

the Senate deletion of title X from the legislation.

I am strongly in favor of the concept establishing mineral resources institutes. For this reason, I cosponsored S. 635, legislation to establish such institutes throughout the Nation.

This legislation was considered by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and passed the Senate on July 15, 1971. The bill is expected to be considered shortly in the House of Representatives.

The Mineral Resources Research Institutes established under S. 635 are patterned on the highly successful Water Resource Research Institutes for which the Congress provided several years ago. This program has been highly successful, and there is every reason to believe that a similar program for mineral resource research would be successful also.

The approach provided in S. 635 is far superior to title X of S. 659 which provides the mineral conservation education program that is not adequate and in addition very clumsy and indirect since it would be administered by the Commissioner of Education only with the advice and consent of the Secretary of the Interior. Is the middleman truly necessary? Furthermore, since S. 635 is an amendment to the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970, in which the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the state of domestic mining and so forth, is clearly stated, the Secretary should also be designated as the administrator of a mineral research and training program authorized by the Congress.

In addition, the provision of S. 635 will insure that research conducted under the program is not diluted and that the research and development under the program will provide valuable results. Much productive activity can be and is being undertaken at the graduate level. With the Federal assistance under S. 635, this effort can be materially increased and in time there can be sufficient feedback so as to furnish incentive for instructional activities at the advanced undergraduate level.

The very real concern for environmental impact which all mining activities must demonstrate is more than sufficient justification for this program of research and training. It is timely, and I strongly urge that the Senate conferees refuse to accept title X of the House-passed legislation and instead insist on a program for mineral research and development as established under S. 635, legislation previously passed by the Senate and to be shortly considered by the House of Representatives.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the program for Monday next is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 10 a.m. After the two leaders have been recognized under the standing order, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes, at the conclusion of which the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The unfinished business will be the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to the House amendment in the nature of a substitute to S. 659. By virtue of the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into earlier today, the pending amendment by Mr. Scott and Mr. Javits will not be the pending question on Monday; but that amendment will go over until Tuesday, along with all other so-called civil rights amendments. On Monday, the committee substitute will be open to further amendment with respect to so-called

noncivil rights amendments, on which there will be a time limitation of 1 hour on each amendment.

Mr. President, there is a possibility of rollcall votes on Monday, and the program for Tuesday next will be stated on Monday.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1972

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:53 p.m. the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 28, 1972, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 25, 1972:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Robert Stephen Ingersoll, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

William A. Stoltzfus, Jr., of New Jersey, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Kuwait, to the State of Bahrain, and to the State of Qatar, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Sultanate of Oman and to the United Arab Emirates.

ACTION

Kevin O'Donnell, of Maryland, to be an Associate Director of Action.

OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

William Rinehart Pearce, of Minnesota, to be a Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for terms expiring December 17, 1974:

Dan W. Lufkin, of Connecticut.

J. D. Stetson Coleman, of Virginia.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 25, 1972

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal of February 18 contains an excellent editorial on the subject of national economic policy.

The editorial focuses on the recent remarks of Mr. Herbert Stein, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, before the National Press Club. It is pointed out that while Mr. Stein was able to deal with the Nation's economic problem in a clever and humorous way, the thrust of his message was deeply serious.

The editorial stresses that much hard work will be required if we are to achieve

economic stability and at the same time maintain economic freedom.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled, "Economic Fun and Games," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

ECONOMIC FUN AND GAMES

According to recent advices from Washington, some administration officials complain that the press paid all too little attention to some remarks by Herbert Stein, the President's principal economist. If so that's a defect that we'll help correct.

Mr. Stein, after all, is an economist to treasure, since he firmly believes that economics need not be a dismal science. In his remarks at the National Press Club, for instance, he suggested that Democratic presidential hopefuls now were busily lining up

economic advisers: "Senator Muskie has offered Senator McGovern Arthur Okun and a first round draft choice from the 1972 crop of Ph.D.s in exchange for Kenneth Galbraith, but McGovern says it's no deal unless Okun grows a beard."

When Mr. Stein gets to the heart of his topic he can also be rather humorous, though perhaps less intentionally so. The basic situation, as anyone can see, does have its elements of comedy.

To begin with the Nixon administration came into office proclaiming the virtues of free enterprise, the folly of constant manipulation of the economy. For a while the Nixon men were almost as good as their word, but then they began to reap the results of the inflation inherited from the Democrats.

So what did the Republicans do? For a while they tried to work both sides of the street. In 1971 B.C. (Before Controls) financial policy became highly expansive, but administration officials even now would like everyone to believe otherwise.

In explaining why Mr. Nixon finally opted for wage-price controls, Mr. Stein puts it this way, without even cracking a smile: "If we had been concerned only with inflation we could have stuck it out with a classic prescription of fiscal and monetary restraint."

On August 15, when controls were imposed, the government had recently finished a fiscal year with a budget deficit of \$23 billion, compared with less than \$3 billion the year before, and it was beginning to sink even deeper into red ink. The Federal Reserve System, meanwhile, was inflating the money supply at a merry pace. That's the sort of restraint that most classicists would disown.

Despite the Republican policy of unrestrained restraint, the Democrats were still snipping at them. Inflation, unsurprisingly, was roaring right along and the economy, also unsurprisingly, was finding it hard to make headway among the confusion.

The Democrats' proposals were also predictable: even more economic intervention. It was surely a joke on the Democrats when the GOP largely took their opponents' advice.

At least Mr. Stein seems to find it pretty funny. "Does anyone propose a more stimulative fiscal policy if that means a bigger deficit?" he asks. Do the "Democrats propose to control wages more rigorously?" So far as we've noticed, no Democrat has been able to come back with a clever reply.

The Nixon administration, Mr. Stein boasts, is "running the biggest budget deficit ever, except for World War II. . . . We have the most comprehensive price-wage control system ever except during the Korean war and World War II. . . . We have suspended the convertibility of the dollar" and, through negotiation, achieved devaluation. How, he implies, can the Democrats do anything more?

Mr. Stein is probably right when he suggests that many of the Democratic presidential hopefuls will wind up by promising to do about what the Republicans are doing but somehow to do it better. "Me-too" plots have never been especially successful in politics, but they seem to be a staple of political farce.

Politicians find economic intervention more fun than the hard work needed to eliminate even the excuses for such manipulation. If unions and businesses possess excessive power, set up elaborate controls to police them; don't bother to try to reduce the power. If there isn't enough spending to keep the economy perking along, take the money from the public in taxes and inflation and spend it; the people don't know what's best to do with their money.

Heading back toward economic freedom won't be easy, even if the politicians finally find the will. However delightful it may be to have a little comic relief in the dismal science, economics was never meant to be all fun and games.

EFFORT TO KILL EUROPEAN RADIO STATIONS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I direct the special attention of the Members to the unfortunate impasse in the House Senate Conference on the bill to provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

The impasse is caused by the obstinacy of one individual, that person being the

chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In my judgment, the determination by Mr. FULBRIGHT to kill Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty is as poor a behavior as I have ever seen in the Congress. It represents a monumental setback for the necessary programming of news to the captive peoples of communism.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at the conclusion of this statement a letter addressed to Senator FULBRIGHT by the chairman of the German Christian Democratic Party's Defense Policy Committee which is pertinent to the remarks I have just made:

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Yesterday, we received the news of your speech in the Senate in which you requested that the radio stations "Free Europe" and "Liberty" should terminate their operations.

Since we know of your political importance and influence, Senator Fulbright, many people in my country were deeply disturbed by the news of your speech. They saw in your request to terminate the operations of these radio stations—in spite of the continued stifling of liberty and freedom in Eastern Europe—another manifestation of American disengagement. We noticed with deepest regret that another result of your speech would be the termination of the practically irreplaceable "Institute for the Study of the USSR". The scholarly activities of this Institute have very essentially assisted in spotlighting the actual meaning of Soviet reality which would have otherwise remained hidden in its carefully fostered semi-obscure.

If the news which we received is correct, you referred to the activities of these two broadcasting stations as "anachronistic". I regret to say that many of my friends and I myself fail completely to understand how you could possibly arrive at such a conclusion. For what reasons do you wish to deprive those who assist us in breaking down the barriers isolating Eastern Europe from their sources of information of the very means which enable them to continue their work? Incidentally, the very concept of such an isolation is alien to men of western civilization. Why do you say that their work is anachronistic? Don't you understand, Senator Fulbright, what it means to millions of people in East Central Europe, in the Balkans, in great parts of the Soviet Union, in the Baltic countries, and in the wide open spaces of Siberia, to hear in their own languages sound information with up-to-date comments during day and night?

Indeed, there are many millions for whom the news of the stations "Free Europe" and "Liberty" are the only connection with the non-Communist world. They are the only voice which reaches them from the far-away countries in which liberty and freedom prevail. For these millions, stations "Liberty" and "Free Europe" are the only means to hear from the West specific news of what happens in their own countries and in the "Socialist block." Have you forgotten, Senator Fulbright, that stations "Liberty" and "Free Europe" were the first ones which in December 1970 broadcast the terrifying news of what happened in the Polish-renamed ports of Danzig, Stettin and Zoppot when the Communist dictatorship had hundreds of desperate workers shot and killed? The news was broadcast by these two stations in a way which made it impossible to obscure these events any longer. At that time, all of Poland heard the voice of the free world. And this voice of the free world came from the two American broadcasting stations, "Free Europe" and "Liberty."

Needless to say, we are aware of the furious opposition fostered for many years by those

who—in the name of Marxism-Leninism—have deprived their peoples of their liberty and freedom. We know that you have asked for many years over and over again that the transmissions of the broadcasting stations "Free Europe" and "Liberty" be terminated. We know that you say that the continued broadcasting of information from the free world amounts to a manifestation of the cold war.

There are also some individuals in my country who would like to cooperate in accomplishing the goals of Communist propaganda, namely to silence those whose voice continues to maintain the hope of enslaved and oppressed peoples that freedom and human rights cannot be permanently suppressed.

Dear Senator Fulbright, I myself have no connection whatsoever with any of the aforementioned institutes or stations.

I write this letter exclusively in my capacity as a freely elected member of the parliament of the German people because I can still recall how during the Nazi regime my parents and I listened to English broadcasting stations each night in order to renew our hope that a dictatorship will not and cannot prevail over freedom. I also write this letter to you because I know that the last rays of hope would be extinguished in Eastern Europe if your proposal should be accepted. Please remember that hundreds of thousands of intellectuals and even many members of the ruling Communist bureaucracy listen to the broadcasts of the stations "Free Europe" and "Liberty".

I appeal to you to support policies which are intended to multiply the outlets for the distribution of free instead of manipulated information. Please do not support those whose only wish is the utter destruction of the means by which free information can be distributed.

Sincerely yours,

DR. WERNER MARX,

Chairman of the Committee of the CDU/CSU Parliamentary Party for Foreign-, All-German, Defense-, and Development Policy. Chairman of the Federal Committee of the CDU for Defense Policy

FAIRFAX COUNTY, VA., UNDERTAKES EXPERIMENTAL SOLID WASTE PROGRAM IN THE MOUNT VERNON AREA

HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25, 1972

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, public understanding and appreciation of the economic and social costs of solid waste is increasing, and a concept of solid waste management is evolving. The growing technology and affluence of American society have laid a heavy burden on solid waste facilities. Refuse collected in the Nation's urban areas has increased from 2.75 pounds per person per day in 1920 to more than 5 pounds today. It is expected to reach 8 pounds by 1980.

According to a bulletin from the National Center for Resource Recovery, a nonprofit corporation organized by industry and labor to monitor and coordinate technology and research in the area of solid waste:

People are increasing at a rate of 1 per cent, solid waste at 4 to 6 per cent. What is

particularly worrisome about this pollution is that at the same time this trash increases resources shrink. . . . We must develop a total system—in which we reduce the production of waste, reclaim useful materials and recover the value of discarded resources.

The Environmental Action Committee of the Mount Vernon area of Fairfax County has translated a concern over the solid waste problem into action. The citizens' group approached the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors with a proposal for an experimental recycling program. The board agreed, and instructed county officials to implement the program.

The result is a 10-week experiment during which the county will collect paper, glass and aluminum placed at the curb by homeowners in three subdivisions of the Mount Vernon area. The materials will be sold by the county for recycling and reuse.

While this is only a trial program, it is tangible evidence of a willingness by local government to undertake a recycling program. It also represents an excellent example of a citizens' group working in concert with local government to solve a serious problem.

Mr. President, the County of Fairfax and the Environmental Action Committee of the Mount Vernon area are to be commended for their joint effort on this matter. An article published January 15, 1972, in the Alexandria Gazette explains the program in greater detail, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

EXPERIMENTAL RECYCLING TO START MONDAY

The first collection in the Fairfax County experimental recycling program begins Monday and will continue for 10 weeks in Hollin Hills, West Grove, and Tauxemont. It is an innovative attempt to solve the solid waste problems of a growing suburban area.

County trucks will pick up newspapers tied in bundles, glass containers rinsed and sorted by color—clear, brown, and green, and aluminum. All recyclable materials of this type are to be placed at the curb by the homeowner and will be picked up by the county the day before the regular collection day. Containers used to hold the recyclable materials will not be picked up. The county will sell the materials they collect. Such items are reused in a variety of ways including making recycled paper and building materials.

This program was instituted as a direct result of work by the Environmental Action Committee of the Mt. Vernon area, a citizens group concerned with local and state environmental problems. Herbert E. Harris II, Fairfax County supervisor from the Mt. Vernon district, endorsed the program and requested the Public Works Department to implement a pilot program. V. Tielkemeier of the Division of Solid Waste organized the experimental program. If it is successful the plan will be expanded around the county.

During World War II it was common practice to recycle and reuse as much material as possible. After the war the practice was discontinued.

The National Center for Solid Waste Disposal, Inc., a nonprofit corporation in Washington, D.C., is concerned with finding practical solutions to the solid waste problem. It provides services, primarily educational, to the general community and performs research and development of the technological

needs for reclamation and recycling. Their preliminary studies indicate that the concept of disposal must be abandoned and be replaced with plans for resource recovery.

A TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS X. GALLAGHER

HON. PAUL S. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1972

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the tragic death of Francis X. Gallagher, one of Maryland's truly outstanding citizens. Francis Gallagher died on Friday, February 11, in Baltimore after an extraordinary career of service to his community, his church, and his fellow man. It was a career all the more unique and all the more tragic because it lasted for so brief a time. Had he lived, today would have been Francis Gallagher's 44th birthday.

Occasionally, Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate to have in our midst someone whose mind and heart and character exemplify all that we hold to be good and true in our own lives. Francis Gallagher was such a man. To have known him and the warmth of his spirit, the keenness of his mind, the depth of his faith, and his commitment to a just and decent society was indeed to have been fortunate. He brightened the lives of all with whom he came in contact and left upon each a lasting and enriching impression. It is upon such men that the strength of our Nation rests and his passing leaves our democracy lessened and our spirit diminished.

Mr. Speaker, at the funeral last week in the Cathedral of Mary, Our Queen, two deeply moving tributes, both included below, were paid to Francis Gallagher. The first was given by His Eminence, Lawrence Cardinal Shehan, Archbishop of Baltimore. The second by his brother, Father Joseph Gallagher. They are important not only because of what they say about Francis Gallagher, but also because of what they say, in speaking of him, about the meaning of a good life. I hope that all will take a few moments to read these tributes.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, much was written in the press about Francis Gallagher's accomplishments and contributions. I have set out below a portion of those comments so that those who did not know him might have a better understanding of how very much he meant to our community. His passing is a tragic loss and we shall all miss him deeply. My wife joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his widow, Mary, his five children, and the other members of his family.

HOMILY GIVEN BY LAWRENCE CARDINAL SHEHAN AT THE FUNERAL MASS FOR FRANCIS X. GALLAGHER

The vast gathering here is in itself a sufficient homily for the occasion because it teaches us the value of the life that we have lost. The passing of Francis Gallagher who is so recently a part of our lives, a part of the

Church, and of this Archdiocese is a mystery to us. It is almost unbelievable that he who so recently played so active a part in this community has now passed from us and will be with us no more.

There is a certain mystery to his going at such a young age with so much promise ahead, so much to do, and with so many who depended upon him. The mystery is solved only in terms of our Christian faith.

Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ accomplished his mission from the heavenly father in fewer years than were granted to Francis Gallagher. The Gospel tells us that unless the seed falls to the ground to die it remains only a seed. If it does die, new life springs forth. Again, the same Gospel indicates to us that our life is to be valued in terms of our service to God and our fellow man and in terms of Christian faith and hope.

When we think back on the life of Francis Gallagher our first memory is likely to be his brilliant mind, ready wit, and pleasant humor; a mind capable of sizing up a situation in its entirety and going to the very heart of it. Beyond this, we think of his great devotion to so many people. He accomplished so much during the short span of his life. But we value a man, not for what he has accomplished but for what he is, the qualities he develops in his life.

Francis Gallagher was a man of great and singular integrity; his word was his bond; he was trusted implicitly; a man of his own conscience. Although his loyalty to his country was sincere and above all suspicion, and although he was united to the Catholic Church with bonds of strongest faith; he was not the Government's man; nor was he the Archbishop's man; he was his own man with his own conscience. He was a man of deep faith, one might say unquestioning faith, if such a thing can exist today. But it was in his all-embracing love that the quality of his Christian character shone most brightly. He had the ability to see a spark of goodness in every man. He was beset by many; I have never known him to turn from any man because he considered him unworthy of his interest, his attention, his help.

He was in many ways like the great Christian lawyer, St. Thomas More. He had the same unbounded energy, the same embracing character of St. Thomas More. When More mounted the scaffold to lay his head on the block, he protested that he died "the king's good servant but God's first." So Francis Gallagher could have said that he lived the State's good servant and the Church's good servant—but God's first.

Like More, too, he had his own martyrdom—a long life of constant and often excruciating pain from which the best in medicine proved incapable of bringing him relief. This pain, however, never interfered with his work nor with that spirit of good will and pleasant humor which was so characteristic of his life. We shall miss him indeed, and we shall remember him tenderly.

We express our profound sympathy to his wife and children, his mother and his brother Joseph, and to all his family and many relatives and friends. While we mourn his passing our hearts are filled with the hope that springs from the knowledge that to a Christian death is but the beginning of a better life—a life in which all of us one day will join with him.

EULOGY GIVEN AT THE MASS FOR FRANCIS X. GALLAGHER BY FATHER JOSEPH GALLAGHER, THE FIRST OF HIS MANY BROTHERS

In the name of my brother's stalwart wife and his five captivating children, in the name of my mother, who first taught him tenderness, and of my younger brother and sister and myself, who were the first to profit from his manly and fortifying presence, I wish to thank all of those people, starting with Cardinal Shehan, who have

honored my brother so highly, mourn him so deeply, and have consoled his family so heartfully.

The profoundest wellspring in my brother was a passionate love for life—despite all its aches and shadows, with which he was not unacquainted, and of which I never heard him complain.

What he loved most about life was people, people as people, in all their wonderfully wild variety—black and white, Protestant, Catholic and Jew, believer and unbeliever, "important" people, and just plain people, Democrats and, as he would probably say, "even" Republicans.

What he loved most about people was the chance to befriend them in their need, to ease their pain even though it magnified his own—that pain which he never outwitted, but which he held in heroic contempt. By the alchemy of his boundless drive, resourcefulness, generosity and availability, he transmuted his own sufferings into a soothing medicine for countless others.

The truest comfort to be found in our present pain is the astonishing and blazing witness of the healing use to which he always cheerfully put his own.

We are none of us surprised that his great heart gave out, for his heart was giving out all his short life long, and that was the part of himself he used the most.

After big holiday meals, my brother loved to quote the words: "We thank you, Lord, for this brief repast; many a man would have called it a meal." Grateful for the feast of him, we might aptly say today as our Grace After Him: "We thank you, Lord, for his brief sojourn; many a man would have called it a lifetime."

Perhaps one of his beautiful children spoke most simply and eloquently for us all. Learning of his father's death, he said in a tone of measureless loss: "He was so nice." So he was. So he truly was.

[From the Evening Sun, Feb. 14, 1972]

FRANCIS X. GALLAGHER

Francis X. Gallagher's bubbling good nature disarmed his opponents and warmed his allies. It was a quality which, coupled with an intelligence that showed him quicker than most where the real truth lay, marked him for leadership in his church, in politics and in civic life. Men smiled when Francis Gallagher appeared; but they stopped to hear what he had to say. Only close friends understood two other qualities which ran largely unseen behind the jolly, perceptive exterior. One was a purposeful morality, a determination to speak up for the weak when the weak needed help and, for the strong, to steer them in the direction of their better instincts instead of their worse. But from a darker side Mr. Gallagher was surely destined to move as high in public affairs as anyone of his generation. This side was a series of debilitating physical illnesses which, time after time, cut him back just when the hour seemed to strike for him to move for the top. As it was, he died at 43 with more substantial accomplishments behind him than most men his age but with his great potential still unrealized.

Annapolis knew him in the late 1950's as a darting young legislator, unafraid of change when reform was in the air. Joe Tydings and young Tommy D'Alesandro were larger men, and more successful campaigners, because in the background of each stood Frank Gallagher and his human wisdom. Later, it was the Catholic Church which benefited and turned more flexible—notably in its attitude toward racial relations—because of the Gallagher advice. Death caught him, characteristically, hard at work defending Father Wenderoth and Father McLaughlin in their Harrisburg trial.

Cardinal Shehan hit it right when he spoke of Frank Gallagher's "courage" and of

the "better place" the world is because of it. What a still better place it could have been but for the frailties which held him back and which stopped him in the end. But what a special courage it took, in the circumstances, to carry him as far as he went.

[From The Sun, Feb. 14, 1972]

FRANCIS X. GALLAGHER

It is always shocking to hear that a vital community figure has been fatally stricken in the prime of life. The fact that Francis X. Gallagher was able to pack so many achievements into his brief 43 years makes it no less disturbing.

As chief legal adviser for the Baltimore Archdiocese, he served Cardinal Shehan during a restless period that saw the church move closer to the temporal mood of the times. When Pope John XXIII initiated the Ecumenical Movement, Mr. Gallagher was available to open local channels with other men of goodwill. If civil rights activists justly sought wider employment opportunities for blacks, he quickly set the machinery in motion. His character sharply reflected that which is decent in contemporary America.

In that regard, Mr. Gallagher worked eagerly through most of his life in the political community. As a member of the Maryland House of Delegates, then people's counsel to the Public Service Commission, and finally as adviser to numerous candidates for office, he lifted politics and public service to a higher level. Whatever the goal, he always seemed to deliver twice the effort of any normal man. And to his tasks he brought a sharp wit and warmth that constantly reminded the vain and the mighty that they were merely mortal.

He was the product of a "typical, Irish-Catholic family," whose offspring went to parochial schools and some on to Loyola High School and College. Such training, when it took, fitted a man with self-discipline, generosity and moral courage. It was understandable that he would be working, practically up to his death Friday, on further proposals for state aid to parochial schools. In a very real sense, Francis Gallagher represented the best that system had to offer.

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun, Feb. 12, 1972]

FRANCIS X. GALLAGHER DIES AT AGE 43

Francis X. Gallagher, the witty, indefatigable attorney, political organizer and advocate of liberal social reform died last night of a heart attack at Johns Hopkins Hospital. He would have been 44 February 25.

At the time of his death, Mr. Gallagher, long-time attorney for the Archdiocese of Baltimore, was a defense attorney for the two Baltimore priests accused in the Harrisburg antiwar conspiracy trial.

MASSIVE HEART ATTACK

John Evelus, Mr. Gallagher's law partner since 1962, said the attorney was admitted to the intensive care unit at Johns Hopkins Hospital Wednesday after complaining of indigestion and an upset stomach.

He died at 11 P.M. yesterday after suffering a massive heart attack.

A spokesman for the family said Mr. Gallagher was not known to have a heart condition prior to his admission to the hospital.

SERVICES TUESDAY

Funeral services were tentatively set for 10 A.M. Tuesday at the Cathedral of Mary Our Queen.

Cardinal Shehan is scheduled to be chief concelebrant at the services.

In the weeks before his admission to Johns Hopkins Hospital, Mr. Gallagher commuted almost daily to Harrisburg, where he was assisting in the defense of the Rev. Joseph Wenderoth and the Rev. Nell McLaughlin, both of the Archdiocese of Baltimore.

Mr. Gallagher became involved in the Har-

risburg trial at the request of Cardinal Shehan.

RAN FOR GOVERNOR

During his political career Mr. Gallagher was an unsuccessful candidate for governor in the legislative election in 1969, a one-term delegate to the General Assembly, and a campaign official for Senator Joseph Tydings, President Lyndon Johnson and presidential candidate Robert F. Kennedy.

Mr. Gallagher grew up in Baltimore, the oldest of four children in what his brother, the Rev. J. Joseph Gallagher, described as a "typical, Irish Catholic family."

GREGARIOUS SCHOLAR

Father Gallagher said his older brother early earned a reputation as a gregarious scholar. He excelled in debate when he attended Loyola High School and became, according to a fellow student, "Mr. Everything" at Loyola College.

Before graduating magna cum laude from that institution, he edited both the school newspaper and the yearbook, was active in the debating and dramatic societies and was elected president of Alpha Sigma Nu, the national Jesuit honorary society.

While studying law at the University of Maryland he was elected to his first political position—delegate to the Democratic State Convention of 1952.

CITY SOLICITOR

Upon admission to the bar he was appointed city solicitor of Baltimore.

Six years later he was elected to the General Assembly from the city's Third District, receiving more votes for the House of Delegates than any other candidate in the city.

In 1961 Mr. Gallagher resigned his seat to become the first people's counsel to the Maryland Public Service Commission. While holding that office, he argued a number of cases successfully, including an appeal against a telephone rate hike.

Mr. Gallagher was noted as a raconteur and as an advocate—often behind the scenes—of liberal causes including civil rights and housing.

But, as representative of the archdiocese, Mr. Gallagher split with liberals when he fought against abortion and for government aid to parochial schools.

SERVED WITH TYDINGS

Mr. Gallagher served in the House of Delegates with Joseph Tydings. He later became a law partner with Mr. Tydings and served as campaign treasurer in the successful 1964 Tydings campaign for the United States Senate.

Senator Tydings was Mr. Gallagher's contact with President John Kennedy and, after the assassination, with Robert Kennedy.

During the 1968 campaign Mr. Gallagher headed the Kennedy forces in Maryland and at the Chicago convention cast his vote for Senator Eugene McCarthy.

He served in a number of civic and public offices. In 1966 he became the president of the Hospital Council of Maryland, and in that same year was appointed acting chairman of Baltimore City Hospitals.

In the early 1960's he was vice president of the Maryland Reapportionment Commission. Later he was a delegate to the Maryland Constitutional Convention.

The attorney was frequently cited for his civic activities.

In 1961 the Junior Association of Commerce of Baltimore awarded him its distinguished service award as outstanding young man of the year.

That same year he received the first annual Metropolitan Civic Society Award. The National Conference of Christians and Jews presented him with a special citation in 1967.

Mr. Gallagher was married to the former Mary Inez Kelly in 1951.

In addition to his wife, Mr. Gallagher is

survived by his daughter, Mary Ellen and four sons Francis, Jr., John Joseph, Patrick Edward and James Lawrence, his mother, Ellen M. Gallagher, of Baltimore, two brothers, the Rt. Rev. J. Joseph Gallagher and Thomas Galvin Gallagher, Los Angeles and a sister, Mrs. Mary Burdell, Dundalk.

NO HOLDS BARRED

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the kidnapping of a 70-year-old woman by two teenagers very understandably has aroused the ire of the editor of a suburban Washington, D.C., newspaper. His observations are worthy of reading:

[From the Enquirer-Gazette, Upper Marlboro, Md., Feb. 17, 1972]

NO HOLDS BARRED

The kidnapping this week of a 70-year-old woman by two 13-year-olds causes us to look with dismay at the decadence of this nation over the past 50 years which has finally reached down to the cradle.

Up until that time this great nation was a safe place to live in, even in the ghetto sections of our large cities. This was achieved by adhering to strict laws and restrictions, thoughtfully designed by our forefathers to protect the innocent and punish the guilty. This even reached down into our school systems where the children were punished for misbehavior and when they went home they were repunished by their parents.

Certain crimes were punishable by life imprisonment or death penalties to keep persons capable of such crimes out of society. This left very little chance for unmanageable children to do serious harm and criminals very little chance to become repeaters.

Since that time some social critics decided that our laws were cruel and inhumane and somehow sold the ideas to those in power that everyone should have a second chance (which now amounts to a third, a fourth, etc.).

Parents were urged to use psychology on their children instead of the rod and teachers were hardly allowed to correct them. This generation has now reached maturity and with the mellowing of the penalties for crime, many do not know the meaning of fear or forced restriction which is so essential to the preservation of society.

A great many of these youngsters are so disturbed that they are on dope, they have no care about their appearance and they do not care about the future. Their parents shun their duties and ship them off to some special school to mingle with others with the same illness. Once they are out of these schools, they do not know right from wrong.

For instance, one recent young man who was killed in the commission of a crime, had in his possession a little book recording 50 rapes, a former capital punishment crime.

A 21-year-old man who killed two adults and a child was tried under juvenile law and, even though convicted, will be back out on our streets in less than a year.

If it is cruel or inhumane to keep this kind of people out of society, then let's look at the other side of the picture. What about the victims of these robbers, rapists, kidnapers and perpetrators of heinous crimes?

Are they not also members of this great land of the free? Under our Constitution aren't they guaranteed protection from the irresponsible law-breakers who are seeking to have their pleasure at other's expense?

If it is not too late, we had better reverse this trend before we completely revert to the law of the jungle.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF VILLAGE COUNCIL PRESIDENTS

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, one of the 12 regions established in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, which recently became law, is the Association of Village Council Presidents. This region, which represents numerous villages along the Lower Yukon and Lower Kuskokwim Rivers, has long been one of the strongest, most organized and vocal of the various Native regional organizations.

Recently, I received in my office a number of resolutions passed by the AVCP at a recent regional meeting. While the resolutions are too lengthy for complete inclusion here, I have prepared a list of the positions taken in these resolutions which I want to share with my colleagues.

I take pride in doing so for two reasons. First, I believe these resolutions indicate the broad range of issues already being addressed by the regional organizations. Second, I hope that my colleagues will note the substantive merits of these positions. Complete copies of all resolutions will be available in my office for all those who wish more details:

LIST OF POSITIONS

No. 72-1: Appointment of Organizing Directors for new regional corporation.

No. 72-2: Designation of new AVCP geographical area.

No. 72-3: Notification of all future muskoxen transplants.

No. 72-4: Re: Cooperative retail store in Bethel.

No. 72-5: Improved air carrier services in the Bethel area.

No. 72-6: Request for village radios for the communities of Kotlik and Chefornek.

No. 72-7: Reallocation of B.I.A. funds for student scholarships at the University of Alaska.

No. 72-8: Designation of subsistence and hardship land use for Scammon Bay, Chevak and Hooper Bay and prevention of subsurface exploration in the Clarence Rhodes Wildlife Range.

No. 72-9: PHS assistance for water well for the village of Kwigillingok.

No. 72-10: Assistance in procurement of tractor for the village of Kwigillingok.

No. 72-11: Request for "seed money" for grocery store from the National Campaign for Human Development of the Catholic Church of America.

No. 72-12: Request for installation of telephone on porch and a private line at the YUT Housing office.

No. 72-13: Support for project to provide recreation, gathering place and social activities in Bethel Heights area.

No. 71-25: Village of Crooked Creek radio schedule and radio ownership transfer.

No. 71-26: Request for travel funds for Human Service Aides of State Department of Health and Social Services, Division of Family and Children Services.

No. 71-27: Release of land for Brown Slough/Bethel seawall project.

No. 71-28: AVCP's recognition and designation of YUT Regional Housing Development Corporation as regional housing development mechanism.

No. 71-29: Request for secondary road construction between Napakiak, Oscarville and Bethel.

No. 71-30: Opposition to and request for repeal of State statute to permit subsistence fishing.

No. 71-31: Designation of AVCP Education Board as policy advisory board for the Bethel Broadcasting Corporation.

No. 71-32: Establishment and support of Executive Director and Administrative Director positions for the Yukon-Kuskokwim Health Corporation and approval of salary levels for these positions.

No. 71-33: Assistance for road improvement of Stony River.

No. 71-34: AFN consultation with AVCP board for actions pertaining to AVCP region.

No. 71-35: Radio-telephone request from State of Alaska for the village of Stony River.

No. 71-36: Electric generator request by village of Stony River for radio use.

No. 71-37: Request for funds and construction of sidewalks for the village of Toksook Bay.

No. 71-38: Implementation of Crooked Creek Airport proposal . . . at an earlier date.

No. 71-39: To inform legislators, state and federal agencies of the need for bridges over two creeks at the village of Crooked Creek.

No. 71-40: Request for BIA housing at the village of Kongiganak.

No. 71-41: Request for State of Alaska to build 3,000 feet of sidewalk through the village of Klipnuk.

No. 71-42: Request for Wein Consolidated Airlines to build cargo and waiting room at village of Mekoryuk.

No. 71-43: Land eligibility and selection rights for people on Nunivak Island.

No. 71-44: AVCP to purchase land with settlement funds.

No. 71-45: Request that portions of Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of the House which eliminates subsistence hunting and fishing be eliminated.

No. 71-46: Request for new school at the village of Alakanuk.

No. 71-47: AVCP release of lands to the village of Kwethluk.

No. 71-48: Establishment of Native Health Task Force to investigate mercury and other metal contamination of marine biology.

No. 71-49: Request for the PHS and YKHC to construct water well for the village of Marshall.

No. 71-50: Request for legislators and FAA to complete airfield at the village of Chefornek.

FLUSHING AIRPORT

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the city of New York, with the help of Federal funds, plans to spend upward of \$11 million to upgrade and expand an airport that should instead be closed at once as a safety hazard.

I have long opposed not only the expansion but the mere existence of Flushing Airport as a threat to the safety of persons living nearby and a potentially dangerous source of increased air traffic in already overcrowded airways.

The Flushing Airport Development Study made for the city by R. Dixon Speas Associates actually supports my position that Flushing Airport is another example of city hall's misconception of progress and its callous disregard for the wishes and welfare of the residents of an area affected by its building programs.

This time it plans to spend millions and millions of dollars to provide a place for corporate executives to land their private planes 5 minutes closer to their plush Manhattan offices.

This amounts to sacrificing public safety on the altar of corporate convenience. This facility is also a haven for those private pilots who wish to avoid too rigorous safety regulations of a controlled field such as LaGuardia. How many pilots using Flushing Airport actually take advantage of the control tower at LaGuardia, and how many simply fly in unannounced?

If Flushing Airport is so vital and so important, then perhaps it should have its own control tower. But why do not we hear Commissioner Leedham ask for one? Is it because the pilots who use Flushing do so because they want to avoid just that? LaGuardia has the closest control tower, but it does not handle Flushing traffic except as requested by a random flight.

I will tell you why, in one word, I oppose Flushing Airport. Safety. I will repeat that word for those who didn't hear it or find it alien. Safety.

I believe, I am convinced that Flushing Airport, in its present location, is a hazard to the safety of the community around it and to air traffic as well.

The Federal Aviation Administration shrugs off criticism of Flushing Airport with the same disdain it shows for air and noise pollution caused by aircraft. The FAA is traditionally oblivious to the public interest, preferring to act like a client of the industry it is supposed to regulate rather than the watchdog it was set up to be.

There are those who say that opposing Flushing Airport is opposing progress. That is tantamount to saying that fighting pollution is being opposed to technological growth. Both contentions are equally ridiculous.

I do not question the need for an airport such as Flushing, only its location. There is a definite need for reliever and satellite fields, but they must be located at safe and reasonable distances from the busy air traffic centers they are supposed to avoid. Flushing does not meet those criteria. To put a satellite reliever in close proximity to a terminal hub airport defeats its basic purpose. That is the case of Flushing Airport. Located as it is under the wing of LaGuardia, one of the world's busiest, Flushing is inhibited and it puts a crimp in LaGuardia as well.

Flushing Airport must be moved to a safer, more suitable site, or it must be closed.

Flushing Airport's location at the center of one of the world's most highly traveled aviation crossroads as well as its proximity to LaGuardia Airport raises the danger of midair collisions.

In 1968, the FAA began granting immunity from enforcement action to persons reporting near mid-air collisions—NMAC. They got about as many reports that year alone as in all 3 previous years put together for the New York City area. Some 89 were deemed by FAA to be "hazardous incidents."

Everytime we fly we are needlessly exposed to danger because the present air traffic system is based on the concept of equal rights for all pilots.

Three-hundred fifty passengers flying at 600 miles an hour in an incredibly complex and fragile airliner have no more priority in the congested airspace over New York than a Cessna 150, the Volkswagen of the sky, flown by a pilot with 35 hours of training and without radio, radar, or anything other than \$10 an hour to rent this "flivver."

How private pilots can misuse this airspace as can be seen from an analysis of the near-miss reports received by the FAA. Most involved at least one private plane. All—and everyone knows the reported number is a small fraction of the total near-miss—represent a deadly hazard to innocent people on the ground or on airliners.

I do not question the private pilot's "right" to fly, although I do not believe that public policy, the rights of the majority, or minimal commonsense should allow him to fly amidst the jets.

A partial answer is limiting private planes to certain airports or banning them entirely from places like Chicago's O'Hare or New York's Kennedy Airport. But, this just pushes the same number of small planes from one home base to another. They still use—and misuse—the same congested airspace over our urban areas. Such limitations do, of course, reduce air congestion to the immediate airport area, which is a help to people who are airport neighbors.

I propose that the Federal Aviation Agency use the power it has to restrict private planes and pilots over our large cities. This can be done by:

First, requiring small planes to have the same equipment we demand of airliners. Those small planes and pilots which can meet the tougher rules should be allowed to fly with the airliners. This means, basically, that all planes would be under positive control of the air traffic system.

Second, giving airliners an explicit priority in the skies, especially over our cities. Three hundred and fifty passengers in a jetliner should have rights, by virtue of their number, over two passengers in a private plane when it comes to using the airspace over large cities. The first step in giving this priority, however, is to be able to control all planes by the equipment and pilot standards recommended above.

Compared to automobile travel, what I suggest for airspace control is quite modest. Instead of having planes fly absolutely wherever they want, they would, over urban areas, fly specified routes, with equipment and pilot training like that protecting the majority of air passengers who fly the airlines.

If we let autos use our land surface as private planes use airspace, we would

have cars driving across lawns, through stores and houses, under the single condition that they do not hit one another.

Private pilots, and their defenders in FAA, will howl at these restrictions. I already have impassioned and bitter letters from private pilots who want to "ground" me from further incursions into their area of private pilot "rights."

But, unless we "thinout" our airspace by allowing only pilots with higher minimum standards to fly planes equipped with basic navigation and communications equipment, under the same flight rules airlines must follow, we will have more and more near-misses, and their eventual product: midair collisions and planes plummeting down on unsuspecting citizens.

Increased traffic for already overcrowded skies is but one of the predictions apparent in the Speas study of Flushing Airport. That study fails dismally in its efforts to gloss over the flaws and shortcomings it detects at Flushing Airport, such as:

Dangerous proximity to one of the Nation's busiest air terminals.

"Extremely poor" subsurface soil conditions that would require millions of dollars and years of effort to overcome. The hazards of surrounding obstructions.

Uncertain sources of funds for capital expansion and operations.

Threats of noise and air pollution.

Vocal and vigorous public objection to the airport.

It calls for spending \$11 million to upgrade Flushing's facilities in 1969 dollars, which would actually be more like \$12 or \$13 million today.

Projections of the airport's success hang, to a large degree, on the city's nebulous plans to develop a college point industrial park adjacent to the site.

The following, in detail, are some of the reasons why Flushing Airport should not be expanded but instead closed; all are based on the Speas report itself:

At a time when the airways around New York City, and especially over Queens, are saturated, this study proposed quadrupling the number of small airplanes weaving in and out of the jet-congested skies.

It talks of improving and extending runways while one of the present strips is closed to all traffic because a Western Electric plant is being built at one end of it. Unless Western Electric puts its plant on hydraulic lifts and lowers it beneath ground level or plans to tear down its new plant, it will continue to be a barrier to traffic taking off into the northeast or landing from that direction.

Instrument operations are not feasible at Flushing, the report points out. This means that bad weather would force aircraft bound for Flushing Airport to divert to already congested LaGuardia Airport, making a bad situation worse.

Fill and drainage would cost more than \$6 million—1969 dollars—because of extremely poor subsurface soil conditions. It would be necessary, according to the study, to institute a hydraulic overfill project to raise elevation. The overfill will settle for many years and will require periodic runway overlays. Place of

fill and construction of runways will require an estimated 3 years for completion.

The development program for the airport is limited by both operational and environmental factors which include the following:

First. The site offers limited area for development and poor foundation soils.

Second. The access road—20th Avenue—offers limited opportunity for realignment.

Third. Proximity to LaGuardia Airport results in less than ideal airspace availability.

Fourth. The rising terrain and existing development surrounding Flushing Airport present obstruction in excess of 100 feet in elevation within 2,000 feet of the site.

Fifth. There is a reticence to condemn additional property to achieve desirable runway lengths and ideal parallel alignment with LaGuardia Airport.

The airport operator has had to set a number of operating restrictions because of such problems as proximity to LaGuardia Airport, ground obstructions, and the lack of specialized equipment.

The report states:

Safe operation of the two airports (Flushing and LaGuardia) would require improvements in the form of visual approach aids.

The major control problem encountered in the operation of Flushing Airport is keeping arrivals of runway 36, the primary direction at Flushing, separated from arrivals on runway 31 or departures on runway 13 at LaGuardia. With the refurbished Flushing Airport attracting more and more itinerant traffic, generally unfamiliar with the field this situation will become more critical, according to the Speas study.

Flushing, as proposed, will not be able to handle the corporate jets and heavier twin-piston or turboprop aircraft, the study contends. This statement is made in the face of the projection that more than one-third of the aircraft to be based at Flushing would be business planes. In light of the corporate trend to jets and other heavier aircraft, Flushing would apparently be useless to one-third of its projected customer-users. What assurances are there that Flushing would not eventually be developed into a corporate jetport? Just because it is not written in any master plans now or because of some verbal denials, there still are no firm guarantees that this expansion program is not the first step in the development of a corporate jetport.

Revenue projections are shaky and appear based on imagination more than anything else. They envision such things as \$7.56 million in State and Federal aid to expand the airport, increased fees and rentals, additional traffic and prosperous concessions such as a restaurant and parking lot.

Estimates of the economic impact of closing Flushing Airport are outrageously exaggerated. The city would lose less than \$20,000 a year—a small price to pay to insure the safety of thousands, if not millions of persons.

The airlines over Queens are saturated with traffic now and cannot take any additional burden. The swarm of planes

makes the skies nearly as congested as the streets below.

Flushing is a primitive, non-tower airport located 2 miles from LaGuardia, one of the Nation's busiest terminals. As long as this airport exists, private planes will be drawn into an already overworked air traffic pattern over our city.

This report proposes spending \$11 million—more than half of it to shore up extremely poor subsurface soil conditions—to expand the airport to handle more traffic in 2 hours than it now handles in a full day. It calls for quadrupling the present traffic, from approximately 54,330 annual operations to about 200,000.

The report tries to dismiss the noise problem created by Flushing and totally ignores the pollution question.

It says "noise generated by 98 percent of the activity—at an expanding Flushing airport—would be insignificant" and "essentially no complaints" are expected from area residents although the noise may "interfere occasionally with certain activities."

This leads me to think that the guiding philosophy behind this study was "My mind is made up, do not confuse me with the facts."

The researchers would have had to do their work in a soundproof booth not to be aware of the noise produced by the airport and the protests of its neighbors and victims.

They dismiss the noise problem by saying the din probably would be absorbed or drowned out by noise from LaGuardia and Whitestone Expressway.

Safety, however, is the most important factor. Because of the proximity to LaGuardia, aircraft using Flushing are relegated to a pattern tucked below that of the neighboring field. Straight-out departures are prohibited. Special turns and maneuvers to avoid LaGuardia traffic are necessary. Flushing's operations must conform to LaGuardia's active runway use.

The current airport operator is an aviation veteran with admirable credentials and a fine professional reputation. He is a vigorous advocate and practitioner of air safety.

But all his talent, efforts, and dedication cannot overcome the inherently unsafe situation of Flushing Airport. And what will happen after he is gone?

As long as this airport is allowed to operate, it will attract private pilots of varying degrees of experience and with widely diverse equipment on their planes. Bringing such pilots and planes into the New York City airspace and over congested residential areas is dangerous and cannot be made otherwise.

The presence of unknown traffic, such as the mail planes flying in and out of Flushing, operating in heavily congested air terminal areas such as LaGuardia presents a hazard to navigation and a threat of mid-air collisions.

Although the city has said it has no plans to expand Flushing Airport in the near future, it continues to harbor the thought, as evidenced by the Speas study. Pressures for expansion will continue as long as Flushing remains open.

Plans to improve and not close Flushing Airport represent a grievously disordered sense of public priorities. Any plans to modernize or expand it should be abandoned and a phaseout program designed and executed. The safety and welfare of the residents of Queens demand nothing less.

I will continue to oppose city-sponsored plans for the expansion of Flushing Airport and will use all the influence I have to see that no Federal funds are committed to maintaining or enlarging an essentially defective and unsafe air facility.

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW'S STUDY PANEL PROPOSES INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORMS

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1972

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished panel of economists, lawyers and Government officials, sponsored by the American Society of International Law, last week issued a thoughtful report on long-term international monetary reform. The specific thrust of the study was to propose improved methods of adjustment among nations' currencies. The opening sections of the panel's report—the explanatory forward, the introduction, and an outline of the proposal itself—follow:

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW PANEL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY POLICY FOREWORD

The American Society of International Law decided in 1969 to convene a study Panel on International Monetary Policy, a panel which would be interdisciplinary in composition and forward-looking in concept. It focused its concern on the reforms which should be made in the international monetary and trade structure to deal with persistent imbalances in international payments and to provide for improved methods of adjustment among currencies.

The Panel's discussions of this subject have benefited by the interaction of international lawyers and international economists and by the preparation of a number of working papers by members of the Panel.

A principal result of the Panel's deliberations has been the conception and drafting of a "Proposed Economic Policy Coordination Amendment to the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund." The amendment is designed to help avert the sort of international monetary crisis which has gripped the world in recent months, especially since August of 1971. It is the belief of Panel members that, if the amendment were adopted, the International Monetary Fund and the governments of the world would be in a significantly better position to deal with problems of currency adjustment in a manner which would maximize international trade and the common welfare.

This report consists of an introduction of the problem, the text of the proposed amendment, and an extended commentary upon it. That commentary draws upon some of the working papers which Panel members were good enough to prepare, notably papers by Professor Andreas Lowenfeld, Mr. Frank Schiff and Professor Thomas D. Willett. The material drawn from their papers is acknowledged by footnotes in the body of the text.

The Panel's Report binds no member of the Panel, still less any institution with which he or she is or was associated. The Report does express the consensus of the deliberations of the Panel, a consensus reached through discussion and not voting. It does not necessarily express the views of every member. In no measure does it express the views of the American Society of International Law—which does not take positions as a Society on problems of public concern—or any other institution.

The members of the Panel (whose affiliations are noted only for the purposes of identification) are: Hans Aufricht, formerly of the International Monetary Fund; Bruce Bassett, Columbia University; Murray J. Belman, of the District of Columbia Bar; Roy Blough, Columbia University; David E. Bodner, Federal Reserve Bank of New York; Michael Bradford, United States Treasury (Rapporteur of the Panel); Mitchell Brock, of the New York Bar; Richard N. Cooper, Yale University; William B. Dale, International Monetary Fund; Thomas L. Farmer, of the District of Columbia Bar; Richard N. Gardner, Columbia University School of Law; Dr. Hendrik S. Houthakker, Harvard University; Robert H. Knight, of the New York Bar; John M. Letiche, University of California (Berkeley); Cynthia C. Lichtenstein, Boston College Law School; Andreas F. Lowenfeld, New York University School of Law; Lawrence C. McQuade, PROCON Incorporated; M. C. Miskovsky, of the District of Columbia Bar; John Rhinelander, Department of State; Walter S. Salant, The Brookings Institution; Frank W. Schiff, Committee for Economic Development; Fred B. Smith, Syracuse University Research Corporation; Stanley S. Surrey, Harvard Law School (Chairman of the Panel); Walter Sterling Surrey, of the District of Columbia Bar; Thomas D. Willett, Cornell University; and Alan W. Wolf, United States Treasury.

This and many other study panels of the Society are funded by a grant of The Ford Foundation. On the Society's behalf, I should like to express its deep appreciation and that of the members of the Panel to the Foundation.

STANLEY S. SURREY,
Chairman, Panel on International Monetary Policy.

PART I—INTRODUCTION

The Panel on International Monetary Policy of the American Society of International Law first met at a high point in international monetary cooperation. On that day—September 26, 1969—the Board of Governors of the International Monetary Fund approved a resolution calling for the allocation of \$9.5 billion Special Drawing Rights over a period of three years beginning on January 1, 1970. Yet it was clear even then that the international monetary system was undergoing extreme strains and needed fundamental changes to function effectively. In a relatively short span of time preceding the first meeting of the Panel two major currencies—the pound sterling and the French franc—had been devalued; after a major crisis, an extensive revision of the gold market had been devised over a weekend, and two major outbursts of speculation in the German mark, accompanied by closed markets and massive movements of funds, had occurred. While the technical problem of providing adequate liquidity for the system had been solved, it was widely agreed that the international monetary system as a whole was not working as it should.

President Nixon's actions on August 15, 1971, suspending convertibility of the dollar into reserve assets and imposing a 10% surcharge on imports, made it clear to all that the international monetary system must be reconstructed with major changes. From a lawyer's viewpoint, the system was indeed in grave difficulty. Two fundamental provisions

of the Fund Articles—Article IV on par values and exchange rate margins, and Article VIII governing convertibility—were deemed by a large number of members to be so out of touch with economic realities that their legal obligations had to be ignored. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade faced similar difficulties as its provisions prohibit surcharges but permit quotas which tend to be even more restrictive.

With the Group of Ten agreement on a new pattern of exchange rates which was reached in Washington on December 18, 1971, the immediate job of finding an interim solution to set the system working again has been done. The task of devising a reformed system will take time—probably some years, judging from the complex issues involved. The Panel's efforts have been directed to this task of long-range reform in the hope that a contribution could be made to reconstruction of the international economic-legal system which is so crucial to world prosperity and security.

The Panel started from the premise that the system had worked well but was now in need of change to meet the requirements of a greatly changed world. It was recognized that many of the key objectives of the Bretton Woods planners have been achieved—the years since World War II have seen an unprecedented reduction in tariff barriers and in quantitative restrictions. They have also seen the elimination of almost all exchange restrictions among industrial countries (even, in most cases, on capital account), and restoration of external convertibility. These developments played a major role in permitting an unprecedented expansion of world trade—from \$55 billion in 1950 to \$311 billion in 1970.

Yet today's world is far different from that in which the Bretton Woods planning went forward. August 15 was not only a demonstration of American economic power, it was also an explicit recognition that American dominance had been successfully challenged by the growth of other centers of great wealth and economic strength: the European Common Market and Japan. Yet, at the same time that this welcome diffusion of economic power has occurred, there has also been a burgeoning growth of restrictionism that has put some of the fundamental precepts of Bretton Woods in full retreat. It would be fair to say that the Common Market—particularly its common agricultural policy, its growing framework of preferential arrangements, and its restrictions on Japanese imports—has not been as outward looking in trade matters as had been promised by its most fervent supporters at home and abroad. Japan, the other great industrial center, can hardly be said to have been following liberal trade policies. Regional groupings are growing up in many areas of the world, which may also turn out to have a restrictionist bias. In many countries—both developed and less developed—there is increasing resort to import substitution policies and governmental subsidies for exports.

The actions taken on August 15 were also an expression of a widespread feeling in the United States that the growing restrictions and export incentives employed by other countries had resulted in a trading system that was biased against this country. This feeling reinforced growing domestic pressure for restrictions on imports, and numerous products have been put under voluntary or mandatory quotas—most recently woolen and man-made textiles. In addition, the countervailing and anti-dumping duty laws have been given more vigorous enforcement and, of course, the President imposed a 10% surcharge on imports, as a balance-of-payments measure. Further evidences of this trend are the favorable votes in the Senate during the debate on the Revenue Act of 1971 on quota and surcharge authority, on authorizing discrimination in the applica-

tion of the Job Development Credit and on authority to apply the excise tax on automobiles solely to foreign vehicles. These actions demonstrate that there is increasing support in the Congress for more restrictions on imports. Not only has there been an increasing pressure for restrictions on imports, but Congress has also recently authorized the establishment of Domestic International Sales Corporations (DISC) to give a tax incentive to increase exports.

Restrictions have also appeared in the field of capital movements. In the United States various selective measures to limit capital outflows have been imposed—the Interest Equalization Tax, the Foreign Direct Investment Program, and the Federal Reserve Voluntary Restraint Program for banks and other financial institutions. Recently Europe and Japan resorted to extensive programs of restricting capital inflows as a means of limiting or preventing appreciation of their currencies.

The tendency toward increasing restrictions on international trade and payments, already evident in 1969, has today become a matter of serious concern for both economic and political reasons. In many quarters fear is being expressed that a trade war will develop and that the Western World will break up into hostile regional monetary and trade blocs employing various kinds of restrictive devices to assure inter-bloc balance in trade and payments relationships—with an eventual adverse impact on political relationships. The possibilities of this eventuality are real, although they have diminished as a result of the Group of Ten agreement on exchange rates. To assure that further restrictions do not develop, it will be necessary to make mutual adjustments that will lay the foundation for bringing the texts of international agreements into conformity with new realities and new objectives. Some fundamental changes of perception will be required, and it will take more than technical devices such as wider margins and more freely movable parties to make the system work smoothly.

The international monetary and trading system worked fairly well and with a minimum of consultation on or coordination of countries' economic policies only so long as the United States and the rest of the world were prepared to accept large and continuing international payments imbalances. After many years of U.S. deficits, and a severely declining trade account, it has become abundantly clear that continuation of the imbalances is neither politically nor economically acceptable to this country and its trading partners.

Yet it is not clear that the free world economy can function without restrictions unless a substitute is devised for the role the United States has played over the last thirty years. As Professor Richard N. Gardner has stated, American post-war planners "were prepared to devote a considerable amount of American wealth, influence, and energy toward the achievement" of a freely flowing system of international trade—and they in fact did so over the ensuing three decades. But, if instead, all countries seek to maximize exports and minimize imports, can the world economy continue to function or will it fall into the disarray that characterized the period between the two World Wars? The Panel's judgment was that the effective functioning of a highly integrated world economy utilizing a system of relatively stable but movable exchange rates with a minimum of restrictions on trade and payments requires a fundamental commitment to a high degree of consultation on and coordination of domestic economic policies aimed at fairly-shared growth while avoiding persistent balance-of-payments surpluses or deficits.

¹ Gardner, Sterling-Dollar Diplomacy (1969), page 12.

The task could be made easier by the very recent development of a less reluctant attitude toward the adjustment of unrealistic exchange rates as well as by the agreement on wider margins for exchange rate fluctuation. But this would not eliminate the need for close consultation and coordination of economic policies. The difficulties of reaching agreement on exchange rate realignment clearly show that the same problems involved in reconciling differing national objectives as part of coordinating economic policies also exist with respect to the setting of exchange parities.

The Panel, composed of lawyers and economists, turned its attention to this problem of improving the international adjustment process in the hope that its particular perspective—a concern for procedure and the techniques of institutional development—could prove useful both in pointing out what is wrong in present adjustment processes and in finding a method of helping the system to function more smoothly in the future. It is the Panel's conviction that success in this field is crucial to the maintenance of a liberal non-discriminatory world trading system.

The Panel concluded that reliance on voluntary cooperation and on consultation on countries' economic policies—a procedure that has achieved a considerable degree of sophistication and refinement in such institutions as the International Monetary Fund and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—is no longer satisfactory. It set as its objective the development of additional techniques for closer consultation on and coordination of economic policies affecting countries' balances of payment and for obtaining full compliance with the judgment of the international community on the policies that should be followed.

As a result of its work toward this objective, the Panel drafted a proposed amendment to the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund. In summary, the amendment—the text of which is presented in Part II of this paper—proposes a new organizational form for accomplishing economic policy consultation and coordination within the Fund. Panels would be established in the Fund composed of Governors of the Fund representing countries whose economies are highly inter-related. Each panel would conduct a general review of international economic trends affecting its member countries and would annually review each member's economy as it affects others in the group. The panel could make recommendations of an informal nature to a member and, where the situation warranted, a special review could be conducted which could result in formal recommendations where a country's economy was having an adverse impact on others. The panel would have the power to recommend to the Board of Governors that a specific currency be allowed to float, that a specific new par value for that country's currency be set at a particular time, and that export subsidies or import restraints be allowed. The panels could also recommend to the Board of Governors that joint measures be taken by all Fund members to induce compliance by surplus or deficit countries which have failed to follow formal panel recommendations. These joint measures could consist of a tax to be placed on imports of the goods or on the reserves of the member concerned if the problem was its persistent surplus, or limitations on new financing in the case of a deficit country.

The details of the amendment are explained in Part III of this paper. It must be emphasized what the amendment is not. It is not intended to be a definitive solution to all of the problems raised. On each of the provisions there were varying views on the correct solution to the problem posed. The amendment text is intended as an illustration of some of the choices that could be made.

Other solutions raised in the Panel discussion are described in Part III. Moreover, it is not intended as an amendment in the formal sense of its being a provision that could be inserted without more into the existing Fund Articles of Agreement. While broadly assuming the existing structure of the Fund, including its decision-making bodies and voting system, no attempt has been made to conform the proposed Amendment to the Articles of Agreement of the Fund.

PART II—THE PROPOSAL

The following text sets out in full the proposed amendment to the Articles of Agreement of the Fund.

Article I—Purposes

(a) The members of the Fund agree that their economic policies and measures often have significant effects on other members and the functioning of the international economy through their impact on members' external balance of payments positions.

(b) Accordingly, the members recognize the need for closer consultation on their economic policies and measures and for coordination of policies and measures having a significant effect on the balance of payments positions of other members.

(c) In order to achieve this objective, the Fund has a responsibility to make recommendations to members to assure a smoothly functioning international balance of payments adjustment process consistent with the purposes of the Fund and, as may be necessary, to offer incentives and require members to apply disincentives in order to achieve compliance with such recommendations.

(d) The members agree that strengthening the opportunities for consultation about and coordination of members' economic policies and measures should be accomplished without impairing member countries' choice of economic priorities or social systems.

Article II—Organization

1. Consultative Panels.

(a) A group of members who face common economic problems and whose economies are so interrelated that an individual member's actions have a highly significant impact on other members of the group may apply to the Board of Governors of the Fund to form a consultation and coordination panel.

(b) Members who are participants in regional international agencies operating in the economic and financial field may, with the approval of the Board of Governors, register such agencies as panels for the purposes of this Agreement. Only Fund members may participate and vote in actions taken by such qualifying panels when acting in their capacity as panels under the Agreement.

2. Rules Governing Panels.

(a) Each member may have one representative on a panel. Representatives shall be Governors or alternate Governors, or temporary alternate Governors.

(b) Each panel may choose a representative who shall participate without vote in the meetings of all other panels.

3. Voting. Each Governor, alternate Governor, or temporary alternate Governor on each panel shall exercise the same number of votes as the country he represents has allocated to it.

4. Role of Managing Director. The Managing Director (or his representative) shall participate in each of the panels. The Managing Director shall have no vote.

Article III—Economic policy reviews and recommendations

1. Periodic Reviews.

(a) Panels shall periodically conduct a general review of international economic trends as they affect panel members and of events that may have significant effects on the international economy.

(b) In particular, each panel shall review the functioning of the economy of each member of the panel annually for the purpose of examining the effect of fiscal, monetary, income, trade, aid, capital flow, balance of payments and other policies of that member on other members and on the functioning of the international economy as a whole.

2. Recommendations.

(a) As a result of reviews conducted under section 1 of this Article, panels may make informal recommendations with respect to members' measures, goals, or policies affecting the balance of payments position of other members.

(b) As a result of reviews conducted under section 1 of this Article, panels may, with the approval of a majority of the total voting power of the panel, initiate a special review under Article IV of a panel member's economic policies. A special review initiated in this manner need not meet the reserve change criteria of Article IV, Section 1.

Article IV—Special reviews

1. Increases or Decreases in Reserves.

Panels shall hold a special review of the economic policies of a panel member whose monetary reserves increase or decrease by more than X% per month for Y successive months. This review shall focus primarily on the causes of the increase or decrease, the impact of the increase or decrease on the functioning of the international economy and the prospects for the continuance of the increase or decrease.

2. Recommendations. As a result of the review provided for in this Article, the panel may take the following actions:

(a) A panel may suggest specific areas of action to be taken to remedy the increase or decrease in reserves or to correct any other situation having an adverse impact on the functioning of the international economy.

(1) Such action may take the form of informal suggestions directly to the panel member or members or formal recommendations to the Board of Governors of the Fund.

(2) Formal recommendations must be approved by a qualified majority vote of the total voting power of the members of the panel. Formal recommendations shall not become effective until approved by 70% of the total voting power of the Fund.

(b) By a qualified majority vote of the total voting power of the panel, a panel may recommend to the Board of Governors that a member or members be released from the obligation of Article IV, Sections 3 and 4, to assure that exchange transactions shall not differ from parity by more than the permitted margin, for such period of time as the panel considers desirable, and subject to any necessary safeguards to promote the purposes of Article I of this amendment and the purposes of the Fund. Unless within 24 hours such authorization is opposed by 50% of the total voting power of the Fund, no further authorization shall be required before the member or members may take the recommended action. A panel may at any time recommend to the released member or members that it or they should promptly propose a new par value for adoption by the Fund and may also recommend the specific par value which should be adopted. Such a recommendation must be approved by a qualified majority vote of the total voting power of the panel.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other agreement, a panel may recommend to the Board of Governors, by a qualified majority vote of the total voting power of the panel, that a member be authorized to subsidize exports or restrict imports on such terms and conditions as the panel may specify, but such subsidy or restrictions shall be applied only to the degree necessary to eliminate the excessive decrease in reserves.

(1) No subsidy or restriction pursuant to a panel recommendation shall enter into effect

until approved by Governors exercising at least 70% of the voting power of the Fund.

(ii) Any authorization granted hereunder shall be reviewed periodically by the panel recommending the authorization to determine whether it should be revoked.

(iii) A panel may revoke an authorization by a qualified majority vote of the total voting power of the panel.

Article V—Compliance procedure

1. *Further Review.* In any case in which a panel has made formal recommendations and the member does not carry out the panel recommendations and the member's external payments position continues to affect adversely the functioning of the international economy, there shall be a further special review of that member's adjustment policies. A decision to conduct a further special review under this Article shall be made by a weighted majority vote of the panel members on the basis of a proposal by the Managing Director.

2. (a) *Action With Respect To Surplus Countries.* As a result of the review provided for in section (1), the panel may, by a qualified majority vote, recommend to the Board of Governors in the case of a surplus member:

(i) that all Fund members levy a charge on all purchases of goods from the members concerned;

(ii) that the Fund impose a charge on the member concerned on all reserve increases above a base figure set by the Board, and such charge shall be deducted from the member's holdings of Special Drawing Rights.

(b) The Board of Governors may adopt a resolution requiring all members to impose a tax under Section 2(a)(i) above or to authorize the Fund to impose a tax under Section 2(a)(ii) above only by 70 percent vote of the total voting power of the Fund.

3. *Action With Respect To Deficit Countries.* In the case of a deficit country, the panel may recommend, by a qualified majority of the voter power of the panel, to the Board of Governors, for adoption by it by a vote of 70% of the total voting power of the Fund, any of the following steps:

(i) a declaration of ineligibility to use the resources of the Fund;

(ii) a prohibition on new financial assistance by members inconsistent with any Fund action;

(iii) a prohibition on members' renewal of existing financial assistance as it matures.

NEWS ARTICLE POINTS OUT THE FRAUD AND INEQUITY OF THE NIXON ECONOMIC PROGRAM

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, an item appearing in this morning's Christian Science Monitor provides new evidence that Richard Nixon's economic stabilization program is a fraud.

It is a fraud because the only thing that is really being "stabilized" is the wages of working men and women. Prices and rents, while nominally subject to stabilization, are pretty much allowed to run rampant, thus allowing businessmen to further fatten their wallets at the expense of the salaried and the fixed-income people of this country.

The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 24, 1972]

LEAKAGE IN PRICE CONTROLS HITS CONSUMER

(By David R. Francis)

WASHINGTON.—In ancient Babylon, the ruler Hammurabi commanded that anyone who disobeyed his orders fixing prices and salaries was to be drowned. In the Middle Ages, craft guilds sometimes banished or pilloried price gougers.

And yet even such drastic measures have failed to make wage-price curbs dramatically successful, historians say.

So in modern, prosaic Washington, the ruler Nixon and his men had no great expectations when he launched his own wage-price controls. The most stringent penalties, after all, are fines of up to \$5,000 per violation, restitution ordered by the courts, and, under some circumstances, suits for treble damages.

Administration officials still emphasize the voluntary nature of the controls—even as the Cost of Living Council insists that 81.8 percent of the consumer-price index remains covered by the controls, with 18.2 percent uncovered.

(Those critics who claim that the controls ought to have more "bite" point out that the 18.2 percent uncovered includes taxes, food in the form of raw agricultural produce, and the costs of buying a home, water and sewer rates, using the postal system, sending children to colleges and private schools, and mortgage interest.)

Nevertheless, the economic stabilization program (abbreviated to ESP), has had some impact; it is said:

It has satisfied the public's desire for some direct government action against inflation. This may boost President Nixon's chances for re-election, depending on results.

It has reduced public expectations for inflation.

That change is reflected in a dramatic drop in interest rates in recent months. To some extent the "inflation premium" has been knocked out of the rates.

But the man in the street does not always appreciate that. Even C. Jackson Grayson Jr., chairman of the seven-member Price Commission, cautions that in the past month or six weeks some of this psychological gain has been lost.

Some people, he said, do not understand that in the current Phase 2, unlike the freeze of Phase 1, prices were expected to rise somewhat. Thus some people were disappointed when they noticed various price hikes.

Chairman Grayson cautions that it may be April before the impact of Phase 2 controls on inflation is clearly seen.

"Controlling a trillion-dollar economy," he says, "is a little like steering a battleship. You throw the helm hard over, and nothing happens. The momentum forward fights the rudder. Then, very slowly, the change of course becomes visible."

A recent public-opinion survey commissioned by the Wall Street Journal found 54.7 percent of 760 adults quizzed thought price controls were not working and 48.7 percent of them figured the same for the wage controls.

Yet, said Mr. Grayson in an interview, many people no longer regard a high rate of inflation as inevitable.

Public attention has been directed to the need to increase productivity (output per man-hour) to dampen inflation.

CONTRADICTIONS HIGHLIGHTED

"I view this as an important focus this program has given the country," commented Mr. Grayson.

It takes some 600 civil servants to grind out the multitudinous rules and decisions of the Price Commission. And the Pay Board has another 130 officials mostly poring over

the details of wage contracts. The two bodies even have their own offset press, on the fifth floor of the nondescript, just-completed, eight-floor commercial office building that houses the new flock of extremely hard-working bureaucrats. The press churns out news releases and other printed documents at a great rate.

Around the nation, some 3,000 employees of the Internal Revenue Service are working full time to see that the stabilization controls are enforced. Another 13,452 revenue agents and 6,094 revenue officers help in performing the duties that are the modern equivalent of Hammurabi's enforcement officers.

To a lesser extent, the wage-and-price control program has highlighted contradictory inflationary elements in the nation's economic policies.

Meat-import quotas, for instance, were in the headlines last week. The limitation on imports tends to boost meat prices. Thus the Cost of Living Council—the body at the head of the wage-price-control pyramid—has been considering allowing more meat imports to prevent meat prices from rising further.

Economists have also lately spoken of the inflationary impact of oil- and textile-import quotas, the Davis-Bacon Act requiring that the government pay "prevailing wage rates" on government-backed construction projects, laws protecting the domestic shipping industry, etc.

FULL REVIEW URGED

"This is an appropriate time to examine afresh all of the federal legislation, rules, and regulations which interfere with competition, unduly raise prices, or otherwise give our economy an inflationary bias," a former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Murray L. Weidenbaum, told a Senate subcommittee Jan. 19.

In an election year, however, economists have little hope that the administration or Congress will do much about politically sensitive "structural" defects in the economy.

And they are skeptical about the direct impact of the economic-stabilization program on the rate of inflation.

After surveying dozens of economists, the Wall Street Journal led a story on the results: "Many economists view President Nixon's venture into wage-price controls much the way Shakespeare once viewed life: full of sound and fury, but signifying very little indeed."

With high unemployment and much slack industrial capacity, economists had expected the rate of inflation to decline this year regardless of whether controls were imposed or not.

The Price Commission's Dr. Grayson, on a year's leave-of-absence from being dean of the business school at Southern Methodist University, says he is "optimistic" that the program will work—that is reduce the rate of inflation by half to a 2.5 percent annual rate by the end of this year.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, Rose Mary Petranovich, a senior attending East Anchorage High School, recently participated in the Voice of Democracy contest conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary.

Miss Petranovich was among the

nearly 500,000 high-school students who competed in this contest by writing a speech on this year's theme, "My Responsibility to Freedom."

As you read Miss Petranovich's poignant contribution to the Voice of Democracy contest, which I am proud to insert in today's RECORD, I believe you will readily see why her speech was chosen to represent the State of Alaska in this competition.

Her theme follows:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Rose Mary Petranovich)

As I walk down the road of life, my feet tire and I grow weary. I fall, but I get up. The road abounds with cracks, but I trudge on. I see blotches of dried blood spilt by those before me. A sign comes into view. It bears a warning: Obstacles Ahead. I cross a wobbly bridge whose wood components have rotted with time. The bridge needs reinforcement. An idea formulates in my mind. I must strengthen the bridge so that others may cross, but I'm not strong enough. I seek help. I convey my thoughts to other travelers. Together we repair the bridge. Then while walking on it, someone slips off. It was a mistake not to have put up a guard rail. The next bridge will have a guard rail. Pausing at the top of a hill, I catch sight of a pool below. I hurry to the pool only to find that it cannot quench my thirst. I look back. It seems I've covered little ground. I look ahead. I have far to go. I continue to walk.

Ideals often conflict with reality. Man has dreamed of a utopia; he has wandered in search of a perfect place. He has encountered problems and has utilized his knowledge to cope with them. Man has made a wealth of mistakes, and he has learned from each one.

The past must be present to find a future. Happenings of the past cannot be ignored—and one cannot turn away from the present depending on the future to hold the answers. By taking past events into consideration and by investigating the present situations, one can shape the course of the future.

Change occurs. Established systems cannot always adapt to an ever-changing society. Governmental services may be faulty. They may not meet the needs and desires of the people. Patterns for living call for improvement. Things that are not all good should not simply be discarded. They can, perhaps, meet basic needs and provide a form of security until something better comes along. Methods can be improved; new ways can be tried. Foundations can be built up. It is not necessary to tear down—totally rejecting the present and seeking something right for all purposes. That something may not be found.

Expression of public opinion is vital. People reflect approval or dissatisfaction. People offer challenges and in doing so, contribute. This ensures the evolution of a more efficient and productive society.

Experimental crops of new ideas are planted. The results are harvested. I owe my spore of thoughts to other people. I must also listen to them. My seed of ideas may not grow. Proper conditions may not prevail. There are limitations to its growth, as there are limitations to freedom. My seed just might germinate. It's worth a try, and that is my responsibility to freedom.

POLLUTION, POLITICS, AND PROTEST

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, on October 6, 1970, Charles L. Gould, publisher of the San Francisco Examiner, San

Francisco, Calif.; presented a speech at the National Association of Real Estate Boards in San Francisco in which he discussed the environmental controversies.

I have been greatly concerned over the lack of balance in the study of current environmental issues, for our confrontation has led us to emotionalization rather than to reason and responsibility. Mr. Gould has, in the following speech, put the various aspects of the current environmental revolution into a new perspective. In the interest of formulating the best plans and programs relating to our environmental questions, I urge my colleagues to study, with care, the following remarks:

POLLUTION, POLITICS, AND PROTEST¹

(By Charles L. Gould²)

(NOTE.—Discussion open until March 1, 1972. To extend the closing date one month, a written request must be filed with the Executive Director, ASCE. This paper is part of the copyrighted Engineering Issues—Journal of Professional Activities, Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Vol. 97, No. PP1, October 1971. Manuscript was submitted for review for possible publication on June 16, 1971.)

I was present a few weeks ago when Dr. Joseph Boyle made an impressive address to this audience on the environmental problems of our times. In addition to other charges, Dr. Boyle told an appalling story of hundreds of workers in a California nylon processing plant who had contracted cancer—as a result of their work—and who had been retired to a company sick farm to live out their remaining few years.

Following the luncheon address, I asked Dr. Boyle for the name of the offending company. I felt a story of such horrendous proportions should be reported in our newspapers. Dr. Boyle was pleased with my interest and regretted that he did not have the specific information with him. However, he assured me that he would direct it to me when he returned to Los Angeles. I followed this request with a long letter restating my interest in exposing the contemptible conditions of the nameless company. That was more than two months ago. Thus far I have received no answer. Please understand—I do not question Dr. Boyle's sincerity. I do not question that he heard the story he reported to this audience. Such stories are in full flood. And they tend to be expanded with each retelling.

We in the press are not without sin in this regard. When a man of science makes a statement concerning disturbing conditions within our environment, too often the statement is quoted without obtaining complete and unequivocal confirmation.

The recent tuna fish scare is a case in point. The authority for the report on mercury contamination was a department of the United States government. Thus, the story carried appropriate credentials. Subsequent investigation revealed, however, that all fish contain some traces of mercury. Tests made on fish frozen half a century ago were revealed to contain more mercury than the levels reported in the recent scare.

The current issue of Fortune Magazine carries an impressive report on various forms of mineral pollution. Deep in the story is the statement that nature releases about 5,000 tons of mercury into the environmental

¹ Presented at The National Association of Real Estate Boards, San Francisco, October 6, 1970; Sacramento Rotary Club, October 15, 1970; San Diego Chapter, Freedom's Foundation, October 28, 1970; and San Francisco Rotary Club, January 19, 1971.

² Publisher, San Francisco Examiner, San Francisco, Calif.

chain each year. That equals—or surpasses—man's record in this regard.

Those who have said Lake Erie was so contaminated that fish could not live in it failed to check with the fish. Last year the catch was one of the largest in the history of the lake.

The public reaction to yesterday's tragic oil spill in San Francisco's harbor is reminiscent of the tremendous outcry when the tanker Torrey Canyon poured millions of gallons of oil into the Atlantic Ocean off the coast of England. It is reminiscent, too, of the very proper public concern when the channel at Santa Barbara was covered with tens of thousands of gallons of raw oil from a ruptured drilling rig. In the Torrey Canyon case you will recall that some scientists said the beaches of France and England might be oil-polluted for half a century. At the time of the Santa Barbara disaster, the charge was widely circulated that the harbor's marine life would be adversely affected for years to come and that some beaches might be unusable for a dozen years. Happily, the actual results were not as dire as those predicted. Nature cleared most of the French and English beaches in less than six months. Ironically, those that were treated with cleansing chemicals took longer.

Three months ago the Examiner unearthed a lengthy and costly study made by university scientists on the effects of the Santa Barbara oil spill. We published the report at that time. Happily, it reappeared again this past weekend on one of the wire services. This scientific report made it clear that early reports of lasting damage to the environment as a result of the Santa Barbara oil spill were grossly exaggerated. It went on to point out that natural oil seepage had been present in the channel for hundreds of years. In fact, it showed that spills traceable to man during the 17 months from the start of the major eruption totaled 7,100 barrels while natural seepage for the same period exceeded 20,000 barrels. This is not intended to minimize in any way the seriousness of the oil spill in San Francisco harbor . . . or elsewhere. It is lamentable that it occurred. None regrets the disaster more than the oil company that owns the offending ships.

I do wish to make it clear that the spill is a passing tragedy. It will be erased. Those of my age will remember the daily reports during the first months of World War Two when German subs were sinking an average of two oil tankers each day along the Eastern Coast of the United States. Hundreds of miles of beaches were black with oil. Fortunately, time and nature worked complete cures.

Now that I have moved into the past, let me try to put some other aspects of the environmental revolution into a new perspective by attempting to flesh out some cold statistics from the record books of other years.

ITEM ONE

It is approaching dawn on the morning of July 15, 1347. . . more than 600 years ago. We approach the harbor of Genoa, Italy. The tortured cries of a small child break the morning stillness. The baby's perspiring face is covered with festering sores. The squalid room reeks with the ugly odor of the open blotches. The mother lifts the small child and gently bathes its fevered face. But it will not be calmed. An hour later the cries of the child are no more but the sorrowful sobbing of the parents is a poor exchange. The baby is dead. Carried by rats in the cargo of a Levantine ship from Constantinople, the black plague has found a home in continental Europe. Before the day is out a dozen citizens will be stricken. Before the week is out, a thousand deaths will be reported and frightened peasants fleeing the black death will carry the seeds of the putrid pestilence to Rome and Naples and a hundred other communities throughout the area.

In less than a month, the breath of death will sweep into Spain and France and Bel-

gium. It will leap the English channel and spread from port cities to the verdant countryside. Day after day for five long years, a thousand cities throughout Europe will echo to the moans of the dying and the sobbing of the bereaved. An endless parade of heavily loaded wagons will rattle over the cobblestones carrying their grim cargoes to the human dung-heaps on the outskirts of the villages. The stench of death is everywhere and hope has fled from the hearts and homes of the rich and poor alike. Before the dread pestilence has run its course—according to the Encyclopedia Britannica—it will have claimed the lives of more than 25 million men, women and children. One of the most terrifying tolls in human suffering in the history of the world.

The proper amount of DDT properly used in the proper places in the proper manner might well have destroyed the germ-carrying fleas and rodents that brought the Black Death to Europe in the 14th century.

ITEM TWO

The scene shifts to another world and another century. It is March 17, 1877. The poor peasants of Lanchow, a small city in the foothills of the KunLun Mountains, almost in the shadow of the Great Wall of China, rejoice as they are greeted by a bright sun for the tenth day in a row. It has been a long, cold winter with heavy snows and the promise of an early spring and early planting is reason for happiness. Their joy, though, is short-lived. An ominous roar from the valleys and gorges high in the mountain is a signal for fear. The unseasonable hot spell has melted the mountain snow and as giant ice dams give way, torrents of water breach the banks of the Hwang-Ho River. First an inch, then a foot, then a yard . . . higher and higher it creeps until it crests at more than 30 feet above normal. Like a tidal wave it sweeps all before it. Even as the people of Lanchow are burning incense to their ancient gods, the raging waters carry them, their animals, and their homes to oblivion.

Yanching, Pingliang, Weinan and a hundred other villages are devastated and destroyed as the flood waters cover more than five million acres of lowland in its pell-mell race to the Yellow Sea.

None will ever know the total toll of the 1877 excursion of the rampaging Hwang-Ho River. Famine and pestilence followed in the wake of the flood waters and the Encyclopedia Britannica puts the death toll at more than nine million men, women, and children.

The proper water-retention dams in the proper places at the proper times might have saved many of these nine million lives.

ITEM THREE

Again these shifts. The year is 1846. The month is October. The place is Ireland. The potato crop has failed. A fungus infection that kills the root fruit of the tuber has swept across the tiny nation from Londonderry in the north to Cork in the south. There were empty larders and empty hearts and empty stomachs in Ireland that year. And as famine marched through the towns and villages, death marched with it. Men, women, and children weakened and died. A thousand. Ten thousand. Half a million. A million. And still the toll mounted. The Encyclopedia Britannica reports that between two and three million persons perished in the great potato famine.

The proper pesticides and fertilizers used at the right time in the right way in the right amounts might have prevented the scourge that swept across the Emerald Isle.

ITEM FOUR

In four weeks last autumn, raging fires blackened millions of acres in California. Tens of thousands of trees were destroyed, hundreds of homes were ruined.

I do not say this so—but—is it not conceivable that the removal of a few hundred trees at the proper time in the proper places to provide fire breaks might have saved some of the precious treasures that were destroyed?

Now, let me make it clear that I do not make a sweeping endorsement of DDT. I raise no clarion cry for more dams or more fertilizer or more pesticides. I do not wish to eliminate any trees. I fight to preserve them. Mine is a cry for reason. It is a cry for truth and logic. It is a cry for study. It is a cry for action based on research rather than emotions.

You in this room today can be a powerful force for reason and responsibility in these matters. Speak out. And speak up. Urge your representatives to make all possible speed in the crusade for environmental betterment . . . but urge them first to formulate plans and programs based on sound and serious study.

Dr. W. T. Pecora, Director of the United States Geological Survey, puts some aspects of our burgeoning pollution problems into a new perspective when he states that "nature is the worst offender." Contrary to the popular belief that nature eternally strives to restore herself to purity, Dr. Pecora documents the truth that compared to mankind, "Mother Nature is a very messy housekeeper." In the last five years we have been exposed to countless reports testifying to the many ways that man is damaging the earth through the careless and casual disposition of waste salts and sodium and calcium compounds. Dr. Pecora raises some scientific and nonscientific eyebrows when he submits evidence that rainfall each year pours more than 4,000,000 tons of table salt on the United States . . . plus 2,500,000 tons of sodium sulphate and 36 million tons of calcium compounds.

While not minimizing the polluting effects of noxious gases emitted by automobiles, Dr. Pecora pointed out that three volcanic eruptions in the past 90 years—Kakatoa in 1883, Mount Katmai in 1912, and Iceland's Heika in 1947—ejected more dust, ashes and gases into the atmosphere than has all of mankind since the beginning of time.

In my own research for today's remarks I developed some rather remarkable statistics about land, people, and congestion. First, on the subject of land. Including Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands, there are slightly over 2½ billion acres of land in the United States. However, more than 750,000,000 acres of this total is owned by Uncle Sam. One of every three acres throughout the width and breadth of our 50 states is in Federal ownership. An additional 150,000,000 acres are owned by city, state, and county governments.

Uncle Sam owns 96% of the land in Alaska; 86% of the land in Nevada; 66% in Utah, and 64% in Idaho. Here in California well over half the land is owned by federal, state, or county governments. I do not intend to shock or disturb you with these figures. I do not deplore this massive ownership of land by the government. I do, though, deplore—and I do protest—the charges made by some conservationists that ruthless business interests are gobbling up all the land in our nation and depriving our people of adequate park and recreational areas. Other self-proclaimed experts present frightening reports on the imminent threat of famine in our nation if population growth is not brought to a grinding halt.

While I am not a champion of unlimited population expansion in our nation . . . or in the world, I believe it is incumbent on responsible authorities to seek out the truth so that predictions can be based on facts rather than fears. For example, while our nation's population continues to rise, it should be made clear that the present birth rate is the lowest in the history of the nation and has actually declined 25% in the last ten years.

CONGESTION

In this age of instant communications most of us are trained to have an emotional knee jerk reaction to certain words and phrases. One is the word congestion. In environmental discussions congestion normally prompts a mental image of millions of Asiatics crowded together in conditions of abject squalor.

While it is true that every large city in Asia—and, in fact throughout the world—suffers from overpopulation, it may come to you as a surprise to learn that one of the most congested large areas on any continent is right here in the United States. And the people living there find it exceedingly pleasant. They would be shocked to learn they are environmentally underprivileged.

I am talking about New Jersey, the Garden State of our nation. With seven and one half million people, New Jersey is far more congested than China, India or Japan. If all of the people of the United States were moved to the State of Texas, it would be far less densely populated than New Jersey is today. If the population of California were increased by 140,000,000 people it would have approximately the same density as New Jersey. Now, we are talking about New Jersey's congestion on a statewide basis but the interesting truth is that more than half of the state is virtually undeveloped. The pine barrens covering several million acres of land in the southern part of the state are essentially as unpopulated as they were when Columbus discovered America.

While I would not recommend it, all of the people on earth today—all 3½ billion of them—could be placed on the New Jersey barrens and each person would have about five feet of space between him and his nearest neighbor.

I am presenting these dramatic—and some what shocking—truths as a means of driving home the need for reasonable and responsible approaches to all statistics dealing with conservation and environmental improvement. Please do not, however, gain the impression that I minimize the potential dangers inherent in overpopulation. Unabated growth over a long period of time can be a serious affront to living conditions throughout the world.

I challenge not the goals of those who set high standards in these fields. I do protest those—who, in search of headlines—march off in all directions and pervert good causes by futilely flailing at the windmills of legitimate change. Make no mistake about it, the environmental problems that confront our nation and the world are of major magnitude. But—they are not insurmountable. They can and will be solved. However, they will not be solved through protest marches and confrontations. They will be solved by harnessing the best brains of science, chemistry, physics, and engineering and then providing sufficient funds to cover the essential research and proper implementation. The price tag for these endeavors will be high. This burden—as in all things—will be borne by the public. However, the Federal Government will undoubtedly establish the priorities and push through a majority of the programs. Thus, at a time when many citizens are rebelling against the high cost of government, we can expect federal spending to continue its upward spiral as Washington comes to grips with this latest challenge.

FEDERAL FUNDS

Let's take a moment to examine the flood of funds that annually pours through the counting houses on the Potomac. To put the picture in proper perspective, let me read the primary plank in the election year platform of one of our major political parties . . . and I quote:

"We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction in Governmental expenditures by

abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus and eliminating extravagance to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 per cent in the cost of Federal Government."

That—gentlemen—was the pledge and the promise of the Democrat Party in 1932. Federal expenditures in that historic year were \$4 billion. A reduction of 25% was advocated; keep that dollar figure in mind. The bare bones figure for the new fiscal year that commenced last July first calls for expenditures of \$205 billion. Can the human mind comprehend the magnitude of \$205 billion?

How does it relate to expenditures of the past? Let us take the administrations of Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe. Let us take all of the administrations from the Revolutionary War, through the Civil War, through the Spanish American War, through World War One. Let us take all federal expenditures—for all purposes—through the 150 years of this nation's history . . . let us take them through and including 1941, the year that brought the United States into World War Two. In those momentous years of war and peace, of prosperity and depression, of growth and expansion, your Federal Government spent 25 billion fewer dollars than the total that will be expended in this current year. In fact, the interest on the Federal debt in this one year will exceed \$15 billion . . . that's more than twice the cost of running the entire Federal Government in all its departments just thirty years ago.

Where does the money go? Who gets it? And why? It touches the rich. It touches the poor. It goes for payrolls. It goes for research. It goes for parks, housing, education, and social services. It lubricates the wheels of the free enterprise system as billions go to General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, Lockheed, Douglas, and other corporations for defense contracts. I do not propose to use a shotgun technique in tossing out statistics, but I do submit that the following human tabulations give a revealing measure of the depth and scope and range and size of some of our social programs that are financed with tax dollars.

This year the total cost of federal, state and local welfare programs will exceed \$120 billion.

Each day 19,000,000 youngsters will receive school lunches.

Nearly 3,000,000 civilians will draw federal paychecks.

Another 3,000,000 in uniform will draw government checks.

Our defense industries—underwritten by Uncle Sam—pour paychecks into 4,000,000 homes.

Two and one half million farmers receive price-support loans.

Nine million families receive surplus food.

More than 19,000,000 persons receive government medical aid.

Twenty three million citizens receive Old-Age Insurance checks.

Tens of millions receive aid, assistance, and pay through Federal highway programs, housing, ship construction, and social rehabilitation programs.

And so it goes—across the width and breadth of our fair land. In large cities and small. In rural areas . . . in fishing villages in every social, economic, political, religious, and ethnic group you find increasing evidence of the role government is playing in the most expansive and most expensive womb-to-tomb social dream in the history of the world.

And—the end is not yet.

MORE PROGRAMS

In the months and years ahead, you can expect Uncle Sam to:

1. Increase subsidies for public education.
2. Extend public schooling through an additional four years.
3. Expand public employment to reduce or eliminate the jobless.

4. Fight for guaranteed annual incomes for all workers.

5. Extend medicare to the young as well as the old.

6. Establish a reverse income tax to provide cash benefits for those below a certain income level.

The list is long and ambitious. And—make no mistake about it—the lights burn late in many government offices as these far-out dreams are put into blueprint form for launching when the time is right. Are these social programs good? Do they serve the best interests of the greatest number? In some areas, I have doubts . . . but . . . certain facts are self-evident. None can deny these truths. Today, more people in these United States have more money than ever before. We earn more, save more, spend more—yes, and owe more—than ever before. In the past ten years we've experienced a national boom that staggers the human imagination. Since 1960, total gross national output in the United States have been increased \$400 billion. That's nearly 80%. Corporate profits—after taxes—soared \$25 billion. Up more than 80%. Personal incomes increased \$300 billion and the number of people employed jumped a whopping 10,000,000. Personal savings skyrocketed \$35 billion. In short, my friends—despite the current recession—the average guy in the street never had it so good. By his personal standards, therefore, we cannot knock, indict, and condemn the pump-priming social concepts that now maintain. These truths place a special burden on management in every area of business. For—as the costs of government increase, so, too, do the costs of private business. And—at this point—I regret to report that I can see no indication of a lessening of labor and tax pressures. You must, therefore, anticipate steadily rising costs and prices in all facets of our economy.

There is the hope and the expectation that mortgage money will ease in the months immediately ahead and there should be a slight softening of interest rates in the near future. This combination should be a stimulant to real estate sales and building construction.

Now, it is sad and ironic that despite the business boom of the past decade and despite monumental expenditures by the Federal Government, pockets of poverty still remain throughout the nation. One official report from Washington states that 8,735,000 families in the United States are impoverished. Now—what vision does your mind conjure? Do you picture a tidal wave of Negro families living in slum conditions? Well—revise your vision. Sixty six percent of these impoverished families—two out of every three—are white.

The uplift and improvement of these people—black and white alike—while preserving the dynamic strength of the American way—and while preserving individual rights and freedoms is a rewarding challenge for all of us.

We must give priority to transferring millions of men and women from relief rolls to payrolls. By so-doing we will create new sources of production and—at the same time—develop new markets for the goods that are produced.

I PROTEST

Now, in the closing minutes of my remarks, let me up-date some observations I made to this group three years ago. Let me once more address myself to the critics of our society and of our nation.

I am unalterably opposed to those who desecrate our flag, denounce our Constitution and extoll the virtues of Godless ideologies of other lands.

I protest those who campaign and petition and parade for individual rights but have no tolerance for the rights of those who oppose them.

I protest those who profess to champion peace but resort to terror, violence, and blackmail to make their points.

I protest those men of God who sow the seeds of conflict and encourage disrespect for temporal law and authority.

I protest broadcast commentators and newspaper writers who feed the flames of fear by allowing rumors, guesses, speculation, and conjecture to masquerade as fact.

I protest whites who preach hatred of blacks just as I protest blacks who preach hatred of whites.

In short, I protest those groups and individuals within our country who champion any system at variance with the basic concept of equal rights and equal opportunities—and equal responsibilities—that must be the hallmarks of our way of life.

Let me make it clear I have no apologies to make for my country or my generation. Never before in history or in any other land has a people accomplished so much, given so much, and asked so little. Four times in one lifetime we have involved ourselves in foreign wars. We have poured the flower of our manhood and the fortunes of our citizens into these battles against aggression, injustice, and tyranny. In these endeavors, we have never coveted a single acre of land nor sought to add a dollar to our national wealth.

Quite the contrary. We have used our material strength and financial fortunes to bind the wounds of the vanquished and we have given aid and sustenance to the impoverished in a hundred nations around the globe. Friend and foe alike. We have battled, too, for progress and betterment on the home front. In one generation we have conquered or controlled diphtheria, smallpox, typhoid, polio, measles, tuberculosis, and pneumonia. No longer do these ancient scourges sweep across our land leaving death and tortured limbs and minds and hearts in their wake.

We have built more schools and colleges and hospitals and libraries than all other generations since the beginning of time. We have trained and graduated more scientists, doctors, surgeons, dentists, lawyers, teachers, engineers, and physicists than did our forebears for a thousand years before. We have raised our standards of living and lowered our hours of work. Luxuries that were beyond the dreams of princes and potentates a generation ago are now available to all our people. The automobile, the radio, the telephone, the airplane, the computer, television, antibiotics, and a hundred other miracles have come to full flower in one generation.

We have taxed ourselves unmercifully to bring hope and health to our sick, our indigent, our young, and our aged. Each year our personal gifts to private charities exceed \$14 billion . . . more than fifteen times the cost of running the entire Federal Government the year I was born.

OPPORTUNITY

We have done more to bring dignity and equality and opportunity to all minority groups than any other generation has ever done in any nation since the dawn of history. Please understand I do not minimize the need for greater efforts in these areas. We have an urgent moral responsibility to move decisively in correcting injustices that have too long prevailed. At the same time, we must not minimize the progress that has been made.

A recent official report shows that since 1960 the number of Negro families earning more than \$7,000 a year has increased more than 100%. In just four years the number of Negroes hired for professional jobs has climbed 35%. Total Negro employment has jumped more than 20%.

Today the average Negro in our nation is more likely to go to college than the average citizen—white or black—in England, Germany, Belgium, Denmark, Italy or Spain. We have more than 300 Negro millionaires in our nation. We have more Negroes sitting as judges . . . more in Congress . . . more in state legislatures . . . more in our city halls . . . and more in positions

of power than all the Communist nations of the world combined.

Yes, don't let anyone sell you the idea that ours is a sick society. It's far from perfect, but it is also far and away the most enlightened, most unselfish, most compassionate in the history of the world. I know what our generation has done. I'll stand on our record. We may not have scored as high as we hoped. But we scored higher than ever before.

And the end is not yet. There is still work to be done. There are still challenges to be met. There are still hopes to be realized. There are still goals to be attained. They'll not be attained by the preachers and teachers of despair. They'll not be attained by sniffing flowers or staging love-ins or hate-ins. They'll be attained by the unsung heroes of every generation. The workers who can dream. And the doers who can hope. They'll be attained by the men and women who believe in God, The Ten Commandments, our Constitution and our way of life; men and women who believe in a better and brighter tomorrow and are willing to work to that end.

TRIBUTE TO ABRAHAM LINCOLN

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1972

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, at a recent Lincoln tribute dinner here in the State of Michigan, our Governor, the Honorable William G. Milliken, delivered what I believe to be one of the more significant contemporary statements on the meaning of Lincoln's life. Although it is not my normal policy to habitually place speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I believe Governor Milliken's remarks are such that all of us without respect to partisan differences, can read with great profit. Thus it is my honor to share the

following remarks of Governor Milliken, who, in his own right, has been a leader in the fight to end enslavement throughout his public life:

REMARKS BY GOV. WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Five minutes is a pitifully short time in which to pay tribute to Abraham Lincoln, and yet, perhaps it is enough. What can one say about Lincoln in an hour that can't be said in five minutes, or even less for that matter? The central fact, the important fact, about him was his greatness, his nobility of spirit, a rare intelligence, and a moral passion that lifted him above other men—all combined with an abiding humility which kept him close to all men.

He was a good Republican, to be sure, but we have no right to claim him as our Party's personal property. For the fact is that he belonged then, belongs now, and will continue to belong to all Americans. The truly great men that our country has produced cannot be classified by party labels, for their greatness transcends the narrow limits of party programs and party philosophies. Lincoln himself turned continually to Jefferson in his continuing search for the meaning and the promise of America.

What would Lincoln do if he were alive today? I don't pretend to know, but one thing is certain—he would try to make things better, as he always strove to make himself better. Lincoln grew. It is no secret that he did not always believe in the emancipation of the slaves or the equality of the races. As much as any man, he was afflicted with the moral blindness of the time in which he lived. But he broke through the attitudes of his younger years to see the truth—that all men should be free.

He believed in the System; he worked within the System; and he fought to save the System. We despair now, some of us, anyway, that this system of ours is too flawed to work. But think of the System then, when Lincoln lived—a nation half-slave and half-free. Lincoln saved the Country because he believed in the System, and he believed in the System because he believed in the people.

In his first extended message to Congress,

he said that the leading object of the government was "to elevate the condition of men—to lift artificial weights from all shoulders; to clear the paths of laudable pursuit for all; to afford all an unfettered start and a fair chance in the race of life . . ." That was how he saw the government—a government of the people that served the people and that would guarantee any person, even a person of the humblest origins, the right to occupy the White House.

In his deep and genuine humility, Lincoln would say to his audiences: "I presume you all know who I am. I am humble Abraham Lincoln. If elected, I shall be thankful; if not, it will all be the same."

Of course he was wrong, because if he had not been elected, this country would not be the same. He freed the slaves, and in the process, began the emancipation of the whites from the attitudes that enslaved them, too. As he changed and grew, so the people of this country continue to change and grow until one day, I am convinced, we shall have the society of equal justice and equal opportunity that Lincoln struggled and died for. Until that day, his truth goes marching on, and we can only follow it.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1972

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, February 28, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us.—Matthew 6: 12.

Our Father God, in this hallowed moment of prayer we come to Thee seeking light for our way, love for our hearts, and life for our souls.

Forgive us that so often we have not responded to the gentle touch of Thy spirit nor have we been receptive to the call of Thy Word to proceed in peace and to live in love.

During these holy days of Lent may we open wide the doors of our hearts and have our whole being flooded with the beauty and glory of Thy presence, then help us to forgive as we are forgiven, to love as we are loved, and to serve as we want to be served.

We pray for our President, may his efforts for peace and cooperation among the nations be fruitful in all good works and in all good ways: to the glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1824. An act for the relief of Clinton M. Hoose;

H.R. 2828. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rose Scano;

H.R. 2846. An act for the relief of Roy E. Carroll;

H.R. 4497. An act for the relief of Lloyd B. Earle;

H.R. 4779. An act for the relief of Nina Daniel;

H.R. 6998. An act for the relief of Salman M. Hilmy; and

H.R. 7871. An act for the relief of Robert J. Beas.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2423. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the suspension and rejection of rates and practices of carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration have until midnight tonight to file reports on certain privileged matters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.