CIO president George Meany over the Columbia Broadcasting System at 9:15 p.m. (EDT) Monday, September 4, 1972:)

This is Labor Day, 1972.

It is a day we have been celebrating for three-quarters of a century—since 1894.

For the trade union movement, this is not only a well-deserved holiday for working people and their families—it is also a time to take stock.

What is the labor movement, really? What's it all about? What are its purposes and goals? How far have we come, and how far have we yet to go, in meeting these goals?

First of all, let me tell you what the labor movement is *not*.

It is not a political party—although to hear some politicians talk, you'd think we were. We are not the property of any political party, and we are not the proprietor of any political party.

So, while we are not tied to any party, we want to see men in office who care about the needs and problems of working people—and who do something about them.

Nor does the labor movement represent *everybody*. We do not represent bankers, corporation executives, Wall Street brokers, or coupon-clippers. We represent those who earn their livelihood by selling their labor—whether it's muscle power or brainpower—to others.

But this does not mean we represent only a small self-interest group. Wage earners and their families make up the great bulk of our population. And the record will show that the achievements of the labor movement have benefitted our entire society—not just union members.

And, finally, the trade union movement was not created by a handful of leaders with a bright idea. It is profoundly rooted in the conditions of modern society. Wherever some men must sell their labor to other men, they have of necessity organized into unions of one kind or another. This is a universal rule, which applies to all workers everywhere—except where they are physically prevented from organizing by brutal government repression, as under Communist and fascist regimes.

This is the reason why workers and their unions have always been the staunchest enemies of all forms of totalitarianism—whether of the left or the right. For the first victim of such regimes has always been the trade union movement.

But we do not believe that only Americans are worthy of free institutions and democratic government—while dictatorship and backwardness should be the lot of the rest of mankind. We think that Asians and Africans and Latin Americans and Europeans are all worthy of free institutions and democratic government.

And so, for us in the labor movement, the triumph of totalitarianism anywhere is a setback for labor everywhere—and, indeed, a setback for the whole human family.

There are great differences among nations and among the various labor movements of the world. Yet the impulse toward unionism is universal.

There is a great difference between life in America today and life in America back

in 1894, when Labor Day was established. Yet the need for unions has endured. Why?

Because the principle upon which the labor movement is based is dynamic. It does not go out of operation when we reach a certain hourly wage rate, or a work week of so many hours, or a given set of fringe benefits.

Today the average wage earner bears far more than his fair share of the tax burden—while corporations and wealthy families bear far less than theirs.

His wages are tightly controlled while prices and profits are allowed to skyrocket.

Millions of workers are unable to find work—at a time when there is so much work that needs to be done to make life better for all of our people.

Meanwhile, workers are being told today that their wages must be sacrificed to fight inflation, that their factories have to be shut down to fight pollution, and that their jobs have to be exported to low-wage countries so that consumers may purchase supposedly cheaper imported goods.

In short, workers feel that they are getting a bad deal. And in this election year, they're going to see to it that Congress knows the way they feel.

We are going to do everything that we can between now and November to elect a Congress that will redress these grievances of working people—no matter who is in the White House.

First, we want tax justice. We want a system that is not rigged against wages in favor of unearned income.

Today the average American supporting a family of four on wages of \$10,000 will pay \$905 in federal income taxes. But if he received the same \$10,000 as interest on state or local bonds he would pay no income tax at all.

This is not fair. And obviously, there's something wrong with a tax system which last year let U.S. Steel get away without paying a single penny in federal income tax—even though they did \$5 billion worth of business—while the steel worker had his taxes deducted from his paycheck.

Along with tax justice, America needs jobs—more jobs at decent wages for all Americans able and willing to work.

America needs 25 million new housing units. We need schools and hospitals, parks and recreation areas. We need mass transit systems in nearly every major city. We need a vast expansion of health services. We need new environmental and anti-pollution projects, and public service programs of all kinds.

These needs are reaching crisis proportions—and yet we have over five million people who can't find jobs. What a waste of manpower.

We've got to get moving. But most of the job cannot be done by private industry or private investors. The real answer is public investment, on a massive scale.

This isn't "wasteful government spending." This is an investment in America—in her future and in her people. This would strengthen the economy, increase purchasing power, improve the standard of living for all Americans.

When we talk about putting our people back to work, we mean at decent wages. So we will continue our fight against substandard wages and for a realistic minimum wage for everyone who works for a living, without any exceptions. Full employment at decent wages is still the best weapon to fight poverty.

We want action from the new Congress to stop the export of American jobs to low-wage countries and to halt the erosion of the nation's industrial base.

We've got to bring our trade policies into line with modern economic realities. While we go on repeating clichés about "free trade," other countries have set up barriers against American-made goods. At the same time, they offer subsidies, tax benefits, and other induc-

ments to attract American capital and technology.

Hundreds of thousands of job opportunities have been lost to American workers because of our outmoded 19th Century trade policies. We in the AFL-CIO are not isolationists. We favor more foreign trade. But we insist that it be fair trade. So we are urging Congress to pass the Burke-Hartke bill, which would go far toward achieving that objective.

We also expect the next Congress to take steps to restore the American maritime industry, which has been all but destroyed by short-sighted policies.

American cargoes—certainly all government-financed cargoes—should be carried in American ships, built in American yards with American-made materials and manned by American seamen. Congress must stop making it more profitable to American shipowners to evade U.S. safety and labor standards by registering under foreign flags.

The next Congress must also face up to the unfairness of the present one-sided system of wage and price controls.

We do not demand special treatment for workers. As long ago as 1966, before any other group spoke out, the AFL-CIO agreed to accept wage controls—provided that there was across the board control of all prices, profits, interest rates, dividends, and every other form of income, as well as wages.

But what happened? Every worker and every housewife knows. Wages were held down, but prices and profits were allowed to go up.

So we are asking Congress to end this double standard. Our message is very simple: Either control prices and profits—just as wages are controlled—or scrap the whole control system. We think that's only fair.

And workers expect the next Congress to protect the right and gains won in previous sessions—rights and gains that are now under attack.

Congress must reject all efforts to undermine free collective bargaining and to impose compulsory arbitration.

It must also reject efforts to erode voting rights, civil rights and civil liberties. It must put teeth in the Equal Housing Act.

Congress must go to extend education opportunities on a free, equal and integrated basis for both children and adults.

There must be action to protect consumers—action on no-fault insurance, on product safety, on fair consumer credit, on truth in advertising and labeling.

There must be action to combat air and water pollution; to create a new national land-use policy and a national energy policy. There must be action on welfare reform to ensure justice both for those in need and for the taxpayers who pay the cost.

These are some of the issues that American workers will have in mind when they go to the polls next November 7.

They are by no means labor issues alone. They are issues of overriding importance to all the American people, for there is nothing narrow or self-serving about labor's legislative goals.

We are very proud of the title labor has earned as "the people's lobby." We have fought for every single major piece of social legislation passed by Congress in the 20th Century, and we intend to keep on doing just that.

So in this election year, as always, we in the AFL-CIO intend to do everything in our power to help elect Senators and Congressmen who share our goals of justice, equality and progress for all Americans.

We intend to do everything in our power to defeat those who seek greater privilege for the few—and greater burdens, lower incomes and fewer opportunities for the many.

Union members are well aware that America and its institutions are not perfect. The

history of the trade union movement is the history of a continuing struggle to improve conditions, to make government more responsive to the needs of the American people.

We will continue that effort to the best of our ability. But we will not join in destroying America or its institutions of government. We will not abandon our commitment to the cause of freedom for all men and all nations—or our commitment to national security.

In the final analysis, each union member will base his or her decision on a personal judgment. No union member's vote is in anybody's pocket. It never will be.

That's why the AFL-CIO urges all union members, their families and their friends to register to vote, to study the issues and the voting records and platforms—and to vote on Election Day.

We have complete confidence in the judgments working people will make in the voting booth. They have never yet short-changed America. And they are not about to now.

## OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

### HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this morning I was privileged to appear before the Select Labor Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee to testify on the Occupational Safety and Health Act. I was greatly aided in the preparation of this testimony by the results of an informal survey of interested parties in my congressional district. In response to my invitation, employers and employees alike wrote to me offering their specific comments, suggestions, and experiences with OSHA. I am most grateful to these respondents for their full cooperation and most useful and informative comments. If I were to generalize from these comments, I would have to say that the vast majority are in full agreement with the goal of the act to provide a safe and healthful working environment for all employees, but at the same time, there is strong feeling that a little more commonsense and flexibility should be applied in the implementation of the act. On the basis of these comments and suggestions, I have today made four specific proposals to change the act relating to construction industry regulations, consultation, alternative means of compliance, and court costs for appeals.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of my testimony:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN B. ANDERSON BEFORE THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, SEPTEMBER 13, 1972

Mr. Chairman and Members of this Subcommittee, I am most grateful to you for this opportunity to appear before you today to testify on the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, and I especially want to commend you on holding these hearings during this session of Congress. I am sure your own mail, like mine, reflects the great concern many of our constituents have about



the implementation of the Act, and this is further reflected in the scores of bills which have been introduced to amend the Act. So, your willingness to hold these oversight hearings this late in the session is a most encouraging development and a clear indication of your conscientious efforts to exercise your oversight responsibilities and respond to this growing concern.

When I learned of your intention to hold these hearings, I sent letters out to various interested parties in my Congressional District requesting their specific comments, suggestions and experiences with OSHA. As a result of this informal survey, I do not feel a majority of the respondents believe the Act should be changed so as to defeat its original intent of providing a safer working place for all employees. However, the consensus of those responding was that the implementation of the Act has ignored the spirit of the law. Perhaps as the many letters from employees and employers alike indicate, all that is really needed is a little common sense.

More specifically, though, I am making four proposals on the basis of these letters in an attempt to make OSHA a more responsive and effective program.

First, I think OSHA regulations should make a distinction between light and heavy construction industries as originally proposed by Congressman Thone in a bill which I have cosponsored.

Secondly, employers should be permitted to request that OSHA officials come into their facilities to advise and consult with them concerning any changes required by OSHA. This I believe would clear up much of the ambiguity and frustration surrounding the Act by allowing employers to obtain advance warning about potential violations of health and safety standards in their plants. It is my understanding that Congressman William Steiger has introduced an amendment along these lines (H.R. 16508) which would apply to firms having 50 or less employees.

Third, employers should be allowed to file for a variance, that is, alternative means of compliance, immediately. As it stands under the present Act, an employer must first pay the penalty for a cited violation and then file for the variance. Allowing a variance initially should encourage greater flexibility in the application of OSHA regulations.

And finally, OSHA should be required to pay the court costs and reasonable legal fees should an employer appeal and win. This would protect particularly those small businessmen for whom the appeals process can be a prohibitory expense.

Now I would like to elaborate briefly on each of these four suggestions, beginning with the proposed distinction in regulations between light and heavy construction. Obviously, there is a need for safe standards for the entire construction industry, yet it is equally obvious that the engineering and safety requirements are considerably different for a two and a twenty story building, just as the equipment used in light and heavy construction is considerably different. For these reasons I have cosponsored Congressman Thone's bill (H.R. 12296) which would require such a distinction be made in the regulations. Since I am sure Congressman Thone will have much to say about this, I will not take anymore of the Subcommittee's time in discussing it; suffice it to say that I fully back this bill and urge favorable action on it.

In connection with this, however, there are also distinctions between small and large businesses which I feel should be given greater consideration in implementing the Act. As an example, a machinist in Rockford, Illinois, employing two fulltime employees, was forced to lay both of them off in order to avoid the impact of OSHA, which, as you know, only applies to firms employing at

least one person. Prior to the enactment of OSHA, this machinist had purchased two reconditioned machines for \$60,000 and had mortgaged his home and business at \$1,000 a month to pay for them. Both machines have open running shafts prohibited by OSHA, and the price of compliance would have meant bankruptcy. The price for the nation, and Rockford, was two unemployed machinists. I might add that the owner is looking into a loan under Section 28 of the Act which authorizes SBA assistance in such cases, but in the meantime he was left with no alternative but to fire his employees.

Similarly, OSHA comes down hard on small businesses which have machinery that may be in violation of the Act's standards, yet which they use only once or twice a year. One letter I received from Rochelle, Illinois, cites the example of manlifts or ladders in some older grain elevators which do not meet stringent OSHA requirements. These are used once or twice a year to lubricate and service the drive units on grain handling legs. The letter goes on to explain that many small businesses are locked into long term leases, and thus are forced to improve and alter buildings they do not even own. OSHA also states that any spray painting requires a ventilated room. No doubt this is appropriate in most cases, but it essentially prohibits a small business, which only infrequently spray paints, from doing so.

Another letter which I received was from the W. E. Kautenberg Company in Freeport, Illinois, which employs 60 persons to manufacture sponge mops, spring level mop sticks, brooms, etc.—work which involves stamping metal parts. In October, 1971, as part of a modernization process, the company purchased a newer building and planned to move their present operation there by June of this year. However, they have postponed their move at least a year because of OSHA. It seems that under Section 1910.217(a), concerning "Mechanical Power Presses," all new installations are required to immediately comply with these regulations while existing installations have until August 31, 1974, to comply. However, OSHA directive #100-6, issued March 23, 1972, defines new installations as "any existing machine installation moved to a new plant. . . ." In this particular instance, the regulations have served to slow down modernization which would have substantially improved the overall safety program of that company.

The above is not cited with the thought in mind that exemptions should be made for specific business sizes or activities. The issue is not as defined as it is, in say, the construction industry. Nevertheless, I think it is obvious that, more often than not, it is the cost of compliance, not the penalty, which is the true burden which is borne by small businesses. Safety should be irrelevant to size, and as statistics show 90% of America's employers employ less than 25 employees, who comprise 30% of the 60-million workers covered under this Act. Yet, as the plight of the above businesses vividly demonstrates, flexibility and discretion are necessary when applying like standards to US Steel and a local machine shop. And, as you will note from the examples I have cited, the cost of compliance may be prohibitive in terms of necessary renovation and modernization—something which surely was not intended by the authors of this Act.

I would like to move on now to the matter of consultation, the second proposal which I have made. It seems to me that providing for onsite consultations would further an explicit intention of OSHA as expressed in Section 21(c)(2), that is, "to consult with and advise employers and employees as to effective means of preventing occupational injuries and illnesses." Such consultation

could help to break down a major barrier to the effective implementation of the Act thus far, and that is a lack of communication and information flow. As one businessman wrote me:

"We can (only) call the Regional Office and talk to a technical advisor as I have done. Results are very poor and most confusing. I asked seven pointed questions with full explanation of conditions. I received two straight answers and five answers that 'this office believes you can do this, but an inspector may not and still give you citations.'"

Another executive wrote that, "In many cases, these standards require companies to interpret requirements, causing many unneeded cash outlays because of errors committed in good faith. This situation is understandable to a certain extent when considering the nature and scope of the Act, but onsite consultations would essentially provide an interpretation of these rules. Furthermore, onsite advice would foster the voluntary compliance basic to the program's success. Consultation would be strictly a privilege and option of an employer. Once officially inspected, the terms should remain as they are today—citations and a period of abatement with daily penalties following if the employer has not complied.

No doubt, it would also be reasonable to make fines a little stiffer at the official inspection if the employer had had onsite consultation about the problem. Thus, the incentive would be retained which would otherwise be lost if, for example, employers were given a period of grace to correct the violation and avoid the fine. This would only lead employers to wait until inspections to act and consequently destroy the overall objectives of uniformity, voluntary compliance and equal competition under safe working conditions.

Now, I would like to discuss my third proposal on variance. An additional means of increasing flexibility and reducing resistance to the Act would be to allow a reasonable variance as an alternative to abatement of a cited violation. Assuming the goal of OSHA is to develop better health and safety practices and not rote obedience to a digest of regulations, it seems to me it is impractical to require an employer to first come into compliance by abating the violation and then appeal on the basis of another method of achieving the same end. Moreover, I would like to see a little more administrative flexibility on the variance Section (6) of the Act.

According to the President's Report on Occupational Safety and Health, as of the end of 1971, the Department of Labor had received 108 applications for variances but had rejected all but two on either substantive or procedural grounds. Applications have apparently continued to increase this year, but, as of yet, the Department has not been particularly liberal regarding the "other man's way of doing things." By allowing immediate variance appeals, the process might become a little more complicated, yet it would also be proportionately more responsive to individual situations.

Finally, I am recommending that the Occupational Safety and Health Administration should pay court costs and reasonable legal fees if the government loses on an appeal of a cited violation. Albeit somewhat contrary to the prevailing legal system in the country, this would help minimize some of the risk and expense of the appellate process which could easily have a chilling effect on a small business. If the government prevails on an appeal, the burden would remain on the employer, thus discouraging frivolous appeals but, by the same token, my proposals would make the employer's right of appeal more realistic.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to add that OSHA is a new program and an

Improving one. George Guenther, the Assistant Secretary for OSHA, is to be commended, I think, for his administration of this new program and for already taking the initiative in modifying some of the more frivolous requirements, including the now notorious split toilet provision and ice water ban. I applaud his flexibility and believe that with the changes I have specified today, OSHA can become an effective and beneficial program.

## INTERNATIONAL WRITING PROGRAM

### HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I commented on the work and talent of a constituent of mine, a man of letters, author, distinguished citizen, and founder, director, and solicitor of funds for the University of Iowa's International Writing Program, Paul Engle.

Recently, Wayne Rindels of the University News Service prepared an article which more fully describes the work and contribution of this great Iowan, this great American, and this great scholar.

Included is an article by Genevieve Stuttaford of the San Francisco Sunday Examiner, entitled "Renaissance Man in Conference."

I hope that my colleagues and all who read the RECORD will take note and read, as I have, with avid interest this display of talent and dedication.

The article follows:

#### ENGLE HITS \$1 MILLION MARK IN WRITERS AID PROJECT

(By Wayne Rindels)

Pretty exciting stuff. Picking up and passing out a million dollars to the best writers in the world, buying sanctuary for them, a chance to produce without pressure.

"You gotta be a tough old goat—which I am—or you get very discouraged. You begin to think the world doesn't love you—for sure the world's money," said Paul Engle, poet, Rhodes scholar, founder of the Writers Workshop at the University of Iowa, and most recently founder, director and solicitor-of-funds for UI's International Writing Program (IWP).

A recent Ford Foundation grant of \$100,000 to IWP marked one million dollars' worth of "cajoling, pleading, threatening and playing my violin."

All of the money has gone into the hands of American and foreign writers.

Life was a bit less astronomical when he began raising money for the workshop 12 years ago; he averaged about \$45,000 a year.

"Which went to American writers who became very distinguished—James Tate, William Stafford, W. D. Snodgrass—to name just three. I picked up a recent issue of Esquire and found seven contributors who have been in the workshop. That's a lifetime investment—and it's been a good one."

But this new baby—the International Writing Program—is a big eater. About \$160,000 a year.

When Engle, 63, retired from the Workshop five years ago, he intended to teach a little and write a lot, but he believed too strongly in an international writing program to slow down.

So he speeded up.

Including the current school year, he has made Iowa a creative sanctuary for 116 writers from almost 50 countries, predominantly in Asia, Latin America and East Europe.

"I wanted to make the whole thing a co-operative international program, where we'd pay part of the cost and the sponsoring country paid part. I figured oil companies in the Near East, for example, would be delighted to sponsor writers. Turns out oil companies are bored with writers."

"I went to see Volkswagen in Germany and Olivetti in Italy—each of them ought to send a writer here."

But the only way Engle's been able to spread his brand of international good will is by pounding on a lot of doors, most of them in the United States.

"Many of them, surprisingly, are corporations," Engle said. "John Deere gives us a generous regular amount with no strings attached. Maytag contributes, so does Sears-Roebuck, Northern Natural Gas and Meredith in Des Moines."

"U.S. Steel agreed to contribute the same week President Kennedy said 'no' to their price raising—I can tell you their thoughts were not on poetry just then."

"If you wax your floors, use Johnson's; if you're in the market for road equipment, I recommend Iowa Manufacturing. There are a lot more restrictions I could put on your shopping list."

Contributors, past and present, number 50. The largest gift was made by a retired woman in California, about \$175,000. The Hill Foundation has given \$125,000 and the State Department gives about \$75,000 annually.

And Paul Engle pays for his own travel.

"Much of our money goes for writers' transportation expenses. Round-trip travel from Tokyo costs about \$1,350—which doesn't include the writer's family. We give each writer \$500 a month to live on here. In short, about \$6,000 per writer per year."

"That means we need about \$160,000 annually to keep going, and since UI has no funds available for foreign writers, I have to drum up all of it."

Writers don't usually catch the fancy of money people, Engle said.

"It's so much easier for a foundation to give money for urban problems. I fail about 90 per cent of the time. Man, do I fail. On a majestic scale, I once sent out 80 requests to a list of organizations who contribute to fine arts; 65 said no and the rest didn't answer."

"I spent four years courting a foundation rich enough to support the entire program—and their stated purpose is to advance international study. Not a penny."

But pessimism has never been Engle's bag. "Last year was very good, Hector Libertella of Argentina finished a novel here that won the largest literary prize in Latin America. Gozo Yoshimasu of Japan was a similar award in his country for work done here. Artur Miedzyrzcki won the annual P.E.N. translation prize in Poland."

"John Batki, a Hungarian, won first prize in the O. Henry Short Story Contest this month. Hua-ling Nieh, of Taiwan, now associate director of IWP, will have a book written here published in New York. Alfonso Romeo de Sant'anna won the biggest literary prize in Brazil for a book he wrote here."

Engle said members of IWP were not unpublished young, aspiring writers.

"I have nothing against them, mind you—I probably helped more young writers than anyone in this country. But on an international scale, it's just too expensive. We have to be sure our people are writers."

"The most important reason they're here is that for the first, maybe only, time in their lives, they have uninterrupted leisure to write."

"We do meet every week where each mem-

ber will talk once about some aspect of writing in his country—what it means to be an African writer, for example. And a few people take classes—but the focus is on writing."

"Another reason the IWP is important is to give articulate people a look at America, and a part of it—Iowa—which is largely passed over by foreign visitors. They get to see a university distinguished in fine arts. Artists have a very respectable position at UI."

"I don't know of another university that supports artists, financially and morally, like this one."

"And third, they gain from knowing each other. Many of their countries don't have diplomatic relations with each other. If someone from East Europe wants to meet someone from Taiwan, he comes to Iowa City."

"Even if the political barriers weren't there, most writers can not afford to travel. And surprising friendships are made—a Korean and a Japanese for, example—that's unheard of!"

[From the San Francisco Sunday Examiner Chronicle, July 18, 1971]

#### RENAISSANCE MAN IN CONFERENCE

(By Genevieve Stuttaford)

The poet Paul Engle may not be the only non-Jewish Jewish mama in the world, but with him it probably works better. As director of the internationally famous University of Iowa Writers' Workshop, over the years he has helped nurture the talents of Tennessee Williams, Flannery O'Connor, R. V. Cassil, Wallace Stegner and Philip Roth among others.

Last week, Engle's alchemy was in full throttle at the University of Santa Clara Writers' Conference held at Asilomar. "He was a touch of divinity," is how one of the participants, a toughened, cynical former bush pilot turned poet, described him. "He's a renaissance man," another student added.

It would have helped to have at least a pair of skates to keep up with Engle at this conference. At 63, he's still accelerating as swiftly as a ten-speed bicycle, scattering love and knishes, concern, peanuts, olives and radishes in all directions, along with gentle tough criticisms of his students' manuscripts.

"You've got to put in an honest day's work around here," Engle laughed as he sat on the floor of his room hosting a picnic with his beautiful wife of one month, Hau-Ling Nieh. "Have another sandwich," he urged, "you're not eating enough," and was already slicing into a crusty loaf of French bread before anybody had a chance to refuse.

"People who come to these writers' conferences want so much, need so much," he explained. "And there's so little time, just these few days with these strangers to try to persuade them not to be too tender about their work."

#### LINE BY LINE

"I take a practical view of teaching. It shouldn't be just talk and theory. What it comes down to is the individual work on the page, line by line criticism. I'm always concrete and I'm always honest. No point in my kidding these students."

That talent is rare, even at creative writing conferences, doesn't particularly trouble Engle. There are, he feels, other spin-off benefits for writers who discover they aren't talented. It gives them the chance to come to a clear confrontation with their difficulties to decide they can be "happy just planting a garden, or just to produce a good child is better than to write a bad poem."

"But the principal value of a conference like this," Engle continued, "is that potential writers suddenly realize that there are others with the same problems, that we're all stumbling over the same stones. Most of



these people have been working in isolation. Now they get to see that the nature of their problems is not all that intimate or personal."

Aside from working with the participants here in private conferences, Engle read aloud and rewrote their manuscripts in seminars. Such public encounter, he noted, has a point. "It's very healthy, you know. You become forever slightly more aware after that elbow in the eye!"

#### SELF-CRITICISM

"The most difficult attribute for beginning writers to acquire is self-criticism. They must learn to commit a critical act on their own work, develop that sense of the difference between 'interesting material' and creative art. Too often writers feel that the subject is enough. But it's what happens to the material when an imaginative intelligence works with it that's important. The focused eye of the talent. Writers must learn that art is something made, not revealed."

He calls that "Engle's first law," and has devoted 35 years hammering it into potential writers, years that have cut drastically into his own writing time. He teaches writing, he said, because of a sense of "owing," the need to give back some of the things given him as a young poet by writers such as Archibald MacLeish and Stephen Vincent Benet and the English poet Edmund Blunden, his tutor at Oxford when Engle studied there as a Rhodes Scholar.

"When I returned to this country after that experience, I was so excited at the idea that writers ought to be teaching writers that I went back to my own school, the University of Iowa, and started a program," Engle explained. "Not just a creative writing course, but a 'total' program."

"For instance, we did the seminar on Proust that the French department wasn't doing. And we studied Tang poetry. It all ties together, this continuity of imagination. As a matter of fact, I think all teaching of literature ought to begin with creative writing. Students should learn all they can about writing. Then move on to literature."

#### WORLD WRITERS

Through the years Engle has built the program's reputation to such a degree that writers from around the world consider it an honor to be invited to study and teach there. About six years ago he began to develop the notion of expanding a separate International Writing Program which now gets most of his enthusiasm and time.

To date writers from Ghana, Hong Kong, Roumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Mexico, Poland, Sweden and Japan have come to the University for a year's study.

Unlike the regular program the foreign one is concerned only with published writers. "We bring them too far not to know beforehand whether or not they have talent," Engle said. Because of the language difficulties—even though those invited are required to have at least some knowledge of English—Engle has to rely on the recommendations and judgment of foreign friends.

The red-tape involved, especially with the Eastern European countries, is extraordinary, and that brings the State Department into the picture. "We need them. At first it was difficult, but now the Government has become much more sympathetic. I guess we had to prove ourselves first. I'm not a propagandist for any political party, but now it has become easier for us. But always we retain the right to choose whomever we want."

The foreign writers invited are provided with round-trip transportation for themselves and their families, as well as some extra U. S. travel and \$500 a month for living expenses.

It all, of course, adds up to a great deal of money. The estimate for the coming year's program is \$160,000. And that's where another facet of the Engle mystique surfaces.

The poet-financier takes glee in explain-

ing how he has managed to raise \$1 million for the International Writing Program so far: "This is done by flattering tycoons, cajoling the Department of State, threatening old ladies, playing my violin to corporations (who are astonishingly sympathetic)."

"That's the charming and revolting thing about this new effort."

"However," he reminisced, "it is curious for me to look back and see what an intense effort, commitment, I have made all my life, so much time for my own books, and yet I feel lucky that, unlike so many people, my life was spent doing something which seemed to me important to the culture of the time and to this country, which at the moment is taking more of a beating than it should."

#### CAMOUFLAGING RACISM WITH CODE WORDS

### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, it seems that this is the year of code words. First we had "law and order"; then there was "busing." Now we have "quotas." Different as they may appear at first glance, these code words are identical in meaning and intent. They all provide official justification for efforts to curtail the basic constitutional rights of minority American citizens. The attempt to hide behind the facade of "quotas" is the most recent and, certainly, the most flagrant of the three.

Last month, Mr. Philip E. Hoffman, president of the American Jewish Committee, informed both presidential candidates of his view that quotas in Federal programs must be eliminated. President Nixon replied to Hoffman's letter:

I do not believe these are appropriate means of achieving equal employment opportunity.

The President, as was to be expected from a man who has not always been candid with the American people, went on to stress his support of the concept of equal opportunity.

Later in August the President instructed his Cabinet on the discontinuation of all quota guidelines in Federal hiring. And then, on September 3, it was learned that the Philadelphia plan was in jeopardy. I am sure my colleagues will remember that this important plan, inaugurated in 1969, said that construction firms, carrying out Federal contracts, were to hire minority employees in proportion to that group's percentage of the population in the area where the construction was being carried out.

As an interesting sidelight, we learned on September 7 that the proportional guidelines would, in all probability, still be used; but instead of measuring a group's percentage of the population of the immediate surrounding area, the area would be expanded. Since much Federal construction occurs in large metropolitan areas, where large numbers of blacks are concentrated, the percentage of blacks will be severely lowered if the Philadelphia plan is modified in this manner. But—and this is extremely important—quotas will still be in use. This says to me that the problem, in the Pres-

ident's mind, is not with quotas at all, but rather with the number of blacks in a particular field. The problem is racial.

In my research on the subject of quotas, I found that the percentage of blacks in Federal jobs has never exceeded the 11 percent that we count for in the population—except in service and clerical jobs. Black employees comprise 25.4 percent of the Government employees who earn less than \$5,000 a year; among employees earning \$30,000 and over, 1.6 percent are black and 97.5 percent are white. I learned that as of May 31, 1971, all minority groups taken together represented only 2.7 percent of the Federal employees at the GS-16-17 level; 3.9 percent of the GS-14-15's; 5 percent of the GS-12-13's; and 8.6 percent of the GS-9-11's.

While this controversy was growing, an 8-month-old report by the Department of Labor came to light. That report contained conclusive proof that black employees are underutilized in the Department; that they are concentrated in the lowest civil service grades, regardless of educational attainment, length of service and the desire to advance; that little effort is made to encourage over-qualified minority employees to advance to challenging positions. For example, the Department's EEO Task Force, which compiled the report, learned that, "Three departmental upward mobility programs have affected only 45 out of 3,500 non-professional employees over the past 5 years."

The report's authors concluded, after presenting elaborate statistical data to support their findings, that quotas were not only an acceptable means of making equal employment opportunity a reality, they were absolutely essential. They went so far as to recommend specific percentages as acceptable: 12 percent for blacks, 8 percent for nonblack minorities and 31 percent for women—on all levels of the departmental bureaucracy.

Thus, while President Nixon maintains that quotas are unnecessary and unfair, at least one Federal agency admits to having a poor record and offers concrete suggestions about how to improve that record.

Columnist Carl T. Rowan, who never fails to add insight and compassion to national events, has written an outstanding column about quotas. He called his article, "Lucky Blacks and Job Quotas." It appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on September 6, 1972. His first sentence sums up the compounded irony of the entire situation:

It is going to come as a wry shock to millions of hungry, miserable black Americans that they have been getting so many of the goodies of American life that the white majority feels discriminated against.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in this Chamber to read Mr. Rowan's important column. I further urge them to abandon code-words and hypocrisy, in an honest effort to solve the terrible problems that confront minority, poor, and disadvantaged Americans.

The article follows:

#### "LUCKY" BLACKS AND JOB QUOTAS

(By Carl T. Rowan)

WASHINGTON.—It is going to come as a wry shock to millions of hungry, miserable black Americans that they have been get-

ting so many of the goodies of American life that the white majority feels discriminated against.

But that is exactly what President Nixon is telling us as he prohibits job "quotas" in federal employment.

This is a political year, and the President knows that all sorts of whites (including those in the American Jewish Committee, to this reporter's dismay) are yelling about quotas. So I understand the political wisdom of Mr. Nixon's gambit, even while deplored it as abysmal leadership.

The problem is that millions of white Americans who do not remotely consider themselves racists know of some instance where a black got something they think their child or a friend was entitled to. So they have swallowed the notion that "the government is giving everything to blacks." Or they utter with bitter relish the cliché that "the thing to be today is black—and a woman."

One of my columning colleagues put it succinctly recently when he deplored racial quotas by saying: "It has reached the point in many instances where a black of inferior qualifications is preferred to a white with superior ones. A black with a modest academic record can frequently take his choice of half a dozen prestigious colleges; a white with the same or better grades often will have to settle for a state university."

Since whites usually decide who is inferior and who is superior, that is an easy allegation for a white man to make, although he can scarcely tell you who the inferior black is who took a job from which superior white person.

The Civil Service Commission, which is to enforce Mr. Nixon's ban on quotas, has put out a report on minority employment in government that the President ought to read. So should my columning friend. It shows that of all government jobs paying more than \$20,000 a year, blacks hold a mere 2%. Of those paid less than \$5,000, blacks hold 25.4%.

Is that discrimination against whites? The only effective "quota" for blacks is in the messenger, janitorial, menial categories.

All the minorities in the nation—blacks, Orientals, Spanish-surnamed, etc., which make up about 20% of the population—hold a mere 2.7% of the top-level (GS 16-18) jobs in government.

That report proves that it is a blooming outrage for people who ought to know better to feed white paranoia with this malarkey suggesting that minorities are getting jobs that whites are entitled to.

You read, or listen to, this nonsense about "quotas" and all you can think of is that one black American in three lives in poverty; that blacks are unemployed at twice the rate of whites; that the normal black family must make do on 60% of the income of the normal white family. You wonder how long you can preach responsible struggling within the system in the face of such cruel, cynical, dumb talk about "quotas."

Honest officials have simply noted that the bureaucracy does not respond to general orders to end discrimination. You have to spell out a "goal." Only then will personnel departments cut out the nonsense where a black college graduate is adjudged scarcely capable of cleaning spittoons.

#### FOREIGN AID: AN INTERNATIONAL-IST INSTRUMENT TO DESTROY PROGRESS

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the foreign aid bill is tentatively scheduled for

floor consideration toward the end of this week.

At that time we can expect to be bombarded by letters from people with good intentions who support foreign aid because they feel either that this is the only way poor countries can defeat poverty or stagnation, or that foreign aid is necessary to prevent an ever-widening gap between per capita incomes of the countries of the world.

These arguments simply do not hold water, according to P. T. Bauer, professor of economics at the University of London. His book, "Dissent on Development," points up the fallacies in the argument for foreign aid and shows that it is not a requisite for economic development of a backward country and may, in fact, be harmful to the country's development by imposing a "managed economy" on its society.

Professor Bauer argues:

Economic achievement and progress depend largely on human aptitudes and attitudes, on social and political institutions . . . and to a lesser extent on external contacts, market opportunities and natural resources. If these factors favorable to material progress are present, societies will not stagnate.

Professor Bauer goes on to say:

If the mainsprings of development are present, material progress will occur even without foreign aid. If they are absent, it will not occur even with aid.

Why, then, we may ask, do we have foreign aid? Professor Bauer's comments are incisive:

The pursuit of certain unacknowledged political objectives seem to be present in much of the development literature. . . . What appears superficially to be conflict between developed and underdeveloped countries is more nearly one aspect of a campaign against the west: there are many people in the west who for various reasons have come so to dislike major institutions of western society, especially the market economy and its corollaries such as private property, that they regard the radical weakening of these institutions as a major objective of policy. Many of these people, influential in the universities, the mass media and the international organizations, consider the underdeveloped countries as allies, or rather as instruments, in the promotion of their aims. (Emphasis mine.)

I include in the RECORD a related editorial from Barron's, September 18, 1972, following my remarks, along with a related newsstory:

[From Barron's, Sept. 18, 1972]

**DISSENT ON DEVELOPMENT—A BRITISH SCHOLAR DESTROYS THE CASE FOR FOREIGN AID**

(By David A. Loehwing)

Washington, even with the candidates out on the hustings, won't lack for spectacle next week. Envoys from 123 countries will gather there for a meeting of the International Monetary Fund, hoping to make a start on patching together some kind of world monetary order to replace the Bretton Woods Agreement, shaken a year ago last August when the U.S. went off gold. The outlook, admittedly, isn't too bright. For one thing, the U.S. still is dragging its feet, insisting that accord on tariffs and other trade barriers be part and parcel of any monetary pact. Equally disconcerting will be the din set up by the have-not, or "developing," nations, whose representatives outnumber those of the "affluent" countries by almost five-to-one. Their stick is that they want any new monetary system to give them permanent aid. Indeed, they demand theirs right off the top. SDRs,

replacing gold in the world monetary system, would not be issued by the IMF on the basis of each nation's subscription, as is now the case, because that way they would simply go into the same old affluent-nation coffers. And that's a bore. Instead, they would be channeled to the developing nations, presumably the largest sums ticketed for the most poverty-stricken. The lucky recipients could swap the SDRs for real, honest-to-goodness merchandise from the rich.

Advocated by a Belgian economist at last spring's UN Conference on Trade and Development in Santiago, Chile (where else?), the foregoing proposal had to be watered down before adoption, because some have-nots feared it would be used by the well-to-do as an excuse to cut back, rather than step up, foreign aid. The widespread support it received, nevertheless, illustrates the attitude of the developing nations toward help from the "developed" countries. Simply put, the beneficiaries insist it's a permanent arrangement; it's theirs by right; it's not enough. Nor is it surprising that they should grab for the handouts so ungraciously when they are constantly being assured by economists and other self-styled experts from the industrialized nations that aid is, in effect, permanent, rightfully theirs and too parsimonious. This view amounts to a consensus in the tight little circle of jet-set economists, anthropologists, diplomats and civil servants who administer relief on a global scale. Somehow they have won acquiescence from otherwise rational statesmen. Nothing in public life, however, is as suspect as a consensus, and fortunately an able iconoclast has emerged to challenge this one. He is P. T. Bauer, professor of economics at the University of London, who sets forth his unorthodox views in a book entitled "Dissent on Development."

Over the past quarter-century, according to former Treasury Secretary John B. Connally Jr., the U.S. has paid out about \$150 billion in foreign aid, outlays which to some extent are responsible for the balance of payments deficits that wrecked the international monetary system. Most of the other industrialized countries now are caught up in the same fruitless philanthropy, to such an extent that the flow of financial resources to the developing countries—about 65% of which is in the form of grants, the rest loans—amounts to \$18 billion annually, up from \$9 billion a decade ago. Far from contributing to world peace and harmony, this vast outpouring tends further to divide the world. Witness last week's holdup of a U.S. loan to Uganda after the president of that country, in a letter to the UN, lauded the Nazi slaughter of six million Jews. Indeed, the very concept of development, as propagated by the foreign aid specialists, is belligerent. It holds that the poverty of the poor countries has been caused by the wealthy ones; foreign aid, therefore is merely a form of compensation for past exploitation. Moreover, were it cut off, the poor would rise up and overwhelm the rich. By subjecting such axioms to critical examinations, Professor Bauer destroys the argument for foreign aid.

The foundations on which the case for development grants and loans rests, Professor Bauer says, are two hypotheses which experts have stated so often and so positively they are taken for granted. One is that the poor countries are caught in a vicious circle of poverty and stagnation; they cannot generate the capital necessary to pull themselves out of their predicament, because doing so would mean cutting consumption below the subsistence level. In other words, as one oft-quoted scholar puts it, "a country is poor because it is poor." The other key postulate is that of the ever-widening gap. It holds that, because the poor countries can't advance, they will inevitably lag or regress, while the wealthy ones will forge ahead; the disparity between per capita incomes therefore will grow. Logically, if these two statements are true, the only way out is continuing large-scale financial support of the poor by the



rich nations. Professor Bauer, however, marshals persuasive evidence to the contrary on both scores.

The theory of the vicious circle, he notes, runs counter to the facts. All wealthy nations once were poor; if poverty prevents capital accumulation, how did they make the grade? The Pilgrims, to be sure, got some technical assistance from the Indians, who told them to plant fishheads under the corn stalks, but otherwise the U.S. started from scratch. Its success, moreover, is being emulated in many parts of the world. The economies of Mexico and Brazil are growing faster than that of the U.S. Nigeria's exports, mainly of ground nuts and cocoa, increased 100-fold in the first half of this century, although foreign capital input was practically nil. Hong Kong, a barren rock with no appreciable resources other than its people, has become a manufacturing center so competitive that western countries have put up trade barriers to protect their domestic industries. "Economic achievement and progress," says Professor Bauer, "depend largely on human aptitudes and attitudes, on social and political institutions . . . and to a lesser extent on external contacts, market opportunities and natural resources. If these factors favorable to material progress are present, societies will not stagnate. . . ." As for the thesis of the widening gap, it is largely based on statistical aberration. If the average income in Ethiopia is really \$40 per year, how do Ethiopians not only survive, but multiply? Actually, per capita incomes in many parts of the Third World are increasing as rapidly as those in industrial countries, but the gains are obscured by lumping them together with the slow growth rates of India and Indonesia. The latter's problems, obviously, have little in common with those of Peru or Nigeria.

The English economist contends that foreign aid is not a requisite for economic development of a backward country. "If the mainsprings of development are present, material progress will occur even without foreign aid," he says. "If they are absent, it will not occur even with aid." Sometimes foreign aid is detrimental, especially when its administration saddles a poor country with a "managed economy." On that score he points to the government export monopolies in West Africa, which drain off peasants' profits from cocoa and coffee plantations to support dubious social schemes, and to the once-prosperous Indian province of Kerala, now impoverished by inflation. Frequently, too, foreign aid induces governments to launch grandiose and ill-conceived industrialization schemes while neglecting agriculture, normally the best hope for raising living standards in a developing country. Unaccountably, financial help from abroad also seems to foster xenophobia. Hostility toward "expatriates," as foreign managers and employees are called, has been a factor in the decline of tea plantations in India and Ceylon; Burma's rice economy nose-dived after the forced departure of Indian landlords; Uganda's economy certainly will suffer from expulsion of people of Asian descent. India, of course, is guilty of the worst misuse of foreign aid—the military buildup for its attack on Pakistan.

If foreign aid is not needed and in some cases actually is harmful, why is its perpetuation advocated by so many economists of international repute? Says Professor Bauer: "The pursuit of certain unacknowledged political objectives seems to be present in much of the development literature. . . . What appears superficially to be a conflict between developed and underdeveloped countries is more nearly one aspect of a campaign against the west: there are many people in the west who for various reasons have come so to dislike major institutions of western society, especially the market economy and its corollaries such as private

property, that they regard the radical weakening of these institutions as a major objective of policy. Many of these people, influential in the universities, the mass media and the international organizations, consider the underdeveloped countries as allies, or rather as instruments, in the promotion of their aims."

Is anyone at the IMF listening?

[From the Evening Star and Daily News, Sept. 18, 1972]

#### POPULATION GROWTH KEEPING POVERTY UP, WORLD BANK SAYS

(By Leo M. Cohn)

Poverty is increasing in underdeveloped countries despite their gains in total production and income, partly because their populations are growing too fast, according to the World Bank.

Total output and income in these countries have advanced by more than 5.5 percent annually during the last 10 years, and the pace has accelerated recently, the bank said in its annual report yesterday.

It estimated a production increase of 6.9 percent in the underdeveloped countries last year, compared with 4 percent in the industrial nations.

While the total gains in the underdeveloped world have been "impressive," the report said, aggregates and averages hide "the grim realities of how life at the lower end of the scale is lived by the poorest among nations and the poorest within nations."

For example, it said, the totals are raised by especially sharp advances in a small number of countries, including the oil producers, while other countries are making little headway.

"As a generality, it is probably true that the world's burden of poverty is increasing rather than declining," the bank said, blaming the backsliding partly on "the continued rapid rate of population growth, which dilutes the benefits of development."

The 117-nation bank makes loans to assist development in underdeveloped countries, and provides economic and technical assistance. It issued the report in advance of its annual joint meeting with the International Monetary Fund here starting Sept. 25.

The bank and its affiliates for the first time approved loans and investments exceeding \$3 billion in the fiscal year that ended June 30, the report said.

This total included \$1.97 billion in loans by the bank, up from \$1.92 billion the year before; \$1 billion in credits by the International Development Association, which makes loans on "soft" terms, up from \$584 million; and \$116 million in investments by the International Finance Corp., up from \$101 million.

#### INDUSTRY AND POWER

Because the United States again deferred confirmation of its scheduled three-year contribution of \$960 million to the IDA, that bank affiliate had to rely last year on voluntary advance contributions of \$448 million from 15 countries to finance its operations.

The bank raised funds by borrowing \$1.74 billion last year, an increase of 21 percent over the year before which raised its total debt outstanding to \$6.95 billion.

In another report anticipating the annual meeting of the bank and IMF, the Atlantic Council yesterday recommended a program for reform of the international monetary system and for interim measures to hold the system together during the reform negotiations.

#### FOWLER REPORT

The council is an organization of leading Americans in industry finance and diplomacy. Its monetary committee, which issued the report, is headed by Henry H. Fowler, who was Secretary of the Treasury in the Johnson administration.

Prompt, small and if necessary frequent

changes of currency values should be required to adjust balance-of-payments surpluses and deficits, the report said. It recommended the lodging of authority in the IMF to propose these changes.

Countries persistently refusing to make necessary devaluations or revaluations could be subjected to penalties, such as denial of credit to deficit nations and trade restrictions against surplus nations, the report said.

When the new monetary system is established, the report recommended, countries with excessive holdings of dollars should be allowed to turn them in to the IMF in exchange for "currency deposit credits," which would be used as reserves. The IMF would invest these dollars in U.S. Treasury debt securities.

#### REDEEMED BY UNITED STATES

Dollars accumulated abroad after this initial exchange would be redeemed directly by the United States through payments of gold and other reserves.

Special drawing rights—reserves created by the IMF—gradually should become the basic international monetary reserve although gold would retain a diminishing reserve role, and dollars and other currencies still would be used in market operations, the council recommended.

#### NIXON LANDSLIDE BUILDING— SAMUEL LUBELL

#### HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is time to take a look at another of the public opinion researchers, Samuel Lubell. Samuel Lubell has had remarkably accurate predictions and analyses of election patterns and returns since 1952 and there is no reason to believe at this point that Mr. Lubell is less accurate than he has been in the past. The important findings of Mr. Lubell indicate that his interviews in 19 States of former supporters of HUMPHREY and Wallace many of the voters are shifting to Nixon.

The surprising two points found out by Mr. Lubell are that the voters are reinforced by two rather strong beliefs; one, to halt Government pressure on behalf of blacks and second, to assert a new competitive sense of individualism that would press the voter's self-interest to the limit.

As most of us know, this would virtually overcome the New Deal's basic philosophy that active use of Government in behalf of all people often benefited to repress racial antagonism.

The final conclusion that Mr. Lubell comes to is that the Nixon landslide is building up across the country because of a remarkable feat of psychological warfare on the part of the President. I herewith append the findings of Samuel Lubell as printed in the Sunday, September 17, 1972, issues of the Washington Star-News:

#### NIXON TURNS VOTER WRATH AGAINST FOE (By Samuel Lubell)

Churning away behind the Nixon landslide building up across the country is at least one remarkable feat of psychological warfare.

None of the presidential elections I have covered since 1952 has generated such in-

tense voter resentments, and over so total a range of discontents—from the war and rising prices, to welfare, taxes, school busing, job and retirement fears.

However, Nixon, instead of becoming the target for these wrath—as usually befalls a president in office—has managed to turn these anger against the Democrats with crushing political effect.

In doing so the President may actually be on his way to establishing a "new Republican majority," but it will hardly be the quiet, contented majority that was seen on TV at the Miami convention.

My interviews in 19 states with former supporters of Hubert Humphrey and George Wallace indicate that many of the voters who are shifting to Nixon will be bringing with them at least two fierce drives:

To halt government pressures on behalf of blacks, even to the extent of pushing some racial issues such as busing and job preferences out of effective national politics.

To assert a new competitive sense of individualism that would press one's self-interest to the limit.

How he can tame these two drives will be the constant problem confronting Nixon in a second term.

Actually, these drives were linked politically by Nixon more than by that master mechanic of discontent, George Wallace.

When Wallace entered this year's Democratic primaries, he did what seemed like a simple thing: he wired together into one explosive circuit the school busing issue with sticks of T.N.T. labelled "tax relief."

The result, wherever he campaigned, was virtually to blow up the New Deal's basic philosophy.

The Roosevelt coalition had been built on a belief in the active use of government in behalf of all people, the benefits often serving to repress racial antagonisms.

Since every use of government is paid for in taxes, Wallace's clamor for tax relief discredited all government.

In the past the argument that "the government has its hands in too many things" has usually been advanced to justify a freer hand for business. Had this message come directly from Nixon, one doubts whether it would have been received so warmly by workers complaining that "Nixon is the tool of business" or "he froze our wages but not prices." Wallace, however, has always been seen as the "real voice of the working man."

George McGovern and other Democrats apparently did not appreciate how antigovernment in its thrust Wallace's "populism" was, not that such a credo could stimulate racial resentment.

Currently one of McGovern's tougher handicaps is that he still comes through to many voters as a champion of further black pressures by the government at a time when many are reassessing the "work ethic" in envisioning society for the future.

A typical reaction was expressed by a salesman and his wife in a Jewish neighborhood in Queens, N.Y. They had never voted for a Republican president before but were shifting to Nixon.

"Minorities are getting everything now and they're squeezing out the middle class," he complained. "We were poor but worked our way up and never asked for help. They want everything for nothing and won't work for it."

His wife added, "I'm sorry, but I'm tired of it. I don't want to hear about their problems any more."

That McGovern faces a complete shut-out in the south is not surprising. The forging of racial anger with an antigovernment philosophy has been developing in the south since the Supreme Court's 1952 desegregation decision.

In one worker neighborhood in Richmond, Va., where Wallace drew 40 percent of the vote in 1968, every white person interviewed

was going for Nixon. The prevailing sentiment, voiced by the wife of a casket salesman, was, "The only issue I follow is busing."

To her that issue was "the government wants to tell us what to do with our children. I'll raise them the way I want to."

So intense was this antigovernment antagonism that many parents balked at proposals that federal funds be given to private segregated schools, or even that tuition grants be made directly to parents.

Typical comments ran:

"I wouldn't be obligated to the government for anything."

"The government just wants a toehold on us to do what they want with us. I don't trust 'em."

On economic issues, outside the south, the antigovernment philosophy still has not gained general acceptance. My interviews do show, however, that the squeeze of continued inflation, mounting war and welfare costs and rising taxes have spurred an every-man-for-himself scramble to protect or advance his own self-interest.

Some surprises emerge. When one isolates the interviews of those who voice the strongest attacks on government, these voters generally are doing better economically than a year ago. They also are the shifters to Nixon. Those who are most hardpressed tend to stick with McGovern.

Nor is there any evidence as yet that economic recovery appeases the "I want more" urge.

Some workers are clearly fighting to be able to spend more of their higher earnings. Near Baltimore, a 21-year-old electronics technician pointed to a new car and motorcycle that he had bought during the past three months. He argued against social security taxes, saying, "we shouldn't have to pay it if we don't want to. The government doesn't use it all for people on social security."

He paused and added, "to be honest, I don't know where the money goes. I just resent them taking it away from me."

With older workers, inflation is the dread insecurity. Among the complaints recorded in my interview notes are:

"You save over the years and then see your money dropping in value all the time. . . ."

"When the man of the house retires he shouldn't have to pay property taxes. . . ."

"Social security should be dropped to 60 years of age. . . ."

"A \$650 deduction for a dependent isn't enough. . . ."

"You shouldn't have to work at the same place for 40 years to get a decent pension. . . ."

Almost no one seems to feel at ease, that he or she has enough.

"As far as I'm concerned these taxes are pure stealing," protested a Michigan truck driver. "I work 15 hours a day and make \$400 a week, but I pay \$100 a week in taxes."

Still, he argued strongly for an increase in defense spending and accused McGovern of "cowardice" in wanting to pull out of Vietnam.

To sum up, with inflation still out of control it probably is unavoidable that every individual should be driven to push any rise in any of his costs onto someone else.

Still, after four New Deal decades, it seems clear that a real surge of aggressive individualism would come to us as a new form of government. It might become easier to shed excesses and abuses; it could also serve as an excuse for shrugging off unwanted or unmanageable social burdens.

Individualism also appears to generate its own, want-more dynamics and psychology, which are not necessarily self-correcting. In fact, curious changes in policy can be forced as has happened with Nixon's family welfare plan, once his No. 1 priority and now apparently shelved.

## ABOLITION OF THE DEATH PENALTY

### HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, several months ago, the Supreme Court, in an historic decision, abolished regular use of the death penalty, on the grounds that it is a cruel and unusual punishment, to be used only in connection with the most heinous crimes.

Many people have commented on this decision, and the potential effect it will have on our system of justice. All seem to agree that it is a momentous one, and one that deserves great examination by lawmakers and private citizens as well.

In St. Louis, a local radio station, KMOX radio, broadcast an editorial opposing the Court's decision, and requesting comment from qualified community representatives. Mr. Eugene Bruder of the American Civil Liberties Union of Eastern Missouri took that opportunity to express the position of that organization of the subject of capital punishment.

Mr. Bruder particularly emphasizes the discriminatory application of this form of punishment against black and poor people convicted of serious crimes. I believe his arguments reflect a true situation, one that exists not only in the South, but all across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the comments by Mr. Bruder, bear relevance for all who are concerned with the protection of the constitutional guarantee of justice. Therefore, I commend this article to my colleagues, and include it in the RECORD of today's proceedings:

KMOXRAD O1120—EDITORIAL REPLY

Subject: All the Help we Can Get.

Spokesman: Mr. Eugene H. Bruder.

Broadcast: Aug. 3, 1972, 8:50 A.M., 5:20 p.m.

(Recently, KMOX Radio broadcast an editorial criticizing the recent Supreme Court decision on the death penalty. The following is a statement opposing the station's editorial stand by Eugene H. Bruder. Mr. Bruder is an attorney and member of the Legal Panel for the American Civil Liberties Union of Eastern Missouri.)

We of the American Civil Liberties Union of Eastern Missouri applaud the recent decision of the Supreme Court abolishing the death penalty for murder and rape, and tightly constricting its future use, if any, to specially selected heinous crimes. We think that Congress and the states should follow through by abolishing capital punishment altogether.

Two of the Supreme Court Justices voted for total abolition, on the grounds that capital punishment causes great physical pain and suffering, and denies human dignity, that it is arbitrary and capricious, in no way limited to the worst offenses; that it has in actual fact been rejected by the American people; and that it is not demonstrably necessary in order to deter crime.

Three other Justices voted, only that as now imposed, capital punishment is unconstitutional because it hits in an arbitrary, capricious, freakish and irrational way, is rarely invoked, but tends to discriminate against blacks, males and the poor, the ignorant and the underprivileged. We submit that all five majority Justices are right as far as they go.



KMOX does not discuss rape, but cases of the death sentence for rape are extraordinarily rare, and are mostly cases in the South in which blacks have been singled out for raping white women. Some would approve of this discrimination, but it is profoundly unjust.

KMOX complains mainly of the convicted murderers who are and will be turned loose on society. But of all criminals, murderers are the least likely to repeat. True, parole can be granted very early in a prisoner's term, but not until the parole board is satisfied that it is in the best interest of society. As for the mass murderers, they are generally insane, and hence not subject to the death penalty anyway.

KMOX says that the Supreme Court decision is a lawyer's delight, but instead it should be called the lawyer's relief. There have been no executions since 1967, and the public actually demands that every legal avenue open to a condemned man be explored. When a lawyer gets such a case he has to drop everything else, and work and worry, usually without any fee. Such business we lawyers are glad to lose, and to that extent KMOX is right.

## THE MINIMUM WAGE AND CITY GOVERNMENTS

### HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, this morning's mail brought a letter from the National League of Cities in which are detailed the problems city governments will face if Congress adopts certain provisions of the Senate-passed minimum wage bill, H.R. 7130:

First. Extending the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to municipal employees, as the Senate version proposes, would mean that Congress would be imposing decisions—decisions that should be made at the bargaining table—upon elected local government officials.

Second. The adoption of those provisions of S. 1861 which relate to firemen's hours and overtime pay would completely disrupt all existing labor contracts and could force local governments to choose from several options, all of which are unsatisfactory.

Third. If cities must pay students \$2 or more an hour, as would be the case in the Senate bill, the league estimates a loss of approximately 1 million summer jobs—in city governments alone—for minority young people.

The complete text of this letter follows, and I commend it to my colleagues' attention.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES,

Washington, D.C., September 15, 1972.

Hon. JOHN N. ERLBORN,

Education and Labor Committee, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ERLBORN: It is our understanding that some time in the next few days either the subject of conferees on the minimum wage bill will again be before the House of Representatives or some compromise will be worked out between opposing viewpoints in the House. We'd like to take this opportunity to call to your attention to some of the problems city govern-

ments will face if coverage by the Fair Labor Standards Act is extended to municipal employees as provided in the Senate-passed bill.

First and foremost, the National League of Cities Policy, which is reviewed and revised annually by city officials representing 15,000 municipalities, quite clearly opposes any extension of the provisions of this Act to cover municipal employees. This objection is based on the principle that elected local government officials should not have these types of decisions forced upon them by elected federal officials. The wages, hours and conditions of employment of local government employees should be settled at the bargaining table and not in the United States Congress. We therefore have advised and urged our members to support the Erlborn substitute.

However, if the concept of full coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act is absolutely non-negotiable, may we suggest some specific provisions of the Senate-passed bill that might lend themselves to compromise. Our most overriding concern is extension of the overtime provisions to certain categories of municipal employees, as for example, firemen, police and part-time or seasonal employees such as students and summer recreation personnel.

The traditional terms of employment for firemen provide for a 56-hour week, (often 24 hours on duty, 24 hours off duty), an arrangement which firemen have always preferred to a straight 40-hour week utilized for most other municipal employees. By accepted standards, fire department personnel spend a relatively small percentage of their on-duty time in response to fire calls and a far greater part of their time in non-productive activities such as eating, sleeping and recreation. The adoption of those provisions of S. 1861 which relate to firemen's hours and overtime pay would completely disrupt all existing labor contracts and could force local governments to choose one of several options, all of which are unsatisfactory:

- (1) increase tremendously the property tax burden or find some other source of revenue;
- (2) reduce the level of service provided by fire departments by simply reducing manpower on duty and/or equipment and fire station houses; this, of course, would drastically increase fire insurance rates for the public;
- (3) revert paid fire departments to volunteer fire departments with just enough paid firemen to drive the trucks to the fire; and
- (4) reduce the level of service in some other function of municipal government to make funds available for increased personnel costs in the fire department.

Extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act to firemen will cause additional problems in terms of policemen. Most cities have attempted to maintain, at the very least, a degree of parity between police and fire personnel salaries. Coverage of firemen under the Act would in most instances mean a salary increase in excess of 14%. Even if law enforcement personnel were specifically excluded, they would hardly expect less. But, more importantly, extending the overtime provisions to police could seriously jeopardize public safety since many cities lack the financial capacity to call law enforcement officers back on duty in crisis situations if they are required to pay time and a half.

In addition to the effects on fire and police services and costs, passage of the Senate bill would undoubtedly put an end to the efforts of our cities to employ a larger number of local young people needing earning power and a constructive job experience during the summer months. If the provision including summer or student help is retained, the result will be a substantial reduction and in many cases a total abolition of student hiring. There is no city in our experience

that would be willing, much less able to afford, paying \$2.00 or better an hour for a towel boy at the swimming pool. We estimate a loss of approximately 1 million summer jobs for minority young people.

We urge you to oppose those provisions of S. 1861 which extend coverage to municipal employees; but if this is not possible, we strongly urge you to seek an amendment to exclude firemen from coverage or to modify the formula so as to recognize the traditional 56-hour work week. We further urge you to give serious consideration to eliminating inclusion of part-time or temporary student personnel. It makes little sense from our perspective for the federal government to urge youth employment through such programs as NYC on the one hand and to make implementation of local initiatives in this direction impossible on the other.

Sincerely,

ALLEN E. PRITCHARD, Jr.,  
Executive Vice President.

## HUD'S LOW-INCOME HOUSING PROGRAM

### HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, HUD's \$235 million program purchasing existing housing for occupancy by low-income people is a gigantic flop. These huge expenditures of public funds have done nothing to alleviate the Nation's housing shortage or reduce the number of people living in substandard housing.

In addition, the Government sometimes pays too much for some private housing that it purchases according to a General Accounting Office report released last week.

The Federal Government has assisted local housing authorities in the purchase of more than 16,000 housing units in multiple-unit complexes which do not need repairs and are intended for low-income families and the elderly. This program is distinct from sections 235 and 236 housing programs which build new homes and rehabilitate other dwellings.

Mr. Speaker, this \$235 million has not built or rehabilitated any new housing at a time when we need millions of new homes. It costs approximately the same—\$18,000—to build a new, low-income unit or purchase an existing housing unit. But rather than build new housing or rehabilitate old housing, HUD seems more interested in permitting big, private owners to unload apartment buildings that are probably low-profit operations.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking the General Accounting Office to investigate further the purchase of private apartment buildings with Federal funds to determine whether or not these purchases were in fact nothing more than bailouts for big property owners who were losing money on these buildings.

In New York City, for example, 30 percent of the people living in housing purchased through HUD were ineligible because of excessive income. In addition, 32 of 152 families, permitted to move into

the housing projects, were ineligible for occupancy.

The GAO concludes:

It seems inappropriate for the LHA (the Local Housing Authority) to have admitted 152 ineligible families when so many eligible families were waiting for housing.

Mr. Speaker, more than 135,000 eligible low-income families are on a waiting list in New York City for low-rent units.

As a result of either bureaucratic bungling or some form of political shenanigans, these ineligible people are getting public housing units.

The same situation exists in Washington where 30 percent of the residents of one project purchased with Federal funds are ineligible for low-income housing. In Cleveland, HUD has permitted a local housing authority to pay 10 percent—over \$70,000—more than “fair market value” for an apartment building.

Overall, the GAO concludes that HUD's program has “not resulted in substantially reducing the number of families or persons living in substandard housing.”

Mr. Speaker, this HUD program also robs local communities of millions of dollars in property taxes. The GAO found that in 10 projects studies, more than \$310,000 of property tax revenues were lost as the result of the transfer of property from private ownership to public housing authorities.

One possible solution to this tax loss would be a program of leasing property from private owners for use as low-income housing, which would keep these units on the tax rolls and alleviate the already crushing burden of property taxes on the average homeowner.

JOSEPH GEORGE, JR.

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in each of our lives we learn to know persons who are very special. To me one of these men was Joseph George, Jr., an unselfish benefactor of mankind, who did much for me as he did for thousands of others. Recently, Mr. George passed away and I have the honor of placing certain biographical material concerning him in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As a very exceptional man, he deserves this special tribute.

The biographical material that follows was prepared by his friend and my friend, George H. Burchill:

JOSEPH GEORGE, JR.

In the past thirty-five years many men have come to San Jose and dramatically affected the lives of thousands of individuals with their kindness, thoughtfulness, humanitarian and other civic causes. But no one has been more helpful to individuals, big and small, than Joseph George, Jr. Close to 1,000 saddened individuals attended the services when the Reverend Dr. Philip Barrett and the Rabbi Joseph Gitin, D.D. spoke to his memory on Saturday July 1, 1972.

Because of his concern for his fellow man regardless of his faith, his work, and kind deeds he will always be remembered as one of our most remarkable figures.

His greatest concern was for his wife, Edith, whom he married in 1929, his son, Glenn, who is following in his footsteps, his daughter-in-law Bobbe, and the three grandchildren Kevin, Mindy and Bert ages 14, 12 and 11 respectively.

But here his story begins:

Born July 7, 1890 in Valdosta, Georgia, one of four children. His father was Joseph George, Sr. and his mother Sarah George.

His early education was received in Valdosta, Georgia. It was interrupted when he enlisted in World War I at the age of 17. He served his country in chemical warfare in Hawaii. After receiving his Honorable Discharge in San Francisco, he became a salesman for Glaser Brothers Candy and Tobacco Distributors. During the depression he moved to San Jose, where he opened a branch for their company.

In 1940, he took his big step by buying Koerber Distributing Company which employed 25 people. The business, with its ups and downs, grew and prospered. In 1946 he incorporated, changing the name to Joseph George Distributors. They now have 250 employees. The thing that gladdened his heart was his relationship with his employees. He took pride in the fact that they were his friends, as well as faithful coworkers. Their problems and those of their families became his problems, and he was never too busy to listen and help.

He, like Abraham Lincoln, did not belong to any specific church. His church was in the marketplace of life. All the men of the cloth were his friends. Back in 1954, a Methodist Minister was hospitalized with a heart attack and no medical insurance. A citizens' group got up a green back bouquet. When Joe heard of it, he immediately sent his check, which was well into three figures, with a special request to have the Minister's wife send all of her household bills to him for payment for the duration of the illness.

During his 39 years of community service, he earned the respect and admiration of thousands of his fellow citizens, and his many efforts will be forever remembered. He served as President of San Jose Rotary—made Man of the Year by San Jose Kiwanis Club—a 32 Degree Mason—Member of the Board of Regents Santa Clara University—Foreman Santa Clara Grand Jury—honored for his record of service in the cause of Brotherhood by the National Conference of Christians and Jews and by Temple Emanuel, because he was the exemplar of brotherhood—Member of Santa Clara County Board of Parole Commissioners—received the Distinguished Citizens Award—President of the old Community Chest, the Alum Rock School District names an Elementary School in his honor.

Members of City, County, State, and National Government, the Judicial, Professional, Bankers, Educational-Businessmen, and Men of the Cloth felt that they lost a dear and loyal friend whose advice and inspiration will be missed. Listen to these testimonials from some of the thousands whose lives have been affected by this outstanding individual.

Fred J. Oehler, retired Vice President, Wells Fargo Bank said: “He was a man of high integrity, generous with a concern for the well-being of his fellow man.”

A. P. (Dutch) Hamann, Vice President of the University of Santa Clara and former manager of the City of San Jose said: “He was the most charitable and most honorable man I have ever known.”

Ray Blackmore, former San Jose Chief of Police said: “Many times Joe asked me to take money for someone needing assistance or a person that needed help to erase his

difficulties. He was always ready and willing to share a problem.”

Rabbi Joseph Gitin, of Temple Emanuel, said: “Joe was a man of stellar character. His word was his bond and integrity was the hallmark of his life. He liked people and looked for their essential goodness. They liked him for what he was, a man who cared and was concerned.”

“Father Walter E. Schmidt, San Jose Senior Vice President of the University of Santa Clara and founder of the Santa Clara Youth Center said: “Joe was one of my first board members. Through his efforts the first \$15,000 was obtained for our new youth building where youngsters profited greatly from his kindness and generosity.”

Reverend Philip W. Barrett, D.D., Pastor of Foothill Community Presbyterian Church, said: “We will always be grateful to Almighty God for his generosity in putting Joe in this area, where he touched so many lives and made them much better.”

“Marshall Hall, Presiding Judge, Superior, Court said: “His efforts built a monument which will live forever as an example for others to follow.”

Mae Drew, widow of Fred Drew, former President of U.S. Products Corporation said: “Joe married the right girl, he and Edith had something rare and intimate between them, a blend of fidelity, pride and humor, but, more than that, a deep concern for the other person with a problem.”

Joe Levitt, President, KXRX Broadcasting Company said:—“In this world of give and take, Joe gave much more than he took, his advice, assistance and guidance was an inspiration to the hundreds of us who were blessed by knowing him.”

Henry J. Down, Sr. President Keystone Company said:—“While a group of us gathered after the Memorial Service, Paul Davies (retired Chairman of the Board of Food Machinery Corporation) said:—“We lost one of our most generous members of our society.” . . . to which we all agreed.”

Victor Corsiglia, President, Garden City Disposal Company said this:—“Joe was a great person who did not know the word No.”

Oliver M. Johnson, Industrialist, said: “We worked together as Rotarians for many years. His fine co-operation and spirit will live with us forever.”

Finally, to again quote our famous Rabbi:—“may the 43 years Joe shared with his loving wife Edith, his loyal son Glenn, and his loved ones, become cherished memories that will comfort and strengthen them in the many years to come. In the words of the poet “to live in the hearts of those we leave behind is not to die “in those in whom he blessed, he lives again, and shall live through the years of eternal life and grow each day more beautiful.”

## DRUG ABUSE AND YOUR CHILD

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, over the past few years, there has been a growing interest at all levels of society in the expanded use of drug products among our citizens.

To provide a better understanding of dangerous drugs and the problems related to their use, I would like to bring to the attention of my constituents and colleagues informational material prepared by the Proprietary Association.

It is interesting to note that a very



knowledgeable consultant on this material was Dr. Nathan Kline of Teaneck, a constituent of mine.

It is my hope that with the distribution of this material, we can educate as many people as possible to the nature and consequences of the use, abuse, and misuse of drugs, especially concentrating upon the prerisk group of youth of elementary and secondary age; that we can inhibit, reduce or eliminate drug abuse within the community; and that we can safeguard the community against further incidence.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point the very informative material, "Drug Abuse and Your Child." The material follows:

#### DRUG ABUSE AND YOUR CHILD

"... she gave me a little red candy type thing and told me to go home, take it and listen to some groovy music. ... I've been feeling great all afternoon, feeling like living again. I've washed my hair and cleaned my room and ironed and done all the things that Mom has been nagging me to do for days. The only problem is that now it's night and I can't seem to turn the energy off ... I guess I'll just have to waste one of my good sleeping pills to stop it. That's life."—Diary of a fifteen-year-old.\*

"All I heard was how I had to make it ... make grades, make a team, make a good impression, make this ... make that ... (but) none of it was for me. It was all for my parents. (Finally) I escaped through drugs."—A twenty-year-old.\*\*

You're a parent. You have school-age children. There seem to be illegal drugs everywhere. You're deeply concerned. What can you do?

We of the Proprietary Association (manufacturers of non-prescription medicines) share that concern. But we believe that some positive steps can be taken to reduce the spread of drug abuse among our young. One of the most important of these is early education in the proper and improper uses of drugs.

And we believe that the best drug education effort is a calm, informed discussion between parent and child.

We urge you to take ten minutes of your time to read the following advice on the subject. It represents the thinking of many doctors, psychologists, and experts on drug-abuse education. It's important reading for every parent.

#### DO NOT DUCK THE ISSUE

First, you should face up to the fact that that every child in America is probably going to have at least one friend who is experimenting with drugs, and who may attempt to influence him.

A parent makes a dangerous mistake if he says, "My child? Never!"

#### START DRUG EDUCATION YOUNG

Take time to reach your children about the use of medicines at a young age, as clearly as two or three. This can establish healthy attitudes toward all drugs that will help when they are older and confronted with illegal drugs.

Set a good example yourself. Whenever you take medicine, or give any to your children, stress why you are doing it, and how carefully you follow the label instructions. Impress upon them the importance of never

swallowing anything if they don't know what's in it or where it came from!

Put all medicines and dangerous substances out of reach of small children, on a high shelf, or in a locked cabinet. Then take a moment to tell them why you are doing it.

Explain that it's the same as not wanting them to cross the street without you. There are hidden dangers in both situations that you must guard them against.

Explain about the different uses of drugs. Proper drug use is when prescription medicine is taken strictly according to your family. Proper drug use is when prescription medicine taken when needed, exactly as directed on the label or as recommended by your doctor, is also proper drug use. Proper use of drugs can benefit you and your family by relieving pain, discomfort, or other symptoms of illness.

Improper drug use often starts with drugs obtained illegally. Improper drug use can also be the use of legally available medicines in ways that differ from doctor's instructions or label directions. Discuss with your young child the dangers of using any product, drug or otherwise, in ways that differ from the label directions.

#### INVOLVE YOURSELF WITH YOUR CHILDREN

"... (my) mom is such a devoted club and civic-minded woman that the whole town would probably fall flat on its face if she took an evening off to listen to her daughter. Mom's the 'pillar of society' in this town. ... She holds up everybody and everything but me, and, man, have I been let down."—A sixteen-year-old.\*

The parent who involves himself with his children (and this *doesn't* mean just sitting and watching TV together) will have less trouble discussing drug abuse.

This kind of real involvement has to include an attempt to understand their view of the world. It means a lot of time spent together. And a lot of that time has to be spent really listening.

Try to find out their problems. Then try to help them understand the different ways to cope with them. Discuss how various people react to stress, so that they can better understand their own feelings.

Your discussion of drug abuse should start naturally in the course of talking about other important things. Eight or nine is not too early an age to begin.

#### DO NOT IMAGINE SYMPTOMS THAT AREN'T THERE

You should know the symptoms of drug abuse. But you should remember that many of these symptoms will also be found in a teenager suffering through an adolescent romance, or having problems in school.

If you should notice a sudden mood change, or see some bad school grades and falsely accuse your teenager of drug abuse, you could do great harm. Keep in mind, too, that long hair and sloppy dress don't necessarily have anything to do with drug use.

"Last night was the bitter end. Mom and Dad flowed tears and flowers about how much they love me and how worried they've been about my attitude. ... They hate my hair ... and they talked and talked and talked, but never once did they even hear one thing I was trying to say to them."—A fifteen-year-old.\*

#### BE SURE OF YOUR FACTS

Don't assume that your children are using illegal drugs. But assume that they know something about them.

So don't start to talk to your children unless you know the names of most drugs (including the slang names), their categories, and a little about the effects of each one. You probably shouldn't try to use the slang terms, but you should know what they are.

To many parents, all illegal drugs are equally evil. So they often make the error

of referring to drugs which are as different as marijuana and heroin, in the same terms. This kind of mistake is a sure way to destroy a child's confidence in your knowledge of the subject.

#### AVOID THE TWO EXTREMES

There are two extremes that probably should be avoided when discussing drugs with your children. One is the "I'm your pal" approach, which has led some parents to go so far as to smoke marijuana with their children to show them they're not completely "out of it." A parent loses standing with his children, when he tries to act their age and breaks the law in their presence. The other extreme is when you become strict and inflexible, based upon your superior age and knowledge. This can foster resentment and rebellion.

Understanding grows when you give your children credit for having the ability to reason and figure out things for themselves. Then you must show them that you have the same ability. Concentrate on major things and let little ones alone.

No matter how much you disagree, listen seriously to what they have to say. Remember that, when you were that age, you didn't want to be exactly like your parents in all your beliefs and behavior.

It is not necessary that you always stay "cool, calm and collected." Emotional maturity means feeling some things deeply, having a range of moods, but always remaining in control of yourself. The child who sees and understands this range in you is helped to learn to cope with his own emotions.

#### BE FRANK ABOUT YOUR OWN DRUG USE

If the point is raised that your own record or that of your friends is not too good in the use of alcohol, admit that this may be a problem. Don't try to avoid the subject. If you state that you are against the abuse of alcohol or drugs by anyone, including yourself, you may open the door to a new kind of respect.

#### MARIJUANA, THE TOUGH SUBJECT

The specific dangers of heroin, LSD, "speed," and most other drugs are fairly easy to point out. However, marijuana is the tough subject, because few facts are known about it. Most important, very few scientific conclusions have been drawn about long-term effects.

Some researchers claim that repeated marijuana use destroys motivation and judgment. Others dispute this.

If you stress too many *unproved* dangers of marijuana, your children may come to feel that they have been lied to, especially if they or a friend should try it once or twice and find the experience fairly tame. They may then draw the conclusion that they have been lied to about the risks of *all* drugs, and make the dangerous mistake of trying to find out the facts about other drugs for themselves, by experimentation with them.

The best answer is perhaps to say that, until conflicting reports are resolved, its use is as risky as the taking of any drug which has not been scientifically checked out over a period of time.

Another point that should be raised is that the child who "turns on" whenever he has a problem is denied the basic learning experience of coping with reality.

Most young people condemn "copping out." If they can come to see that most drug abuse is just that, then you will have reached an important understanding.

Your children may use the common argument that marijuana use is no worse than alcohol. One answer to that is that alcohol abuse is an equally serious problem. And its use by the young is prohibited by law. You

\*From the Book "Go Ask Alice," by Anonymous. Copyright 1971 by Prentice-Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Reprinted with permission.

\*\*Copyright 1970 by Medical Economics, Inc. All rights reserved. Used by permission.

wouldn't want them drinking whenever they have a problem, either.

There are three other facts that many young people forget:

At times and unpredictably, marijuana distorts time and depth perception. Therefore, its use by the driver of any vehicle could endanger all those in or near it.

Secondly, since the original source of marijuana is always an illegal one, the child has no protection against contaminated marijuana even if he gets it from a friend.

Finally, marijuana is illegal. A criminal record is a hard thing for anyone to carry throughout his life. And some states still have severe penalties for simple possession. Many other countries have even stricter laws which include long-term jail sentences.

If you should find out that your child has experimented with marijuana once or twice, don't panic. Above all, don't let him assume that he's now a "hardened drug user" and must go and try everything.

Experimentation in even a healthy child is not something to get unduly upset about. However, a well-informed and well-counseled child who continues to experiment may be giving evidence of some other more deep-seated problem.

#### WHAT TO DO IF YOUR CHILD HAS A DRUG PROBLEM

There is always the possibility that you may discover that one of your children is in serious trouble due to the use of drugs. He may be psychologically dependent on them or even physically addicted.

The chances are, he will be relieved at the opportunity to talk to somebody about it.

Assume he's scared. He got into the thing himself. But now he's in over his head. Don't let your anger and distress over what the child has done move you to condemn the child. Recriminations or accusations at this point are useless. Remember, what he needs most is your love, support and help.

#### WHERE DO YOU TURN?

Different communities have different kinds of agencies that offer help with drug problems. But perhaps your best source of that help is your family doctor. He can usually be counted on to give medically-sound advice in the confidence of a patient-physician relationship. Do not be upset if your child would rather talk to a doctor than you. And don't press for all the details.

#### ASSUME YOUR RESPONSIBILITY

In the last analysis, however, the responsibility is yours. We urge you to remember these simple guidelines:

Teach your young children the proper uses of all medicines. Start early, when they are two or three.

With your older children, eight or nine is not too early to start some very simple discussion of illegal drugs. Don't assume that the job will be done by their school or church, or well-meaning friends. You must do it. And that's a crucially important task for all parents today.

With teenagers, the key thing is to be calm. Don't panic. Show your children where you stand. They want to know. They will respect honesty, and firm, loving guidance.

This parent-child dialogue can be the most effective drug-education effort.

#### SOME DRUGS OF ABUSE

DRUG NAME, SLANG NAME, HOW USED, AND EFFECTS AND DANGERS\*

##### Cannabis

Marijuana: Pot, Tea, Grass, Mary Jane, Weed, Smoke, Boo; smoked in "joints,"

\*The effect of any drug depends on the amount used, manner and frequency of use, and the strength of the drug.

"sticks," "reefers," pipes, eaten in food; euphoria, increased pulse rate. High doses may lead to reduced motivation, impulsive behavior, anxiety, bring on psychotic reaction.

Hashish: Hash; smoked, eaten; like marijuana, but about six times as strong. Tendency to hallucinate after high doses.

##### Hallucinogens

LSD, Mescaline, Psilocybin: Acid, Sunshine, Peyote, Mesc.; swallowed (capsules, liquid, sugar cubes), injected; hallucination, dilated pupils, unusual hilarity, intense anxiety, paranoid reaction, impairment of normal motivation, some prolonged psychotic reactions. Occasional recurrence of hallucinations with no new drug taken.

##### Stimulants

Amphetamines, Methamphetamines: Speed, Bennies, Dex, Hearts, Greenies, Pep Pills, Crystal; swallowed (tablets), sniffed as crystal, injected; Abnormal alertness and aggressiveness, loss of appetite, paranoid activities, acute depression as dose wears off ("crashing"), rapid tolerance build-up.

Cocaine: Coke, C., Dust, Snow, Speedballs (when mixed with heroin); sniffed or injected, hyperactivity, paranoid activities, possible convulsions.

##### Depressants

Barbiturates: Reds, Yellows, Blue Heavens, Barbs, Downs; swallowed (tablets or capsules), injected; sluggishness, faulty judgment. Physically addictive. Danger of death from overdose, especially in combination with alcohol or from unsupervised withdrawal.

Alcohol: Booze; swallowed (liquid); possible acute and chronic intoxication, cirrhosis, physical dependence and addiction, with serious withdrawal symptoms, including convulsions and delirium.

Tranquillizers: Quietters, Downers; swallowed (capsules); drowsiness, nausea. Possible physical dependence from use of excessive doses over long periods of time, with withdrawal symptoms, including convulsions.

##### Narcotics

Opium: Poppy, Black Stuff, Tar; smoked; euphoria, then drowsiness.

Heroin, (opium derivative): H, Horse, Skag, Junk, Stuff; sniffed, injected just under the skin ("skin popping") or into vein ("mainlining"); euphoria, then drowsiness. Likelihood of physical addiction with painful withdrawal or death from overdose.

Morphine (opium derivative): M, White Stuff, Dreamer; same as heroin; same as heroin. Slower-acting, longer-lasting.

#### ADMINISTRATION COVERUP OF RED CHINESE HEROIN CONTINUES

#### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Lewis Walt, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, testifying before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee August 14, 1972, on the sources of heroin in Asia, said:

All of this just doesn't make sense from the standpoint of criminal economics. It does make sense, however, if the operation was political in origin, because then it would only be natural for the organizers to want to hook as many G.I.'s as possible, as hard as possible, and as fast as possible—and to hook them, moreover, on a habit so expensive that they would have to engage in far more crime than the ordinary addict to feed the habit once

they returned home. The Communists had so much to gain from such an operation—

Special report No. 112 "China and Drugs," prepared by the Strategic Intelligence Office of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs (BNDD), says:

In each case the (opium) traffickers were people engaged in criminal activity for the usual profit motive.

There could not be a more complete contradiction than in these two statements, one by a Marine General of unquestioned integrity and long service in the Far East, the other by bureaucrats of an administration which has staked its prestige on trade and friendly relations with an avowed enemy, Red China. Most Americans will find it hard to disbelieve General Walt on a matter of this importance, especially when it can be shown that BNDD has not told the truth in its special report.

Evidently alarmed by the rapidly accumulating evidence of massive Red Chinese involvement in the heroin traffic—see my newsletters 72-17, 72-19 and 72-21—and stung by the persistence of those who will not keep quiet about it, the Nixon administration has now gone so far as to deny officially that any significant amount of the killer heroin that is blasting the lives of 600,000 Americans today comes from the poppy fields of Red China. This almost incredible statement has to be branded for what it is: an outright lie. Reasonable men may differ as to the percentage of the heroin sold to drug addicts which comes out of Red China, but in view of the fact that this percentage is reliably estimated as high as 80, to say that there is no significant amount cannot possibly be true.

The BNDD special report states unequivocally that:

Not one investigation into heroin traffic in the area [Southeast Asia] during the past two years indicates Chinese Communist involvement.

In almost the next sentence the cover-up begins with this statement:

The origin of the raw opium can also be traced to the producing area of the Golden Triangle, little of which is under Communist control.

This statement is also a lie. The "Golden Triangle" refers to that part of Southeast Asia where Laos, Thailand and Burma come together. The readily ascertainable facts show that most of this area is under Communist control. In Laos virtually the entire region where opium poppies are, or easily can be grown, has been taken over by the North Vietnamese and Chinese Communists, as two men who are probably more thoroughly and personally acquainted with this area than any other Americans—Dr. Charles L. Weldon and Edgar "Pop" Buell—have both testified this year before the House Internal Security Committee. If there is dope coming from there, it is Communist dope and BNDD knows it.

In Burma, the BNDD line is that the poppy producers are simply tribes that cannot be controlled by the Burmese Government. What they do not say is that, according to the area handbook of



Burma published by the U.S. Government last year, the rebellious tribes in the opium-growing parts of Burma—primarily upper Shan state—are Communist-led, and armed and equipped by Red China. A refugee from Red China, whom my staff and I have personally questioned, reports that those Burmese rebels are paying for their weapons by sending their opium crop to Red China for refining. She also reports that she personally saw Red Chinese Army units harvesting opium in the southernmost province of China, Yunnan. The late Francis E. Walter, former chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, pointed out on September 21, 1961, that it was in Yunnan Province many years ago that Mao Tse-tung, then head of only a small band of conspirators, "conceived the Chinese Communist policy of narcotics peddling or 'soul poison.'"

On July 27 President Nixon asked for \$135 million more to fight drug abuse, including funds for a major new office of national narcotics intelligence to be headed by William C. Sullivan. The late FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover dismissed this man from a top FBI position after he made speeches all over the country denying that organized Communist activity presents a significant danger to the internal security of the United States. Apparently this is regarded as good background and preparation for the work of this new office. It reminds me of a statement I once heard Tom Anderson make:

They have just invented a new deodorant called "Stereo." The smell is the same, but you can't tell where it's coming from.

#### SHRIVER DISTORTS FACTS

### HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the following "Letter to the Editor" from the Sunday, September 3, 1972, Plain Dealer, speaks for itself:

PEACE CORPS EX-AIDE SAYS: "SHRIVER DISTORTS FACTS"

As one who served in the Peace Corps, I have had high esteem for Sargent Shriver because of the many wise policies and traditions he established as its first director. Among these was the "apolitical" concept of Peace Corps, keeping it free from partisan politics and developing bipartisan support in Congress for its programs.

To witness Shriver now using the Peace Corps as a political issue is disappointing. Furthermore, his statement that the Peace Corps has failed to prosper under the Nixon administration implies a neglect by Nixon. Shriver should know better than most people that President Nixon saved the Peace Corps. This past spring he transferred badly needed funds to it by executive authority after the Democratic-controlled Congress failed to appropriate sufficient money to keep Peace Corps a viable agency.

If President Nixon had not taken this extraordinary action using executive authority to provide more money to Peace Corps, it would have been necessary to bring home prematurely over 2,300 volunteers who were serving in about 45 countries. This would have abrogated commitments made in good faith to those idealistic Americans who were

prepared to give two years of service in Peace Corps, as well as to the developing countries that were being helped by the personal efforts of these Americans.

Shriver has badly tarnished his own image with those of us who believe the Peace Corps can and should be apolitical. Additionally, his willingness to distort the facts for a political expediency makes us more skeptical of other issues he is raising.

KEVIN O'DONNELL,

Former Associate Director of Action for International Operations (Head of the Peace Corps)

#### THE EXPORT OF U.S. JOBS

### HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I present at this time two statements by the executive council of the AFL-CIO. One deals with the export of U.S. jobs, the other with Workman's Compensation. I call attention to these reports because of their timeliness. With the election of a President and Congress a few short weeks away, it is very important for all of us to realize that the issues being discussed in the press and other media by the candidates are not striking at some of the very serious root causes of this Nation's problems. The exportation of jobs has been the subject matter of many discussions by myself and others on the floor of the House. We have attempted to awaken the Congress and the people to the serious threat to our economy in the area of job opportunities. In answer to the problem, apparently the only thing being done is a coverup of spectacular maneuvers and red herring, high level meetings here and abroad.

Recently the President journeyed to Hawaii and, like the mountain, he labored hard and brought forth a mouse. He met with the new Japanese Premier who graciously agreed to purchase a billion dollars worth of American goods and products in order to cover up this administration's very sad record of the exportation of jobs through the importation of Japanese products.

Usually, the freetraders have some answer which is based upon an outdated philosophy which overlooks the dangers of unlimited imports into our consumer market. However, I find it hard to get satisfaction out of any of the answers that they give when I look at the serious facts which have developed in the last 10 years. Imports into the United States moved from \$16,500,000,000 to an annual rate of \$53,800,000,000 in 1972. Automobiles are up from \$433 million to \$6 billion, iron and steel up 379 percent, computer and office machines up 790 percent, radios and TV sets up 927 percent, footwear up 574 percent, clothing up 354 percent, machinery up 740 percent and last but not least one of the greatest job-killing products that is imported is transportation equipment—buses and trucks—up 1,284 percent from \$719,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000. The source of this information is the

U.S. Department of Commerce. Some of us have predicted that the increase during this 10-year period has been destructive to the American economy, but I know of no person who dared to estimate that the growth would be anywhere near this tremendous volume in these and other products which are now pouring into the American marketplace. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the timely action of the AFL-CIO in this regard certainly should be given more consideration by the Congress.

Closer to home, right here in Washington, D.C., the new Metro system, which will cost approximately \$1 billion before it is completed, keeps right on buying and contracting for foreign-made products. In a recent bid for an earth tunnel on the Carrollton route, the bid form was written in such a way that options gave the bidder the choice of American products or foreign products. Apparently, the successful bidder is buying cast iron lining for the tunnel that is no longer made in the United States in any form and, therefore, the entire project will be supplied by Great Britain.

In that way American taxpayers' money is flowing directly out of the country and taking with it hundreds of man-hours of work. As a result, American workmen will continue to beat their paths to the welfare offices to get their handouts.

The Metro tried to put in the Buy American provision, but were ordered by the administration to repeal the resolution. This would have guaranteed that the work and millions of dollars of other work the Metro will do would have remained here for domestic labor. Attached, Mr. Speaker, are the two resolutions. The first one covers the matter of the export of U.S. jobs and the second one deals with the great necessity of Federal action on workmen's compensation laws. I am sure they will be helpful to the Members.

The resolutions follow:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON THE EXPORT OF U.S. JOBS, CHICAGO, ILL., AUGUST 28, 1972

The AFL-CIO has repeatedly called for the U.S. Government to regulate and curb the accelerating U.S. export of jobs, production, technology and capital to subsidiaries and other affiliates abroad.

One clear example is the Mexican situation. Today there are about 350 assembly operation plants under the Border Industry Program in Mexico, employing more than 46,000 workers at wages of 20 to 58 cents hourly. An increase of 1,000 new jobs per month has been reported in the last six months in these industries. Total employment in the Border Program is expected to reach 50,000 by 1973.

But the so-called "Border Program" has been extended to a "Mexican Industry Program" with plants operating throughout Mexico. Some of these plants have multinational connections around the world. Japanese companies are already firmly entrenched in Mexico, assembling components used in their U.S. production facilities in California, where the labor force is largely Mexican nationals.

The security of American workers and their families is clearly adversely affected by Mexican workers who commute to the U.S. to work, returning to Mexico at night. Mexico remains a non-consumer based

economy, highly managed by government direction and closed to imports that it determines are not necessary for Mexican development. U.S. and foreign firms have invested billions of dollars in subsidiaries and other affiliates to produce in Mexico, largely for export back to the United States, causing a widespread loss of job opportunities in this country.

Haiti, too, is rapidly becoming a haven for U.S. businessmen seeking low wage labor. Some 15,000 jobs have been created in hundreds of light manufacturing and assembly plants in Haiti, mostly American-owned. The products are returned principally to the U.S. market. Wages in Haiti are 70 cents per day.

Similar business interests now propose making Costa Rica another haven for runaway firms.

The AFL-CIO opposes the practice by U.S. Embassy officials of brokering cheap labor markets and poor working conditions in Mexico, Haiti and elsewhere at the expense of American taxpayer, worker and consumer.

Adoption of the Burke-Hartke bill is a necessity to stop the special tax advantages and import privileges of American companies operating abroad. The time has come for the U.S. Government to end the disastrous conditions it is creating in the American economy through the award of undeserved tariff and tax privileges for runaway capital and technology. Should these disastrous practices not be halted immediately by the U.S. Government, a crisis of tragic proportions can develop in this country.

The AFL-CIO again urges the Congress to pass the Burke-Hartke bill in the interest of national economic security and the jobs of American workers.

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION, CHICAGO, ILL., AUGUST 29, 1972

The National Commission on State Workmen's Compensation Laws, established by Congress to undertake a comprehensive study and evaluation of state workmen's compensation laws in order to determine if such laws provided a prompt, adequate, and equitable system of workmen's compensation for American workers and their families, recently reported to the President and the Congress.

The Commission report states:

The inescapable conclusion is that state workmen's compensation laws in general are inadequate and inequitable.

This emphatic conclusion was unanimous, without a single member of the Commission—18 individuals representing every major interest group concerned with workmen's compensation issues—expressing a dissenting view.

The Commission report reinforces in almost every instance the AFL-CIO position of the need for sweeping changes to modernize the present system of compensating the victims of work injury and disease.

The Commission report, in general, found that coverage, weekly benefit amounts, medical benefits and rehabilitation benefits were inadequate. In many instances these same elements of workmen's compensation were also found to be inequitable. The report was critical of the failure of state administration of workmen's compensation, and the lack of interest in the program by state legislators. The Commission was appalled at the existing low level of wage replacement benefits provided by state programs. It was also critical of the failure of the state programs to cover all occupational injury and diseases, the failure of many states to permit injured workers to select their own doctor for treatment, and the imposition of arbitrary and unrealistic limits on benefits and medical care. The Commission report included numerous recommendations for improving the existing program and the enactment of federal mandates in 1975 if the states failed to establish

programs conforming to their recommendations.

Major recommendations outlined in the Commission report include:

#### WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

"Compulsory coverage of all wage and salary workers without numerical or occupational exemptions—agricultural workers, domestic workers, and public employees should be extended the full protection of workmen's compensation in the same manner as other workers in the labor force.

"Complete coverage of all work related injuries and diseases.

"Full medical care and rehabilitation services without limit as to time or dollar amounts.

"Weekly benefit amounts should be at least 80 percent of the worker's spendable weekly earnings.

"The benefit structure of the entire workmen's compensation program should be substantially improved by increasing the maximum weekly benefit to 200 percent of the state average weekly wage.

The 200 percent maximum benefit level to be reached in periodic increases between July, 1973 and July, 1981.

"Free choice of physician by injured worker.

"Injured worker should be given a choice and permitted to file a claim in the state of injury, state of hire, or state where employment is principally located.

"Workers receiving benefits based on former wage levels—those injured years ago—should have their benefits adjusted to current wage levels through establishment of a special fund for this purpose."

The AFL-CIO has been urging the states to make improvements similar to the Commission's recommendations for many years. Our experience demonstrates that the states are unwilling or unable to modernize workmen's compensation programs. Federal legislation is needed now to achieve this goal.

The Commission recognized this need, but recommended a delay of three years before federal action is taken.

The AFL-CIO cannot support this recommendation of the Commission. We urge the Congress to make enactment of Federal workmen's compensation standards a matter of the highest priority in 1973.

#### OUR ENVIRONMENT

#### HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, we, as legislators, as well as all the people of the United States, face a problem which no other society in the history of the world has had to face. We are running out of clean land, clean air, clean water.

Look at Lake Erie with its slimy shores and wasted waters, supporting ever fewer forms of life. Stand on a hill overlooking one of our major cities and watch the mustard-colored haze drifting everywhere. In my own Chicago area, Lake Michigan is being threatened with extinction and its tributaries are being clogged with waste materials. These are not isolated examples, but reflect widespread conditions across America.

Our Nation, as the industrial leader and example to the world, must take the initiative in finding ways to heal these ravages on our environment. We, as individual citizens, must bring to manage-

able terms the waste materials of our daily lives.

In the last few years, many pollution abatement bills have been enacted into law, and as a result, we are beginning to witness tangible results in the struggle to protect our environment. I have actively supported every piece of effective environmental legislation brought before the Congress, including the Water Quality Improvement Act, the Environmental Policy Act, the Clean Air Act, the Environmental Pesticide Control Act, the Clean Water Restoration Act, the Water Pollution Control Act, the Wildlife Protection Act, the Resource Recovery Act which provides for solid waste disposal, and other landmark legislation.

Additionally, the Noise Control Act recently was passed by the House of Representatives, and hopefully, before the conclusion of the 92d Congress, it will also be passed by the Senate and signed into law. This bill, which I supported, would coordinate Federal noise control and research activities as well as establish noise emission standards for new products and streamline enforcement of noise abatement laws. The provisions of this bill will go a long way toward helping to alleviate the noise problem in the areas surrounding airports such as O'Hare International Airport in Chicago.

I am glad to report that Federal funds authorized by this Congress are now being utilized to clean up the north branch of the Chicago River. The Corps of Army Engineers is expected to complete removal of debris from the north branch by December and in order to keep this waterway clean thereafter, I have sponsored legislation to provide for maintenance on an annual basis—so the north branch may stay clean and may be utilized, as it once was, for recreational purposes by the residents of the northwest side of Chicago.

I have also introduced legislation to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment. No single committee presently exists in the House of Representatives or in the Senate for the sole purpose of anticipating and planning for the many changes taking place in the total ecological system. It is of paramount importance that we develop the ability to plan ahead and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in harmony. Establishment of the joint committee which I have proposed would go a long way toward achieving this objective.

We have made substantial advances in the field of water quality by establishing nationwide standards for pure water and providing money to local areas to help them achieve these standards. Liability has been established for cleanup costs of oil spills and controls have been specified on acid mine drainage. Since most of our air pollution is caused by automobiles, strict standards have been set by the Congress. Industrial pollution is being reduced, and certain dangerous pesticides have been banned. We have made considerable progress, but much remains to be done.

In our democratic society, we are committed to development of policies which insure maximum individual freedom and



human development. These worthy objectives cannot be achieved in a decaying and overburdened environment. We must devise policies that take full account of the impact of technological development on the environment and we must continue to provide the programs and the funds necessary to eliminate environmental pollution. As I have done in the past, I shall continue to work for the enactment of the strongest possible environmental laws and shall continue to support full funding for our existing programs.

## NIXON HAS STRONG EDGE AMONG CATHOLICS

### HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, we generally are not interested in religion as a factor in politics. However, the amount of space that has been given to it this fall certainly indicates that among some Catholics, there has been a decided shift at the Presidential level.

A recent poll of the New York Times-Yankelovich survey of voters shows that the President has a 24-point lead over Mr. McGovern among Roman Catholics nationally.

The surprising part of the Times-Yankelovich survey is that Mr. Nixon has a lead over Mr. McGovern of 35 points in New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey. This represents an 11-point stronger lead for the President among Catholics in those three States than nationally.

Former Mayor Robert F. Wagner, who is serving as chairman of McGovern's New York State campaign, frankly admitted it in an interview and attributes it to the Nixon stand on abortion and aid to parochial schools. I attach herewith the article by Mr. William E. Farrell in the New York Times Sunday, September 17, titled "Nixon Has Strong Edge Among Catholics in Area."

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 17, 1972]

#### NIXON HAS STRONG EDGE AMONG CATHOLICS IN AREA

(By William E. Farrell)

President Nixon's edge over Senator George McGovern in their race for President is greater among Roman Catholics in New York, Connecticut and New Jersey than among Roman Catholics nationally.

That is among the findings of a recent New York Times-Yankelovich survey of voters, which showed the President with a 24-point lead over Mr. McGovern among Roman Catholics nationally. In the tristate area, Mr. Nixon's lead over the Senator from South Dakota was 35 points.

Persons associated with Mr. McGovern's campaign are aware of Mr. Nixon's popularity with tristate Catholic voters, and they explain it in various ways.

A basic clue to the different figures in the poll was that a larger proportion of tristate Catholics identified themselves as Republicans than did in the national sampling, while fewer of them said they were independent.

"What lies beneath all this is suburbanization of the Catholics in the last 20 years," said Richard C. Wade, a City University urban-affairs professor and former chairman of Mr. McGovern's campaign organization in New York State. "That differential looks like a suburban differential."

#### BLOC TREND CUT

A major migration in the last decade, Mr. Wade said, has been the movement of Catholics, mainly Irish and Italian, from the cities to the suburbs.

Once these Democratic urban enclaves are broken up, the long-time pattern of bloc voting is diminished.

Once scattered through the suburbs, "they vote less like a bloc and tend to take on the dominant views of the community in which they live," Mr. Wade said.

Former Mayor Robert F. Wagner, who is serving as chairman of Mr. McGovern's state election campaign, said in an interview: "Frankly, at this stage it's Nixon getting into the abortion battle—Nixon's speeches on aid to parochial schools."

This was a reference to the President's unusual action last May, when he enunciated his support in a letter to Cardinal Cooke of a campaign to repeal the state's liberalized abortion law.

The letter was made public at about the time the Legislature was considering repeal of the controversial liberalized law. Both houses voted to repeal the measure, but Governor Rockefeller vetoed the repeal bill.

Similarly, the President has committed himself to extending Federal aid to Roman Catholic schools and the issue of governmental aid to parochial schools has been enmeshed in tristate politics in recent years, particularly in New York.

Mr. Wagner and others said that Mr. McGovern's views on these and other issues close to Catholics were not well-enough known.

Mr. McGovern has said that the Federal Government should not be involved in legislation regarding abortion and that it is up to individual states to decide the issue.

Like Mr. Nixon, he feels that a constitutional means can be found to provide funds for financially strapped parochial-school students.

#### "BECOME CONSERVATIVE"

Like Mr. Wade, Mr. Wagner said that the growth of the suburbs, which are predominantly Republican, was a major factor for the Catholic sentiment for the President.

"They become more prosperous and tend to become a little more conservative," Mr. Wagner said. "At this stage a lot of them don't know McGovern."

As Catholic voters—mainly of Italian and Irish extraction—moved from the cities they tended to lose their identification with the Democratic party, said Paul O'Dwyer, a leading reform Democrat, and "they've become very conservative."

Mrs. Jean Westwood, the new national Democratic chairman, said that the reason for the large Catholic margin for Mr. Nixon was that "George McGovern hasn't been in there [the state] much."

"As George McGovern appears in the state," Mrs. Westwood said, and makes his "true position" known, the margin will shrink.

"It's a volatile vote this year," she said.

#### REVENUE SHARING—WHAT REVENUE?

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as the President reports to the people that he

will not seek tax increases, he asks Congress to increase the debt ceiling by \$15 billion to a historic new first of \$465 billion, and Congress prepares for the up-coming national election by enactment of a revenue-sharing bill.

The American people should simply ask: If our Nation is further in debt than ever before, and if the President is not going to increase taxes, what revenue will be shared?

Many informed working people have now learned that the Government has no money that it does not deduct from their individual paychecks. Revenue sharing comes only as deductions from paychecks.

Several newspaper clippings follow:

[From the Evening Star and the Daily News, Sept. 18, 1972]

#### SHARING WHAT REVENUE?

The federal budget is running so far in the red that, at present tax rates, it will be along about 1977 before the federal government has some disposable money to start new programs.

For all that, the Congress is well on its way to passing a revenue-sharing bill, one that will pass along more than \$30 billion to state and local governments over the next five years. The money obviously will represent deficit spending, and it will increase the pressure for new federal taxes.

We won't belabor the point too much, for it looks as if nothing at this point can stop the revenue-sharing bill. It has the inevitability of a glacier on the move. President Nixon long ago gave it his support, which he is not about to change in the middle of an election year. The House passed the bill in June. The Senate, by a vote of 63-20, passed a similar measure last week. How could they dare not? With great expectations, governors, mayors and county commissioners have been waiting for the money so long they had begun to count the cash as already theirs. Some of them even had budgeted it for the current fiscal year.

Since the two versions of the bill differed on several important points, the opportunity was there for the House-Senate conference committee to make the legislation more palatable. On balance, the conferees fumbled the opportunity.

The Senate, moving to halt a run-away program for welfare-related social services, had attached the program to revenue sharing and had stipulated a \$1 billion ceiling. Something like that was essential, for without it, the federal government would have been obligated to spend on social services alone nearly \$5 billion this year. It also promised to ease the task of redrafting the big HEW-Labor appropriations bill, which President Nixon recently vetoed as too expensive, largely because it included the unchecked social-services subsidies. Conferees from the House, which did not address the problem in its own revenue-sharing measure, did go along with the Senate, as they should have. But then the conferees casually raised the subsidy limit from \$1 billion to \$2.5 billion, more than twice the amount the administration considers fiscally defensible.

On a second point of major difference, the Senate had changed the House-approved formula for distributing revenue-sharing money to favor rural states over large, industrialized states and, within the states, to favor central cities over suburbs. It was a tricky combination but on the whole a backward step. The conferees should have adopted the House formula but instead took a middle course between the two bills.

Revenue sharing is certain to become a fixed part of government operations. But it remains a question as to where Uncle Sam will get the revenues to share with the states and cities.

[From the Evening Star and Daily News, Sept. 15, 1972]

#### \$15 BILLION U.S. DEBT RISE ASKED

The Nixon administration is asking Congress to raise the federal debt ceiling by \$15 billion to \$465 billion.

Treasury Secretary George P. Shultz, who made the request in a letter to the House Ways and Means Committee yesterday, will argue the case at a hearing before the committee.

The decision to ask for a \$15 billion increase is based on revised estimates of the budget deficit for fiscal 1973, the year ending next June 30. The most recent official estimate by the administration, in June, projected a \$27 billion deficit, but independent analysts expect a deficit of \$30 billion to \$35 billion.

President Nixon's demand for a rigid limit holding federal spending to \$250 billion probably will overshadow the debt ceiling issue. The administration wants the spending limit included in the debt legislation.

Congress must act on the debt ceiling by Oct. 31, because otherwise the present limit of \$450 billion would drop automatically to \$400 billion. The debt subject to the statutory ceiling is about \$437 billion and rising.

#### MCGOVERN CREDIBILITY

#### HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Richard Wilson writing in last Friday's edition of the Evening Star discusses some popular myths which most people believe to be factual. One is the well-known attribution to President Nixon of a claim to have a "secret plan" to end the war. As Mr. Wilson points out, William Safire has carefully researched the subject and has been able to find neither any documentation of this claim nor any person who believes that Mr. Nixon made the claim who can document it. Yet Senator McGovern continues to perpetuate the myth, and to deride the President for failing to reveal the nature of this "secret plan" which never existed. I challenge the distinguished Senator to point out the occasion on which the President made such a claim, and if he cannot do so it would seem to me to be appropriate for the Senator to discontinue this libel.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wilson continues along the same lines to point out that, contrary to popular belief, Senator McGovern has never specifically withdrawn his pledge to institute a \$1,000 grant for everybody in spite of the fact that the impracticality of this scheme has been amply demonstrated, not least by the detailed study performed by the staff of the House Republican conference. And in checking on Mr. Wilson, I find that he is quite correct, that at least in his speech before the New York Society of Security Analysts, there is no specific mention of a withdrawal of that proposal.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I challenge Senator McGovern to inject some honesty into his treatment of the voters. Does he, too, finally recognize the impracticality, and if so is the \$1,000 Dem-

ocrat grant on which he conducted his entire primary campaign now to be considered officially withdrawn?

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include the Wilson column from the September 15 Evening Star, and the Safire letter to the editor from the September 12 New York Times:

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 15, 1972]

SHRIVER ERRS IN HIS DENIALS OF \$1,000 FOR ALL

(By Richard Wilson)

Vice presidential candidate Sargent Shriver denies that George S. McGovern ever proposed his \$1,000-for-everybody plan. It was just a figure used in a "study paper," according to Shriver.

McGovern's running mate evidently does not believe the literature of his own campaign. The McGovern for President Committee's voluminous summary of "McGovern on the Issues" contains an outline of an "income distribution plan" with an annual payment "that might be as much as \$1,000 per person or \$4,000 for a family of four." Shriver's denial thus takes on the same plausibility as his charge that President Nixon "blew" a chance to settle the Vietnam War.

McGovern speaks no more of the controversial \$1,000 idea, leading to the perhaps erroneous conclusion that he has dropped it. He has not, however, dropped his references to President Nixon's "secret plan" to end the Vietnam war although it is amply proved that Nixon never said he had a "secret plan," in fact had none, and did not pretend to have one.

The only "secret plan" was in the imagination of those who wished to deride Nixon's commitment to end the war, and is now being repeated endlessly in campaign orations, newspaper advertisements and television broadcasts.

William Safire, a presidential speechwriter and tireless researcher of political lore, has exploded the myth of the Nixon "secret plan" in an analysis which defies challenge. Confronted by the analysis, various perpetrators of the myth have admitted their error, but not McGovern.

The source of the "secret plan" myth was apparently Nixon's speech in the presidential primary campaign of 1968 at Nashua, N.H.: "And I pledge to you the new leadership (evidently a Republican administration) will end the war and win the peace in the Pacific . . ." This statement was translated by reporters and politicians into the idea that a plan existed, although Nixon said he had "no magic formula, no gimmick" and if he did would tell Lyndon Johnson.

He said he had some specific ideas on how to end the war, and "they are primarily in the diplomatic area." That, in the beginning, was the area in which Nixon moved and he sent his representative Henry Cabot Lodge, to Paris with a new diplomatic initiative that failed.

In September of that year I lunched alone with Cabot Lodge in his suite at the Crillon Hotel in Paris. Lodge said then, and I take the liberty of repeating now, that Nixon's confidence in new diplomatic moves had been unrealistic. Nixon had learned there would have to be much more than that.

The "plan," if it can be called that, which then developed was the unilateral withdrawal of American ground combat forces from Vietnam, at first experimental, and soon becoming irreversible policy.

There is nothing secret about anything Nixon did thereafter. He undertook a combination of military and diplomatic pressures to force Hanoi to a settlement accepting an independent South Vietnam. Military pressure was applied in Cambodia and Laos, through air support of South Vietnamese

ground operations, heavy bombing of the North and mining Hanoi's harbors. Diplomatic pressure was applied in Moscow and Peking in direct personal contact with the leaders of Hanoi's main supporters.

Little of that could have been planned in advance. Prince Sihanouk's ouster in Cambodia had not yet created the opportunity for an allied incursion. Hanoi had not yet begun its outright invasion of the South which created the opportunity and justification for heavy bombing and mining the harbors. Chou En-lai and Leonid Brezhnev had not yet agreed to receive Nixon.

On the evidence, the "secret plan" idea falls on its face, joining there on the floor Sargent Shriver's pretense that McGovern never proposed \$1,000-for-everybody.

In point of fact, McGovern has not repudiated \$1,000-for-everybody. This is another journalistic construction on his opening campaign speech in New York but the speech itself can be examined in vain for a direct repudiation.

The idea is still there but obscured now by proposals increasing taxes on the long-term gains of investors in stocks and real property, and of primary concern to at least 30 million such investors.

"Secret plan" there was not, a plan for income redistribution there certainly is. And so the campaign rocks along with somewhat more than its share of hyperbolic nonsense.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 12, 1972]

THE SECRET OF MR. NIXON'S "SECRET PLAN"

(By William Safire)

WASHINGTON.—"The Old Guard dies, but never surrenders." Those ringing words were supposed to have been said by Gen. Pierre Etienne de Cambronne, commanding Napoleon's Imperial Guard at Waterloo, when called upon to surrender.

He never said it. A reporter named Rougemont invented the remark some time after the battle, and General de Cambronne went to his grave firmly denying he was the author of the famous phrase.

Could that happen in modern times? With tape recorders, press conferences, attributed quotations, microfilm records—is it still possible to invent and then perpetuate a quotation?

Consider this one: "I have a secret plan to end the war."

Who said it? Why, Richard Nixon of course. When? On March 5, 1968, in Nashua, N.H. Or did he?

Everybody says he did, carefully using quotation marks to show the "secret plan" was right out of the 1968 candidate's mouth.

As George McGovern put it in 1971: "Three years ago, Richard Nixon campaigned on the pledge that he had a 'secret plan to end the war.' . . ." McGovern returned to the theme in his acceptance speech: "I have no 'secret plan.' . . ."

John Lofton, editor of the Republican National Committee's weekly publication, "Monday," has made a hobby of writing a polite query to everybody who quotes Richard Nixon directly as having used the words "secret plan." Once in a while he gets a reply.

The most forthright of these came from Anthony Lewis of The New York Times, who wrote in October 1969: "I think you have caught me in a mistake. The truth is I wrote that out of the same general impression that so many people seem to have. But I have now checked back through our files and agree with you that I cannot find the precise phrase 'a plan' in what Mr. Nixon said during 1968."

What Mr. Lewis did find, and what is most often cited as the basis for "secret plan," was this remark of Mr. Nixon's on March 5, 1968, in Nashua, N.H.: "And I pledge to you the new leadership will end the war and win the peace in the Pacific. . . ."



In late 1970, John B. Oakes, editor of the editorial page of *The New York Times*, responded to a new query on another use of the "plan" by citing the same quotation and asking: "How could he make such a pledge if he didn't have a plan?" The *Times* editor argued: "It seems obvious that Mr. Nixon implied that he had a plan when he gave his pledge. But, as I say, it was doubtless an error to put the words in quotes and if that is what you want me to admit, I am glad to do so, and to state that it won't appear that way in this context again." Nor did it—in *The Times*.

Not everyone was willing to stop using the phrase when its unreliability was pointed out. N.B.C.'s Edwin Newman replied: "When I spoke of a secret plan, I did not mean it as a quotation. It was shorthand, which is sometimes unavoidable, for a plan that the President said he had and the particulars sometimes unavoidable, for a plan that the President said he had and the particulars of which he said he could not divulge without impairing the plan's chance of success." (Italics mine.)

Did Mr. Nixon ever say he had a "plan," secret or otherwise? He did not; nobody who has been challenged on the use of a direct quotation on this has ever come up with the citation of time or place. Mr. Nixon never said it; the use of quotation marks is inaccurate, unfair and misleading. But it continues, error feeding on error, as a myth becomes accepted as truth. The question then becomes—if he did not actually say it, did he imply that he had a secret plan? His remarks on March 5, 1968, in Nashua, N.H., were a pledge "to end the war and win the peace." He continued he had no "pushbutton technique" in mind, but would "mobilize our economic and diplomatic and political leadership."

Not surprisingly, both press and political opponents came back with the question "How?" Newsmen pressed for details, and

when no plan was set forth, its absence was noted. The first use of the word "plan" that I could find was in the March 11, 1968, *New York Times* subhead: "Nixon Withholds His Peace Ideas. Says to Tell Details of Plan Would Sap His Bargaining Strength If He's Elected." The Associated Press lead three days later added to the idea of a specific plan, necessarily cloaked in secrecy: "Richard M. Nixon says the reason he is not ready to spell out the details of his plan to end the war in Vietnam is because he is reserving his 'big guns' for use against President Johnson if he wins the Republican Presidential nomination."

In that A.P. story, Mr. Nixon stressed that he had "no magic formula, no gimmick. If I had a gimmick I would tell Lyndon Johnson." The furthest he would be drawn into a discussion of a "plan" was this: "But I do have some specific ideas on how to end the war. They are primarily in the diplomatic area."

That's as much as the clips I have seen shown about the "plan." Would a fairminded person say they constitute the basis for an inference that the candidate possessed a detailed, and necessarily secret, panacea for the conflict? I think not—no more than one would infer that Senator McGovern has a "secret plan" to fulfill his pledge to bring back the prisoners in ninety days.

Throughout the campaign and on into the years ahead, we can expect to hear some orators and commentators use a little inflection around "secret plan" that makes it sound like a quotation. The quotation thereof is no dark media conspiracy, just an example of how some writers and cartoonists, too lazy to check source materials, casually pick up and perpetuate an error. A small but hardy band of newsmen, with no constituency but objectivity, will wince when they see the nonquote quoted.

TRIBUTE TO THE HON. DURWARD G. HALL

## HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1972

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those who have paid tribute to my good friend from Missouri, Dr. HALL, on his 62d birthday, the last which he will enjoy as a Member of this House. Very rarely have the good doctor and I agreed on legislative matters, but we have shared a common love for this country and a common desire to make America a better place. Our only differences have come on the means to arrive at these goals.

For many years, Dr. HALL has carefully scrutinized legislation and caused all of us who advocate a larger role for the Federal Government to make sure that all our "i's" are dotted and our "t's" crossed, because if we fall short in this area we are sure to hear about it from Dr. HALL and my good friend from Iowa, the other half of the Hall-Gross team. But in this role the gentleman from Missouri like the gentleman from Iowa, has made a significant contribution to the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, I for one will miss Dr. HALL and I know I speak for all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle and I wish him all the best in the years ahead. He is a very great American and this House and this Nation are better for having him come this way.

## SENATE—Tuesday, September 19, 1972

The Senate met at 8:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

### PRAYER

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

Our Father God, we thank Thee for the freshness of the morning, for the promise of the new day, and for the hope of high accomplishment in so many areas of need. In the heat and burden of these anxious days, which drain our strength and demand our best, we remember Thy Word, "in quietness and confidence shall be our strength." While we work for the things which must be done now, keep ever before us the vision of Thy eternal kingdom. With the benediction of the morning prayer upon us may we face the toil of the day with zeal for the truth, with honor held bright, with hatred of all deceit and hypocrisy, and with the knowledge that all great and noble service is based on magnanimity, patience, and self-giving. Thus may we have a part in bringing a redeemed world into the fullness of Thy kingdom.

We pray in His name who went about doing good. Amen.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., September 19, 1972.  
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
President pro tempore.

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

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, September 18, 1972, be dispensed with.

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

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

### ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will please state the first nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Antonin Scalia, of Virginia, to be Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

### NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—IN THE COAST GUARD

The second assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Routine nominations placed on the Secretary's desk, in the Coast Guard.