

tices under such act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 8255. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, to deal with unfair competition in imports and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8256. A bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to provide for the registration and regulation of domestic investment companies organized for the sale of their securities to foreigners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8257. A bill to amend section 14 of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. NIX, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. BIES-TER, Mr. WINN, Mr. REID, Mr. YATRON, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. RYAN, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 8258. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 8259. A bill to establish a U.S. Fire Administration and a National Fire Academy in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of death, personal injury, and property damage from fire, to increase the effectiveness and coordination of fire prevention and control agencies at all levels of government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. SHOUP:

H.R. 8260. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical, hospital, and dental care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available, financial resources, health manpower, and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDABBO (for himself, Mr. BELL, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H.J. Res. 582. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee on Classified Information; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.J. Res. 583. Joint resolution proposing

an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for mandatory retirement of the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.J. Res. 584. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to force and effect of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. WALDIE, Ms. SCHROEDER, and Mr. STOKES):

H.J. Res. 585. Joint resolution to end the war in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.J. Res. 586. Joint resolution to amend title 5 of the United States Code to provide for the designation of the 11th day of November of each year as Veterans Day and the 30th day of May of each year as Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI (for himself, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. HUBER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.J. Res. 587. Joint resolution commending the New York Times for its defense of freedom of the press against the threats of the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.J. Res. 588. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to alter the process of election of U.S. Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. PODELL, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.J. Res. 589. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that a citizen shall not be ineligible to the Office of the President by reason of not being native born if he has been a U.S. citizen for at least 12 years and a resident within the United States for 14 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STOKES:

H.J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to end the bombing in Cambodia and Laos; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TREEN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DE LUIGO, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GROVER, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. HALEY, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. KEMP):

H. Con. Res. 229. Concurrent resolution

relating to the U.S. fishing industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TREEN (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WYATT, and Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina):

H. Con. Res. 230. Concurrent resolution relating to the U.S. fishing industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H. Con. Res. 231. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the National Guard and Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States cut back on unnecessary fuel expenditures which are not required for our national security or defense readiness; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

H. Res. 420. Resolution to establish as part of the congressional internship program an internship program for secondary school teachers of government or social studies in honor of President Lyndon Baines Johnson, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

229. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, ratifying, again (after rescinding previous ratification) the 14th amendment of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ECKHARDT:

H.R. 8261. A bill for the relief of Ngan Sham Kwok Chee Stella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 8262. A bill for the relief of Dr. Laurence T. Gayao, his wife, Edith Cabus Gayao, and their daughter, Lorraine Gayao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 8263. A bill to provide for the payment of death benefits in lieu of Servicemen's Group Life Insurance benefits to the eligible survivors of certain individuals killed while participating in the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps Flight Instruction program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GEORGE BAKER—QUEENS VFW
COMMANDER

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the Queens, N.Y., chapter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars recently installed as its commander, Mr. George Baker of Jamaica. As the U.S. Representative of the Seventh Congressional District, New York. I am proud that Mr. Baker is my

constituent and I look forward to working with the Queens VFW on such issues as the need for a medical college and veterans' hospital to be located at the St. Albans site in Queens County.

A recent article in the Long Island Press presents an interesting sketch of George Baker, his family and his goals as Queens VFW commander. I am pleased to insert the text of that article in the RECORD at this point:

New VFW Commander "LOOKING FORWARD TO CHALLENGE"

(By Ernie Johnston Jr.)

Last weekend was an exciting one for George Baker of Jamaica.

On Saturday night he was installed as commander of the Queens Veterans of Foreign Wars and then on Sunday he celebrated his 51st birthday.

As a matter of fact, it has been an exciting past several months for Baker who is a transit supervisor with the New York City Transit Authority working out of the Jamaica depot.

He proudly displays a 25-year award for his service to the Transit Authority with Metropolitan Transportation Authority head William Ronan's signature affixed to it.

Through it all, Baker has been anticipating his new position with the VFW. "My wife said I would have to get a larger size hat because my head will swell," said Baker jokingly.

Baker is the second black person to be elected to head the Queens VFW, the first being Henry Archer of Brooklyn.

"You might say that I was his protege," said the Florida-born VFW commander.

Baker had come to New York in 1940 to attend the World's Fair and after much urging by his brother not to return to Panama City, Fla. but rather to attend school in New York, he decided to finish his education here.

"I graduated from Jamaica High School and in 1943 went into the Army and worked as a medical specialist. I rose to the rank of sergeant major and was with the Seventh Army in North Africa, Italy and France," said Baker.

Baker has been involved in VFW activities for 21 years. It was a fellow postal worker who lived on the same street who urged Baker to join the organization.

"I wasn't connected with any organization," Baker said, "so I decided to join. I later became commander with my local post, a position held for three years. . .

"But it was during that time I was putting my children through school and college and didn't have the time to get involved like I wanted."

Baker's son, George, Jr., 24, is an auditor for Associated Hospitals, Patricia Ann, 25, is an employment specialist, while a younger daughter, Jacqueline, 16, is a senior honor student at Cardozo High School in Bayside.

His wife, Gloria, shares much of his VFW interest as she is county conductress of the VFW auxiliary of the Queen's County Council. "She should be progressing through the chairs of the organization to president in a few years," said Baker.

Baker credits much of his moral support and advice he has received pertaining to VFW affairs to William McCarthy of Kew Gardens. McCarthy is the legislative chairman of the Queens Council.

"He has been my chief advisor over a great many years," he said.

Baker is an avid fisherman and since his VFW activities take up his schedule five nights a week he finds little time for other hobbies.

Already Baker is planning to push for St. Albans Naval Hospital to be continued as a veterans facility. "Our policy within the VFW is to fight this thing by contacting our congressmen and senators for their support.

"We are advocating setting up a medical college in conjunction with the naval hospital. Such a facility would be state supported," Baker said.

Baker heads an organization of more than 7,000 members.

"You know I am looking forward to the challenge this position offers me. I have been looking toward this for quite a number of years."

MINNESOTA COLLEGE RECRUITS VIETNAM DISABLED

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, when I was in the Minnesota Senate, before being elected to the Congress, I authored enabling legislation which led to the establishment of Southwest Minnesota State College in Marshall.

This liberal and technical college is unique because its buildings are designed and built to be convenient and easily accessible for the handicapped.

The curriculum and staffing are also

planned for the needs of the handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues and the other people who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include in it an article from the Jobs for Veterans Report about this unique college at Marshall:

Southwest Minnesota State College—the State's only four-year Liberal and Technical College—has a veterans' organization which is actively recruiting veterans. It's called the Vets Club.

Through the organization's efforts more than 200 veterans are enrolled at the institution. Since 1972, the club has worked with veterans organizations and the Minnesota Department of Veterans Affairs to aid the veteran in his educational endeavors. The club has many aims but one is to bring disabled veterans to the campus.

The Vets Club, which holds membership in the National Association of Collegiate Veterans and is affiliated with the Minnesota branch of the American Legion, is behind the drive to bring young students from the hospital to the campus. So far six disabled veterans are on campus.

Not content with merely bringing the disabled to campus, there are reachable phones and accessible bathrooms for the disabled. There is a rehabilitation counselor, a work experience counselor who works full time on placing disabled veterans, a registered physical therapist, and a secretary on full time call for the disabled. Additional services, such as readers for the blind and a test administering program, are also available. Most important, the school offers varied curricula of interest to disabled veterans who want to prepare for rewarding employment.

Marshall, Minn., the community in which the school is located, has taken interest in the disabled on campus. Its citizens have had their downtown curbs ramped so that these students can move about the town with ease. In return, they have found their businesses patronized by a group of people who otherwise may not have been able to enter their stores.

Dr. Joseph Rossillon, assistant to college president Dr. Howard Bellows, has said: With a common goal of easing the readjustment of the disabled veteran, club, school, and town are an example to the Nation of what can be done to attract disabled young people to higher education.

DARREL DUNN: A DEDICATED FEDERAL SERVANT AND ADMINISTRATOR

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to a dedicated Federal servant and administrator, Darrel A. Dunn, who recently retired from his position as Associate Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Dunn, a native of Langdon, Kans., made many lasting contributions in the field of agricultural credit, both at home and abroad, during his 20 years of distinguished service. He will be sorely missed and we owe him a great debt for his service to our Nation.

I know I speak for all those from rural America in extending best wishes to Mr. Dunn for good health, happiness and

continued fulfillment as he returns to the family farm in Reno County, Kans.

Darrel Dunn began his Federal service as Kansas State Director of the FmHA on May 4, 1953. He had two decades of experience in agricultural credit work and shared responsibility for conduct of a program which invested more than \$3.2 billion in rural America this year.

In addition to his responsibilities as State Director, Mr. Dunn served as an Assistant Administrator of FmHA in Washington from 1957 to 1961. He worked for 10 years with the Agency for International Development as an agricultural credit adviser in Ankara, Turkey, and New Delhi, India.

It was a privilege to endorse him for a return to the Farmers Home Administration and the assignment as Assistant Administrator for Farmer Programs in 1970.

He administered a joint government private lending policy that brought some \$300 million of commercial support for FmHA borrowers. His efforts resulted in the first billion dollar lending program for FmHA farmer-borrowers.

He had a personal understanding and compassion of the needs of rural America, and he utilized his expertise and knowledge to further rural development and farm ownership.

U.S. POLICY ON THE 1974 WORLD POPULATION CONFERENCE

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in 1974, a World Population Conference under the auspices of the United Nations is to be held in Bucharest, Rumania. As the Stockholm Conference on the Environment helped to shape international environmental policies for the future, so this conference is expected to have an important impact on worldwide action on population issues.

Among the groups which are interested in making a contribution to the formulation of U.S. policy at that meeting is the Center of Concern, a new public interest group based in Washington.

Recently the center issued two memorandums on the subject of the 1974 World Population Conference and related issues which should be of interest to all who are concerned about the future of mankind on our planet.

For that reason I am placing them in the RECORD at this point and urge the attention of my colleagues to them:

U.S. POLICY WITH RESPECT TO THE 1974 WORLD POPULATION CONFERENCE

(By William F. Ryan)

PREFACE

The Center of Concern, a public interest group in Washington, D.C., has recently embarked on a population policy project. Over a period of eighteen months the Center staff will engage in activities designed to sensitize North American decision-makers to global issues and Third World perspectives on population. Our aim is constructively to influence decisions made at the 1974 World Population Conference of the United Nations.

Our hope is that these decisions will be such that they promote human dignity and justice rather than reinforce present global social injustices.

With this purpose in view, this present memorandum attempts (1) to point out some significant inadequacies in the UN *Second Inquiry*, and (2) to suggest some ways in which these inadequacies can be addressed by the United States government in a way which will offer positive leadership in the promotion of global cooperation and justice.

INTRODUCTION

With the passing of Resolution 1486 (XLVIII) in April, 1970, the UN Economic and Social Council agreed that all member states would be asked to prepare a reply to the *Second Inquiry on Population Growth and Development*. This *Second Inquiry*, to be conducted in 1972-1973, was to be similar to the successful *First Inquiry* held in 1963. Member states were asked to report their individual status "concerning population trends, economic and social development, and policies and action programmes taken by them."

In September, 1972, UN Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim announced that 1974 had been proclaimed UN World Population Year, and that a World Population Conference would be held as the highlight of the Year. It was also decided that the work of this 1974 World Population Conference would be assisted if member states prepared a *Country Statement* well in advance of the Conference. This was to be "a country statement summarizing their situation and outlook with respect to population growth and how this may affect their programmes and plans for economic and social development."

Member states have now been given the option of using a single reply to serve the purposes of both the *Second Inquiry* and the Conference *Country Statement*. Thus individual governments may "leave their country statement in essentially the same form as the reply sent to the Secretary-General for purpose of the *Second Inquiry*," or alter it in any way the government "considers most important from the standpoint of the interests and objectives of the Conference."

This present memorandum is directed to those interested in the response by the United States to this request for a *Country Statement*. The population staff of the Center of Concern see the 1974 Conference as a highly significant opportunity for the US government to lead world thinking in the enunciation of population policies which promote human dignity and justice. We feel an appropriate *Country Statement* offered by the United States could do much to ease international tensions and promote harmonious international relations. But to have such a desired effect, there is great need for a response with broader perspectives and deeper sensitivity than is implied by the *Second Inquiry* request.

To respond only within the limits suggested by the *Second Inquiry* will tend to direct debate towards the areas of conflict which the UN Conference itself is designed to resolve. Those responsible for the US *Country Statement* will need to carefully consider the objectives of the Conference and recognize the extent to which the US can take a role of positive leadership in achieving those objectives. This memorandum attempts to point to some considerations in this direction.

INTERESTS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE CONFERENCE

The developed world has frequently approached the population problem of other countries on the basis that population growth acts primarily as a hindrance to development. The achievement of slower population growth rates has been regarded as a necessary precursor to more rapid development. This approach has led to a substantial and increasing amount of international con-

flict. As Rafael M. Salas, Executive Director of UNFPA, has emphasized:

"It is common these days to refer to rapid population growth as the single most important obstacle to improved living standards in developing countries. It is not surprising that this point of view is challenged in many developing countries as simplistic and misleading. The real 'obstacles' to development lie elsewhere, not merely in the rate of population growth, but in the compound effects of such factors as the neglect of agriculture, rigid social structures, imbalances in resource allocation as well as the unequal relations between rich and poor countries and the maldistribution of income. . . ."

Because many persons in the less developed countries agree with Salas' emphasis, and do not feel that the developed countries give sufficient recognition to it, there is a sense of conflict frequently present in population policy discussions.

One of the key interests in the 1974 World Population Conference is the extent to which the conflict existing on this issue of population policy can be decreased. The stated Conference aim of "promotion of international cooperation for the solution of population problems" will not be achieved unless this conflict is squarely faced and resolved to the extent possible. If government delegations come to the Conference with uncompromising positions, the ensuing debate will do little more than publicize and reinforce present disagreements. The Conference objectives, then, will certainly not be aided by *Country Statements* which take a narrow perspective on the relationship between population and development.

INADEQUACIES OF THE SECOND INQUIRY

In offering member states the option of combining their Conference *Country Statements* with their *Second Inquiry* responses, the United Nations has requested that they "prepare and make available to the Conference a country statement summarizing their situation and outlook with respect to population growth and how this may affect their programmes and plans for economic and social development."

It is true that this request focuses on the impact of population on economic and social development and on environment. But it is highly significant that nowhere in the *Second Inquiry* is there explicit recognition that development trends and plans also have impacts on population. The complex feed-back interrelationships between population growth and distribution, societal values, economic development, social organization, and technology are not explicitly recognized. Lack of such explicitation, of course, narrowly limits the range of debate.

That such an approach as characterized by the *Second Inquiry* is limiting is widely recognized. Demographer Ian Pool of Carleton University has stressed:

"From the outset it must be recognized that it is impossible to develop a population policy by restricting discussion entirely to demographic variables. This is because population growth is inter-related with all other aspects of social and economic change, with the environment and with technological change. In this way population growth is both an independent variable and a dependent variable. It must be noted that generally discussions in public of the 'population problem' relate to the role of population growth and size as an independent variable."

Similarly, this interrelationship was stated in the Declaration of Population Strategy for Development, adopted by the 23-nation Second Asian Population Conference in Tokyo on November 13, 1972:

"While population has a direct effect on economic and social development and the human environment, conversely policies in the fields of education, health, housing, social security, employment and agriculture have an impact on population and, there-

fore, require integrated national planning and coordinating action at the highest government level."

In addition, Raphael Salas has noted that—

"Changes in fertility behaviour are more likely to occur as an integral part of an overall process of social and economic change which is, generally speaking, not yet occurring on a sufficiently broad scale in most developing countries. . . ."

Empirical studies bear out these observations. Taiwan and Mexico can be used as illustrations of how alternative development strategies can affect birth rates. In Taiwan birth rates have declined markedly over the last fifty years whereas in Mexico they have declined very little. As William Rich points out in a recent study for the Overseas Development Council:

"Highly uneven distribution of income and social services as well as religious constraints and a lack of government support for family planning programs have all contributed to Mexico's sustained population growth."

While both countries have experienced substantial increases in productivity, the poorest 20% of the population in Taiwan "improved their economic standing by over 200% in the last two decades, while the income level of the same group in Mexico fell by 20%." Although cultural, geographic and political conditions in Taiwan and Mexico differ, their impact upon birth rates is not clear. What does seem clear, however, is that significant differences in development strategies—income distribution, social services, etc.—are linked to differences in family size.

In short, then, the *Second Inquiry* unfortunately encourages a response which would approach the population/development interrelationship primarily from only one side, that is, by treating population as an independent variable. Such a response from developed countries would, as explained above, tend to reinforce present international conflicts rather than resolve them. Unless the developed countries demonstrate recognition of and attention to the development impacts upon population, the less developed countries will very understandably view the UN Conference with increasing suspicion and fear.

THE OPPORTUNITY FOR THE UNITED STATES

The United States is under careful world scrutiny with respect to population policy. It is in an extremely advantageous position to set an example for the type of world thinking which should go on in this area. The UN *Second Inquiry* has defined too narrow a perspective for the sort of response which would enable the US to give leadership in promoting human dignity. This is not to suggest the *Second Inquiry* should be ignored or perfunctorily answered. Indeed, it is already being answered with all the detailed information requested and answered in a spirit of good faith and cooperation.

But at this time the United States is in a position to do much more. It would be unfortunate to waste the opportunity. It could show decisive leadership in the developed world by making a statement for the Conference independent of, but complementary to, that required in answer to the *Second Inquiry*. In such a statement, the US could raise those perspectives and variables lacking in the *Second Inquiry*, and raise them before the less developed nations are forced to do so in self-protective defense. Thus the possibility of confrontation could be lessened and an enormous amount of global goodwill created by the United States' initiative in raising wider and deeper issues. The impact of such a gesture could greatly enhance cooperative international relations. This would be especially true if the US encouraged other developed nations to do the same.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the concern of this memorandum is that the United States may miss the timely opportunity that the formulation of global population policy provides for it officially to take positive leadership in promotion of international understanding and justice. The missing of this opportunity will in fact tend to reinforce an approach to the population question which is increasingly a source of international tension. If the US response were deliberately to take a broader definition of the population problem and a broader view of the causal relationships between population and development, the stated aims of the 1974 World Population Conference would be well served. The latter approach could do much to promote social justice in the development of global population policies. It could also do much to reestablish faith in the intentions and desires behind US international policies.

DRAFT NOTES ON A "JUST" GLOBAL POPULATION POLICY

(By Peter J. Henriot)

PREFACE

In discussing population policy in relation to the coming United Nations Population Year and Conference, the population staff of the Center of Concern has been emphasizing the need for formulation and support of a "just" global population policy. The present memorandum presents a draft of early ideas to situate the need for such a "just" policy and to delineate some of the elements which would make up that policy. It is our intention to expand further these ideas in subsequent memoranda. Reactions and suggestions will be much appreciated.

THE PROBLEM

There is a population crisis. The statistics used to demonstrate population growth rates are widely quoted but not always understood. It would be simple and certainly attractive to assume that continued population growth in and of itself constitutes a crisis and that in stopping such growth we will have resolved our social problems. In fact, what we are facing is a complex fabric of breakdowns in the human system that represents a global social crisis. One of the interdependent causal factors of that social crisis is rapid population growth.

Treating population growth as a separate problem, independent of other sources of strain within the global system, ignores its dependence on the other dimensions of social development. Population growth is not the only problem, nor the cause of all problems, nor the major obstacle to solution to all problems. Rather, population growth combines with widening gaps in income distribution, unequal consumption of food and mineral resources, insufficient health, education, housing and transportation services, increasing unemployment, environmental deterioration, in addition to widespread individual powerlessness to tip the already teetering balance of interdependent social pressures. Thus is created a crisis of global proportions.

According to the ancient Greeks, a time of crisis is a decision point, when decisions that are made can lead to solution or disaster. The decision point with respect to population growth is upon us. Essentially we are faced with a choice between inaction or ineffective action with resulting global catastrophe, and comprehensive, constructive action with potential for sane and humane social evolution. Clearly the latter is preferable. But the current absence of adequate planning and commitment to action serves to make the crisis more alarming. The attempts of the last decade to limit population numbers have not been successful. Clearly, a wider approach is necessary.

THE SOLUTION

Deliberately designed population policy is an imperative because the alternative—inac-

tion leading to catastrophe—is unacceptable. Policy, by its very nature, is determined by implicit or explicit priorities. We must first establish acceptable priorities so that we can adequately consider alternative policies. The position taken here begins with the postulate that the only truly acceptable policy priority is the enhancement of human dignity. For the "marginal, underdeveloped" two-thirds of the world's population, human dignity is grounded in global social and economic justice and a participation in the decisions leading to that goal. Given this position, what would a global population policy look like if it were to maximize global justice?

TOWARD A JUST GLOBAL POPULATION POLICY

We are clearly far from the time when we will be able to describe in extensive detail a just population policy. But we are already late in beginning the process of formulation and enunciation. We can at least begin by outlining several objectives of a just population policy.

A just population policy would:

1. promote greater equalization of resources, social services, as well as political power and participation, both internationally and intranationally;
2. respect national sovereignty, cultural differences, and specific needs;
3. support sensitive and comprehensive approaches to social problems in place of simplistic technological tinkering;
4. elicit a wide measure of popular agreement and understanding of the extent to which social needs supercede individual freedom in the realm of reproduction;
5. insure easy access for all individuals to whatever knowledge and chosen means are necessary for them to control the number and spacing of their children;
6. be combined with concurrent social, economic, and political policies as one facet of a comprehensive program to solve social problems, thus refraining from presenting population growth as the most pressing of social problems;
7. delineate the relative importance of population phenomena within all social, economic, and political policies (e.g., education, housing, urbanization, industrialization, transportation, etc.), and vice versa;
8. stress the fact that population is people and not numbers; that every statistic in every survey represents an individual with basic rights and freedoms.

These various elements of policy are obviously interrelated and are by no means exhaustive. But they are set down to help us begin to elicit something more comprehensive, more concrete. The debate and decisions of the UN Population Year and Conference will need a perspective which incorporates these elements if the challenge of the population crisis is to be effectively and humanely met.

A SHORTAGE OF SUMMER JOBS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the Missouri House of Representatives has approved a resolution on an important problem confronting the State of Missouri. I would like to call this to the attention of my colleagues so that they can have this in mind when appropriate legislation is considered.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Missouri House of Representatives is aware of the extreme shortage of funds which have thus far been appropriated by Congress to provide summer em-

ployment for urban youth seeking jobs; and Whereas, there is currently pending in Congress an amendment to the Labor Department's budget which would provide funds for programs to assure jobs for youth during the summer session; and

Whereas, in past years the Neighborhood Youth Corps and other agencies have provided several thousand summer jobs to young men and women in the greater St. Louis area and proportionate numbers of jobs in other major metropolitan areas of Missouri; and

Whereas, it is estimated that no more than three thousand jobs can be funded this year due to lack of money from the federal government unless the above-mentioned amendment receives a favorable vote in Congress; and

Whereas, it is the sense of the Missouri House of Representatives that without an adequate job program, serious repercussions may result and be manifest in an increase of juvenile delinquency and crime in general;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Missouri House of Representatives of the Seventy-seventh General Assembly that Congress be memorialized to provide the funds for summer jobs sought by the above-mentioned amendment; and

Be it further resolved that the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be instructed to send suitably inscribed copies of this resolution to each member of Missouri's Congressional Delegation.

SMITHSONIAN POLICY STATEMENT

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, the Board of Regents of Smithsonian Institution at its meeting on May 9 issued a policy statement concerning Smithsonian's museums' acquisition policy.

The statement declares that the policy of the Institution is not to acquire or exhibit objects and specimens which have been stolen, unscientifically gathered or excavated, or unethically acquired from their source.

This policy statement is particularly welcome in view of the recent publicity given the unethical acquisition policies of some museums, and in order that all of the Members may read it I include it at this point in the RECORD:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION POLICY ON MUSEUM ACQUISITIONS

The documentary value of a museum collection is a principal criterion of its excellence, and museum accession records should therefore be of the highest order of accuracy and completeness. To this end, each object acquired should have a provenance as completely documented as possible. Objects with incomplete provenance should be acquired only when they are of exceptional rarity, and when it is reasonably certain that their origin, context, and history can be established through scholarly research. An inadequate provenance may give rise to doubt as to the licit quality of an object. Each provenance should be a matter of public record.

The Institution supports the free exchange of information and artifacts which contributes to the advancement of knowledge and promotes international comprehension and goodwill. The legitimate international transfer of natural and cultural material should be facilitated by all available means, including loans and sales, and the Institution encourages such transfers in the same manner as it now fosters international exchanges be-

tween museums. At the same time, the Institution undertakes to cooperate fully with local, state, Federal and foreign authorities and institutions in their endeavors to protect their art, antiquities, national treasures and ethnographic material from destructive exploitation. An illicit international market has contributed to the despoliation of museums and monuments, and the irreparable loss to science and humanity of archaeological remains. The Institution repudiates the illicit traffic in art and objects. Objects and specimens which have been stolen, unscientifically gathered or excavated or unethically acquired should not be made part of Smithsonian museum collections.

In consideration of this policy, the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution adopt the rules set forth below for the acquisition of art, antiquities, and other specimens. The Director of each Bureau shall be responsible for the application of the rules. Donors, vendors, and correspondents will be notified of this policy.

1. Each Director of a museum or collection, before authorizing the acquisition of an object, whether by purchase, transfer, gift or bequest, has the responsibility, in good faith, to ascertain, from the circumstances surrounding the transaction, or his knowledge of the object's provenance, that the object in question was not stolen or wrongfully converted, and is not illegally present in the United States.

2. Each Director also has the responsibility to ascertain that any proposed new acquisition was not unethically acquired from its source, unscientifically excavated or illegally removed from its country of origin after the date of adoption of this policy.

3. (a) In cases of doubt, the Director should consult widely within the Institution, particularly with those scientists or curators whose interests would be affected by acquisition of the object, and with the General Counsel. Where helpful, a special panel should be created to help pass on the questions raised.

(b) In the case of a substantial proposed acquisition of foreign provenance whose acceptability is in question, the Institution will contact the competent authorities or corresponding national museums of the probable countries of origin, or the countries whose laws may be affected by the transaction, in order to determine whether the latter can advise the Institution as to the status of the object. If any such object can be demonstrated to form part of the national patrimony of another country, the Institution will take reasonable steps within its power to aid that country in its efforts to effect the object's return.

4. In case the Institution should hereafter come into possession of an object which can be shown to have been acquired, excavated or exported in violation of Rule 2 above, the Institution should proceed as appropriate in each case, to seek to return the object to the donor or vendor or to contact the competent authorities or corresponding national museum in the probable country of origin, to determine what steps might be taken best to preserve the interests of all parties.

5. The policy set forth here should be applied in determining whether to accept loans for display or other purposes.

6. The provenance of acquired objects shall be a matter of public record.

NCOA LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of C. A. Mack McKinney, director

of legislative affairs for the Noncommissioned Officers Association. I include the organization's legislative program at this point in the RECORD:

NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR 1973

The Noncommissioned Officers Association of the United States of America (NCOA), composed of nearly 125,000 Noncommissioned and Petty Officers of the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard; active, retired, reserve, National Guard and veteran; shall continue to support personnel legislation as its primary goal for 1973.

The Association's Creed objectively marshals its "Strength in Unity" motto to work for the well-being of its individual and collective membership, ever mindful that this is the principle on which it was founded.

The need for a viable, active organization such as the NCOA to speak for the NCO and petty officers corps is apparent more so today than at any time in our Nation's history.

For more than 185 years the military was the forgotten segment in our Country's labor force. They were only respected when their fellow Americans required their services to defend the rights to liberty and justice for all.

It was not until 1968 that the military pay scales and other allowances climbed sufficiently to provide a near-decent living level for the service member. Since that year they have continued to increase to where the average military person may now consider himself or herself adequately reimbursed for the services required by his Country.

But in less than five years, many of our Nation's lawmakers, government officials and civilian workers are crying for a reversal. "The military member is receiving too much money, too much in allowances, and too many benefits." The cry is to cut back on those monies, allowances and benefits that are necessary for the well-being of the career serviceman or woman.

Our Nation is undergoing a transition period following the termination of American participation in a hostile environment in Vietnam. Many of the Nation's lawmakers are actively supporting an All-Volunteer Force concept that will, according to Administration officials, provide our Armed Forces with a lean, professional corps of volunteer men and women.

The Association, however, submits that the present program of offering monetary awards to new enlistees and first reenlistment members is not the answer. Providing for the comfort and welfare of the military member and his or her family is of paramount concern.

The Nation cannot ignore the career-motivated military member of the NCO and petty officer corps. These are the professionals; these are the men and women who are, were, and shall always be the "backbone" of the services. It is they who train our young men and women of the volunteer forces. It is their dedication, their loyalty, their devotion that molds today's youth into the lean, professional military member of tomorrow.

The NCO's and Petty Officers of the worldwide Non Commissioned Officers Association pledge their continued loyalty to our Nation, our fellow-countrymen and our Services, and seek the same pledge from those we serve.

As members of the Armed Services and the NCOA, and as citizens of this great Nation, we join together in general assembly this 18th day of April 1973 at San Antonio, Texas, and adopt the following legislative program in behalf of ourselves and our fellow-NCO and petty officers stationed throughout the world, and those who are retired members or veterans of the U.S. Armed Services.

1. To continually support legislation and regulatory provisions that provide for the well-being of the NCO and petty officers' corps; active, retired, reserve and National

Guard; and for their dependents. It is with the understanding that our efforts in this behalf will normally contribute to the welfare of all military members.

a. Primary concern shall be centered on the following goals:

(1). Renewed recognition of the trust and confidence in our NCO and petty officers of the Armed Services.

(a). It is with considerable concern that the NCOA continues to find officials who fail to afford the trust and confidence normally extended to the NCO and petty officers corps. Two primary reasons may be contributed to this failure; (1)—personal or collective thinking, and (2)—the inadequacies in the present promotion and assignment policies of the individual Services. The first may be rectified through educational efforts on the part of senior DOD officials and Armed Services commanders. The second requires a comprehensive study by a panel of enlisted personnel at the E-4 through E-9 levels. The NCOA recommends that DOD order such a study to commence at the earliest. It further recommends that the following points be considered; (a)—review all regulations prior to dissemination to ensure that the provisions of such directives do not degrade nor demean the NCO or petty officer corps, nor is it detrimental to their discipline or morale; (b)—cease to promote enlisted personnel to the ranks of NCO and petty officers solely on the basis of time-in-grade, time-in-service, and/or on-the-job proficiency; instead, promote on the primary attribute of possessing and practicing potential leadership capabilities; (c)—establish NCO and PO Leadership Training Course for potential promotees and not for those who have been promoted and make it mandatory that selectees must be attended and successfully passed such a course before the promotion can be effected; (d)—establish an Enlisted Counsellor (EC) specially at grade levels E-4 through E-9.

(2). To support any and all congressional legislation that will curtail the attainment, sale or use of dangerous drugs, and that which will vitally assist in the treatment of those military personnel addicted to dangerous drugs or alcohol; however, such legislation should contain the following provisions;

(a) Treatment of military personnel should be initiated while in the armed services, but only for a specific period of time, after which continued use will cause the user to be discharged from the service as an undesirable.

(b) Permit properly-conducted searches and seizures by senior NCO and petty officers on military personnel suspected of having dangerous drugs in their possession to be accepted by the military courts.

(c) Provide immediate and irrevocable dishonorable discharges for military personnel found guilty of illegally selling or passing dangerous drugs.

(d) Immediately suspend regulations that now call for the involuntary testing of NCO and petty officers for drug usage.

(3) Continue support for increased appropriations for a more active military family housing and bachelor quarters program.

(4) Maintain the present military retirement system for those members now on active duty and those who subsequently enlist in the Armed Services prior to the date of enactment of any new system.

(5) Support legislation that will provide equal rights for men and women in the Armed Services; that will correct inequities existing in present retirement laws as pertains to enlisted and officers; and that which will correct injustices to enlisted personnel that now exist in law, in writing or as a moral obligation of the United States government.

(6) Urge the Armed Services to encourage their individual members to take pride in their uniform and to further encourage the wearing of the uniform on and off duty.

(7) Review Statuses of Forces agreements

to provide better protection and economic indiscrimination for military personnel.

(8) Work toward the attainment of an All-Volunteer Force, but with the understanding that the President may retain the induction authority under the Selective Service System in the event a rapid buildup of military forces is required to prevent aggression.

(9) Actively increase support of the National Guard and Reserve. To assist in the President's program of Employer Support for the National Guard and Reserve; and to support legislation that will assist the Guard and Reserve in attaining their recruitment goals.

2. To support a stronger defense posture for the United States that will ensure military offensive and defensive capabilities equal to or superior to that of the Soviet Union. The program is to include:

a. An Armed Forces strength at least equal to its size as authorized by the Fiscal Year 1973 Military Procurement Authorization Act.

b. Sufficient funds for the research and development of superior weapons.

c. Increased procurement of weapons, ships, planes and other hardware essentially needed for the U.S. Armed Forces.

d. An adequate airlift and sealift capability.

e. A capability to destroy most enemy missiles before they can strike the United States.

f. An adequate space system including the space-shuttle.

g. Sufficient appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the continued support of the U.S. Coast Guard.

h. An accelerated civil defense program aimed to instruct all persons living in the United States how to respond to various alarms related to armed attacks and how to properly defend and protect themselves.

3. To support and encourage congressional legislation that will:

a. Prevent any member of the communist party or any group advocated toward the overthrow of the U.S. government from teaching in any public school in the United States or supported by the U.S. taxpayers, or to be employed by any governmental agency at the national, state or municipal level.

b. Provide for the arrest, conviction and imprisonment of any person or persons that:

(1). Advocate the overthrow of the United States through words or action, or who through violence or force attempt to impose their convictions upon other citizens of the United States, or who willfully and illegally destroy any public or private property.

(2). Conspire, attempt and/or carry out the crime of kidnapping (including "sky-jacking").

(3). Wound or kill a policeman, fireman, or security guard while in the performance of their duty, or as a result of such duty, and that such a crime will be considered an offense against the federal government.

c. Establish a Freedom Academy to train leaders for the United States in the Cold War.

d. Provide a continuing program to keep the American people, particularly military personnel, fully informed of the goals and activities of organizations and nations dedicated to the overthrow of the United States through force, violence or subversive efforts.

4. To support congressional legislation that will:

a. Permit prayer in public schools and buildings.

b. Require the Pledge of Allegiance to be recited daily in all public schools, but allow those who are religiously-opposed to be excused from the recitation.

c. Make it a federal offense to desecrate the Flag of the United States.

d. Make it a federal offense to fly or display

a foreign flag of any nation that is in conflict with the U.S.

e. Redesignate the 11th day of November of each year as Veterans Day and the 30th day of May of each year as Memorial Day.

f. Encourage the playing of the National Anthem at all public gatherings, sports events, etc., that are televised or broadcast, or possess a public address system.

5. To support the continuation of the United States foreign policy program with the following recommendations;

a. Pursuit of further negotiations and agreements of military limitations and economic trade with the Soviet Union, Red China and other communist nations, but not to include technical and technological assistance that in any way may be related to military development of these nations.

b. Maintain the commitment to NATO and provide an adequate troop level and combat element to assist in acting as a deterrent to Soviet Union military and economic advancement in Eastern Europe; and

c. Continue the commitments to other allied and friendly nations that are materially aiding the United States strategically or economically. However, such commitments shall be subject to;

(1). Pursuit of increased financial and/or economic aid from those nations that are now experiencing greater economical wealth.

(2). The continual pursuit of full repayment by all nations indebted to the United States.

d. Insist that all nations having membership in the United Nations pay their full share for maintaining that organization, or be expelled for cause. And that the United States refuse to contribute any more financial aid than its annual assessed amount.

6. To adamantly oppose any legislative proposal calling for general or selective amnesty for selective service evaders, and military deserters.

7. To support congressional legislation designed to regulate congressional lobbying activities only if such regulations distinctively exempt military and veterans organizations of a non-profit status from complete statutory control.

REPORT TO PETER J. BRENNAN, SECRETARY OF LABOR

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the following report was presented to the Honorable Peter J. Brennan, Secretary of Labor, by Donald P. Haggerty, the research director of the National Conference of Motion Picture and Television Unions.

The report deals with the unions' views on H.R. 1090, a bill to require contractors of departments and agencies of the United States engaged in the production of motion picture and television films to pay prevailing wages and fringe benefits.

The material follows:

Mr. Secretary: The United States Department of Labor does not presently provide any protection for wages paid to employees engaged in the production and processing of motion picture and television films for government contracts by extending the payment of prevailing wage statutes to private contractors involved in producing films for Federal departments and agencies.

Millions of dollars are spent annually to make films for departments and agencies of

the United States with contractors who compete unfairly for such government business by paying substandard wages and deny the usual fringe benefits, such as health and welfare and pension, to employees.

The United States Congress long ago expressed its desire to discourage substandard labor conditions for governmental contracts dating back to 1931 when Congress adopted the Davis-Bacon Act to protect laborers and mechanics employed in Federal public works construction contracts.

Employees working on government contracts for manufacturing or furnishing of materials, supplies, articles or equipment in excess of \$10,000 have been provided similar protection under the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act of 1936.

Additional protections were provided for employees working on projects performed for or financed by the United States Government in 1962 under the passage of the Contract Work Hours Standards Act which guaranteed established weekly as well as daily overtime pay requirements for laborers and mechanics on Federal public works and on work financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government.

Congress provided further minimum wage and fringe benefit protection for craftsmen, manual laborers, guards, watchmen and supervisors in positions having predominantly trade, craft or laboring experience who are engaged in work under Government contract to furnish services to Federal agencies with the passage of the McNamara-O'Hara Service Contract Act of 1965.

Professional performers and related or supporting professional personnel employed on projects or productions assisted by grants from the National Endowment for the Arts were guaranteed prevailing wage rates with the passage of the National Foundation of the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965.

The employees in the motion picture production and processing industries are not provided any comparable statutory protection from substandard wages and working conditions. The passage of H.R. 1090 would resolve this inequity and substantiate the original desires of Congress by providing that prevailing minimum wage rates and fringe benefits for workers employed in the performance of any contract or subcontract entered into with the Federal Government for the production or processing of motion picture films shall be determined and enforced by the Labor Department in the same manner as for service employees under the McNamara-O'Hara Service Contract Act of 1965. Since the protection of prevailing wage legislation is already enjoyed by so many other types of employees working on government contracts, such protection should be extended to American film workers making motion picture films which are such a valuable aid to the conduct of governmental functions in the field of mass communications.

On August 27, 1972 at a reception at the California White House, President Nixon stated:

"Speaking to all of you, and to everybody in this whole community that we call Hollywood, I would like to express appreciation as an individual, and also speaking as President of the United States, for what you, the people of Hollywood, have done for America and have done for the world."

In October, 1972, the President instructed governmental agencies to "Better Utilize the American Motion Picture Industry in Film Production."

This Administrative Mandate has not been adhered to and the White House has not followed through with its directive to provide protection for the workers in the Motion Picture and Television Industry from the unfair "low bid" format that is presently being followed by governmental departments and agencies.

The employees of the Motion Picture Industry have been suffering from depressed conditions resulting from the "runaway" problem for the past 20 years and their wages and fringe benefits reflect this condition. The employees of the Motion Picture Industry do not have any contractual provisions for sick leave, nor do they have an automatic escalation "cost of living" clause, nor do they have dental, psychiatric or optical provisions. Their health and welfare medical coverage has dropped from 80% to 50%. Employees in this industry have 7 holidays (if they work long enough to qualify). The average in manufacturing is 8.9, etc.

For comparable work performed in the Los Angeles area, for example:

HOURLY WAGE RATES

	Motion picture industry	Building and construction trades
Electricians.....	\$5.62	\$9.54
Plumbers.....	5.62	8.62
Painters.....	5.62	7.60
Carpenters.....	5.62	6.75
Laborers.....	4.335	5.495

The average rate for the Motion Picture Industry skilled craftsmen and technicians as stipulated by the Association of Motion Picture & Television Producers, Inc. on January 31, 1973 was \$5.54 per hour.

It is an inequitable situation that the average hourly rate in the Motion Picture Industry for comparable work performed by equally skilled craftsmen outside the industry is anywhere from \$1.00 to \$4.00 per hour lower than the corresponding outside rates.

Immediate relief from the current unemployment crisis is necessitated by prompt action through governmental channels in eliminating the "low bid" formula that rewards employers paying substandard wages refusing to provide medical or hospital fringe benefits or retirement incentives.

Whether the immediate short range financial advantages being gained by United States governmental departments and agencies will justify the long range economic losses for "the people of Hollywood who have done so much for America" (Nixon); in terms of mounting unemployment, increased welfare costs, and the erosion of our domestic film making capabilities is a question that the government of the United States will have to answer as a matter of public policy.

I sincerely hope that the Executive Branch and the Congress will provide us with the answer by promptly amending the Service Contract Act of 1965.

H.R. 1090

A bill to require contractors of departments and agencies of the United States engaged in the production of motion picture films to pay prevailing wages

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any contract (and any bid specification) entered into by an agency or instrumentality of the United States for the production or processing of motion picture films shall contain a provision specifying the minimum monetary wages and fringe benefits to be paid laborers, mechanics, craftsmen, technicians, professional employees, and related or supporting personnel employed in the performance of the contract or any subcontract thereunder, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in the same manner as the wages of service employees under the Service Contract Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1034), and the provisions of such Act shall apply for purposes of determining and enforcing the payment of such wages and fringe benefits.

Sec. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as repealing or modifying in any way

other Federal laws prescribing minimum wages or overtime pay for contracts subject to this Act.

TEXAS HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION
HOLDS ANNUAL MEETING

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week in Houston the Texas Hospital Association held its annual meeting and I am proud to say that the event was one of the most outstanding health conventions ever to be held.

Hospitals from across Texas sent delegations of health care personnel to the association's 44th annual convention and exhibit show held May 19-23, in Houston, to learn about ways of keeping pace with the Federal health programs, ways of improving patient care, and become aware of the most recent scientific advancements in the delivery of health care.

"Living With Change" was the theme for the 5-day convention and the delegates heard discussion on the new Federal regulations dealing with over 100 changes in the social security medicare and medicaid programs, revenue sharing, labor relations, phase III regulations affecting health care providers and consumerism.

In conjunction with the THA convention, 20 other health care organizations affiliated and allied with THA held educational programs of their own. The groups meeting with THA were: Association of Protestant Chaplains for Texas Hospitals; Conference of Allied Health Educators; Hospital Purchasing Agents Association of Texas; Medical Explorer Scouts; Texas Association of Homes for the Aging; Texas Association of Hospital Auxiliaries; Texas Association of Hospital Engineers; Texas Association of Hospital Governing Boards; Texas Association of Nurse Anesthetists; Texas Association of Operating Room Nurses; Texas Association, Staff Directors of Hospital Volunteers Services; Texas Chapter, Society for Hospital Social Work Directors; Texas Conference of Catholic Health Facilities; Texas Dietetic Association; Texas Medical Records Association; Texas Society for Hospital Nursing Service Administrators; Texas Society of Central Service Personnel; Texas Society of Hospital Executive Housekeepers and Texas Society of Hospital Pharmacists.

Approximately 7,000 persons attended the convention, which featured sessions of the Association's House of Delegates, installation of Charles L. Foster, FACHA administrator of Knapp Memorial Methodist Hospital, Weslaco as the association's new leader and a dinner honoring Horace M. Cardwell, FACHA, administrator, Memorial Hospital, Lufkin and chairman-elect of the 7,000 member American Hospital Association.

Guest speakers at the convention included James A. Cavanaugh, staff assistant to the president for Health Affairs, Washington, D.C.; John Alexander Mc-

Mahon, president, American Hospital Association, Chicago; Mary Bennett Peterson, author of the Regulated Consumer, Washington, D.C.; Richard J. Garvey, chief of operations and analysis branch, Health Division, Office of Price Monitoring, Cost of Living Council, Washington, D.C.; Arthur S. Fefferman, chief economist, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue and Taxation, Washington, D.C., and Thomas M. Tierney, Bureau of Health Insurance, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Baltimore, Md., and Leo J. Gehrig, M.D., Vice President, American Hospital Association, D.C.

Special recognition was extended to L. E. Frazier, Jr., a Houston attorney and civic leader, who was given the 1973 Founders Award of the Texas Association of Hospital Governing Boards for his leadership and distinguished contributions to health care in Texas. He is vice chairman of the board of trustees of the Memorial Hospital System, and in eleven years on that board, he has helped develop and expand the satellite hospital concept which Memorial has pioneered.

Members and affiliates of the Texas Hospital Association should be proud of the excellent program. I commend the officers of the Association, especially C. Jack Price, the immediate Past-President, and Mr. O. Ray Hurst, Executive Vice President of the Association, and his extremely capable staff for a job well done.

MARGUERITE MOYNIHAN AWARDED
FOR OUTSTANDING CIVIC INVOLVEMENT

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, Miss Marguerite Moynihan of Milton, Mass., will be honored with a luncheon at the Milton Hill House in recognition of her amazing civic involvement. Miss Moynihan has been selected to receive the Good Citizenship award of the Mutual Trust Life Insurance Co. A dedicated woman, Miss Moynihan has spent most of her life working to aid her fellow human beings. She has been associated with many community-centered organizations and has always endeavored to better the lifestyle of her community. It is my privilege to pay tribute to such a remarkable citizen and to thank her for the invaluable services she has rendered to her community and to the Nation at large.

The following is a background history of the award Miss Moynihan will receive on Friday, June 1, and a brief summary of the many activities in which Miss Moynihan has participated:

MARGUERITE MOYNIHAN CHOSEN FOR GOOD
CITIZENSHIP AWARD

Marguerite Moynihan, a resident of Milton, Massachusetts, has been selected to receive the Good Citizenship Award of Mutual Trust Life Insurance Company. Every year, the company honors policyowners who have helped to better their home communities. Ms. Moynihan was nominated by Mutual

Trust Life general agent Charles J. Interland, also a resident of Milton. The Interland Agency is located at 10 Fairway Street, Mattapan, Massachusetts.

On June 1, Ms. Moynihan will be honored with a luncheon in Milton (Milton Hill House). She will receive an engraved Revere sterling silver bowl, and Mutual Trust Life will present a check to her favorite charity.

Through the Good Citizenship program, now in its 11th year, Mutual Trust Life salutes outstanding citizens who have been nominated by the company's general agents across the country. Past winners have included a newspaper publisher from Connecticut, an Ohio juvenile court judge, an 18-year-old honor roll student from Utah, a county commissioner from Florida, a Chamber of Commerce president from California and an Iowa industrialist.

"During her career, she advised and assisted many unfortunate people with a kindness, courtesy and compassion that nowadays seem to be 'out of style,'" general agent Interland declared when he nominated Ms. Moynihan for this year's award. She has worked for her home town of Milton since 1935. In 1969, she retired from the position of Director of Welfare for Milton. The same year, Milton Hospital started a Social Services Department and named her as director, a position she still holds.

Marguerite Moynihan has taken a personal interest in needy senior citizens of her community; she has run errands for them, driven them in her car and aided them in many ways. She is on the committee of the Milton residence for the elderly, and on the advisory board of the Milton Visiting Nurses Services. In addition she is chairman of the board of the Milton Campership Association, which raises funds for emotionally disturbed children.

Her "ecumenical outlook" is reflected in the fact that she is welfare secretary of the town of Milton Service Unit of the Salvation Army, and also active in a variety of committees in St. Mary's Parish.

Founded in 1904, Mutual Trust Life is one of the 100 oldest life insurance companies in the United States. The Chicago-based company has well over one billion, one hundred eighty million dollars of insurance in force, and exceeds \$310 million in assets.

CHEMICALS CONTROLLED

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Environmental Protection Agency has just recently banned the dumping of certain substances in the ocean. The Agency will now prohibit, "under any circumstances," the dumping of radioactive materials and chemical or biological warfare substances, including what are commonly known as nerve gas, mustard gas and agent orange. Used in Vietnam, this consists of 2, 4, 5-T herbicide.

In the wake of chemical devastation in Vietnam, we are finally moving in the proper direction to the control and curtailment of toxic chemicals.

In this perspective, I will soon introduce the Herbicide Export Control Act of 1973 and the Chemical Warfare Prevention Act of 1973 in the House of Representatives.

The first proposal will halt the exportation of 2, 4, 5-T herbicides.

The latter will prohibit the exportation

of all herbicides to Portugal and South Africa, nations engaged in chemical warfare in southern Africa.

Chemicals unfit for use in this country should not be peddled abroad. I welcome the support and cosponsorship of my colleagues in these legislative efforts to control chemical destruction.

FUEL SHORTAGES IN AMERICA

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, it has become painfully clear that some sections of the United States have fallen into the grip of a potentiality crippling energy shortage. Gasoline stations in some areas are rationing their supplies, some farmers cannot secure liquid petroleum to heat and cool their homes, and urban areas are haunted by the threat of blackouts or brownouts. In my own district, cities are turning off the street lights because they cannot purchase enough natural gas and fuel oil to fully power their electric generating turbines.

The problems associated with the energy shortage are complex and manifold. Though more realistic market regulations will increase American petroleum and natural gas production by encouraging exploration and refinery construction, we are meanwhile forced to rely increasingly on petroleum imports, a practice which could compromise our foreign policy prerogatives.

Whatever action is taken with respect to petroleum and natural gas, we know that the world supply of both will be depleted or greatly reduced relatively soon and that other sources of power must be ready to meet energy demands. And any source of power must be reasonably clean and environmentally accepted.

Congress is cognizant of the energy shortage. Several committees have begun probing its maze of problems, and legislation has been introduced which would create a central committee for studying the shortage. Today I am introducing into the RECORD the following article, which I think will prove useful to those of us who are concerned about this Nation's energy supply.

The following, by John H. Douglas, appeared in the May 26 issue of Science News:

FUEL SHORTAGES IN AMERICA: THE ENERGY CRISIS COMES HOME (By John H. Douglas)

The energy crisis has come home. Across the nation hundreds of neighborhood gasoline stations have closed, schools have had to suspend classes during cold waves for lack of heat, shortages to farmers threaten a new round of rising food prices and millions of Americans have begun to wonder whether their summer vacation plans will be curtailed by fuel rationing. They have also begun asking troublesome questions: Why did the crisis get this far? Why did it come first in petroleum products? Is anybody doing anything about it?

The answers rest on an understanding of two very different, but equally grave, problems—long-range ecology and short-range economics.

The long-range problem is the more easily stated: An end is in sight for America's reserves of oil and gas, but the nation continues acting as if they would continue forever. Half the country's original oil has been burned; a third has not been pumped but is known to exist, a fifth has not been discovered but is presumed to exist from geological considerations.

Oil supplies about half the nation's energy needs and demand is expected to double in the next 12 years. If it does, and if domestic production increases as expected, by 1985 the United States may have to import as much as 60 percent of its petroleum. The price of this imported oil, and the resulting cost of powering the country, would be many times higher than at present.

The soaring demand for oil stems from several factors. Shortages of natural gas have forced industries and utilities in some areas to switch to oil. (Low cost and lack of new wells have combined to bring natural gas—the cleanest conventional fuel—into critical shortage, with projections of rising demand and import needs roughly equivalent to those for oil.) Environmental pressure has forced industries that once depended on coal to use oil or gas, and at the same time, has slowed the installation of nuclear reactors that could potentially ease the fuel shortage. New refineries and deep-water ports for supertankers have also been blocked. Electric companies increasingly use diesel turbines for power generation. More immediately, the worst winter in decades for many regions severely depleted existing stockpiles. Something had to give.

What gave were the "mom and pop" independent filling stations. Almost entirely dependent on surplus gasoline of "brand name" distributors, the independents suddenly found themselves cut off from supplies as the major petroleum companies moved to protect their own dealers. By last week, 600 private-brand stations had closed, hundreds of others had shortened their hours, and the nation, especially Congress, had begun to awaken to the growing problem.

A series of hearings before a Congressional subcommittee quickly revealed a situation more encompassing and more serious than most people yet realized. Darrell M. Trent, acting director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, told the committee acute problems were only "temporary and localized," and that gasoline rationing was unlikely. If that were so, asked Rep. Paul Cronin (R-Mass.), why couldn't Boston find a bidder for its municipal fuel contract? Rep. J. J. Pickle (D-Tex.) demanded to know why Austin, Texas, should experience over a dozen instances of fuel shortages this winter though it lies in the middle of a fuel-producing region.

Trent's assurances aside, rationing has already begun, depending on one's definition of the term. Demand for gasoline is expected to exceed supply by two to five percent this summer, and prices have already begun to rise for big users. Cleveland, Ohio, has just promised to pay 35 percent more for gasoline to run its buses. The Massachusetts Turnpike Authority has had to pay 49 percent more for this year's fuel contract. Iowa plans to reduce the speed limit on its highways to conserve gasoline, should the pinch worsen. Ten-gallon limits on individual "fill-ups" are becoming more and more common. One major oil company has recently started "voluntary" nationwide rationing and lowering of octane to conserve fuel.

Trent suggested to the Congressional committee that states should begin allocating fuels within their boundaries and "jawbone" the oil industry to make sure fuel is spread evenly around the country. "That," grumbled Congressman Pickle, "doesn't help much." The situation will only get worse as the country has to depend on foreign suppliers for oil, added Rep. Bob Bergland (D-

Minn.). "Those folks won't take green stamps—they want cash!"

Indeed, America paid \$2.1 billion a year for oil imports in 1970; now it imports \$7 billion worth of oil a year, and some industry projections anticipate the need for \$30 billion worth of imported petroleum annually by 1980.

However, long before that figure is paid, say some experts, the country will either have to find its energy elsewhere, or do without. "The projections are fantasies," says J. T. Claiborne Jr., head of an appraisal firm. "Such import needs would bankrupt America, eliminating us as a customer." Already, evidence has surfaced indicating the danger of too heavy reliance on Middle Eastern oil and pointing up the complex role short-term economic pressures have played in creating a growing emergency.

Some economists, like MIT's M. A. Adelman, believe that the energy crisis, at least in the short-range, has been artificially created. "The world 'energy crisis' or 'energy shortage' is a fiction," he says. "It makes people accept higher oil prices as imposed by nature, when they are really fixed by collusion." American oil companies, he charged in a Wall Street Journal article, have acted as "tax collectors" for the oil sheikhs, according to ever higher demands by Middle Eastern exporters in hopes of driving up the worldwide price of oil.

Between now and 1985, the world will probably burn more oil than has been consumed so far throughout history, sending perhaps a half trillion dollars into the Middle East.

Some of the smaller oil-producing countries have been raking in money almost twice as fast as they can spend it, leading them to make speculative ventures with American dollars. Such speculation is now blamed, in part, for precipitating the latest dollar devaluation. The emerging villain, from the American point of view, is the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). The organization's latest move is a demand for hundreds of millions of dollars added to existing oil contracts to counterbalance devaluation. The member countries—which produce 85 percent of the world's oil—have scheduled an extraordinary meeting in Vienna later this month to decide how to enforce their demands, since Western oil companies, they say, "continue to adopt a negative attitude." That, in the euphemistic parlance of international finance, amounts to making them an "offer they cannot refuse."

Whether viewed as the machinations of an international cartel or simply the inevitable pinch that comes with dwindling supplies, the shortage of fuel is real and all the suggested remedies seem both unpleasant and very expensive. Intense pressure is mounting to relax atmospheric-pollution standards enough to reintroduce coal—cheap and abundant—as a primary source of energy. Likewise, offshore drilling, the Alaska pipeline and deep-water ports for supertankers, which environmentalists have so far successfully blocked, will gain new impetus. Oil companies say capital investment for new refineries, new pipelines, new drilling and new tankers could run to the astronomical figure of half a trillion dollars by 1985, and they have already begun approaching the Government for help.

Ultimately, the consumer must pay. OEP Director Trent expects gasoline prices to rise this summer by about a nickel a gallon. Congressman Cronin predicts prices of 50 to 80 cents a gallon by summer's end, but he quotes the president of one oil company as saying the price could be \$1.25 a gallon "soon." Meanwhile, the Federal Trade Commission is studying possible antitrust action against the nation's major oil companies, claiming their control of refinery capacity seems to have "contributed in a major way" to the current fuel shortage.

Oil cannot long remain the principal source of energy for the United States, much less for the world. At present rates of consumption, currently proven Free World reserves of oil

could last only about 35 years, with new discoveries possibly extending that time by a factor of two or three. By taking into account the continued rapid expansion of industrialized countries and the technological development of Third World nations, the figure reduces sharply. The expected rise of imports, following the recent lifting of all quotas, will probably ease the current pinch. Alaskan oil may someday provide 20 percent of the country's needs, particularly if new technology assures its safe transport (SN: 5/19/73, p. 325). Oil now locked in shale, and thus not counted as "reserves," might someday be freed by nuclear explosions, but thousands of such explosions would be required to make a significant impact.

Ultimately other energy sources must be exploited. Environmentalists and industrialists alike must make hard choices as to what the sources will be. The transition to new sources can be made smoothly only if pursued with foresight and compromise, not the amateurism and intrigue that have led, in part, to the present crisis.

FUNDING OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, Montana's university system, like many other university systems throughout the Nation, is facing a financial crisis. University officials, taxpayers, and students are feeling the pinch from increased costs and lack of sufficient funding. With this in mind, students at the University of Montana are taking a close look at the amounts of money which they and the taxpayers contribute toward intercollegiate athletics. They are not questioning the value of intercollegiate athletics, but are seeking alternate ways to fund these expensive programs. One of the funding proposals brought to my attention was that of Bruce Saylor, a sophomore in journalism at the university. It is an interesting approach to the problem which merits printing in the

RECORD:

CONGRESSMAN SHOUP: This is merely an idea for possible legislation dealing with funding of intercollegiate sports.

The University of Montana campus had to face a serious problem during the Central Board budgeting problems during the planning for the 1973-74 budgets. Bickering and conflicts between students arose during these sessions as each student has his own interests and student fees alone cannot cover these expenses.

It is my suggestion that the United States government start legislation which calls for professional sports corporations paying colleges and universities for individuals they sign to contracts to participate in professional sports. This would alleviate the problem of campuses trying to single-handedly produce successful athletic departments, only to start over when the star individuals finish their eligibility and compete on the national level in professional sports.

Major League Baseball has a farm system it uses to develop players for their top organizations. The National Football League is one example of a professional sports corporation which does not have a farm system as such to develop these players. Instead, these corporations use college campuses for these services and the colleges never receive more than perhaps, a thank-you.

These corporations should be required to pay the colleges for the services the corporations are now exploiting.

A program as this suggestion would keep intercollegiate athletics on campus where they can be enjoyed by students and would not interfere with a sports competitor's higher education. This system would also allow the students' other interests, receive more student funding and satisfy more people. Also, the sports corporations could benefit from this as it would promote higher levels of intercollegiate competition and if athletics were forced off of the campuses, these corporations would be forced to pour money into farm systems to make up the difference.

I am willing to look into these possibilities farther and am sure I can receive assistance from several interested parties in doing so. I would appreciate you contacting me and tell me if you are willing to consider this possibility.

College years are filled to the brim with serious academic problems for the student without there being a need for the students to bicker over programs for each deciding who will enjoy their collegiate lives the most by what programs get the most money.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

BRUCE SAYLER,
Sophomore, Journalism.
MISSOULA, MONT.

THAT PRESIDENTIAL PAPER

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of May 27 printed an article by Richard Holbrooke which delves into President Nixon's motivation in creating the Special Investigations Unit known as "the plumbers." Mr. Holbrooke describes the distorted view of the world and the distrust that led Nixon to declare a private war on those he perceived to be enemies of "national security" and deplores the auxiliary unit that chillingly resembled a covert, personal police organization. Holbrooke clearly points out that the White House remained immersed in the Cold War era that had ended and that this very mistaken perception led to many illegal and criminal actions. In order that all Members gain from Holbrooke's insight, I am inserting this article in the RECORD at this point:

READING BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT'S LINES

(By Richard Holbrooke)

In defense of himself, Mr. Nixon has provided us with one of the most remarkable documents of his remarkable career. With his back against the wall, stripped of the protective layers of staff, fighting for his political life, he has given us in his May 22 statement an extraordinary insight into the way he views the world.

Never mind for a moment, if he is finally telling the whole truth, or even a good part of it. The courts and the Senate will decide that in the coming weeks, with help from investigative reporters. Consider, rather, the world the President lives in, and ask yourself if it bears any resemblance to yours:

1969: The world we live in, he believes, is threatened by a subversive conspiracy at every level. In the words of columnist Stewart Alsop, summarizing the views of the inner Nixon team, the administration believed that "the left-wing opposition had infiltrated the secret vitals of the Nixon foreign policy."

1970: Then a sudden threat "of critical proportions": a wave of violence sweeping across the nation, with "some of the disruptive activities receiving foreign support."

1971: a theft of 47 volumes of studies and documents "from the most sensitive files," a "security leak of unprecedented proportions," creating "a threat so grave as to require extraordinary actions."

And so—viewing the world outside the oval office as hostile, the President took internal security measures. But because he could not even trust the established agencies any more—particularly the FBI, where old anti-subversive hero J. Edgar Hoover was no longer cooperative—he created an extraordinary little organization, which he himself refers to as "the plumbers."

Nothing is more astounding than the creation and existence of this group. It had no legal or legislative basis for existence; its very existence was a well-kept secret. It operated under the close supervision of John Ehrlichman, who presumably knew what the President wanted. It strikes me that this group, the Special Investigations Unit, may be the closest thing our nation has ever had to a secret, personal police. In the name of the President (and whether or not he authorized its specific acts) this group conducted illegal and criminal actions. The President personally selected the unit's "first priority"—Daniel Ellsberg. In a mood which must have been fierce and was certainly based on a misreading of the potential importance of Ellsberg, the President now recalls:

Because of the extreme gravity of the situation, and not then knowing what additional national secrets Mr. Ellsberg might disclose, I did impress upon Mr. Krogh the vital importance to the national security of his assignment.

The President says he never authorized or knew of any of the "illegal means" then "used to achieve this goal," and perhaps he did not, but he had declared a secret war on his enemies, and then set loose his personal troops with a ringing order to win the day. As he himself now admits, those actions were his responsibility.

His distrust of the regular government, including even parts of the White House and Henry Kissinger's National Security Council, must be beyond all previously understood levels. Why else, for example, charge "the plumbers" with "compiling an accurate record of events related to the Vietnam war, on which the government's records were inadequate (many previous records having been removed with the change of administrations) and which bore directly on the negotiations, then in progress." There was a qualified NSC staff under Kissinger working on this problem; there was State, Defense, the CIA; and, ironically enough, there was a voluminous study of just these questions, with information of great potential embarrassment not to Nixon but Lyndon Johnson and the Kennedys. That study, of course, was the Pentagon Papers.

Much more will undoubtedly become known about the extraordinary, extralegal activities of this extraordinary group, although we may never know its full scope. The President is still trying to preserve secrecy concerning its activities under his very last line of defense, national security. But unfortunately for the President's case, it was members of this same group who committed the break-in at the Watergate.

Conspiracy, subversive, Communist—those words of the 1940s and 1950s are missing from the President's May 22 statement. But they cry out from between the lines, echoing an era that we thought—and the President had even said—was ended. Richard Nixon, a veteran of those days, apparently thought he had some reason to know better.

CHIEF JUSTICE BURGER ON THE FRAGILITY OF FREEDOM

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Warren E. Burger, Chief Justice of the United States, addressed the Law Day Ceremony on April 29, 1973, at the St. Johns Cathedral in the city of Jacksonville, Fla., which I represent in the Congress. The Chief Justice spoke with great eloquence, on this particular occasion, discussing the fragility of freedom. I was personally present at this impressive ceremony and believed that the remarks of the Chief Justice were so significant that with his permission, I am including them herein for wider distribution:

THE FRAGILITY OF FREEDOM

(Remarks of Warren E. Burger, Chief Justice of the United States at the Law Day Service, St. John's Cathedral)

During the week that begins today people will gather in small groups and large, all over the country, to turn their minds away from the turmoil and confusion of our times—and from daily tasks—to focus on an ideal shared by civilized people everywhere—the ideal of freedom.

The formal recognition of Law Day by proclamations of Presidents is something of fairly recent origin, but the underlying idea is ancient.

What I have to say today will therefore be quite simple and I will tread no unfamiliar ground. We are in a house of worship where it is a common practice to deal in a simple way with old truths; people gather here regularly to repeat old creeds, old prayers, psalms and songs from times long past. As we restate a creed or recite the 23rd Psalm to draw fresh inspiration and new strength, so we can turn to old truths learned by countless generations before us at great cost and over many centuries. The title to an article, a speech or a sermon is significant only in the sense it tells what the author or speaker is trying to say. With so elusive a topic as the need for the rule of law, if I were to have a title for this brief and simple message it would be the fragility of freedom.

When men and women first came down from rude tree houses in forests and jungles and from caves to take the risks of living in groups—and we know there are many risks—they had already experienced, for uncounted centuries, a kind of existence in which none could survive except those most fit for the harsh environment they had to contend with. Passive people simply did not survive. Only the strongest, the fiercest and most ruthless could contend with the elements, with predatory animals and predatory neighbors, all eager to seize whatever they could. People had no time to concern themselves with anything beyond bare existence.

As people gradually began to gather to live in larger and larger groups, in tribal villages, and later in towns, tribal customs developed with crude rules to curb the same aggressiveness that had enabled people to survive. Thus the idea of the rule of law was born even before Man's comprehension was able to grasp this as a concept. From hard experience our primitive ancestors learned that communal life and unrestrained aggressiveness could not co-exist. In their own way they discovered that total freedom was not freedom.

So it was that slowly, haltingly and painfully over a span of more thousands of years than science and history can even yet meas-

ure, the human family came to develop not just rules of conduct in terms of tribal customs, but three basic mechanisms to regulate that human aggressiveness which had kept them from extinction, and to guide those human energies and urges into constructive channels.

First came what we would now call laws—not unlike those laws that today regulate the speed of automobiles or prohibit theft of another man's goods. Next came practices that developed into religion as Man searched for God, and finally came the formulation of customs that we now call manners. Law, religion and manners are thus closely linked in the evolution of human institutions. We can accept religion as a divine revelation, but in the whole scheme of human existence the rule of law is hardly less so.

As we look back we see that the development of the human species from caves, forests and jungles to the present could not have occurred without these three factors. Scholars and social scientists see the universal nature of the evolution of rules of law, forms of religion and manners of civility in the fact that centuries before any means of communication or of travel were available, the people in Asia, in Europe, Africa and the Western Hemisphere independently developed these three patterns of restraint—these three pillars of civilization—in much the same way.

These behavior controls were invented by our forebears and became foundations of civilization without the aid of psychologists, lawyers or theologians—except that even those primitive people had the seeds of these disciplines within them. These restraints were the inventions of necessity made by people who learned the hard way that there can be no human progress, no lasting change, no improvement in the human condition, except in a setting of the rule by law.

Until these propositions are challenged or shaken by events, we tend to take them for granted as immutable parts of life, like the earth we walk on and the skies above, and the precise mathematical order of the universe. But they are not immutable. Eric Hoffer commented once that our social and political order is even more fragile and vulnerable than a human being who cannot survive if the heart stops for even a matter of minutes. Therefore these three vital supports of civilization must be constantly reexamined and reaffirmed. The Book of Judges tells how Israel became "prey to bands of raiders and plunderers." When the Roman Empire fell, cities very nearly disappeared. In the great city of Bologna, Italy, the seat of a university dating back to the 11th Century, there are still standing the towers that affluent people made part of the walled enclosure of their homes. As recently as the 17th Century and even early 18th Century, we know that Paris and London were made up of large areas of lawless slums and small compounds of fortress-like homes of the rich. These people may have been made more safe by their towers and their walls, but they were not made more free.

We know, now, that men and women could not have developed homes, farms, factories and, finally, schools, universities and laboratories without the order produced by the rule of law. We know how often in human history there were setbacks when human aggressiveness reasserted itself. Our own history books remind us that in the great period of expansion of our country into the West, it was accompanied by a frank attitude of many people that came to be expressed as "dog-eat-dog and the Devil take the hindmost." What a distressing experience to see that the primitive hostilities of prehistoric Man again surfaced as recently as the 19th Century in a civilized nation.

And then we come to our own century in which one war has followed another, and millions of innocent people died. In more pessimistic moods it seems that human beings have not changed basically over these

thousands of years except that, with our highly developed technology, more people can be killed more swiftly and efficiently in our time.

But this dismal view is not entirely accurate. Although some of our forebears 100 or 150 years ago cynically spoke of the dog-eat-dog philosophy and some practiced it, most people shared with their neighbors and helped them in adversity and sickness, and most people accepted the restraints of the law. So I suggest that a fair perception of history shows that we are making progress, and if it is not as swift as we would like, there is more progress than in many periods in the past 5,000 years. But this progress could not have been made without having the rule of law that has maintained order so that people could work and create, learn and improve.

Yet as recently as the 1960's and for most of that decade this country experienced a rising scale of attacks on our institutions. It was a twin attack by the lawful means of free expression, which we must not change, and by the unlawful means of violence when universities, colleges and public buildings were occupied, buildings were burned, great libraries and priceless manuscripts were destroyed. The country was disturbed and troubled, but with few exceptions the official reaction was calm as befits mature people.

On occasion some of the leaders and spokesmen for the violent groups sought to compare themselves and their acts with those of 200 years ago culminating in our Declaration of Independence from England. That analogy was spurious, as anyone who reads history can readily see.

The Revolution of 1776 succeeded because the protestors had a clear focus on objectives and valid grievances. Their protests were against being ruled by a distant King and Parliament who denied them a voice or vote in government. Their objective was to gain a voice and a vote, and for a number of years before and indeed even after 1776 many leaders of our Revolution would have gladly abandoned the Revolution had England granted their legitimate demands. The acceptance of the need for the rule of law by those who signed the Declaration of Independence was shown by the great pains they took in those historic lines that preceded the recital of grievances. You will recall they said that "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to separation." They were troubled by that step and felt a need to explain.

In the 1960's nothing stood in the way of the protestors having a voice in their times and their government, except that they could not secure sufficient popular support in a system that gives public office to those who have such support. Fortunately, except in a few places the policy of patience and tolerance succeeded in avoiding tragic consequences throughout that decade. Those few tragedies should teach us a great deal.

That mindless violence of the 1960's seems to have stemmed in part from a confused idea that human beings will be happier and life will be better if they "act out what they feel"—and as soon as they feel it—in short to elevate emotion over reason and experience as the guiding force of conduct. Instant gratification at all cost seemed at times to be the order of the day.

Yet a most encouraging sign has emerged with some of these protest leaders running for public office and some being elected, making clear that the system is indeed open to all. This has the added benefit of subjecting those who challenge the system to the chastening experience of bearing responsibility and being accountable at the ballot box. Accountability for stewardship is not simply a political mechanism but one closely related to our religious beliefs, and again we see the linkage between the law and religion.

The protests of the 1960's, like others over

our 200-year history, were, however, not totally devoid of reason, except in their resort to violence. The hard truth is that there was and is much that needs change in our social, political and economic institutions but there never has been a time when this was not true. Man differs from the lowly ant whose structured existence has remained static for millions of years. Man is constantly pressing for change.

Very often social explosions are brought on by rigid and unreasoning resistance to change. Long ago Disraeli said, "We must choose to be managers of change, or we will be victims of change." Mature, reasoning people elect to be the managers, and, being mature, they know that change must be orderly to preserve continuity with the past. The rule of law permits us to be the managers of change and to maintain our links with the experience of the past.

However painful we find it, we should ask whether some of those who challenged the system in the 1960's have not intuitively perceived that we are in a period of great change and that what was good enough 50, 40 or even 30 years ago is not necessarily good enough for today and for the future. The underpinnings and fundamentals of our institutions are valid, but we must be willing to re-examine the methods of implementation and make orderly adjustments from time to time.

When reasonable people speak of order as a product of the rule of law, they know well the difference between the kind of order Hitler imposed and that state of order which permits each individual to develop the talents God has given. Judge Learned Hand put his finger on the kind of order that flows from the rule of law when he said it must have two elements, *first*, authority, which implies the coercive powers of enforcement, and *second*, acquiescence, which implies genuine acceptance by a majority. Hitler's kind of order was all authority with acquiescence only by fear. That kind of order would never be acceptable to free people.

We must maintain our insistence that the rule of law is the best way to establish the condition of order that is indispensable for improvement and change. But even as we do it, we must be receptive to the challenge even to ideas we cherish. This is not easy. It will never be easy, but it is as inescapable as change itself. We of the generation over fifty are the outgoing generation. We have had the opportunity to try to improve our world, and in the perspective of history I believe it will be seen that during the past third of a century, in beating off the hordes that would have enslaved Europe and Asia, in finding ways to live with alien philosophies—and even possibly to modify them, and in recognition of the rights of minorities here at home, the outgoing generation has contributed some share to both change and improvement.

Within our own legal structure our generation is slowly evolving new functions of the rule of law that will have great impact on our system of justice. The law has now rejected the cynical laissez-faire philosophy of "Let the buyer beware", and it is now accepted as a proper function of the law that to assure justice the foolish and the weak must be protected from the ruthless and the strong.

If we can respond with open minds to new ideas, if we can provide universities that will let youth quest and search and if we will listen to them, I believe they will accept our belief that justice can best be attained when human beings acknowledge the restraints of law, religion and manners.

No matter what coercive powers of enforcement governments may assert, the peoples in country after country in all ages have demonstrated that Man was meant to be free, but that this ideal can be realized only under the rule of law. And this must be a rule that places restraints on individuals and on governments alike. This is a delicate, a fragile

balance to maintain. It is fragile because it is sustained only by an ideal that requires each person in society, by an exercise of free will, to accept and abide the restraints of a structure of laws. If it seems a contradiction to say that to preserve freedom we must surrender some freedom, it is no more so than to say, as Christians have been saying for 2,000 years, that "he that loseth his life . . . shall find it."

CONGRATULATIONS TO FOOTE, CONE, AND BELDING ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the 100th anniversary of Foote, Cone, and Belding Communications, Inc., was recently celebrated in Chicago, and the agency's recognition is well deserved. Foote, Cone, and Belding has long enjoyed the reputation of being one of the Nation's most creative, imaginative, and responsible advertising firms.

Foote, Cone, and Belding has become synonymous with modern advertising. Founded in 1873 by Daniel M. Lord, the agency became known as Lord and Thomas near the turn of the century. Under the innovative leadership of Albert D. Lasker, the agency launched a career which has consistently stressed that responsibility and dignity must accompany the tremendous persuasive power of advertising. This proud heritage continues today as Foote, Cone, and Belding begins its second century.

During FCB's centennial week, Chicago's mayor, Richard J. Daley, took the opportunity to award Fairfax M. Cone, the agency's cofounder, the city of Chicago's Medallion of Honor for Distinguished Public Service. The award was in recognition of the public service Fairfax Cone, as the agency, has performed for the city in taking an active interest in the problems of Chicago and in developing civic pride. Mayor Daley said of Fairfax Cone:

He is a booster of the best in all of us.

So too has his agency, Foote, Cone, and Belding, sought to represent its clients responsibly and truthfully.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an editorial which appeared on Friday, May 11, 1973, in the Chicago Daily News commemorating Foote, Cone, and Belding's first 100 years.

The editorial follows:

FCB'S FIRST HUNDRED YEARS

An advertising agency has fewer physical assets than almost any other kind of business you can name. No factories, no machinery, no lands, usually no building of its own; even its office furniture may be leased.

So an agency that lasts to celebrate its 100th birthday—as Foote, Cone & Belding did this week—must get its staying power from other kinds of assets. And those are people and ideas.

Since Daniel M. Lord opened his shop in Chicago in 1873, many of the most renowned practitioners in advertising history have made it their home: Albert D. Lasker, the father of modern advertising; the great copywriters, John E. Kennedy and Claude C. Hopkins; the brilliant young trio of Emerson Foote, Fairfax Cone and Don

Belding who took over when Lasker retired; and the present top management team of Arthur W. Schultz and John E. O'Toole.

FCB now has 1,900 people spread through 13 countries serving more than 350 big clients and billing \$271 million a year in advertising.

Yet the payoff today is just what Lasker said it was: The ability to propel merchandise from market to consumer with a strong sales proposition.

This is a people-to-people exercise, and there is nothing hifalutin about it: FCB has made it with such homely propositions as *Raid Kills Them Dead*, by raising such earthy questions as *Where the Yellow Went and Does She or Doesn't She*, and by perceiving the merchandising utility of Amos & Andy, Bob Hope, and Smokey Bear.

But it takes more than cleverness or even genius to make it across a century. FCB has maintained a steady concern for the integrity of its clients and the good will of their customers, and nobody's about to invent a better sales proposition than that.

LABOR ORGANIZATION PENALTIES LIMITATION ACT OF 1971

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make certain limitations on penalties levied by a labor organization upon its members.

Our late—and sorely missed—colleague, the distinguished Senator from Vermont, Win Prouty, introduced identical legislation during the 92d Congress.

Because his remarks in May of 1971 explain the need for this legislation so clearly, I ask that his statement at that time be reprinted in the *RECORD* at this point:

LABOR ORGANIZATION PENALTIES LIMITATION ACT OF 1971

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, prior to 1947, labor organizations held complete authority over the job security of rank-and-file union members.

The man's skill, competence, and ability meant nothing, nor did the employer's desire to retain him as an employee, if he incurred the wrath of his union's leadership.

By the simple device of expelling this man from the union, the union leaders forced the company to discharge him under union security agreements providing that union membership was a condition of employment.

It is obvious that rank-and-file employees thought many times of the consequences before opposing the union leaders' acts, policies, or statements of any kind—personal and political as well as those relating to union or employment-connected affairs.

The Taft-Hartley amendments to the National Labor Relations Act in 1947 attempted to cope with this problem, and did so to a substantial extent.

Agreements requiring union membership as a condition of obtaining employment were prohibited, agreements requiring union membership after 30 days of employment as a condition of continued employment were sanctioned, and a union's right to prescribe its own rules for the acquisition or retention of union membership was protected.

However, rank-and-file employees were given additional job protection from retaliatory action by their union leaders through the requirement that an employee could not be discharged under a union security agreement for non-membership in the union if

membership in the union was denied or terminated for any reason other than his failure to tender the periodic dues and initiation fees uniformly required as a condition of obtaining or retaining union membership.

Thus, while a union retained the right to expel a member, it lost the power to force him to engage in conduct or activities he did not favor by holding the loss of his job over his head. His job was secure, as far as the union's authority was concerned, so long as he paid or tendered his initiation fees and union dues.

The 1947 Taft-Hartley Amendments to the National Labor Relations Act gave rank-and-file employees greater protection from abusive use of power by his union leaders in another area.

The original National Labor Relations Act, commonly called the Wagner Act, contained a sort of magna carta for workers in our country by guaranteeing them the right to organize, form, join or assist labor organizations; to bargain collectively; to select their own bargaining representatives; and to engage in any other concerted activities for the purposes of collective bargaining or for their own mutual aid or protection.

The Taft-Hartley amendments extended this guaranty to cover the right of a rank-and-file employee to refrain from engaging in any or all of these activities, except where he refuses to pay initiation fees or union dues under a valid union security agreement.

For example, prior to 1947, a union member was protected from retaliation by his employer if he refused to cross his union's picket line to go to work.

After the 1947 amendment, this same employee was also protected from retaliation from the union if he decided he wanted to cross his union's picket line and go to work. Or so, at least, everyone thought. He could still be expelled from union membership, of course, but expulsion for this reason could not result in the union lawfully requesting the company to discharge him under a union-security agreement.

Public and congressional discontent and concern over alleged abuses of power by union leaders in conducting the internal affairs of their unions—areas over which the National Labor Relations Board had no jurisdiction—continued to increase.

This mounting concern that some unions had gone too far in protecting the interests of union officers at the expense of the interests of rank and file members was reflected and culminated in the enactment in 1959 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, otherwise known as the Landrum-Griffin Act.

Under this legislation, a whole new range of procedural and substantive obligations was placed upon labor organizations. See, for example, *Ryan v. I.B.E.W.*, 361 F.2d 942.

Government responsibility for implementing and enforcing these regulations bearing essentially on the internal affairs of unions was vested in the Department of Labor under the Landrum-Griffin Act rather than in the National Labor Relations Board.

Nevertheless, The National Labor Relations Board and the courts moved into this area and fashioned changes in employee-protection provisions.

The technique employed by unions to circumvent the clear intent of the National Labor Relations Act was use of the union fine.

Since 1947, as noted above, section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act has guaranteed employees the right to engage in—or to refrain from engaging in—the activities therein enumerated.

Thus, a union member's right to cross his union's picket line to go to work is an activity protected by section 7. A union's attempt to restrain or coerce him in the exercise of this right is an unfair labor practice under section 8(b)(1)(A) of the National Labor Relations Act, while a union's attempt to have the employer fire him or otherwise discrim-

inate against him for engaging in this conduct is also a violation of section 8(b)(2) of the act. If acquiesced in by the employer, of course, the employer also commits unfair labor practices under section 8(a)(1) and (3).

The new approach worked, however. Exorbitant daily fines placed on members for crossing their union's picket line were held to be collectible in State court litigation, and the National Labor Relations Board and the U.S. Supreme Court sanctioned this action as well as holding that it did not constitute an unfair labor practice by the union.

See *Allis Chalmers Manufacturing Co.* 149 NLRB 67 (1964); affirmed 388 U.S. 175 (1967).

Similarly, union fines have been upheld against employees for filing deauthorization petitions with the National Labor Relations Board—that is, petitions seeking a Board election to determine whether representation by the incumbent union is still desired by a majority of the employees.

See *Tawas Tube Products, Inc.*, 151 NLRB 46 (1965). Cf. *Pittsburgh-Des Moines Steel Co.*, 154 NLRB 692 (1965); affirmed 373 F.2d 443 (CA 9—1967).

This device has also been used successfully by unions to achieve unilaterally what they were unable to obtain through collective bargaining at the bargaining table.

Thus, the National Labor Relations Board and the courts have found no violation of the National Labor Relations Act where a union has assessed fines against its members for exceeding production quotas unilaterally established and prescribed by the union. See *Wisconsin Motors Corp.*, 145 NLRB 1097 (1964); affirmed 393 F.2d 49 (CA 7—1968).

The key to this latest successful approach by union leaders to keeping their rank-and-file members "in line" is, of course, the fact that State courts have held such fines collectible rather than throwing these actions out on the ground that they ran counter to public policy, and the additional fact that the National Labor Relations Board and the Federal courts have refused to find such conduct unlawful under the National Labor Relations Act.

Indirectly, therefore, unions have found a way to "restrain or coerce" rank-and-file members in the exercise of rights supposedly protected by section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act—rights which Congress thought it had fully protected under the 1947 Taft-Hartley amendments.

The right to levy fine can indeed be a heavy and coercive penalty upon individual union members. This is particularly so if the fines are for exercising rights guaranteed under the National Labor Relations Act, or for engaging in conduct which is in accord with their collective bargaining agreement.

The essence of my amendment, Mr. President, is this. It would be an unfair labor practice for a union to fine any member for exercising rights which are his under the law, or for carrying out the lawful instructions of his employer.

The present officially approved power to fine union members opens the door to vast and possibly unlimited future employee liability as this doctrine is applied and expanded.

It is particularly regrettable when this liability fastens upon an employee who never wanted to be a union member but who is required to be under a lawful union security agreement.

I submit that union abuse of this power with judicial approval is completely at odds with the objective of establishing democratic procedures for union affairs and directly contravenes the right of the minority to dissent.

In 1953, the U.S. Supreme Court said:

The policy of the act is to insulate employees' jobs from their organizational rights. *Radio Officers' Union v. NLRB*, 347 U.S. 17, 40.

This, I submit, is what my bill is designed to help accomplish.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS TAX ACT

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been active in the effort to enable the Nation's future senior citizens to provide for their own retirements in comfort and dignity. Today I am renewing that effort by introducing the Retirement Benefits Tax Act. Legislation to enact pension reform was first requested by the President in a December 14, 1971, message to Congress. Now, a full 16 months later, he has asked us to consider a new, more comprehensive proposal. The time has come for an energetic congressional review of pension reform.

The plight of the Nation's senior citizens has been a matter of concern to me for some time. Indeed, during the time I have spent representing the Second District of Colorado in Congress, a number of significant pieces of legislation to assist them have been passed. Invariably however, the legislation has established or expanded a Government program which is aimed at providing some specific benefit for retirees.

Most senior citizens with whom I have met, through periodic forums I hold and through meetings in my office, stress that they are not interested in receiving welfare benefits. Rather, they would prefer enjoying a measure of the fruits of the labor produced during their working years. Moreover, I have been impressed with the number of persons who are presently in the workforce and who would like to provide for their retirement years through their own devices.

All too often they are unable to do so. While their salaries enable them to live in relative comfort, they simply lack the resources necessary to save for the future. More often than not their inability to save can be traced to the fact that their taxes—including income taxes, sales taxes, and property taxes—represent the single largest claim on their paychecks.

The Retirement Benefits Tax Act would make it possible for those Americans who choose to provide for their retirement to do so. It would reward self-reliance. It would assure the future for those not covered by adequate pension plans to take the steps necessary to have a degree of financial independence during retirement.

There are five principal features of this legislation, Mr. Speaker. First, an income tax deduction would be provided for those who wish to save independently for their retirement. Second, the tax deduction for self-employed persons who provide for their own and their employees' retirement is liberalized to better conform to current financial realities. Third, the bill establishes a minimum standard for the vesting of pensions in those who take part in a private plan for a number of years, but who lose their jobs or change their jobs prior to actual retirement. Fourth, it provides for a higher minimum financing standard to increase the secu-

rity of pensions. Fifth, the bill amends the tax laws to permit a lump sum representing one's retirement benefits to be put into a qualified retirement savings program without paying tax until benefits are drawn upon retirement.

Only 30 million employees are covered by private retirement plans. The others, unless they are of substantial means, will have to rely on social security or some other public retirement plan for the main source of their income following retirement. For these people, my bill would permit a deduction of up to 20 percent of an individual's salary, with a limit of \$1,500 annually, for contributions made to a segregated retirement fund. A wide variety of investment possibilities would be allowed the taxpayer who chooses to establish such a fund for himself. Standards for the distribution of the accumulated assets of the fund are established to assure that the fund will not be utilized before retirement and to further assure that the fund will be liquidated during the life expectancy of the participant. Also, the deduction is reduced for those whose employers contribute to a fund and for those not now subject to either social security or railroad retirement taxes. This would place all taxpayers on an equal footing with respect to total impact on income and tax liability.

At present, those who are self-employed or who do business other than as a corporation are severely limited in the amount the business can deduct from its taxable income for contributions to retirement funds. No such limit exists for corporations, and the result has been a proliferation of firms doing business as corporations chiefly for this tax purpose. Even professionals are being allowed to incorporate in many States so as to take advantage of the tax laws concerning employer contributions to retirement funds. Whatever the merits of incorporation, this is not a decision which ought to be made on the basis of the deductibility of employer contributions to retirement funds. Therefore, my bill would increase the deductible contribution limit for noncorporate firms from \$2,500 to \$7,500 per employee, and it would increase the percentage of eligible earned income from 10 percent to 15 percent.

For those 30 million Americans who are now covered by private pension plans through their employment, the bill would preserve interests accrued through the years. A basic problem in the present private pension system is the situation of the worker who loses his pension when he is discharged, laid off, resigns, or moves to another job. For these persons, the typical private pension plan pays no benefits when retirement age is reached, despite the fact that both the employer and employee treat contributions to the fund as deferred compensation. The bill provides that employees would receive a vested right in their pension funds equal to 50 percent of accrued benefits when their age plus their years of service equal 50. Additional vesting of 10 percent would accrue for each additional year worked. Provisions to prevent employee abuse of the vesting requirements are included.

So that employees expecting retirement benefits under their firm's plan will have the security of knowing that their vested benefits are being adequately funded, my bill would augment existing minimal protection standards with an additional requirement calling for at least 5 percent of the unfunded, vested liabilities in a pension plan to be funded annually. Further, an employee who leaves his job for one reason or another is freed from taxes on the lump sum he receives upon termination. My bill, then, ends the discriminatory tax treatment given the individual who chooses to stay with one employer.

Mr. Speaker, the Retirement Benefits Tax Act comes at a particularly opportune moment. The Ways and Means Committee, on which I am privileged to serve, has recently concluded 3 months of hearings on tax reform and will present a new tax bill to this body in the near future. If included in a general tax bill, I believe my proposal will fill the need for Federal legislation which would protect employee interests in their pension funds and encourage private thrift without depriving individuals and funds of the flexibility they now enjoy. I commend this bill to my colleagues' attention and ask for their support.

JOBLESSNESS AND THE YOUNG

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, within the near future, this body will take up a matter of unfinished business from the 92d Congress: Increasing the national minimum wage. When we do, we will once again be faced with the question of whether we should set a separate minimum hourly rate for our young people. In spite of the fact that the members of the Education and Labor Committee recognize and deplore the disproportionately high unemployment rate among our youth, the bill which the committee will bring before us does little or nothing to put these young people into jobs. Instead, that bill, for all practical purposes, merely continues the existing, limited student certification program, which obviously has not encouraged youth employment opportunities.

To remedy this failing of the committee bill, I will join several of our colleagues, as I did last year, in offering a substitute bill which provides a two-tier minimum wage rate—one rate for adult breadwinners, and another for youth. I believe this body, as it did in 1972, will endorse this two-tier system.

In saying this, I recognize, of course, that there are those among us who doubt the wisdom of the youth differential. I would like, therefore, to call attention to a recent article by the noted columnist, Milton Viorst, in the Washington Star-News. Mr. Viorst's realistic appraisal of this feature of our substitute bill carries a message that needs to be heard.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Star-News, May 28, 1973]

JOBLESSNESS AND THE YOUNG
(By Milton Viorst)

For some years, liberals in Congress have been agonizing over the philosophical and practical implications of establishing a two-tier minimum wage, lower for teenagers than for adults.

In the last session of Congress, in fact, legislation to raise the minimum wage—which has remained at \$1.60 since 1966—was defeated, largely because liberals were unable to reconcile themselves to the principle of the two-tier system.

On the whole, liberals have found that such a system smacks of discrimination. They are no more comfortable conceding a lower minimum to teenagers than to women, blacks or cripples. Equal wages somehow seem part of equal rights.

It is relevant, also, to mention that the labor unions have been dead-set against a two-tier system. Labor leaders are understandably apprehensive that employers will shift to younger workers, if wages are lower, and thus threaten the jobs of union members.

Needless to say, since the liberals in Congress are much dependent on labor, not only for campaign funds but for support for overall legislative objectives, they are ill-disposed to dabble with anything the unionists feel so deeply about.

The idea for a two-tier minimum wage then, has by default become a conservative cause—which tends to make it even more suspect in liberal eyes. The reasoning goes: Any variation of the minimum wage supported by people who oppose the principle of a minimum wage must, automatically, be bad.

The reasoning is unfortunate because it obscures the arguments in favor of the two-tier system.

The arguments center on the barely disputable contention that, when the minimum wage is the same for teenage and mature workers, an employer will pick the adult every time, and maybe for overtime, while the teenager walks the street.

The unions consider teenage unemployment a tolerable price for a prosperous adult labor force—and they (like the corporation execs who consider profits more important than anything else) have a right to their point of view.

But more and more economists and sociologists, liberals as well as conservatives, are reaching the conclusion that an undifferentiated minimum wage serves to price teenagers out of the labor market, and that this is a social disaster.

I talked with one of them the other day, Prof. James Q. Wilson of Harvard, who is a recognized expert on violent crime in American society. Wilson emphasized that violent crime, in all countries, is basically a practice of the young.

Wilson cited some stunning facts, which say much more than all of the pious and get-tough declarations of our public officials. He said that more young people in the crime-prone age bracket from 15 to 24 came into the population from 1960 to 1970 than from 1900 to 1960.

Looked at another way, he said, if you think of persons under 25 as an invading army and persons over 25 as a defending army, in 1960 the two forces were equal. By 1970, the invaders had become twice the size of the defenders. Wilson called this shift a "dramatic discontinuity" in American society.

Getting back to the job question, Wilson also pointed out that teenage unemployment in 1960 was about 8 percent. By 1970, the rate had at least doubled—and for black teenagers it had, perhaps, doubled again.

By 1970, Wilson said, we had two societies in America—but not necessarily the two societies (black and white) predicted by the President's riot commission in 1968. It was

an adult society of unparalleled prosperity, and a youth society of idleness and poverty.

Under those circumstances, for the country to have avoided a violent crime wave would have been a sort of miracle. What could be more conducive to growing violence than a burgeoning crime-prone age group with no work to do?

MONTEREY PARK ENDORSES H.R. 261, ASIAN AMERICAN AFFAIRS ACT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the United States for years has totally ignored the special problems which face our Asian American communities.

While it is true some Asian Americans have broken through various political, economic, and social barriers; discrimination and prejudice continue to plague a great number of these people.

Many communities, such as Monterey Park, Calif., are realizing the need for Federal action which would help eliminate these ever-growing problems.

On May 7, 1973, the city council of Monterey Park adopted a resolution in support of H.R. 261, the Asian American Affairs Act, which I authored with our colleague, SPARK MATSUNAGA.

I want to extend my thanks to the city council of Monterey Park for their action. For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting the resolution passed by the Monterey Park City Council regarding H.R. 261:

RESOLUTION No. 7697

(A resolution of the city council of the city of Monterey Park supporting H.R. 261 relating to the establishment of an Asian American Affairs Cabinet Committee)

Whereas, while it is true that Asian Americans over the years have surmounted legal, economic, political, educational, and social barriers, the facts indicate that in all too many instances, the remnants of prejudice and bigotry still pervade our society and continue to confront the Asian American citizens in this country; and

Whereas, the problems of the Asian Americans include both the youth and the elderly of the country; partly because of the language barrier and partly because of social and cultural differences; and

Whereas, while the City of Monterey Park and many of its neighboring cities have taken constructive steps to help solve the many and complex problems confronting the Asian American citizens of the community, this City Council is of the opinion that only federal action can begin to investigate, isolate and rectify the many inequities; and problems relating to the Asian American population; and

Whereas, on February 22, 1973, the Honorable Glenn M. Anderson, Member of Congress, introduced H.R. 261, which he co-authored together with the Honorable Spark M. Matsunaga, which would create a meaningful and effective Cabinet Committee for Asian American Affairs with the specific task of identifying the problems of Asian Americans, developing solutions to those problems and correcting the injustices that presently confront Americans of Asian ancestry;

Now, therefore, the City Council of the City of Monterey Park does resolve as follows:

Section 1. That this City Council does here-

by support H.R. 261 in its entirety and does hereby urge its favorable passage.

Section 2. That the City Clerk is hereby instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to Congressmen Glenn M. Anderson, Spark M. Matsunaga, and George Danielson, Senators John V. Tunney and Alan Cranston, the League of California Cities.

Section 3. The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this resolution.

RELIGIOUS AND WOMEN'S GROUPS OPPOSE RESTRICTIVE LANGUAGE IN H.R. 7806

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, when the House takes up consideration of H.R. 7806, the legislation to extend Public Health Services programs, one part of this proposal merits careful attention.

I refer to section 401(b)(2) in title IV, in which new restrictions on the use of abortions are placed.

According to a group of major religious organizations and women's groups, this specific language in the bill dealing with abortion was written without due consideration by committees or the public. No public hearings were held and the public was not given a chance to comment on this restrictive language.

I, for one, oppose these restrictions, and I urge that they be deleted from the bill.

For a fuller commentary on this problem, I now insert into the RECORD the following statement made by the religious and women's groups:

JOINT STATEMENT ON H.R. 7806—THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES ACT EXTENSION

We, the undersigned organizations and religious denominations, are gravely concerned about the possible passage by the U.S. House of Representatives of section 401(b)(2) in Title IV of H.R. 7806, the Public Health Services Act Extension.

This subsection goes far beyond subsection 401(b)(1), which seeks to protect individual doctors and health care personnel from being compelled to participate in abortion procedures contrary to their religious beliefs. Subsection (b)(2) permits any "entity" to refuse to perform abortions or sterilizations, to refuse to make facilities available, or to "provide any personnel" for such operations.

This subsection was written into the Public Health Services Act Extension without due consideration by the Congress or by the public. No public hearings have been held, nor has there been adequate opportunity for public comment. Even the Subcommittee's sessions held to draft this amendment were closed to the public. This is extraordinary procedure for legislation of dubious constitutionality and with such sweeping effect on fundamental constitutional rights.

Our opposition to section 401(b)(2) centers on the following points.

First, the subsection unfairly favors the religious beliefs of one or a few groups at the expense of the religious beliefs and professional commitments of health care personnel and men and women seeking abortion or sterilization. It threatens the rights of individual doctors and nurses to implement their own beliefs and their duty to render appropriate medical care, and ignores the needs of individuals to receive health care to which they have a fundamental constitutional right. In fact, the subsection as worded permits a few persons (such as a hos-

pital administrator or a few board members) to "legislate" policy for a whole institution that may be contrary to the beliefs of a majority of the staff and patient populations. This clause is particularly dangerous as it would apply not only to private or denominational hospitals, but also to public hospitals, clinics, state medical boards and other health care agencies.

Second, in many areas where entire counties or communities are served by only one or two religiously-affiliated hospitals, the subsection would permit these institutions to receive federal funds while effectively denying total health care to all men and women in the community. This would have the effect of undermining the Supreme Court's recent decisions and preventing full enjoyment of constitutional rights. If adopted, this legislation would particularly deny access to certain types of health care to the less affluent who are unable to travel outside their communities for such services.

Third, the subsection clearly could result in institutions' terminating staff privileges or employment of doctors, nurses, and other health care personnel, or otherwise discriminating against those who choose to participate in abortion and sterilization procedures outside the bounds of the institution, on their own time. In communities with limited medical facilities, this could lead to an institution exercising "veto power" over the establishment and operation of high quality medically-sound facilities for the performance of abortion or sterilization anywhere in the area. Because of this dangerous possibility, and because any bill purporting to protect individual rights should protect the rights of all rather than just those of a few, the Senate-passed provisions prohibiting discrimination based on religious belief should be incorporated into the House bill.

Fourth, the language of the House bill barring "any Court" from entering certain orders could be interpreted as a Congressional attempt to deny "government involvement" in these hospitals' policies or to deny federal courts jurisdiction to enforce fundamental constitutional rights in appropriate situations. We believe either interpretation might well render the bill unconstitutional.

Finally, we believe subsection (b) (2) raises grave First Amendment problems concerning the separation of church and state. It appears to be designed to encourage institutions that wish to operate on a religiously-motivated basis to deny constitutional rights to individuals of other persuasions, while receiving federal funds. And of course, without regard to possible constitutional problems, the bill is objectionable insofar as it sanctions the religious beliefs of one or a few religious demonstrations while hindering free exercise by members of other religions of their own free, responsible choices in matters of abortion and sterilization.

In light of these concerns, we urge the House of Representatives to delete those sections of H.R. 7806 which violate individual rights (Title IV, Section 401 (b) (2)) and to include language protecting individuals from institutional discrimination on the basis of their own religious beliefs:

American Civil Liberties Union.

Church of the Brethren, Washington Office.

Division of Social Ministries, National Ministries of the American Baptist Churches, U.S.A.

National Board, Young Women's Christian Association of the U.S.A.

National Council of Jewish Women.

National Organization for Women.

National Women's Political Caucus.

Planned Parenthood.

United Church of Christ, Board of Homeland Ministries.

United Methodist Church, Board of Church and Society.

Women's Equity Action League.

Women's Lobby, Inc.

Unitarian Universalist Association.

Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation.

American Humanist Association.

American Ethical Union.

ANOTHER VIEW OF THE WATERGATE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in times of national crisis it is always instructive to stand back and view the problems confronting us from another perspective. One way of accomplishing this is to read what other nations think of the situation, recalling that because of our world leadership position everything that happens in the United States has global repercussions. The Watergate affair, although a peculiarly American phenomena, is no exception. The understanding of this situation by foreign governments can perhaps offer us some insight into the matter that our own closeness to it prevents us from seeing. Following is a reprint of an editorial of May 21, 1973, from a leading Dublin newspaper, *The Irish Times*, which I think my colleagues will find interesting:

FOULING THE NEST

President Nixon must be under a severe strain—unless he is a man of iron nerve—when he delivers a speech as he did on Saturday without making any reference to the scandal which, with every week, envelops him in its clouds.

This week may increase the inundation: on Friday the former director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. Richard Helms, told a Grand Jury that he was ordered by the President's chief-of-staff, Mr. H. R. Haldeman, to help to conceal the Watergate scandal and that the orders came from "higher up."

In this context that could only mean the President. If, by a continuation of luck and strategy and the sheer ability to survive, he manages to ride out this squalid affair, the President will be the only skittle left standing in the alley. Even Dr. Kissinger, who would have been too intelligent, one might have supposed, to get involved, has not escaped. He, too, allowed his staff to be subjected to wire-tapping. All the sinister apparatus of spying that used to be associated with embassies in Moscow has now been discovered in Washington, and used, not against foreigners, but colleagues.

On the assumption that President Nixon is the only member of his staff who was not out of step, that the practices of his closest advisers (sometimes friends) were unknown to him, he cannot escape the charge of choosing undesirables. The choice of his Vice-President was, to say the least, bizarre. Now the idea of President Agnew is probably Mr. Nixon's strongest card. That such should be the position, that he should have chosen such a running-mate, is itself something for which he owes his people an apology.

The spectacle of the United States in trouble may give satisfaction to some. There was a time, and it was not long ago, when this nation cherished close ties with that great country. The United States was founded in a generous and idealistic spirit. It represented—or symbolised at least—a step for-

ward in the harsh progress of mankind. Any-one in the West who welcomes its loss of influence, humiliation and internal weakening takes a short as well as an ungenerous view.

It is a time to condole with the country which has fallen into such unworthy hands. And whatever President Nixon's future may be and whether or not he retains his office, he has done ill service to his country, more than any external enemy has achieved since the Declaration of Independence.

The disclosures will not merely discredit the President's entourage; they will arouse well-founded suspicion of how politics and affairs of State are conducted in the U.S.A.

And not only in the U.S.A. In this country we have witnessed in recent years a lack of candour in high places. In Britain, despite Mr. Heath's criticism (what else could he say?), the Lornho business and the importance of the names associated with that concern shake confidence. Mr. Reginald Maudling and the revelations in the Poulson bankruptcy suggest that the standards of Ancient Rome are no longer required or expected among the ruling few.

The wrong done is to the democratic process. If one of the American generals of World War II were still available it is not too far-fetched to imagine a rally round such a figure and a Cromwellian purging of Congress. Many Americans must today be in that mood. The test of the American system has not yet come. It may be resilient enough to survive these shocks. If it does it must begin at once to clean out its political stables.

RETURN TO THE RAILS

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, development of Arizona, like that in most western States, stems from the completion of pioneer railroads. The railroads of my State—the Southern Pacific and the Santa Fe—are still of major importance to the economy.

Railroad passenger service is something else. The railroads suffered the same decline in ridership that affected all railroads after gasoline rationing ended with the return of peace after World War II.

However, for a multitude of reasons—highway traffic congestion, air pollution, proper use of our limited land resources, and now the energy crisis—I believe it is important that we do everything possible to restore railroad passenger service to its proper place. There are many modes of transportation, and we need them all. But we need the balance in our overall system provided by a stronger railroad passenger service.

Amtrak has made a good beginning in this area, and has passed its second birthday with hopes and indications of a successful future.

I was pleased to read in the May issue of *Environmental Quality* magazine an editorial by Richard Cramer, editor, an exceptionally fine view of the problems we must deal with in meeting the transportation needs of this country—and the part Amtrak is playing in solving them.

RETURN TO THE RAILS

(By Richard Cramer)

Since World War II, the percentage of railway passengers in America has declined from some thirty percent of the nation's travelers to less than five percent. And as

the train lost its popularity in America, people quickly focused on the bus, truck, plane and automobile as more desirable modes of transportation. Today we're beginning to recognize the appalling results.

As Lewis Mumford aptly states, "By shifting the main burden of transportation to cars and trucks, we have extravagantly multiplied the number of vehicles in constant operation, decreased their speed, wasted time, money and petroleum, slowed freight and mail deliveries, and increased human tensions. Meantime, we have nullified the shorter work week, and the promised gain in leisure, by spending more hours in monotonous daily travel, under conditions highly inimical to health."

Yet there's an alternative to the frenzied highway and airport expansion which continues to contribute to our deteriorating environment: A return to the rails. Railroads are the nation's safest, most efficient and economical means of transportation today.

But first some facts. The highway use of motor fuel exceeded 103 billion gallons in 1972. This is 877 gallons of fuel for every registered motor vehicle in America, exclusive of motorcycles. The EPA has suggested gasoline rationing for the notoriously toxic Los Angeles basin. This past winter thousands of cities experienced shortages of fuel, with no promised easing of the crisis in the near future.

More facts. The automobile uses 2½ times the energy per passenger-mile than a train in cross country travel. An airplane—six times the energy. A person who flies coast to coast is personally using as much fuel for that one trip as his automobile will consume in six months. If he takes the train, he will use one-sixth as much energy as in a car.

So let's consider the advantages of returning to the rails, from a purely environmental viewpoint. Trains have the unique potential for using energy from just about any source—oil, or electricity from coal, gas or atomic energy. Thus, as our crisis for oil further develops, trains could potentially make use of other fuel resources in greater supply.

Trains also require far less land than either airports or highways. Manhattan's two railroad stations handle 105 million passengers a year, on just 124 acres. New York's three airports handle less than a third as many passengers on more than 60 times as much land. The new Dallas-Ft. Worth airport is as large as Manhattan Island, but its capacity is less than Manhattan's 9-acre Penn Station.

Infinitely less air pollution is created per passenger by the most heavily traveled diesel or electric railroad as compared to cars or planes. While railroads are currently responsible for only about 1 percent of the total national air pollutant emissions, the automobile is responsible for "over half of the two million tons of pollution which we pump into our air yearly," according to John P. Olsson, Deputy Under Secretary of Transportation. And the airplane? A study released by the EPA last December said that although 90 percent of the nation's jet airlines now have engines producing a reduced level of emission fumes, aircraft will continue to be a major source of air pollution until at least 1980.

Yet despite the environmental advantages of rail passenger service, the future of Amtrak, our only rail passenger commodity, is in doubt. When Amtrak began operating on May 1, 1971, it inherited a passenger network that had suffered seriously from mismanagement and neglect. With some Government "seed" money, Amtrak cleaned up the trains, reduced the fares, got them on schedule and began an extensive advertising campaign to get travelers "back on the rails."

Come this June 30, 1973, Congress must review Amtrak's operation, and pass new leg-

islation to keep the passenger rails open. But several of President Nixon's top advisors are opposed to Amtrak, believing there's no place or need for rail passenger service. Most notable are Domestic Advisor John Ehrlichman, Treasury Secretary George Schultz, and newly appointed Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Caspar Weinberger. There is even speculation that Weinberger, former Director of the Office of Management and Budget, will recommend to his successor that Amtrak be dismantled, under the guise of wanting to hold the line against wasteful government spending. Perhaps these "advisors" also wish to keep the support of railroad presidents who do not want passenger trains interfering with their profitable freight trains.

Proponents of Amtrak include virtually every member of the Senate and a large percentage of the House, as well as consumers, environmentalists and rail labor unions. Yet the pro-train forces are not nearly as powerful as the highway or aviation interests. *Fortune* magazine has estimated that the combined forces of the highway lobby spend \$100 million a year on their Washington offices alone. Thus the fate of rail passenger travel in this country is indeed tenuous.

The solution is clear. With fuel running out, land becoming scarce, and our air quality reaching the point of no return, it's time we had a choice in our modes of travel. Amtrak's survival could help shape the course of passenger transportation in America for years to come, but only if we let our legislature know how we feel. Write and tell them to support passenger trains. Also, you yourselves should try a return to the rails—you'll love it.

DOLLAR OVERHANG

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the recent dollar devaluation is one symptom of the underlying ill of heavy foreign dollar holdings "Dollar Overhang." I have proposed, both in hearings of the Banking and Currency Subcommittee on International Finance and in the RECORD, that the Treasury Department take aggressive action to return some of these dollars to the United States. Only in this way will we have some reliable expectation of a stable dollar value abroad.

Last month I invited representatives of the Treasury Department to my office to discuss in more detail the proposal I had urged and the current plans of the Department. At the conclusion of that meeting, I asked Deputy Assistant Secretary Sam Cross to send me a memorandum covering the points he had made. I want to share that memorandum with the Members of the House.

The letter and memorandum from Mr. Cross follow:

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., April 16, 1973.

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HANNA: When we met in your office the other day to discuss proposals for consolidating U.S. dollar balances held by foreign official institutions, you asked for a memorandum summarizing the points I mentioned.

A memorandum is enclosed.

Please let me know if you have any fur-

ther questions or if we can help in any other way.

Sincerely,

SAM Y. CROSS.

PROPOSALS FOR REDUCING THE LIQUIDITY OF U.S. DOLLAR BALANCES HELD BY FOREIGN INSTITUTIONS

1. The Treasury is at present giving renewed consideration to the possibility of special measures aimed at reducing the liquidity of U.S. dollar balances held by foreign official institutions. We cannot at this stage predict the outcome, but we are re-examining the entire question to see whether new initiatives are in order.

2. As of the end of January 1973, U.S. liquid and other liabilities to foreign official institutions amounted to about \$61 billion. There have been a number of proposals that these funds should be consolidated, funded or in other ways made less liquid, as a move toward international monetary stability. To considerable extent, however, these balances represent the working balances and reserve holdings which other nations have sought to accumulate. They undoubtedly wish to retain sufficient balances to finance their trade and payments and as a cushion for balance of payments need. Thus by no means all of these balances are either very volatile or a source of instability. The very large holdings are concentrated in the hands of a very few central banks. In fact, about 60 percent of the total is held by the monetary authorities of three countries.

3. The Treasury has been receptive—and to a degree has actively encouraged—investment of dollar balances in nonmarketable U.S. Treasury bonds and notes. As shown in the attached table, at end January 1973, the total of such issues (including both those payable in dollars and those payable in foreign currencies) amounted to about \$16 billion, or 25 percent of the total balances held by foreign official institutions. (It should be noted, however, that the bulk of these issues can, under various conditions, be converted into marketable issues.) During 1972, the total of non-marketable issues rose by about \$7 billion, largely through increases in the amounts held by Germany.

4. There are, however, serious constraints on the scope for bilateral arrangements between the U.S. and large dollar holding countries to reduce the liquidity of the dollar balances:

Central banks traditionally desire to hold their reserve assets in a very liquid form so that they can use the assets on short notice if necessary, and they do not like to give up that liquidity for the higher earnings which might be earned;

The Treasury is reluctant to pay more interest than necessary to finance the public debt, and does not wish to give preferential interest rates to one class of lender (foreign official institutions).

5. More broadly, the United States view has been that the question of the dollar balances must be examined as one part of the much broader issue of long-term international monetary reform—involving decisions on effective means of balance-of-payments adjustment; possible exchange rate regimes and degree of flexibility in rates; the proper role of gold, currencies and SDR in the system; the appropriate degree of international liquidity; and other issues. The Smithsonian Agreement and the mandate of the Committee of Twenty (C-20) both recognize that decisions on long-term monetary reform must encompass all such interrelated issues.

6. To the extent the balances are in some sense "excess" to the holders' needs or wishes, the balances are perhaps more a reflection of past instabilities than a source of present instability. Thus during the monetary crises of last February and March, the market pressures which were experienced did not, generally speaking, result from previously acquired dollars being sold on the ex-

change markets by the authorities in Germany, Switzerland, Japan, and other such very large dollar holders. They were basically the result of additional dollars being transferred out of the United States and elsewhere to these large dollar holders, further increasing the total balances substantially above the \$61 billion mentioned earlier.

7. The fact that the dollar balances are the result of past international monetary instabilities means that any lasting solution requires not just a means of dealing with the liquidity of these balances, but development of a new international monetary system without the instabilities of the past. Obviously, if nothing were done to create a more stable monetary system and a more effective balance of payments adjustment process, the instabilities and imbalances of the past might emerge again. Even if the present balances were fully consolidated, there might simply be a new build-up of additional dollar balances under such conditions, and the world would be no better off.

8. In the U.S. proposals for monetary reform presented by Secretary Shultz last September, we contemplated that there would be a declining but continuing role for foreign currency holdings in the system. We recognized that a number of countries want to hold currencies in their reserves, and we stated that

official holding of such currencies "need be neither generally banned nor encouraged." At the same time, we noted the possible need for some consolidation of present large liquid currency balances, and we said "careful study should be given to proposals for exchanging part of existing reserve currency holdings into a special issue of SDR, at the option of the holder."

9. Thus the question of consolidation of the dollar and other currency balances is on the agenda of the C-20 and proposals have been received by the C-20 Deputies. This is not to suggest the matter can be easily resolved. Quite aside from the fact that it must be dealt with as part of the whole reform issue, there are opposing national interests and different views. Holders of the currencies understandably would want maximum return on their assets, and maximum protection against loss from exchange rate changes, while issuers of currencies would naturally have a different interest. And, from the viewpoint of all nations in the system, there are thorny questions of achieving, in a world of convertibility, a sustainable balance between the availability of primary assets (SDR) in the system and claims on such primary assets—which means either providing for substantial increases in the amount of SDR in the system, or limiting somehow the ex-

tent to which currency holdings can become a claim on primary reserves. Without some means of attaining a sustainable balance between the claims on and supply of primary assets, the monetary system could be subject to severe strains, and the prospects of maintaining a system of general convertibility would be dim.

10. As yet it is by no means clear how these important aspects of long-term monetary reform will be resolved, or what decisions will be made with respect to consolidating, funding, or exchanging part of currency balances into SDR. But the importance of the issue was reiterated in the communique issued at the end of the Ministerial Meeting of the Group of Ten and the EEC, of March 16, 1973 which stated:

"In the context of discussions of monetary reform, the Ministers and Governors agreed that proposals for consolidation of official currency balances deserved thorough and urgent attention. The matter is already on the agenda of the Committee of Twenty of the IMF."

11. Whatever the steps, multilateral or bilateral, to make these balances less liquid in the short term, the longer-term solution is a strong U.S. balance of payments which enables us to reduce the balances through surpluses.

TABLE IFS-4.—NONMARKETABLE U.S. TREASURY BONDS AND NOTES ISSUED TO OFFICIAL INSTITUTIONS OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES

[In millions of dollars or dollar equivalent]

End of calendar year or month	Payable in dollars										Payable in foreign currencies						Bank for International Settle- ments
	Total	Total	Belgium	Canada ¹	Denmark	Germany	Italy ²	Korea	Sweden	Taiwan	Thailand	Total	Austria	Belgium	Ger- many ³	Italy	
1962	251											251				200	51
1963	893	163		125			13		25			703	50	30	275	200	175
1964	1,440	354		329					25			1,086	50	30	679		257
1965	1,692	484		299			160		25			1,208	101	30	602	125	257
1966	695	353		144			184		25			342	25	30	50	125	111
1967	1,563	516		314			177		25			1,047	50	60	601	125	211
1968	3,330	1,692	32	1,334	20		146	15	25	20	100	1,638	50		1,051	226	311
1969	4,181	1,431	32	1,129			135	15		20	100	1,750			1,084	125	541
1970	3,563	2,480	32	2,289			25	15		20	100	1,083			542		541
1971	9,657	7,829	32	2,640		5,000	22	15		20	100	1,827			612		1,215
1972	15,872	14,333	20	2,840		11,315	22	15		20	100	5,539			306		1,233
1972:																	
February	9,658	7,829	32	2,640		5,000	22	15		20	100	1,828			612		1,216
March	9,940	8,188	32	2,840		5,158	22	15		20	100	1,752			536		1,216
April	12,440	10,688	32	2,840		7,658	22	15		20	100	1,752			536		1,216
May	12,441	10,688	32	2,840		7,658	22	15		20	100	1,753			536		1,217
June	12,441	10,688	32	2,840		7,658	22	15		20	100	1,753			536		1,217
July	15,864	14,188	32	2,840		11,158	22	15		20	100	1,676			459		1,217
August	15,864	14,188	32	2,840		11,158	22	15		20	100	1,676			459		1,217
September	16,022	14,345	32	2,840		11,315	22	15		20	100	1,677			459		1,218
October	15,871	14,345	32	2,840		11,315	22	15		20	100	1,526			306		1,220
November	15,872	14,345	32	2,840		11,315	22	15		20	100	1,528			306		1,222
December	15,872	14,333	20	2,840		11,315	22	15		20	100	1,539			306		1,233
1973:																	
January	16,016	14,474	20	2,840		11,471	22			20	100	1,542			306		1,236
Feb. ⁶	15,863	14,474	20	2,840		11,471	22			20	100	1,389			153		1,236

¹ Includes bonds issued to the Government of Canada in connection with transactions under the Columbia River treaty. Amounts outstanding were \$204,000,000, September 1964 through October 1965; \$175,000,000, November 1965 through October 1966; \$144,000,000, November 1966 through October 1967; \$114,000,000, November 1967 through October 1968; \$84,000,000, November 1968 through September 1969; \$54,000,000, October 1969 through September 1970; and \$24,000,000, October 1970 through October 1971.

² Notes issued to the Government of Italy in connection with military purchases in the United States.

³ In addition, nonmarketable Treasury notes amounting to \$125,000,000 equivalent were held by a group of German commercial banks from June 1968 through November 1972. The dollar

value of these notes was increased by \$10,000,000 in October 1969, and by \$18,000,000 as of Dec. 31, 1971. See also footnotes 7 and 8, table IFS-1.

⁴ Includes an increase in dollar value of \$84,000,000 resulting from revaluation of the German mark in October 1969. See also footnote 7, table IFS-1.

⁵ Includes \$106,000,000 increase in dollar value of foreign currency obligations revalued to reflect market exchange rates as of Dec. 31, 1971. See also footnote 8, table IFS-1.

⁶ Dollar equivalents not revalued to reflect end-February 1973 de facto conversion rates.

Note.—For further information, see "Public Debt Operations," tables PDO-8 and 9.

THE POSTWAR FOLLIES

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Rear Adm. Ernest M. Eller has written a story in the May issue of *Sea Power* magazine which should be read by every Member of Congress, and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

THE POSTWAR FOLLIES—PEACETIME PARSIMONY LEADS TO WARTIME CALAMITY, WARNS EMINENT HISTORIAN

(By Ernest M. Eller)

(NOTE.—Rear Admiral Ernest McNeill Eller, former Director of the Naval History Division, retired from the Navy in 1970, ending a distinguished 48-year career. Currently, he is serving his second year as National Historian of the Navy League. Author of the book "The Soviet Sea Challenge," Admiral Eller has been an anxious observer of the momentous changes of the past decade which have eroded U.S. oceanic strength and tipped the precarious balance of sea power in favor of the Soviet Union. These are his views.

After all major conflicts in which the United States has been involved there has been, and rightly so, a cutback of U.S. military forces.

Sometimes—more often than not, unfortunately—such cuts have gone beyond the point of reason and safety as the nation's craving for peace and weariness with war, particularly with expenditures for war, have caused the pendulum to swing too far—regardless of postwar world conditions, U.S. international treaty responsibilities, and domestic economic needs.

The country again faces such a situation today as, in the wake of the longest war—and one of the most divisive—in U.S. his-

tory, she begins a substantial dismantling of the country's defense establishment and turns to consideration of what many stridently proclaim as "higher priority" domestic matters.

But it is no exaggeration to say that, if America follows too closely the postwar excesses of the past, if she once again permits the pendulum to swing too far, she will be inviting calamity.

This is particularly true as regards the situation at sea, where the United States is losing the fight to a relentless opponent—and, in fact, in the opinion of many naval leaders, has probably already lost it.

It is also exaggeration to state, alarmist though it may sound, that never before in history has the United States been in as great peril as she is today.

This is so because, for the first time in history, the nation is faced with a ruthless antagonist which, always strong on land, is now, and has been for several years, furiously building a strength at sea which is today second to none.

THE BRITISH SHIELD

In the past, particularly throughout the last century, the benevolent shield of British sea power protected the United States and many other nations from would-be predators. When in this century aggressor nations, ambitious for world conquest, became more so because of the naval and military weakness of the democracies and finally did challenge the Royal Navy, as well as the ascendant, newly powerful U.S. Navy, at sea, there followed the catastrophe of two world wars.

Those who lived through the darkest days of World War II, particularly, know how perilously thin was the margin of naval/military strength by which the Allies finally won out, and should remember that Great Britain nearly succumbed to a submarine force insignificant to that which the Kremlin now directs. Those in the U.S. Navy who survived will never forget the dark and desperate year after Pearl Harbor when the Japanese had a stronger Navy in the Pacific, nor the immense efforts required of the combined navies of the United States, Great Britain, and other Allied countries to check the smaller German and Japanese navies.

With such examples from the recent past, with a strong friendly sea power no longer standing between America and potential adversaries, with an avowed enemy already armed to the teeth daily growing ever stronger—particularly on, under, and now over the seas—and with the acknowledged responsibilities thrust upon and accepted by her as the most powerful of the world's democracies, it seems incredible that America has allowed herself to become abysmally inferior in most of the essentials of sea power.

But this is exactly what has happened. It is hard to understand why this is so. Perhaps today's willingness, not to say eagerness, to demolish the tools of war simply reflects historical American tendencies to let hope ride over common sense. The country has always suffered heavily in times of war for its lack of foresight during the preceding periods of peace.

If history repeats itself once again, if the past is lantern for the future, which it is, Americans can expect cruel days ahead—but *this need not be so if, in fact, U.S. leaders in Congress and in the Executive Branch can read history, and can learn from it.*

EARLY ECONOMY ERRORS

Examining the past may help to put the present situation in better perspective. After the American Revolution Yankee maritime enterprise ranged far and wide. Merchant ships multiplied, and commerce prospered. However, bankrupted by the long war, and struggling to unite on national purpose, the nation's forefathers disbanded the small U.S. Navy of the day and depended upon the good will of others for protection.

They soon learned—the hard way, unfor-

tunately—that freedom cannot survive without the courage and sacrifice and strength that won it in the first place. In a world where power must back the best intentions, one cannot fight sturdily for the right and then on victory day abandon his arms and leave the future as unprotected as the past. Strength in peace is almost more important than in war, *for it can prevent war.* Weakness, on the other hand, invites war.

In 1785, as the United States auctioned off her last warship, Barbary corsairs captured American merchantmen and enslaved the crews. Neglected by their government, many luckless sailors, the "POWs" of their day, died in captivity, and a decade would pass before the last survivors were freed—any similarity with Korean War and Vietnam War POW experiences is more than coincidental.

Worse followed. The French Revolution that began in 1789 soon ignited the fifth World War of that century. In efforts to cut each other's lifelines, both England and France (America's ally, under another government, during the Revolutionary War) preyed on the American merchant marine. The U.S. government protested—but it was too weak to do more.

Then, in 1792, Algerian corsairs captured several ships and enslaved over 100 more American marines. Congress finally authorized the building of six frigates—but soon cut that number to three when U.S. diplomats negotiated a humiliating peace at a tribute cost of one-sixth of the national revenue (then \$6 million).

At that time the nation's income came almost exclusively from taxes on foreign trade. During the 1795-97 period, income averaged under \$6.5 million annually, of which the Navy was allocated 5.5 per cent. Congress obviously wasn't rushing to rebuild a fleet, even though world war still raged.

As hostilities mounted, outrages against American commerce increased. French corsairs even captured ships in U.S. territorial waters. Congress consequently sped up commissioning a small fleet, and the country entered upon the naval quasi-war with France.

In 1801, following successful conclusion of that war, the U.S. government commenced operations against the Barbary pirates—but, as usual, tried to conduct them on a shoestring: naval appropriations dropped from \$2.11 million in 1801 to \$916,000 in 1802. The war thus dragged on for years until finally settled when the government agreed to pay ransom for the U.S. POWs.

Thereafter, as war continued and American commerce suffered heavily, naval budgets grew. From 1806 to 1811 they averaged around \$1.9 million annually, or 20 per cent of the national budget. Such wiser allocation of resources to provide protection at sea in perilous times, however, was hamstrung by what can only be called the "gunboat aberration." (Not only do Americans usually deceive themselves that the end of the war means peace forever, but they ever follow the other chimera that security can be bought on the cheap. This time the bargain basement offered Mr. Jefferson's gunboats. Most of the Navy's increased funds went into this folly; hence real preparedness afloat benefited little.)

FOLLY AND FORESIGHT

When the War of 1812 came the United States had, therefore, only a few high-seas warships. The little Navy could not stop the ravages—including the burning of Washington—of the British fleet, but it won notable single-ship duels and lake victories of lasting importance to the American future. When the war ended in 1815, the government consequently continued to strengthen the Navy by commissioning ships of the line, backbone of sea power. During the period 1817-12, appropriations for the Navy averaged \$3.56 million, or 18 per cent of total government spending. Three sea wars in less than two decades, and pirate depredations in the West

Indies, had apparently driven the lesson home.

It is not necessary to detail the wisdom or folly in naval appropriations for the ensuing century to World War I, except to note two significant examples:

(1) Power afloat played a giant role on the ocean, bays, and rivers during the Civil War. Yet when peace came naval funds plummeted and stayed in the deep six. For 25 years they averaged under 7 per cent of the overall budget, and did not rise to above 10 per cent until the late 1890s. The nation survived such a perilously low level of security only because of Britain's benign rule of the seas—a safeguard no longer present.

(2) One of the few instances of wise and strong U.S. maritime policy over an extended peacetime period followed the short Spanish-American War. During that war, naval expenditures rose only moderately over the years immediately preceding, holding at about 10-11 per cent of total national spending (then \$605 million). But in 1900 a new trend began.

It was a time of cataclysmic changes. Giant forces were sweeping the world. The rising tide of the Industrial Revolution and accelerating technology had completely changed navies. A modern ship of the line, the "battleship," had evolved. Submarines were bringing their deadly stealth to boost the offensive strength of navies and increase defensive problems. Aircraft would soon follow.

These revolutionary developments at sea converged with the rise of ambitious rivals east and west yearning to wrest the sea from Britain. At the same time, although not understanding it, the United States was rising to world primacy. Without conscious preparation the nation was becoming world leader.

TR'S PRESCIENCE

A number of Americans, with Teddy Roosevelt—a leader who demonstrates the overriding importance of a single great man in shaping history—in the van, did understand the changes taking place, however, and saw clearly that the key to the defense of freedom lay at sea. With Teddy Roosevelt on the bridge, funding for the Navy rose steadily to about 18 per cent of the rising national budget. Had the U.S. government held to the preceding low 6-10 per cent ratio, in the opinion of many military historians, World War I might well have gone the other way.

Roosevelt's foresight did, of course, provide the naval muscle needed by the Allies to win World War I, and should have been an example to future generations of the necessity for strength at sea. Yet, since World War I armistice of November 11, 1918, the record of U.S. national peacetime leadership in providing a navy adequate to the nation's needs and to cope with changing and increasingly hostile world conditions has been as bleak as the worst of the past, with only a few bright spots.

Each generation seems to find its own false standard to displace strength, which history has repeatedly demonstrated is the one sure hope for peace in a world where aggression never sleeps. The post-World War I generation found solace in the term "disarmament." Full of good will, the United States scrapped real ships, afloat and building; other nations scrapped mostly blueprints and obsolete hulls.

The Depression and vocal anti-arms advocates led U.S. leaders to cut back even more. Hence, the Navy was not permitted to build up even to treaty levels. By 1930 funds allotted to the Navy had shrunk to under 11 per cent of the national budget, and matters soon grew worse. From 1932 to 1939 Navy funding averaged well under half a billion dollars annually—about 7 per cent of the national budget, approximating the doldrum ratio of the 1870s and 1880s. The Army received little more.

This head-in-the-sand folly, it should be

noted, took place in an environment radically different from the post-Civil War era, when the British Navy kept world peace. During the 1930s explosive dangers raged on three continents as the world was rocked by the conquests of the Nazis in Germany and the Fascists in Italy at the same time Japanese imperialists were threatening Asia and the Communists were completing their brutal consolidation of the USSR.

WHAT PRICE WEAKNESS?

The inevitable followed. Determined aggressors, encouraged by weakness, unloosed the horror of another world war. If Britain and America had been prepared, this and future generations may well ask, would Hitler have risked the gamble into Poland? If the United States had doubled appropriations for sea power in the 1930s, would Japanese militarists have dared the Pearl Harbor Day of Infamy?

America's scrimping—Navy funding, for example, fell from \$2 billion in 1919 to a \$484 million average during the years 1931-38—during the fateful decade of the 1930s turned against her with a vengeance. Expenditures on the Army (and Army Air) exceeded \$50 billion in the single year of 1945, and on the Navy (and Marines and Navy Air), \$30 billion. During the long and bloody battles of World War II the small dollar savings achieved by crippling U.S. military strength in the 1930s were turned—at a cost of hundreds of billions of dollars—into an awesome and awful loss of life, untold human misery, and a world torn asunder and open, moreover, to yet another ruthless type of aggression: communism, with its evil philosophy that the end justifies the means.

Yet did America heed? No, she seemed bent on suicide, as in wild abandon, after VJ Day, she dissipated her expensive and hard-won military strength. Theorists hoisted a new signal of cheap security—the atomic bomb, which would now keep peace without the expense of conventional arms. Sea power, which had just made possible victory in the most gigantic struggle in the history of mankind, was obsolete, and this was where the biggest savings could be achieved.

Communist intrigue and aggression soon caused new crises: in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Berlin, Greece, Iran, and China. But the United States continued to cut its military strength, nevertheless. The party line now ran that if the nation spent more on defense it would go bankrupt. By 1950 the Navy's share of the now much-reduced defense budget had dwindled to 30 per cent from nearly 50 per cent through most of the 1930s—although dollar expenditures of course much exceeded those of the 1930s, as inflation and sophisticated weapons skyrocketed costs.

Looked at through another prism, the Navy's share of the overall national budget had shrunk to 10 per cent, a hazardous level at any time, but downright foolhardy in 1950, when the mantle of leadership of the Free World had fallen on the United States.

Thus, even with the tragic lesson of the 1930s made abundantly clear by hindsight, only a decade later U.S. leaders were making the same disastrous mistakes. Actually, such repetition of previous mistakes was far worse than the originals, since there was full evidence of the Kremlin's intent to dominate the world stage.

THE LONELY GUARDIAN

The folly of the late 1940s surpassed preceding ones in yet another way. During the 1930s the Navy shared U.S. defense funds close to 50-50 with the Army, averaging over 45 per cent of the small pittance that Congress was allocating for security. But at that time Great Britain still had a powerful fleet, comparable in size to the U.S. fleet. By 1950, however, the U.S. Navy stood almost alone as guardian of the seas, but the share of the new tri-service defense budget earmarked for sea power had dwindled to 30 per cent.

Just as Pearl Harbor followed America's

lack of foresight in the 1930s, so in 1950 came the onslaught of the communist juggernaut that rolled down Korea, sweeping to the last corner of land on that embattled peninsula before finally being checked by the Inchon landing and subsequent U.S./U.N. counterattacks. The shadow of the mighty World War II Navy and Marine forces that had swept across the Pacific sufficed once again, though barely, and only because the sea was uncontested.

Had the U.S. Navy been stronger and had U.S. forces ashore been larger, however, there might have been no Korean War and no need for an Inchon landing. The dollars saved by cutting the defense budgets from 1947 to 1950 went up like smoke. The loss of lives and the world disruption that followed those budget cuts—inevitably, it would seem—could be directly charged, once again, to abandonment of the wise maritime strategy that had just led to victory in World War II.

THE SOVIETS MOVE AHEAD

Today, for the third time in one wracked generation, the United States is repeating the same mistakes of the recent past. With the Soviet Union driving to dominate the sea, the nation is spending less than 10 per cent of the national budget for security afloat—this was the level of disaster in the past, and was at that low level only because no navy in any way comparable to the USSR's present-day fleet existed to challenge the Free World. Today, because of the USSR's furious naval/maritime build-up, coupled with America's own neglect—not to say deliberate cutback—of its Navy, the Soviet Union has shot ahead in nearly every aspect of sea power. In the Navy the Soviets lag only in carriers, amphibious ships, and at-sea replenishment ships. But the Russian fleet now far exceeds the U.S. Navy in submarines, guided-missile surface ships, mincraft, and—most important of all for the future—in new construction. One early consequence of U.S. lethargy occurred when the United States—which only five years earlier had been far ahead—accepted, in the 1972 SALT Agreement, a 3:2 Soviet superiority in sea-based ballistic missiles.

In shipyards, oceanography, R&D, merchant marine shipping, fishing fleets, and training of seamen, the Soviets also have drawn far ahead. The significance of the purposeful Soviet drive to win the world at sea, and of the incredible inaction of this country, becomes even more apparent when it is remembered that only 25 years ago the United States led overwhelmingly in all aspects of sea power, and the USSR far behind, wasn't even in the running.

It is now evident, and becoming more so each day, that the United States will in the future have to import more and more raw materials for the U.S. economy—and, therefore, the American way of life itself—to survive. This being the case, intelligent men may ask, why have those who control this nation's destiny not seemed to learn, as apparently Kremlin leaders have learned, that the nation that controls the seas controls the course of civilization?

There are those who say that the present drive to cut expenditures for national security is a natural revulsion on the part of democratic peoples to spending heavily for armaments immediately after a war. There may be some truth in this theory, but it is evident from a study of history that the nation acted more wisely after the War of 1812, the Spanish-American War, and the Korean War. At least part of the difference, it would seem, was the foresight of the nation's leaders of those times, as well as their willingness to go to the people and explain to them the need for a continuing strong national defense.

The seas, and free access to them, have ever wielded a mighty influence on the American destiny, and will prove even more vital to the American future. Those who love and understand the sea, and who also know and love

this country, may well pray today—having seen the Free World and the U.S. role in it twice barely escape annihilation—that in this third and last chance of this century U.S. leadership, in Congress as well as in the Executive Branch, will rise to the need and not throw away, once again, the strength that has always been a mandatory prerequisite to freedom.

GRUMMAN SUN SHIELD

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, the Skylab mission now seems well on the way to success, thanks to the erection of a device to shade Skylab from the Sun, and thus make it habitable for the astronauts. The construction of the Sun shield was accomplished in less than 2 days by a team of engineers at Grumman Aerospace in Bethpage, L.I., and they certainly deserve a great deal of credit for helping to save this \$2.6 billion space venture. So that my colleagues might have an idea of the work that went into the construction of the Sun shield, I include in the RECORD an article that appeared in the May 25 issue of Newsday:

A GRUMMAN PARASOL TO THE RESCUE

(By Mark Bloom)

CAPE KENNEDY, Fla.—After one of the most bizarre countdowns in the history of the American space program, three astronauts blast off this morning for the severely crippled Skylab laboratory, which they hope to repair and live in for 28 days.

The attempt at an unprecedented space repair job was made possible in large part by the high-speed efforts of a team of engineers and machinists at Grumman Aerospace in Bethpage, L.I., who responded to the Skylab crisis with a round-the-clock crash program.

The Grumman team devised, designed and fabricated the critical telescoping extension rods for a parasol-like device that astronauts Charles (Pete) Conrad, Joseph Kerwin and Paul Weitz plan to erect to shade Skylab from the sun, cooling it down to habitable temperatures.

After intensive testing in Houston which went past deadline after revised deadline, the parasol device arrived here last night at 9 PM—an unheard of mere 12 hours before launch. Also arriving at the last minute were two backup sun shields.

It was the loss of a micrometeoroid-heat shield during launch of the space station 10 days ago that threw the \$2.6-billion Skylab program into disarray and made an improvised sun shield essential.

For Grumman, the accident brought an opportunity for a rescue, as hectic though obviously not so dramatic, in the tradition of the lunar module "lifeboat" tow on the crippled Apollo 13.

This time, instead of saving lives, the Grumman efforts could help save the entire Skylab project, in which three crews are to visit and work in the station for up to 56 days over the next eight months. Grumman previously had no hardware on Skylab.

Grumman's part began last Sunday about 1:30 in the afternoon, just after Phil Vassallo, director of Grumman machine operations, sat down to dinner with his family in Bethpage.

Vassallo, 39, received a call from Jack Buxton, a Grumman vice president who heads operations at Houston, saying that the space agency had accepted a Grumman offer of help.

Grabbing bites between phone calls to

Houston, Vassallo finished his dinner about the same time he completed the first rough drawings of the series of telescoping rods the space agency needed for deployment of the parasol.

About that time, he called Edward Hertford, the Grumman machine shop manager, who was having a party after his son's confirmation that morning.

By sundown, Vassallo and Hertford had rounded up some raw material—aluminum tubing—and they had a team of eight working on the problem at one of Grumman's plants. By the next morning, the group had expanded to 20 lunar module veterans, including an engineering team headed by Bud Lee, and a quality-control group led by Joseph Kingfield. Machining had to be to tolerances of one-thousandth of an inch, which is extremely difficult with aluminum.

Most of the original group had about two hours' sleep that night, and there was none at all for anyone the second night. Finally, by 5 AM Tuesday morning, the rods and their documentation were sent on their way to Houston for testing, and everyone could relax. But only for six hours. At 11 AM, the space agency requested a backup set of rods, and everyone went back to work. The backup hardware was delivered on time early yesterday.

Vassallo, who ran the operation, said, "We were back doing the kinds of things we've been doing for years around here, quick reaction to a crisis. The people I called were used to reacting to those things, and there were plenty more if I had needed them."

LET US GET THAT OIL MOVING

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, further delay in building a trans-Alaska pipeline to a terminal within the United States is unconscionable. Both the pipeline and the terminal in this instance will be U.S. controlled and beyond foreign interruption whether by assessment or force.

Those that want a pipeline across Canada to the Midwest seek to defer construction of the Alaska pipeline and to eventually substitute a trans-Canada pipeline. Such a course is wrong on two counts. First, it will delay our vitally needed oil—2 million barrels per day per pipeline—by months and perhaps years. Second, we need both pipelines for reasons obvious, for we are presently in critical deficit in both oil and refinery capacity in this country.

So let us get on with the trans-Alaska pipeline without further delay, and work to approve and negotiate with our Canadian friends for a second, trans-Canada pipeline, as rapidly as possible.

What is at stake is 4 million barrels of oil a day from one of the largest known oil reserves in the North American Continent. The urgency of the need for this oil is undeniable, as well as the fact that the degree of urgency is escalating with every passing day.

In this connection the following editorial from today's Washington Star-News is significant.

RISKY QUIBBLING OVER OIL

Petroleum may well be running a close second to Watergate as a national obsession

before this year ends. Already the gasoline shortage is causing some people to trim their summer travel plans, and a fuel-oil crunch may be on the way. This whole problem could become a full-blown crisis, because the supply simply isn't there any more to meet the demand. And against such an ominous background, we find it incredible that a sizable segment of Congress, largely from the Middle West, is raising a parochial obstruction to the trans-Alaska oil pipeline.

This huge petroleum artery is ready to be built. The pipe that would extend almost 800 miles across Alaska, from the northern Arctic rim to the warm-water port of Valdez on the southern shore, already is on the ground. On that North Slope, untapped, is the largest oil pool ever discovered on this continent, which can come flowing down the line at a rate of 2 million barrels a day. And most importantly, this would be a domestic source, reducing the nation's costly and risky dependence on foreign oil imports. Those will rise to about 5 million barrels a day this year, and drastically increase until, in the 1980's, the dollar outflow may strike a severe blow at the American economy.

So the Alaskan oil is absolutely essential. Right now the \$3 billion pipeline project is stalled, however, by a Supreme Court ruling on a question of corridor width across federal lands. Congress could, and should, remove this obstacle in short order by amending an old right-of-way law. But as that attempt gets underway, some lawmakers—in both the House and Senate—have launched a counter effort. They argue that the trans-Alaska line should be scrapped in favor of a route across Canada. That way, the oil would enter the petroleum-hungry Midwest which, they contend, will pay a cost penalty if shipment is down the West Coast in accordance with present plans.

There are some good points in this argument, but they have been raised much too late to justify any interference with the trans-Alaska plans. Shifting to a Canadian route could mean a five-year postponement in gaining access to North Slope oil, according to Interior Secretary Morton. If Congress forces such a delay, either by action or inaction, it will face a furious populace in the Midwest and everywhere else in the event of a crippling oil emergency. It should, as President Nixon recommends, get the Alaskan project unjammed, while the government begins negotiations for another pipeline across Canada. For this country will need every drop of oil it can get from both lines and then some.

ISRAEL CELEBRATES 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, recently the State of Israel celebrated the 25th anniversary of its declaration of independence. These 25 years, much like the first 25 years of our Nation's history, were not easy times, but rather were times that required individual and national sacrifice for an ideal that has come under repeated attack around the world—democracy.

The similarity between Israel's struggle and our own does not stop with a comparison of governmental systems. As our country was built by emigrants fleeing religious prejudice and political repression, so was Israel. Its open arms extended to Jews in Russia waiting to emigrate and all people wishing to be

repatriated to their traditional homeland will offer scholars a subject of study for years to come.

At this point, Israel also faces a problem that we in this country have had to deal with since our founding—that of the integration of different racial and national groups while, at the same time, the maintenance of ethnic identity that is the very hallmark of the tolerance of a free society.

Although this is a period of celebration and joy, signaling the end of the first era of modern Israeli development, it does not mark the end of sacrifice or, unfortunately, the diminishing of tensions in the Middle East. The impasse still exists and every avenue should be explored to achieve a firm and lasting peace.

MALCOLM X REMEMBERED

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the response and reaction initiated in the black community by the remembrance of Malcolm X on the anniversary on May the 19th of what would have been his 48th birthday is truly moving and promising.

The goals and dreams of black America that Malcolm so well expressed are still kindling. It is up to caring and freedom-loving Americans to make those dreams burn with the glowing fire of reality.

An interesting article appeared in the May edition of *Encore* magazine, entitled "An Interview With Malcolm X" which I place in the *RECORD* at this time for the information of my colleagues:

AN INTERVIEW WITH MALCOLM X

(All quotes attributed to Malcolm X in the following article are taken from interviews and speeches given and made by Malcolm during his lifetime. In some cases his actual words have been slightly modified, in terms of tense, to make the story flow smoothly.)

He appeared mysteriously and suddenly at my table in the rear of the small restaurant on 125th Street early in 1973. A ghost, his complexion was that of beach sand, his close-cropped hair was burnt umber, flourishing about his chin was a trimmed red goatee. He was lamppost straight, over six feet tall, his dark suit jacket hanging loosely about his shoulders and chest.

His bearing was that of an infantry general, but he was without his Honor Guard. His face was stern, somewhat narrow. And, despite the horn-rimmed glasses, his eyes emitted great strength, gazing fixedly with unnerving penetration. His voice was hoarse, fast-clipped; it had the quick-silver cadence of the street hustler; a voice that could put goose pimples on women and high resolve in men.

He looked down at me and politely asked that I move to the other seat at the two-chair table. "I never sit with my back to a door," he said dryly.

Palming the greasy metal dish, he poured a liberal serving of cream into his cup. "Coffee is the only thing I like integrated."

"You know, since you departed eight years ago," I said, "Blacks have been giving off signs of changing their minds about themselves. But in many ways, things have remained the same, or they have gotten regrettably worse."

He sipped his coffee patiently, gazing directly at me, expressionless, but not cold, staring at me, but not through me.

I saw him for the first time and thought of him as the man-child in a land without promise, the son of a handy man and Baptist minister in Omaha and Lansing who had followed Marcus Garvey until he was killed and mutilated by Whites on a street. head bashed in, cut almost in two by a streetcar.

I gazed at the converted citizen of the Nation of Islam. By now he had been converted again—this time to the orthodox Eastern Moslem religion. Malcolm X was now El-Hajj Malik El-Shabazz. "What changes did you undergo after enduring the agony of your prison conversion to the Nation of Islam?" I asked.

"I still marvel at how swiftly my previous life's thinking pattern slid away from me, like snow off a roof. I would be startled to catch myself thinking in a remote way of my earlier self as another person.

"It made me very proud, in some odd way, to give up pork. One of the universal images of the Negro, in prison and out, was that he couldn't do without pork. My first pre-Islamic submission had been manifested. My brother Reginald visited me at the prison one day and lectured me about the teaching of the Honorable Elijah Muhammad. At the end of his talk he said: 'The White man is a devil.'

"Every instinct in me, which would have scoffed at and rejected everything else, was struck dumb.

"The White people I had known marched before my mind's eye. The state [welfare] people always in our house after the other Whites I didn't know had killed my father... the White people who kept calling my mother 'crazy' to her face until she was finally taken off by White people to the Kalamazoo asylum... the White judge who had split up our family... the teacher who told me in the eighth grade to 'be a carpenter' because thinking of being a lawyer was foolish for a Negro... the New York City cops... the fence back in Boston... Boston cops... the social workers... the prisoners... the guards.

"As a Black prisoner, I was most perfectly preconditioned to accept the words 'The White man is a devil.' It was right there in prison that I made up my mind to devote the rest of my life to telling the White man about himself—or die. And awakening this brainwashed Black man and telling this arrogant, devilish White man the truth about himself is a full-time job."

I told him about the current Black Liberation Army scare sweeping police precincts across the republic. "The police are illegally carrying shotguns in their cars," I said. "Almost every police injury in the Black community is linked to this phantom Black 'army.' In Nassau County, New York police spent weeks searching for BLA members who allegedly shot out the windshield of a police squad car. The search ended when the police found that the car had been hit as it drove past a vacant lot in a White neighborhood that is used as a rifle range."

A smile played briefly at the corners of his mouth. He reminded me of the phantom "Blood Brothers" group created by the imagination of police and New York City newsmen in 1964. The police said that the alleged group was comprised of young Harlem Blacks sworn to kill White people.

"No such organization existed," I said.

"If they don't exist," he said, "it's a miracle. Our people in this society live in a police state. We need a Mau Mau. In Mississippi we need a Mau Mau. In Alabama we need a Mau Mau. In Georgia we need a Mau Mau. Right here in Harlem, in New York City, we need a Mau Mau. We have to give them an alternative.

"Black people have got to learn the White

man's language if we're going to communicate with him. If he speaks French, we can't speak German. If he only understands the language of a rope, get a rope. If something was wrong with that language, the federal government would have stopped the cracker from speaking it to you and me."

The juke box in the restaurant began blaring a song by James Brown: "Waaaaaaa-aaaaaaa, Eeeeeeeeeeeeee Huh-Huh, I Got Ants in my Pants and I need to Dance, huh, Lordy, Lordy, Eeeeeeeeeeeeee."

He shook his head, gazed at his watch, and leaned over the table.

"I always maintained," he said, "that Blacks in America should defend themselves against White violence, murder by policemen, and brutality. If it takes violence to get the Black man his human rights in this country, I'm for violence. Exactly, you know, as the Irish, the Poles, or Jews would be if they were flagrantly discriminated against."

"If the leaders of the nonviolent movement can go into the White community and teach nonviolence, good, I'd go along with that. But they are teaching nonviolence only in the Black community. I'm not for telling Black people to be nonviolent while nobody is telling White people to be nonviolent."

"Besides," he said with a half-grin, "Black people aren't nonviolent with each other. Here in Harlem some Blacks talk that non-violent talk. But you can go to Harlem Hospital and see them going in there all cut up and shot up and busted up where they got violent with each other. So Negroes are talking about being nonviolent with the enemy. There's an inconsistency there."

Hunching his shoulders beneath his loose jacket, he coughed into his cupped fingers. He leaned forward and asked softly about Dr. Martin Luther King.

"He was assassinated by some White man with a rifle in Memphis in 1968," I said.

His face froze and his eyes grew harder; his lower lip quivered for a fleeting moment.

"Our goal has always been the same," he said. The approaches were different... with Dr. Martin Luther King's nonviolent marching dramatizing the brutality and the evil of the White man against defenseless Blacks. And in the racial climate of this country today, it was anybody's guess which of the extremes in approach to the Black man's problem might personally meet a fatal catastrophe first—nonviolent Dr. King or so-called violent me."

The police in Harlem," I said, "are as blood-thirsty as they were eight years ago. Of late the White cops have been given to shooting even Black policemen: accidentally, of course, usually five or six bullets in the back or chest. Nothing is ever done to the trigger-happy cops. The mayor and the top cops usually attend the funeral, and the murdered policeman's character is made suspect."

His face thawed almost imperceptibly. "Nowadays, our people don't care who the oppressor is, whether he has on a sheet or uniform, he's in the same category. I'm not against law enforcement. But we have to suffer from officers who lack understanding and who lack any human feeling for their fellow human beings. In Brooklyn the Hasidic Jews formed vigilante committees. No one thinks it's so wrong. I say that all we need is a few. But, because of the type of oppression and tyranny and opposition we are confronted by, ours need to be invisible. You never see them. You just feel them."

"Any time you know you're within the law, within your legal rights, within your moral rights, in accord with justice, then die for what you believe in. But don't die alone. Let your dying be reciprocal."

"It sometimes seems," I said, "that small numbers of Blacks are beginning to adopt the politics of reciprocity as applied to violence."

"Negroes didn't do this 10 years ago," he

said. "They are waking up. It was stones yesterday, Molotov cocktails today; it will be hand grenades tomorrow and whatever else is available the next day. Those days of the turn-the-other-cheek fight are gone."

"Do you feel that Blacks will wage indiscriminate violence against Whites because they are White?" I asked.

"It's smarter to say that you're going to shoot a man for what he is doing to you than because he is White. If you attack him because he is White, you give him no out. He can't stop being White. We've got to give the man a chance. He probably won't take it, the snake."

We ordered more coffee and two slices of bean pie.

"The same thing happened to the French in Indochina. The Algerians did it to the French again in Algeria. Nowhere on this earth does the White man win guerrilla warfare. And this is the day of the guerrilla. You've got to be mighty naïve, or you've got to play the Black man cheap, if you don't think someday he is going to wake up."

"But in domestic urban guerrilla warfare," I said, "isn't there the question of odds?"

"Don't let anybody tell you anything about the odds are against you. If they draft you, they send you to Korea and make you face 800 million Chinese. If you can be brave over there, you can be brave right here. These odds aren't as great as those odds. And if you fight here, you will at least know what you're fighting for."

"If violence is wrong in America, violence is wrong abroad. If it is wrong to be violent defending Black women and Black children and Black babies and Black men, then it is wrong for America to draft us and make us violent abroad in defense of her. And if it is right for America to draft us and teach us how to be violent in defense of her, then it is right for you and me to do whatever is necessary to defend our own people right here in this country."

Speaking rapid-fire now, he leaned forward, fixing an unnerving stare on me.

"As long as the White man sent you to Korea, you bled. He sent you to Germany, you bled. He sent you to the South Pacific to fight the Japanese, you bled. He sent you to Vietnam, you bled. You bled for White people, but when it comes to seeing your own churches being bombed and your little Black girls being murdered, you haven't got any blood. You bled when the White man says bleed, you bite when the White man says bark, you bark when the White man says bark."

The thin waitress, a bulb of an afro blooming about her head, brought us more coffee.

"Thanks to you," I said, "most young Blacks now wear their hair in afros. But recently, with the influence of the movie 'Superfly,' some Blacks, more noticeably entertainers, have again started sporting processes or straight-hair wigs."

"I remember seeing my first 'conk' when I went to Boston as a teenager," he said. "I couldn't get over marveling at how Negroes' hair was straight and shiny like White men's hair. And I was among the millions of Negroes who were insane enough to feel that it was some kind of status symbol to be light complexioned. But later I learned to hate every drop of that White rapist's blood in me."

"After I got my first process, I vowed that I'd never be without a conk again. And I never was for many years. This was my first really big step toward self-degradation."

A smile flashed across his face, showing those long white teeth. Just as quickly it receded and the hard eyes took over. "The ironic thing is that I have never heard any woman, White or Black, express any admiration for the conk. Of course, any White woman with a Black man isn't thinking about his hair."

We paid our check and walked out into the warm May sun of Harlem. Down 125th Street, south on Lenox Avenue. Past a tangle of wig merchants at the corner. Threading our way through the maze of numbers runners at 121st, the addicts at 120th. As we walked, the faces of Harlem turned on their axes, starting in amazement at my tall, gangling companion, who walked swiftly, smiling and nodding to those we passed.

"Before your conversion," I said, "you loved the race of your White grandfather. Afterward, did you counsel hatred for the White man?"

He wheeled toward me in midstride near 119th Street. "Some Whites have the audacity to refer to me as a hate teacher. If I'm teaching someone to hate, I'm teaching them to hate the Ku Klux Klan. But here in America, the White man has taught us to hate ourselves. To hate our skin, to hate our hair, hate our blood, hate what we are. Why, Uncle Sam is a master hate teacher.

"Are you trying to change the White man's mind?" I asked.

"It is not necessary to change the White man's mind. We have to change our own minds about each other. We have to see each other with new eyes. We have to see each other as brothers and sisters. We have to come together with warmth so we can develop unity and harmony that's necessary to get this problem solved ourselves."

"This Black conversion," I said, "would only nourish a revolt since the American structure of White supremacy would be left intact. Do you feel that a revolution is needed?"

"The Negro's so-called revolt is merely an asking to be accepted into the existing system. A revolution means a complete overturn—a complete change. The so-called Negro revolt will become a real Black revolution when it links up with the worldwide Black revolution that has been taking place since 1945."

"Where?"

"When I say Black, I mean non-White, Brown, Red, or Yellow: Our brothers and sisters in Asia who were colonized by the Europeans; our brothers and sisters in Africa who were colonized by the Europeans; and in Latin America. They all have been involved in a struggle since 1945 to get the colonizing powers, the Europeans, off their land, out of their country."

"This certainly is real revolution."

"Revolution is always based on land. Revolution is never begging somebody for an integrated cup of coffee. Revolutions are never fought by turning the other cheek. And revolutions are never waged by locking arms and singing 'We Shall Overcome.' That's part of our problem: we do too much singing. It's time to stop singing and start swinging. You can't sing up on freedom, but you can swing up on some freedom."

"Revolutions overturn systems. And there is no system on this earth which has proven itself more corrupt, more criminal, than this American system which still enslaves over 30 million Afro-Americans. Blacks will realize that it is impossible for a chicken to produce a duck egg. The system in this country cannot produce freedom for the Afro-American. It is impossible for this economic system, this political system, this social system, as it stands, to produce freedom for the Black man in the country. And if ever the chicken did produce a duck egg, you will have to say that it was certainly a revolutionary chicken."

He was himself a duck egg, hatched by a chicken, reincarnated a second moment within his own lifetime—a second conversion, coming around the final turn as El Hajj Malik El-Shabazz, servant of Allah of the East, confirmed by the journey to Mecca, drinking this time the waters of Zem-Zem, making the seven circuits around the Ka'ba—"Takbir" running away from the Nations of Islam, laying them (The Honorable Elijah Muhammad) to rest but finding no

rest himself, expanding, rethinking, finding blue eyes and blond hair at the Zem-Zem, he made room for them in his world, he was speechless, spellbound. He grew out of the Nation's world and into the world of Allah, the new world of El-Shabazz.

We stopped at the corner of 118th Street and waited for the "walk" light.

"We have to broaden our scope," he said, "and think of ourselves as a part of the large majority of non-Whites on the world's stage. The American power structure doesn't want any Negroes to start thinking internationally. It is time for all Afro-Americans to join the world Pan-Africanists." [Malcolm X persuaded the Organization of African Unity during its Cairo conference in 1964 to pass a resolution stating that the discrimination against Negroes in the United States was a matter of deep concern to the Africans. In August, 1964, the *New York Times* wrote that the Justice and State departments had begun "to take an interest in Malcolm's campaign because it might create a 'touchy problem' for the U.S. if raised at the U.N."]

"Do you suggest that Blacks begin to migrate back to Africa?" I asked.

"Migrate back to Africa," he said, "is still a long-range program. And while it is yet to materialize, millions of our people who are still in America need better food, clothing, housing, education, and jobs right now."

"If we migrated back to Africa culturally and philosophically while remaining here physically, the spiritual bond that would exist between us and Africa through this spiritual migration would enhance our position here. Africa would act as a foundation for us. Blacks will never have a foundation in America."

"No, I'm not an American. I'm not a patriot or a flag saluter or a flag waver. I don't believe in deluding myself. I'm not going to sit at your table and watch you eat, with nothing on my plate, and call myself a diner. Sitting at the table doesn't make you a diner. Being born in America doesn't make you an American. If birth made you an American, you wouldn't need any legislation, any amendments to the Constitution."

"Those Honkies that just got off the boat, they're already American. Poles are already American. The Italian refugees are already American; every blue-eyed thing that came out of Europe is already American. And as long as Blacks have been in this country they aren't Americans yet. They are the victims of Americanism."

We turned back onto 117th Street. We sat on the stoop of an old crumbling six-story apartment building. He looked disappointed. He looked at his watch, removed his glasses, and rubbed his eyes.

"Sometimes I have dared to dream of myself that, one day, history may even say that my voice—which disturbed the White man's smugness and his arrogance and his complacency—that my voice helped to save America from a grave, possibly even a fatal catastrophe."

Uncoiling his long frame from the steps, he said: "I could die suddenly at the hands of some White racists. Or I could die at the hands of some Negro hired by the White man. Or it could be some brainwashed Negro acting on his own idea that eliminating me he would be helping the White man."

And as quickly as he had appeared that morning, he was gone.

SOCIAL SERVICE REGULATIONS MUST BE CHANGED

HON. BARBARA JORDAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Miss JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, the re-

vised social service regulations issued May 1 by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are cumbersome, counterproductive, and unnecessarily restrictive. Drawn up in response to a congressionally endorsed administration request to place a \$2.5 billion limit on expenditures for social services and to provide a more orderly system for their delivery, they have become a prime example of bureaucratic overkill. In the State of Texas alone, some 148,000 people previously eligible for supporting social services designed to keep them off welfare rolls will be dropped from a wide variety of services. Texas expects to lose some \$50 million in Federal support because of unnecessarily restrictive definitions of who is eligible for what kinds of services.

Gov. Dolph Briscoe of Texas has issued a detailed critique of these regulations which he calls a giant step backward. He points out that these regulations "are certain to assure that many of those getting off of welfare rolls will be forced to return." This certainly was not the intent of Congress when it enacted the capping on social services, since Congress clearly rejected any sweeping cutbacks in existing programs.

I commend Governor Briscoe's excellent statement to the attention of my colleagues with the firm belief that other States will soon realize these regulations will have an equally devastating impact.

The Senate Finance Committee has been conducting hearings on these regulations and I encourage the House Ways and Means Committee to immediately begin its own investigation. These regulations must not be allowed to take effect.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT ON THE SOCIAL SERVICES REGULATIONS

(By Dolph Briscoe)

The HEW news release announced by Caspar Weinberger on April 26, 1973, suggested that the new social services regulations are intended "to get families off the welfare rolls and onto the job rolls—and keep them there." Furthermore, Mr. Weinberger implied that the Revenue Sharing Act provided a "legislative mandate" to limit the availability of such services. He expressed the opinion that "these regulations will not force any low income family back onto welfare because of child day care expenses." Finally, he said the regulations will carry out both the intent of Congress and "the directions of the President" that social service programs be focused directly on those most in need.

Unfortunately, an analysis of the impact these regulations will have on Texas social services programs illustrates that Mr. Weinberger's evaluations are incorrect. Although the final regulations are an improvement over the proposed regulations which were published in the Federal Register on February 16, 1973, they are still a giant step backward. "Contrary to the statements made by Mr. Weinberger, these regulations will restrict the availability of social services for many needy Texans and will force many low income families and individuals back onto the welfare rolls." In addition, the regulations will increase administrative red tape and expenses beyond the level reasonably necessary to assure efficient, effective administration of the social services programs. It is highly doubtful that Mr. Weinberger correctly interpreted the intent of Congress if he really believes these regulations reflect that intent.

The problems these regulations will create

are more fully described and illustrated by the following comments:

I

The definitions of eligible individuals in the final regulations are a slight improvement over the proposed regulations, but they remain incredibly restrictive. If, as Mr. Weinberger said, the purpose of social services is to get people off the welfare rolls, these regulations fail miserably to achieve that goal.

For instance, in Texas, the AFDC payment level for a family of four, with no income, is \$140.25 per month. In order to be eligible for free social services as a potential recipient, the family could have income of no more than 150% of that level, namely \$210 per month. The family could have income up to 233 1/3% of that level (i.e., \$327 per month) and receive social services in the form of day care, provided they paid an increasingly greater share of the cost of such care when their income went over \$210 per month.

By way of contrast, if a family is receiving AFDC they are entitled to an income disregard for earned income. The first \$30 of earned income and 1/3 of the balance may be disregarded in determining the amount of an assistance grant. In addition, some of the expenses of earning the income (including the cost of day care) may be deducted before the amount of the grant is established. But there can be no income disregards in determining eligibility for social services as a potential recipient. Thus, a working mother of three not on welfare and earning \$328 per month would not be eligible for social services (even day care). On the other hand, an AFDC recipient could go to work and earn up to \$349, continue to receive a small AFDC grant and also be eligible for social services (including day care) and Medicaid coverage at no cost to her. Needless to say, the excessively restrictive financial eligibility criteria for potential recipients are counterproductive.

The following are examples of cases which were qualified under previous regulations as potential recipients of assistance and therefore eligible for day care. Each received day care for all children in the family at a cost of \$147.68 per month per child, which was paid by the Texas DPW day care program:

Mrs. B.—Works five days a week in hospital making \$276 a month. Has never received AFDC. Has three children, ages 1, 5 and 6. Cared for by grandmother until she was forced to go to work to maintain her own home. Mother pays fee of \$2.00 per week. Would have to quit her job and go on AFDC if this care were not available.

Mr. and Mrs. P.—Have three children, ages 2, 4 and 5. Mother has Muscular Dystrophy and cancer. Requires hospitalization. Father has job paying \$5,500 per year, but was forced to stay off job to care for children until day care could be arranged. Never received AFDC. If day care had not been arranged, this man would have lost his job.

Mrs. J.—Has three children, ages 2, 4 and 8. Mother never married. Works 9:00 to 5:30, five days a week as clerk at department store. Earns \$320 a month. Never received AFDC. Her job was threatened because of irregular attendance resulting from unstable child care plan prior to day care placement. She pays about \$4.00 per week for care of her children in a day care center. She would have been fired if her work attendance had not improved after placement of children.

Mr. and Mrs. E.—Have six children, ages 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8. The father is emotionally ill, and in and out of home. The mother is employed as a barber, making \$134 a week. This family formerly received AFDC. If the mother had to quit work to care for children, the family would have to go back on AFDC.

Mrs. L.—Has four children, ages 2, 5, 6 and 7. She is separated from her husband and has trained under the WIN program. She is employed in a hospital at \$350 a month. She will have to return to AFDC rolls if child care at minimum fee is not available.

The financial eligibility criteria for potential recipients are equally counterproductive in the adult categories. Since Texas cannot supplement SSI payments, no aged, blind or disabled individual can be considered a potential recipient unless his income is less than \$195 or less than \$292.50 for a couple. If services such as chore services and home-maker services were more widely available, many of the elderly and disabled poor could be kept out of nursing homes and other institutions, ultimately reducing the expenses of Medicaid programs. Without the availability of such services, many of the elderly poor are forced into nursing homes at tremendous expense to the State and Federal government.

In addition to the financial eligibility criteria, other requirements of eligibility are excessively restrictive and self-defeating. For instance, to be eligible for social services as a potential recipient, a person or family must have a problem which, if not corrected, is likely to cause them to become recipients within six months. At that point it is frequently too late to expect social services to have any viable preventive function. Under this requirement an elderly person must be 64 1/2 years old before he can be eligible for any services as a "potential."

This six month time period is especially absurd in regard to family planning services. How can a woman of child-bearing age who is not pregnant and has no children be provided family planning services? She cannot become a recipient within six months, and therefore she is ineligible to receive family planning services as a potential recipient prior to pregnancy. The time limits for eligibility as a former recipient are also restrictive. Only limited kinds of services may be provided to former recipients for three months after they leave the rolls. Such restrictions are certain to assure that many of those getting off of welfare will be forced to return.

Another eligibility requirement to qualify for services as a potential recipient is that available resources not exceed permissible levels for financial assistance. This requirement is an administrative nightmare, but more than that it is analogous to allowing a drowning man to go under for the third time before pulling him out and giving him oxygen.

II

Not only are eligibility requirements unduly restrictive, but also the types and scope of services which may be provided are very limited compared to those permitted under previous regulations. Although the Revenue Sharing Act (P.L. 92-512) indicated Congressional intent that a substantial effort be made to meet the needs of the mentally retarded, the alcoholic and the drug addict, the range of services available under these regulations is not of significant help to these groups of people and their problems.

In many instances the services described are limited to referring people to other systems (e.g. education, health, employment, etc.), even when the other systems are incapable of handling the volume or types of people being referred. Many of the services which could help keep people from becoming recipients have been eliminated or restricted by the new regulations. They include such services as character building out-of-school programs for pre-teen children; child guidance clinic services for disturbed children; half-way houses for alcoholics and drug addicts; self-care training for the retarded; and, programs for pregnant teenage girls which permit them to learn child care, develop vocational skills, continue their education and otherwise better prepare themselves to meet their responsibilities as mothers.

The regulations also eliminate the availability of Title IV-A funds for non-AFDC child welfare services. Although the authorized level of funding for such services has been increased under Title IV-B, those funds

have not been appropriated. Consequently, the new regulations have the effect of eliminating staff and services by approximately 50% for non-AFDC children's protective services. In Texas this amounts to a loss of approximately \$3.5 million in Federal funds.

The limitations on eligibility, the exclusion of certain services and the restrictive definitions of other services, particularly educational services and services for the mentally-retarded, will have a significant impact on social service programs in Texas. These new regulations will probably result in a total loss to Texas of more than \$50 million in Federal funds next year. Such a loss will obviously affect significant numbers of people. Precise estimates of the numbers affected are not yet available; however, the following estimates are representative of the numbers of persons who will be deprived of services due to these new and more restrictive regulations. Services to the mentally-retarded and mentally-ill will be drastically curtailed. The best estimates available indicated that 17,649 persons receiving services for the mentally-retarded will no longer be eligible for such services. Likewise, 23,693 individuals will no longer be eligible to receive mental health services. Furthermore, initial estimates indicated that vocational educational services will no longer be available to some 3,562 previously eligible persons.

Social services to families, including home management and certain other functional educational services directed at maintenance of the home will not be available to some 16,319 persons. Delinquency prevention services will not be available to an estimated 6,828 children and some 110,000 children have received licensing services which will not be available under the new regulations. Furthermore, the new regulations affect foster care services to 3,700 non-AFDC related children and protective services to approximately 50,000 non-AFDC children. Approximately 4,250 persons will not be eligible for family planning services. Information and referral services, whereby persons are advised of and directed to other community resources will affect some 22,290 persons, 148,291 excluding licensing services.

III

In addition to defining eligibles so restrictively that it is more profitable for them to remain on the welfare rolls, and reducing the effectiveness of social services by narrowly defining the services available, the new regulations also increase the bureaucratic red tape and administrative expenses of providing such services. The eligibility determination process is as rigorous, and therefore will be as costly, as an eligibility determination for a grant of assistance. Especially time-consuming is the matter of checking resources other than income. Such requirements prior to delivery of services create unnecessary administrative obstacles to the provision of needed services. They will cause delay to recipients and reduce the time available to staff for service functions. In some instances, such as in the provision of emergency and protective services, and delay will effectively eliminate the benefits such services are intended to provide.

The administrative paperwork required by these regulations, particularly in the individual determination of eligibility, is difficult to reconcile with the statutory criterion of administrative efficiency. The accountability and effectiveness of social service delivery can be assured much more efficiently and with much less red tape than these regulations create.

Numerous legal objections can and have been made against these regulations. It has been said that various provisions contravene the letter and spirit of the Social Security Act, the Revenue Sharing Act (P.L. 92-512) and other indications of Congressional intent. When these regulations were published in proposed form, a record number of comments were made. According to HEW, 208,515

comments were received from 198,759 individuals and organizations. Despite this unprecedented response, the changes made by the present Administration have been minimal. In most cases, the changes have been piecemeal and quantitative rather than qualitative in nature. In short, the final regulations are overly restrictive, and they will reduce the effectiveness of social services programs thereby defeating the purposes of previous Congressional enactments.

SENATOR JACKSON SPEAKS ON HEALTH

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished junior Senator from Washington, the Honorable HENRY M. JACKSON, recently delivered the principal address at the dedication ceremonies for the new Colonial Penn Center at the University of Pennsylvania at Philadelphia.

Construction of the center was made possible through the generosity of Mr. Leonard Davis, chairman of the board of the Colonial Penn Group, Inc., and will house the Institute of Health Economics which bears his name.

Senator JACKSON addressed himself to the health care needs of Americans and the ways in which academic institutions such as the Leonard Davis Institute—may join with the political institutions of the United States in developing solutions to those needs.

Senator JACKSON's treatment of this topic was both succinct and comprehensive, and is, I believe, well worth the attention of the Members:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON
ON HEALTH CARE DELIVERY

It is a pleasure for me to participate today in the dedication of the Colonial Penn Center. This center will house the Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics and other divisions of the University of Pennsylvania concerned with the organization, financing, and delivery of health care in this country. Today's event has a special meaning for me because of my great admiration for Mr. Leonard Davis, who I believe has been an innovator in the health insurance field, and who has had a constructive interest in solving the health care problems facing our country. His generous gift which allowed for the construction of this building attests to this.

I believe every American has a right to good health and to good health care. We have come a long way toward making this right a reality, but as long as good health care is denied any citizen we have unfinished business.

I believe there are two groups of Americans who are being denied the right to adequate health care—those who don't have access to it and those who cannot afford it. We must meet the needs of these groups by improving the delivery of health services and providing assistance to meet the rising health care costs.

One of the ways to improve health care delivery is by providing for more health care personnel. I believe this institute will help supply us with these needed health care experts—be they in the insurance field or in the hospital administration field.

Health economics has been a much forgotten field of study. I think the Wharton School of Finance and the University of Pennsylvania Medical School should be

proud of their efforts in the establishment of this institute. Together they have made substantial contributions to our health manpower resources.

The basic problem with the delivery question is, of course, our health manpower shortage and the great maldistribution of our existing health manpower. This disparity of health manpower distribution between geographic areas and economic groups can be striking. We all know that health care for the poor citizens in rural areas or the urban ghettos is not equal to that available to middle income suburbanites.

There are several ways to correct this inequity. One approach which I took in the 91st Congress was to sponsor legislation which created the National Health Service Corps within the Public Health Service. The corps is an agency of H.E.W. and is comprised of physicians, nurses, dentists, and other health care personnel who are assigned for a two-year period to work in communities having insufficient health care personnel. The corpsmen are paid by the Federal Government and provide these services at cost according to the patient's ability to pay. The program is designed to help improve health care delivery to the poor and to those who have inadequate access to health resources.

Essentially, the National Health Service Corps is designed to solve one of the serious aspects of our health care crisis—the highly uneven social and economic distribution of our health care personnel. I believe that the 144 national health corps programs across the country have proven to be highly successful. An example of one of these successful programs can be found right here in your own Philadelphia.

Another one of our major health care problems is the fact that our prevailing system of health insurance is seriously deficient in coverage and puts too much stress on using the high cost component of the health care system—the hospital.

I know that countless Americans have been put in the hospital for tests of one kind or another simply because "their insurance would cover the procedure, but only in the hospital." I also feel confident that many millions of our citizens have neglected seeing their physician either because of financial considerations or as is so frequently the case—pure procrastination. Taking care of a medical problem early can lengthen lives, improve family life, and make our country more productive.

Private and public health insurance programs need to provide necessary incentives for preventive care. I believe the introduction of health maintenance organizations and group health insurance programs have done and will continue to do much to lower the health care delivery costs and provide better distribution of health manpower resources.

This institute is addressing itself to improving the development and operation of health maintenance organizations through its study of group health insurance and prepaid medical plans. Health costs are, as we all know, spiraling higher every day. The health maintenance organization concept has proven to be a powerful incentive in providing quality health care at a reasonable price to our citizenry. A major problem with the development of health maintenance organizations is the lack of public understanding of the concept and the advantages of such group programs. I believe that the education and research provided by this institute will help to enlighten the public to their advantages. I think it is important to remember that the health maintenance organizations which have been successfully operating in this country are the result of the efforts made by the private health insurance companies to provide a comprehensive prepaid program of health care to its participants.

I believe this idea needs to be expanded and so does the Congress. On Monday the Senate is scheduled to vote on the health maintenance organization and resources act of 1973. This act provides \$1.5 billion in Federal assistance in developing and expanding health maintenance programs in urban and rural areas. I think we can all agree that the present health care system is not organized properly. Our present system is oriented more toward treating diseases rather than providing health maintenance services and maintaining good health. By providing better access to good health—for example through health maintenance organizations—we will help alleviate the maldistribution of health resources in our inner cities and rural areas.

In addition to breaking down the geographic barriers that keep health care from those who need it, we must destroy the economic barriers. To do this we must provide for a system of comprehensive national health insurance.

I have supported the principle of Federal health insurance since it was first considered by the Congress over 25 years ago. Experience since then has only strengthened the case for national health insurance. Soaring costs have made good health care an unreachable luxury for too many Americans.

However, we cannot expect to create a workable system of national health insurance overnight. I don't believe a system of national health insurance will, by itself, provide all Americans with good health care. I sincerely feel that the most urgent needs are to provide comprehensive health insurance for the poor and the aged and protection for all Americans against the staggering burdens of prolonged illness. Many of us have seen examples where a single catastrophic illness completely wiped out the lifesavings of a family. This is a wrong which must be righted now. I believe that the primary consideration of any national health insurance program should be to protect the American family from this awful plight.

In closing let me emphasize that the Federal Government cannot and should not attempt to solve the national health care problem single handedly. One of the strengths of our present system is its pluralistic nature—a combination of public and private, voluntary and state supported efforts. Each element in that system—government, the professions, the hospitals, and the health insurance industry, is challenged by today's health care crisis. I believe we can reorganize and modernize our health care system in the next few years if all concerned are willing to recognize and meet their responsibilities. In making these reforms, we should not outlaw fee-for-service arrangements for doctors or scrap the existing system of private medical practice or private health insurance. What we need to do is make optimal use of the available facilities and talents of all concerned. Health maintenance organizations, community health centers and mobile emergency health teams can all help in bringing about adequate health care and adequate access to it for all Americans. The faculty, staff, and students of the Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics should be proud of the efforts they are making to bring about adequate health care services to all Americans.

TRIBUTE TO DILLON GRAHAM

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying warm tribute to Dillon Graham who has just re-

tired from the Associated Press after a 25-year assignment to the Capitol and after 44 years continuous service with the Associated Press.

Dillon Graham has lived up to the highest and finest traditions of his profession. He has been alert, diligent, and persistent but always fair. He has exemplified the recognition of his profession that it is a public servant as well as a private enterprise. Dillon Graham is a fine gentleman, a dedicated American. He leaves behind a record of which he can always be proud.

The best wishes of all of us who have known him through the years on the Hill will go with him through what we hope will be many years of happy retirement.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MAX NUSSBAUM

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 11, 1973, in the Crystal Room of the Beverly Hills Hotel, Dr. Max Nussbaum, rabbi of Temple Israel of Hollywood and a Zionist leader of international prominence, will receive the Prime Minister's Medal at the Israel independence dinner which will celebrate the 25th anniversary of Israel's statehood.

A former national president of the Zionist Organization of America, a past president of the American Zionist Council, and currently a member of the Presidium of the Actions Committee of the World Zionist Organization, Dr. Nussbaum and his wife Ruth, arrived in America from Germany in 1940.

He became rabbi of Temple Israel in 1942, was a member of the first United Jewish Appeal delegation to Palestine in 1948, and served as delegate to the 24th, 25th, 26th, 27th, and 28th World Zionist Congresses in Jerusalem. He was formerly chairman and is now honorary chairman of the World Jewish Congress in the United States.

Dr. Nussbaum received the Eleanor Roosevelt Humanitarian Award in 1968. He and Mrs. Nussbaum were honored with the Brandeis Award of the Zionist Organization of America in 1969. In 1971, the rabbi was given the Scopus Award of the American Friends of Hebrew University for his contributions to Israel and to the Jewish people.

Proceeds of the Scopus Award banquet 2 years ago went to the establishment of the Max Nussbaum Department of Research on the Holocaust and Jewish Resistance at the Hebrew University. Dr. Nussbaum has also been commended for his work in behalf of interfaith understanding by the California Assembly.

He has received honorary doctor's degrees from Hebrew Union College, Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati; and from Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning in Philadelphia. He earned his formal Ph. D., summa cum laude, from the University of Wurzburg in 1934.

At age 25 Max Nussbaum was rabbi of the Great Jewish Congregation in Berlin, was the youngest rabbi in Germany, and was a regular contributor to the

German Jewish and European Jewish press.

He arrived in the United States from Germany in 1940, spared the fate which fell to so many and, in the words of Victor Carter, "here and wherever civilized man would listen, his voice was heard and his genius flourished."

In the United States, Dr. Nussbaum has achieved national and international influence and prestige. He is one of the most admired men in our community and one of our most able leaders.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, it is with special pleasure that I call attention to the honor which is being paid to Dr. Nussbaum on June 11. It is a tribute which reflects the regard and respect of all of us who are privileged to know him.

NATIONAL CUSTOMS SERVICE ASSOCIATION VIEWS ON REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have studied the National Customs Service Association's memorandum, filed with the House Government Operations Committee in connection with House Resolution 382, urging disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 2.

The NCSA is now in its 50th year representing employees of the Customs Service, and its views merit attention. I urge my colleagues to give serious consideration to the contents of the memorandum, and to vote for House Resolution 382 when it reaches the floor this week.

The memorandum follows:

NATIONAL CUSTOMS SERVICE

ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D.C., May 16, 1973.

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2

Reorganization Plan No. 2 proposes to create a new agency to combat the international drug trade by waging "global war" against the menace.

The new agency would be called The Drug Enforcement Administration and would be headed by an Administrator reporting directly to the Attorney General. The new agency would provide a unified command for drug enforcement activities.

The Reorganization Plan states as one of its major aims the improvement of port-of-entry inspections and would transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury all functions currently vested in Justice Department officials, to inspect persons or the documents of persons. The immediate effect of Reorganization Plan No. 2 would be to transfer to the Drug Enforcement Administration approximately 500 Customs agents and to transfer some 1,000 employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) to the Bureau of Customs.

The National Customs Service Association (NCSA) is the representative of the vast majority of Customs employees who would be directly affected by Reorganization Plan No. 2. NCSA is the exclusive representative, under Executive Order 11491, as amended, of employees in the appropriate unit in eight of the nine Customs Regions. We have canvassed our National Vice Presidents in each

of the Customs Regions in order to obtain the views of the membership concerning the Plan. We find that there is overwhelming opposition to the Plan in its present form.

At the outset, we want to make it clear that we are in complete agreement with the President that the international traffic in narcotics is a vicious and corrosive force and has a destructive effect on the lives of many of our citizens. In spite of the heroic efforts of the Customs Service, much needs to be done in order to stem the flow of narcotics. Clearly, we would normally favor and strongly support any and all plans that would assist the interdiction of narcotics. However, we sincerely feel that the President's Reorganization Plan falls short of its desired objective. We strongly favor the unification of all agencies concerned with the narcotics fight. We strongly favor unified direction and elimination of any factors that have weakened the all-out fight against the drug menace.

We have reservations, however, concerning the arbitrary transfer of 500 Customs agents to the new agency. In addition to their duties in combatting narcotic smuggling, many, many Customs agents are highly skilled in the detection of fraudulent practices against the Government. To arbitrarily transfer agents with this sort of experience and expertise would be foolhardy. The net result would seriously diminish the ability of the Customs Service to combat fraudulent practices which would result in the loss to the Government of many millions of dollars in revenue.

If transfers of Customs agents should occur, we strongly recommend that it be done on a highly selective basis rather than an across-the-board transfer of 50 individuals without consideration of extenuating factors relating to the personal situation of the individual and the loss of skill to the Customs Service.

We have grave doubts as to the desirability of transferring 1,000 INS personnel to the Bureau of Customs. We believe that so many complications will be generated by such a move that the benefits are problematical and, on balance, that the move would not be a good one.

We foresee many complications in integrating the INS force with the BC employees. Many complications concerning seniority, work assignments, promotions, career ladder projections, double supervision and a host of others can result. Additionally, so much cross-training would be necessary to make the program even minimally workable, that the time required for this alone would greatly inhibit the effectiveness of the program. Work assignments and schedules would be interrupted to such an extent that the capability of both forces would be dangerously lessened.

It should be borne in mind that an experiment has been tried in the recent past using BC and INS inspectional personnel in a "one-stop" inspection. The project was abandoned after a trial period proved it ineffective. There is no reason to expect that the same concept would now be workable.

An additional important point that should be given great consideration is the morale of the employees involved. Both BC and INS employees are engaged in sensitive activities and high morale is absolutely essential to the successful accomplishment of the BC and INS missions. Any lessening of morale is immediately reflected in less intensive performance.

In consideration of the benefits to be derived from a unified command in the fight against narcotics and the consideration of the problems inherent in the transfer of Customs and Immigration personnel, we urge that H. Res. 382 be approved and that Congress itself make an immediate, comprehensive and intensive study of the feasibility of a unified agency to effectively combat the drug menace.

JOHN J. MURPHY, President.

FILLING THE GASOLINE DEMAND

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my Washington Report entitled "Filling the Gasoline Demand":

FILLING THE GASOLINE DEMAND

Americans are beginning to feel the pinch of the energy shortage, most of all in the gas tank. Many gas stations across the country have closed (562 by last count), and others are shortening their hours and limiting the amount a customer may purchase. Big fuel users, like bus lines, trucking firms and other vehicle fleets, both private and public, are scrambling for sources of supply. Calls to my office from gas distributors, farmers, businessmen and families planning vacations come frequently now, and the questions are usually the same: "How severe is the gasoline shortage? What can be done about it?"

No one can be certain just what will happen this summer, but here is the best information I can obtain:

PRICES

In Indiana, regular grade gasoline presently costs 40c per gallon, on an average, and premium grade gasoline is selling for 44c. There are some reports that the price of gasoline will soon jump to \$1.00 per gallon, but such a tremendous increase is not likely in the near future. Higher production costs may drive prices up a few cents a gallon, probably only several cents at the most. Across the nation travelers will find different prices in different places. There should be no major increases, but a gradual rise in prices should be anticipated. Wide-ranging gas rationing should not be necessary. Prices at discount stations that are normally a few cents cheaper than brand-name gas will probably be closer to major oil company price levels.

SUPPLY

Gasoline stocks in Indiana are not sufficient to keep pace with demand. Indiana drivers will probably encounter "spot shortages" of gas, with filling stations along busy highways hit hardest this summer. One oil company has already told its dealers on the Indiana Toll Road to limit gasoline purchases to 10 gallons per car and 35 gallons per truck. Independent stations which rely upon big refineries or the wholesale market will have even more difficulty getting enough gasoline. Across the nation gasoline stocks are 12 percent below their level of last year, while demand is up 6 percent. Today we use 47 million barrels of gasoline each week and produce only 43 million barrels.

There are a number of reasons for the present gasoline shortage. Basically, our natural oil supply is reaching its limit, and our capacity to produce gasoline has been exceeded by our soaring demand for petroleum products. The world-wide appetite for oil has turned a buyer's market for oil into a seller's market.

Exhaust emission control devices, automatic transmissions and air conditioners guzzle more and more gas per mile, as auto sales boom and clean air regulations are tightened. Distillation of crude oil into fuel and other products rather than gasoline just shifts the problems; catching up on last winter's fuel oil shortage helped create the existing gasoline supply problem. Many inland gasoline refineries cannot get enough U.S. crude oil and consequently 47 refineries are now operating at only 70 percent capacity.

The administration is attempting to deal with gasoline shortages by loosening import

controls on the flow of oil from abroad and by establishing voluntary guidelines designed to insure a fair allocation of gasoline stocks on a proportional basis with key national needs such as farming, food processing and emergency transportation receiving top priority.

Steps to assure that the gasoline shortage does not become permanent should be taken now, including the construction of new refineries and superports for the gigantic oil tankers, new exploration, obtaining the oil from the continental shelf, shale deposits, and Alaska, as well as improving the oil distribution system. Meanwhile, to help us get through the shortage period, especially the summer months of peak demand for gasoline, here are a few practical suggestions:

Avoid unnecessary automobile trips.

Driving slowly: A car traveling 60 mph uses 11 percent more gas than one going 50 mph.

Drive a smaller car.

Plan and consolidate trips—form car pools.

Keep car engines tuned and tires properly inflated.

Heat your home a bit less in winter.

And finally, walk or ride a bicycle—it's good exercise!

BRANDT'S MAY 11 ADDRESS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a statement of great importance to the American people as well as to the peace of Europe was made on May 11 by Chancellor Willy Brandt before the Bundestag. In my view, the position outlined in this speech is constructive and hopeful and shows imagination in dealing with the complex problems confronting West Germany. It also represents, I believe, a promising step toward the settlement of issues with East Germany. Because of its importance I insert in the RECORD a partial text:

EXCERPTS FROM CHANCELLOR WILLY BRANDT'S MAY 11 ADDRESS BEFORE THE BUNDESTAG ON THE BASIC TREATY WITH THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

All constructive foreign policy begins by noting that which is. The frontiers of power in the center of Europe will be immovable for an unforeseeable length of time, if peace on our continent and thus peace in the world is not to be jeopardized.

With the building of the wall in the summer of 1961, the division not only of the city of Berlin but also of the (two) parts of Germany were—in a literal and dreadful sense—cemented. Patriotic pathos has not brought the wall tumbling down; flaming appeals for a spirit of humanity and to justice and right—at least the right of self-determination—have unfortunately failed to do away with the minefields. We had to decide whether to simply resign ourselves to the existing conditions or to permit the breeding of impotent national resentment. My government and the coalition upon which it is sustained decided otherwise. We committed ourselves and our friends in the country to accept the bitter realities—not because we felt they constituted an order and system made tolerable by the process of inurement and creeping insensibility but because the only way to move forward is to start with these realities.

The Basic Treaty is designed to serve detente and peace in Europe and thus the safeguarding of our national substance. It cannot tell us anything about if, when, or how a common mode of life for the Germans can be found again. At this moment we know nothing about this.

I want to repeat with all due precision that the Basic Treaty is not at variance with the historical continuity of German existence; it confirms this continuity in the form that is possible today.

German realism cannot be a unilateral contribution by the Federal Republic of Germany. We must hope—and have a right to expect—that the government in the German Democratic Republic will also do justice, at long last to the imperatives of German realism. We cannot refrain from pointing out to the government in the GDR the serious fact that it still maintains the most unnatural frontier regime far and wide in our civilization...

Together with France, we have been able to extricate the process of European unification from the anachronistic rigors of nationalism. Europe is, Europe is becoming reality; this reality, too, demands recognition...

Not the last important purpose of my visit with the President of the United States last week was to make it clear to our American friends that the Atlantic partnership can no longer be a bunching of bilateral relations, but that it must be the basis of sound European-American relations. The American President's clearly articulated interest in meetings—during his planned visit to Europe in the fall—not only with the governments of individual states, not only with NATO, but also with the European Community can become a considerable gain in ground for the reality constituted by Europe.

At any rate, we have refuted the legend that Europe can only be born as a product of tension. That the west needs external pressure to induce it to reflect on the mutual character of its interests. We know today that Europe needs detente to be able to consummate its unification.

We also know that the mutual character of Atlantic interests lies not only in the security interests of the States on either side of the ocean. According to the insights of our policy, detente and European unification are intertwined. Both are foundational aims of our policy; both are to become reality as parallel actions. An important function falls to the Basic Treaty at this point. Detente in the world—fragile as it may repeatedly seem, or as it in fact is—would undoubtedly have come about without the participation and the contribution of the Federal Republic of Germany, but then it would have passed over us and our interests.

H.R. 5452, SEA GRANT COLLEGE
EXTENSION

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to voice my strong support for H.R. 5452, which extends the Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966.

This legislation was developed to demonstrate the determination of this country toward the development, management, conservation and utilization of ocean resources. It provides a means through which scholars and learning institutions can apply their knowledge to the needs of their localities and the entire country. In the long run, the entire world would be helped through these endeavors.

Colleges and universities which have received support through the 1966 act and justified this support may, after a period of 3 years, qualify as a sea grant

college. I am proud to point out that the University of Hawaii, along with only five other institutions, has been designated a sea grant college. The university provides a comprehensive and necessary program in oceanography and related fields. Because of Hawaii's status as our only island State, support received through the Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966 is extremely important to the institution, and of considerable importance to the sea grant program itself.

As all parts of the world continue to exhaust the resources of our land areas, it is imperative that we continue to research the potential of our oceans. This is not a luxury, but a matter of survival. Through continuing support of the 1966 Sea Grant College and Program Act and all amendments to strengthen that act, we will hopefully make the sea grant college program as productive to our Nation as has been the program of land grant colleges.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the approval of H.R. 5452.

WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there follows the Washington News Notes I am about to circulate in the 32d Congressional District of California under a June 1973, dateline:

CONGRESSMAN CRAIG HOSMER'S WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES, JUNE 1973

THE VITAMIN CONTROVERSY

There's an old jingle that goes: "I never saw a vitamin, and I never hope to see one. But one thing I'm certain of, I'd rather C than B1." A lot of Americans won't be seeing or taking vitamins, at least not in today's dosages, if a new Food and Drug Administration order goes into effect.

Congressman Hosmer's Vitamin Bill, H.R. 643, now with 144 cosponsors, would head the FDA off at the vitamin counter. "At point," says Hosmer, "is whether a person can choose to buy harmless vitamins or whether he must go to the physician to have them prescribed."

Hosmer emphasizes that H.R. 643 will not hamper FDA control of any item which is either harmful intrinsically or harmful if taken in excessive quantities.

INCREASED JOBS AT LONG BEACH NAVAL SHIPYARD

The Secretary of Defense has announced that civilian positions to be added at Long Beach Naval Shipyard by June 1974 will be 1,700 instead of the 820 originally announced. The count does not include 220 additional civilian jobs relocated from Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard.

REVENUE SHARING

During the last fiscal year, the 32nd Congressional District received more than \$5.5 million from the Federal Government's Revenue Sharing program. These funds can be used for projects which include Public Safety (law enforcement, fire protection, building code enforcement), Health, Recreation, Libraries, Social Services for the poor and the aged.

The 1974 Federal Revenue Sharing program will spend \$4.078 billion in the State while \$3.876 will be collected from Californians to pay for it.

THE THROW AWAY GENERATION

During 1972, Americans threw away 88 million cans, 34 billion glass bottles, 40 million tons of paper, 7 million old cars, 8 million TV sets and 3 million tons of plastic materials.

HOSMER'S BILL FOR A NEW NAVAL DISTRICT HDQS.

Congressman Craig Hosmer and 21 other metropolitan Los Angeles Congressmen have introduced legislation to establish a new Naval District Headquarters in Long Beach.

The Administration has proposed consolidation of the Eleventh Naval District based in San Diego and the Twelfth Naval District located in San Francisco as an economy move.

In introducing the bill, Congressman Hosmer noted that the facilities being closed at the Long Beach Naval Station will be ideal for the new Headquarters.

SCARCITY: SIGN OF THE TIMES

Animal, vegetable or mineral, you name it and the U.S. suddenly has come up with a shortage. It is clear that in the years ahead vast changes must be made both in the way we use our resources and in development of them.

We are increasingly dependent on other nations. This means that foreign policy will loom larger economically than ever before. President Nixon is wisely opening up new trade channels with countries that have vast natural resources. And Congress will play an important role in forming a national policy of intensive development, recycling of valuable minerals, controls over usage, and encouragement of trade abroad that will keep our supplies coming in.

THE FUEL SHORTAGE

The fuel shortage affects us all, and because of the possibility that gasoline will be in short supply this summer, here are a few tips on how to conserve fuel:

Keep your engine tuned. An improperly tuned engine can use one-third more gas. Decelerate and accelerate gradually. Don't floor the gas pedal.

Drive at a steady pace. If conditions permit, try to stay under 40 miles per hour.

Air conditioning can increase the fuel consumption by 6%, so use it sparingly.

When parked for more than a minute, don't let the engine idle. You will use more gas than it would take to restart it.

MISGUIDED SST PROPHETS PRACTICED FALSE ECONOMY

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, several of our colleagues appear to be boasting about their action in killing the American SST.

With the development of a Russian SST, as well as the British and the French Concorde, it may be well to reflect on the consequences of the unfortunate votes cast in March 1971, which resulted in abandoning the SST program after the investment was virtually completed.

Mr. Speaker, a most thoughtful discussion of this subject appeared in last Thursday's Chicago Tribune, in which blue-collar columnist, Mike LaVelle, outlines the scare techniques which resulted in our unfortunate decision, and some of the consequences which we are just now beginning to experience. Mike LaVelle's article follows:

BLUE-COLLAR VIEWS: SST AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

(By Mike LaVelle)

Well, the Russians have their SST, the Tupolev 144, and the British and French now have their SST, the Concorde, in production, and somehow the earth has survived ecological disaster.

On March 24, 1971, the 92d Congress of these United States, following a biased media blitz against the SST, cancelled an eight-year program of government support for our SST.

By 1975 there will be a slew of SSTs flying the commercial airways, but none of them will be American. Did we save money by cancelling our SST? No. The Department of Commerce has estimated that it cost \$100 million more to dismantle SST than it would have to build and test them. An SST program in production would have created 50,000 new jobs, its abandonment cancelled 150,000 jobs then in existence. It was a retreat not only from technology, but from a social responsibility.

I am reminded of two books by the objective philosopher Ayn Rand wherein energy, creativity, brains—in essence, the producers of America who have given the average worker and farmer the highest standard of living in the world—are challenged by knot-headed, know-nothing consumers and parasitical pseudo-intellectuals who prefer a collectivist mastery over people [and to a degree get it] rather than an individualistic bettering of their lives thru the results of unfettered minds.

Here are some of the arguments against SST:

"The great need is for jobs for less skilled workers, not the highly skilled groups who would build SST." "The Environmentalist Handbook."

"A sonic boom loosens 66,000 tons of rock in Mesa Verde National Park." "The Environmentalist Handbook." Apparently we should punish skilled workers because they spend time and money in schools to learn those skills, rather than threatening to blow them up raging at a system that refuses to feed them and clothe them simply because they exist.

I suspect that in the latter part of the 19th century one of the Luddite arguments against the automobile was that its chug, chug and ooga, ooga were responsible for avalanches and earthquakes.

Here is eco-nut Paul Ehrlich in September, 1969, telling us of 1973 in his horror hype: "The year 1973 . . . suddenly our citizens were forced with nearly 200,000 corpses and massive documentation that they could be the next to die from respiratory diseases." "The Environmentalist Handbook."

It is disaster apostles like Ehrlich who with such imagined overkill wreck the credibility of other more responsible environmentalists. There is also this side issue concerning the SST. With the American dollar devaluation it might be well to keep in mind that of all the commercial airline planes flying today 85 per cent were built by American firms in former years. In 1969 we exported \$2.2 million worth of civilian planes and attendant parts.

Its effect on the balance of trade has been to recapture some American dollars that we spend abroad or send abroad in our buying of foreign cars, TVs, radios, etc.

It would be a supreme irony to see the American dollar further devalued when just to compete with foreign airlines we are forced to buy their SSTs. Is it further possible that in an American retreat from technology we could as a nation be reduced to a giant repair shop servicing [and consuming] what others create? What effect would that have on traditional American creative pride?

And what of our cancelled space programs? Are we to leave our universe and the galaxies beyond undiscovered and fallow? The immutable laws of biology hold as well for the planet earth as it does for the smallest anthill upon it—expand or die.

We are as infinite in the uses of our intelligence as we wish to be, and as limited. Exploration is in our blood and our brain cells and so is fear and apathy. I'm sure that the first caveman who ventured over the hills and across the waters was told by the fear-mongers and lazy of his day that it was a foolhardy and dangerous undertaking. The cave was where it was at and forever meant to be. And so thruout history: "The earth is flat. Sall beyond the horizon and you will fall off." "If man were meant to fly, God would have given him wings."

Times have changed, but the doomsayers, the fearful who would strap Prometheus to an earthbound rock, have not and never will change. They are the cumbersome baggage on Apollo's chariot. Slowing him down perhaps, but those trips will be made.

THE PLIGHT OF AMERICA'S SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, America's senior citizens, particularly those living in major urban areas, are confronted by serious problems of health, housing, nutrition, crime, transportation, and loneliness. All too often, Federal, State, and local programs have fallen short of the objective of locating and uplifting the elderly, ranging in age from 65 to 85 and even 90 years old.

In light of this situation, it is encouraging that a new and ambitious program aimed at providing assistance to isolated, ignored, and neglected senior citizens is beginning this week in the Grand Concourse area of the Bronx. The Concourse Jewish Community Council, under the leadership of its executive director, Mr. Murray H. Kiok, is undertaking a survey to determine the location and numbers of elderly Jewish poor persons in five selected Bronx areas, three within community planning board No. 4 and two within community planning board No. 5.

The sample areas to be covered are:

First, Nelson Avenue between West 164th and West 166th Streets; second, the block bounded by East 169th and 170th Streets, between Clay and Teller Avenues; third, Jessup, Shakespeare, and Nelson Avenues, between West 172d Street and the Cross Bronx Expressway; fourth, West Burnside Avenue to West Tremont Avenue, between Loring Place and Phelan Place; and fifth, East 183d Street, between the Grand Concourse and Valentine Avenue.

The survey, which is expected to last a month, will focus on establishing contact with those elderly Jewish poor who are often overlooked by social services agencies—the infirm, senescent, and frightened senior citizens who are unable to make their location known to social services workers because of their own reclusion or lack of information about available services and agencies. To a large extent, this subculture of isolated elderly poor is composed of widows and widowers suffering from intense loneliness, anomie, and, in many instances, malnutrition.

A basic purpose of the survey will be

to determine the needs, both physical and social, of these people, through interviews and questionnaires which include inquiries on availability of shopping facilities, frequency and nature of food purchases, victimization by crime, and desire for hot meals programs. The council hopes to project the results of its five-area survey over the entire Grand Concourse region to arrive at an estimate of the overall number of Jewish elderly poor in that section of the Bronx.

The Concourse Jewish Community Council has already completed a study on the availability of social services and social agencies in the Grand Concourse area. When it has completed its survey on locations and numbers of elderly Jewish poor, it will undertake the missions of matching existing social service facilities with those persons in need of assistance, determining where new social service centers and agencies are required, and persuading Jewish social assistance facilities and agencies to remain in areas where they have a hidden constituency to search out and serve.

The Concourse Jewish Community Council, located at 1130 Grand Concourse, Bronx, N.Y., has received a grant of \$81,760 from the city of New York, and if its project of surveying and bringing assistance to the isolated elderly of the Grand Concourse area accomplishes its objectives, the city's grant will certainly be money well spent.

The May 1973 issue of Saturday Review of the Society contains a fine article by Margaret H. Bacon on the subject of this nationwide problem of the hidden elderly poor, entitled "Why the Old Are Getting Mad." The article vividly describes the situation of the forgotten elderly poor and underscores the inadequacy of existing Federal programs for improving the lives of the country's senior citizens, who, having worked many years to build a strong America and raise their families, find themselves neglected in the allocation of our national resources when they grow too old to remain in the labor force. Since the Concourse Jewish Community Council will be grappling with the problems of these forgotten Americans, I request that the article be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

WHY THE OLD ARE GETTING MAD

(By Margaret H. Bacon)

(NOTE. Margaret H. Bacon is a member of the information services department of the American Friends (Quakers) Service Committee.)

You can live on a dollar a day in Philadelphia—if you don't eat much, that is. Addie Wentzel, a 76-year-old woman of Pennsylvania Dutch extraction pays \$54 every two weeks for her cheerless room in a cheap Philadelphia hotel. Since her check from the Department of Public Assistance comes to \$69 for the same period, Addie is left with \$1.03 a day for food, clothes, and transportation. By consuming lots of white bread and canned soup, which she heats on an illegal hot plate, she managed for a time to get by. A few days ago, however, she fainted in a corner grocery store, perhaps as a result of malnutrition, and the police took her to a clinic. Addie is supposed to go back for tests, but she is afraid that if she leaves her room and sets out for the clinic, she will faint again. Alone in the world, she has nowhere to turn for help.

Several floors above in the same hotel lives Valerie Belmont. (The name is fictitious, as are the names of the other elderly persons described here.) Valerie is 77 and has such poor eye-sight that she could be declared legally blind. Unfortunately, this would not result in a larger pension than the \$69 she, like Addie, receives biweekly from the Department of Public Assistance. Valerie pays \$56 every two weeks for her room and so must try to live on 93 cents a day. She can get a cheap hot lunch five days a week at the Philadelphia Center for Older People, but she needs a companion to lead her across the busy streets from the hotel to the center. The elderly woman who formerly accompanied her has since found a part-time job; she can no longer help out. Valerie has no one to look after her.

In a rooming house a few doors down from the hotel lives Tony Montinez. Tony is a Mexican-American who came to this country in 1917 to work on a railroad. Now he has washed up in a dark bedroom off a corridor smelling of urine. He pays \$40 a month for his room. Once a week the wife of a former friend comes to clean his room and buy him groceries. Otherwise Tony has no visitors. He suffers from emphysema and doesn't know how to get to a clinic for treatment.

Addie, Valerie, and Tony belong to the most forgotten group in America—the isolated elderly poor. Somehow, somewhere they have become detached from that web of family and friends that sustains most people in their old age. They live in dirty hotels or decaying rooming houses or tumble-down shacks at the end of forgotten country lanes. Prey to muggers, robbers, and confidence men, confused by the bureaucratic red tape that surrounds what little help is available to them, ashamed of their own isolation, afraid of dying alone, they wait out the empty hours.

Of the 20 million Americans over 65 years of age, six million are said to live in poverty. One recent nationwide survey found that approximately 38 per cent of the elderly poor live alone. This would come to 2,280,000. Probably there are many more. The census on which these figures are based excluded men and women who live in hotels, considering them transients. There is only one way to find the elderly poor—go from door to door.

Addie, Valerie, and Tony were discovered by just this process when the Philadelphia Center for Older People added an outreach worker to its staff and sent her into a relatively quiet and genteel area of central Philadelphia. Approximately 10,000 persons live in the area to which 25-year-old Jean DeGraff has been assigned, some 1,800 of them over 65. In four months of work Jean has discovered 100 persons who require immediate attention. These are the men and women who face eviction but have no place to go, who need medical attention but have no way to get to the clinic, who need someone to bring them food, who desperately need money to tide them over until the next welfare check, who are starving for human contact. Jean says she frequently feels that she is trying to sweep back the ocean with a toy broom.

In theory, federal and state social service programs make provision for the elderly poor. But with rare exceptions these programs are based on the premise that the needy individual will take the initiative to seek services. The premise ignores the fact that it is next to impossible for the shy, lonely, and confused older person to overcome his fears, work his way through the red tape, accept the insensitivity with which he is generally met, and persist until he actually gets help.

Take food, for example. The elderly poor are eligible for either the surplus commodities program or food stamps, depending on which system of distribution prevails in their county. But the commodities program presents the older person with almost insurmountable difficulties of transportation and storage. He must present himself at a certain time and a certain place, receive bulky

packages of foodstuffs, often totally unsuited to his needs, and somehow carry them back to his living quarters.

Food stamps are slightly more adapted to the use of the elderly, but the process of applying for them is formidable and often humiliating. Many older people have heard (incorrectly) that they must give up their homes or their bank accounts in order to be eligible; others feel it represents a disgrace to accept such help. Hotel and rooming house residents do not qualify since one must have adequate cooking facilities to be eligible.

For the home-bound a program called Meals on Wheels has been developed. Elderly invalids with incomes below the poverty level—the line is drawn by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) at \$2,725 for aged—couples and \$2,100 for aged individuals—are entitled to one hot meal a day. Ideally, the meal is delivered by another elderly but still vigorous worker who stays to pay a friendly visit. For those lucky elderly persons who receive such calls it is often the one event of their day. Like most such programs, Meals on Wheels is underfunded and thus available to only a minute percentage of those who might benefit from it.

In March 1972 President Nixon signed into law a Nutrition Program for the Elderly to be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The plan was to provide food for the elderly poor in a variety of ways, including Meals on Wheels and hot lunches served in neighborhood centers. In October of the same year Nixon vetoed the HEW-Labor appropriation, which included funding for the program he had proposed seven months before. The new budget for fiscal 1974 calls for \$99 million for this program, but no one knows whether Congress will pass it, nor how it will be implemented if it is passed.

Before any nutrition program for the elderly can be effectively implemented the problem of outreach must somehow be solved: the elderly poor must be found before they can be helped. In 1968/1969, under an OEO grant, the National Council on the Aging (NCA) conducted a search for the invisible elderly in 12 representative cities. Altogether some 44,000 elderly people were interviewed, of whom 19,000 were poor and another 5,000 "near poor." (The poverty level used in the survey was set at \$1,999 for aged couples; \$1,499 for aged individuals; the near poor were defined as those whose combined or individual income ranged up to \$1,000 more.) Of these, only 19 per cent of the poor and 9 per cent of the near poor had ever applied for surplus food or food stamps, and only 14 per cent of the poor and 6 per cent of the near poor had ever received any government aid for nutrition. It is figures like these that make the concerned very angry when the Department of Agriculture announces that it has returned money appropriated to food programs as "unused" in order to demonstrate "fiscal responsibility."

The elderly poor experience similar difficulties when it comes to their medical needs. Although Medicare and state and local supplements supposedly are designed to provide for their needs, few of them realize the benefits to which they are entitled. Some 15 percent of the elderly poor have not signed up for Medicare at all; among blacks this figure rises to 22 per cent. Almost all of those interviewed reported long waits and total indifference when they tried to explain their symptoms, or get new glasses, or have a drug prescription filled. The same callous attitude generally meets the elderly poor when they attempt to get better housing, look for part-time work, or break out of their isolation.

To fill their empty days, many old people spend hour upon hour in public places. The waiting rooms of bus terminals and train stations are full of them. A network of centers for the elderly is badly needed. Such centers,

commonplace in most European nations, are sparse in the United States. A few, supported by the United Fund, do a heroic job, but they usually find themselves overwhelmed by the needs of those elderly who are sufficiently healthy, wealthy, and motivated to come to the center. There is no time nor staff to seek out the lost.

Under the OEO a large number of senior centers were established throughout the country. In addition, under Title IV-A of the Social Security Act funds were made available for the establishment of a number of centers for the elderly, called Late Start centers. These were to provide not only a hot lunch and a social and counseling program but also an outreach program, sending workers into the community to knock on all those doors. Both of these badly needed programs are jeopardized by President Nixon's cutbacks on all funds allocated for social services.

Also swept away in the cutbacks are funding for the building of subsidized housing for the elderly (another area in which the United States is far behind most of Europe) and money for Medicare. The elderly are now being asked to pay for a larger portion of their hospital and doctor bills. Programs for research and training for geriatric workers have been slashed, along with programs for the employment of the elderly. New Social Security regulations appear to mean that most of the elderly poor will receive a small supplement but will become ineligible for food stamps.

All these anti-old people measures may prove poor politics in the long run. There are more than 20 million Americans in the 65-or-over bracket and every one of them has the vote. In most major cities coalitions of the aging are rapidly forming to fight the cutbacks and to lobby in Washington and the state capitals for the funding of such programs as Late Start. Much of the leadership in the new movement is coming from retired union workers, many of whom fought the battle for the closed shop 30 years ago. Significantly, the elderly black, Puerto Rican, Mexican-American, and blue-collar workers are pulling together in these new coalitions in a way their younger counterparts are not.

Addie Valerie, Tony, and the two million others who are in their predicament have lacked a voice. Now however, the more vigorous older citizens, outraged by the recent Nixon cutbacks and by the nation's apparent indifference to the needs of all the elderly, are becoming more militant. Perhaps, as a result, their fellow citizens will at least notice, and finally attend to the needs of, this long-silent, long-forgotten host of Americans.

DILLON GRAHAM, CORRESPONDENT FOR ASSOCIATED PRESS RETIRES

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, 1973, my friend Dillon Graham will retire after 25 years of service as a correspondent for the Associated Press at the U.S. Capitol.

I have had the pleasure of knowing Dillon since I have been in Congress, and have found him to be an effective and accurate reporter. He has obviously done a good job for the Associated Press while maintaining the profound respect of the Members of Congress.

As Mr. and Mrs. Graham begin retirement, I want them to know that they shall always have my very best wishes.

A MOTHER'S PLEA AGAINST THE LEGALIZATION OF MARIHUANA

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for some time now a great deal of attention has been focused on our drug oriented culture as there is little doubt but that drug abuse is rapidly becoming one of the most serious problems in America. However, far too often we hear only from those who espouse the legalization of marihuana rather than from those whose personal experiences clearly show the need to strengthen our laws relating to the use and/or possession of this mind-altering drug.

Although marihuana is regarded as a "weaker" or milder drug in comparison to the "hard stuff" such as heroin, I can see no logical reason for the Government sanctioning its use. In my mind, this would serve as a signal to thousands of impressionable youths throughout the country that the Government had put its stamp of approval on this drug and that it was alright to use without any harmful effects.

The May 3 issue of the Evening Independent contained a "Letter to the Editor" from a concerned mother who is personally experiencing a not-so-rare situation involving her son's efforts to rehabilitate himself. I believe the anguish suffered by "H. K." and her family, as described in this letter, merits the attention of my colleagues.

A MOTHER'S PLEA: DON'T MAKE MARIJUANA LEGAL

Editor:

I am writing this letter on the way to Fort Lauderdale to visit our son at the drug-abuse rehabilitation center—called "The Seed"—founded by Art Barker:

My husband and I are taking this trip (500 miles) twice a week on Monday and Friday, to attend the open meeting. We leave at 2 p.m. and arrive home between 3:30 and 4 a.m.

From 7:30 to 11:30 p.m., we sit with hundreds of parents at The Seed, looking across to hundreds of young people. We do not talk, we just sit and listen as one youngster after another unfolds his or her story of drug involvement. Ages range from 10 to 25 years—drugs from marijuana to heroin.

Then the time comes for the parents to say a few words and when the microphone reaches us, we get up, look at our son, tell him we miss him and love him.

On March 18 he was 17 years of age. For 16 years he was a fine upright boy with a good sense of justice and high goals, a loyal friend and loving son—a good student, a popular boy who was good in school and good at sports.

Shortly after his 16th birthday, he told us that he was smoking marijuana, that he liked the high feeling it gave him and so did his friends. To subdue our protests and horror, he informed us that he saw harm in taking alcohol or tobacco and would not partake in such partying with his friends even if they should do so. Both, he told us, are addictive and habit-forming.

But marijuana—that was a different story! No hangover, not addictive, and most of all—as he had read—our own government commission stated publicly after much research (not in the houses of families with teenagers) that marijuana is a minor drug compared to alcohol and tobacco, and that same commis-

sion recommends legalization of the weed. The same argument was given us by all his friends.

From then on we had to watch our only son turn from an open-minded, honest boy to a boy who had many secrets; who, in place of a kiss when he came home, would look downward, hurry to his room and lock the door. The Visene bottle was never out of reach. His grades in school dropped from A-B to C-D and, on the last report card, an F. The F was for skipping too many days in school, a fact we were not even aware of. A boy with a 100 per cent attending record was twice suspended for 10 days each time, for leaving school grounds without permission. Dents and scrapes on his and his father's car became numerous and so were the traffic tickets.

One night he and two of his friends were arrested while smoking marijuana in our son's car on a deserted strip of marshland. They were all 16 years old. They were handcuffed and brought to the police station. Our son was not charged because his friends had the marijuana and paraphernalia in the back seat at the time of apprehension. Lucky?

I don't know how often I have stood in the laundry crying because I had found another shirt or slacks with burnt holes down the front . . . holes made by burning marijuana held with a so-called roach clip. Eleven joints were found behind a book; a plastic bag half full of the weed was found under the car seat; another joint in the back pocket of his jeans—these were a usual kind. For the rest of the family, another day of tears, threatening, begging him to stop. He would and could NOT!

Two weeks before his 17th birthday, we had him picked up by the local police, brought to the police station and then to the Juvenile Detention Center, to obtain a court order to have him ordered to the full-time Seed program.

Now all we can do is love him and hope he will understand that in order to save him from a criminal record, we had him taken against his will, hoping Seed will do for him what it was able to do for so many others—clear his head, make him happy and high on life again in place of being high on marijuana, so he will be able to function as a useful citizen.

We miss him so! We are scared parents! We do not believe in the government commission's recommendation and findings. We do not want marijuana legalized!

Legalization of marijuana would add to our nation's problems—the problem of the habitual "pot head."

In the name of our children, WAKE UP! The government commission should be awakened to the reality of its responsibilities. The damage already done amongst the young users, and the users who went on to other drugs, is great.

The commission's attempt to justify its recommendation of legalizing marijuana by comparing it to the already legal and misused drug "alcohol" . . . is irresponsible. Marijuana should be judged on its own destroying merits.

LORRAINE HANSBERRY

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I would today like to pay tribute to Lorraine Hansberry, a talented and sensitive black playwright whose untimely death from cancer was a great loss to the theater and to the public as a whole. Her first play, "A Raisin in the Sun," was a phe-

nomenal success, winning Ms. Hansberry the New York Drama Critics Circle Award at age 29.

"A Raisin in the Sun" is a moving portrayal of human pride and dignity of a poor black family in Chicago's South Side. Yet the message of the play, as with all great plays, is timeless.

Today has been declared "Lorraine Hansberry Day" by D. C. Mayor Walter Washington in honor of the opening tonight of "Raisin," a musical version of "A Raisin in the Sun" adapted by Robert Nemiroff. I urge my colleagues to honor a fine and gracious woman by attending this performance. I would like to close with the words of James Baldwin:

SWEET LORRAINE

(By James Baldwin)

That's the way I always felt about her, and so I won't apologize for calling her that now. She understood it: in that far too brief a time when we walked and talked and laughed and drank together, sometimes in the streets and bars and restaurants of the Village, sometimes at her house, sometimes at my house, sometimes gracelessly feeling the houses of others; and sometimes seeming, for anyone who didn't know us, to be having a knockdown, drag-out battle. We spent a lot of time arguing about history and tremendously related subjects in her Bleeker Street and, later, Waverly Place flat. And often, just when I was certain that she was about to throw me out, as being altogether too rowdy a type, she would stand up, her hands on her hips (for these down-home sessions she always wore slacks) and pick up my empty glass as though she intended to throw it at me. Then she would walk into the kitchen, saying, with a haughty toss of her head, "Really, Jimmy. You ain't right, child!" With which stern put-down, she would hand me another drink and launch into a brilliant analysis of just why I wasn't "right." I would often stagger down her stairs as the sun came up, usually in the middle of a paragraph and always in the middle of a laugh. That marvelous laugh. That marvelous face. I loved her, she was my sister and my comrade. Her going did not so much make me lonely as make me realize how lonely we were. We had that respect for each other which perhaps is only felt by people on the same side of the barricades, listening to the accumulating thunder of the hooves of horses and the treads of tanks.

The first time I ever saw Lorraine was at the Actors' Studio, in the winter of '57-'58. She was there as an observer of the Workshop Production of *Giovanni's Room*. She sat way up in the bleachers, taking on some of the biggest names in the American theater because she had liked the play and they, in the main, hadn't. I was enormously grateful to her, she seemed to speak for me; and afterwards she talked to me with a gentleness and generosity never to be forgotten. A small, shy, determined person, with that strength dictated by absolutely impersonal ambition: she was not trying to "make it"—she was trying to keep the faith.

We really met, however, in Philadelphia, in 1959, when *A Raisin in the Sun* was at the beginning of its amazing career. Much has been written about this play; I personally feel that it will demand a far less guilty and constricted people than the present-day Americans to be able to assess it at all; as an historical achievement, anyway, no one can gainsay its importance. What is relevant here is that I had never in my life seen so many black people in the theater. And the reason was that never before, in the entire history of the American theater, had so much of the truth of black people's lives been seen on the stage. Black people ignored the theater because the theater had always ignored them.

But, in *Raisin*, black people recognized that house and all the people in it—the

mother, the son, the daughter and the daughter-in-law, and supplied the play with an interpretative element which could not be present in the minds of white people: a kind of claustrophobic terror, created not only by their knowledge of the house but by their knowledge of the streets. And when the curtain came down, Lorraine and I found ourselves in the backstage alley, where she was immediately mobbed. I produced a pen and Lorraine handed me her handbag and began signing autographs. "It only happens once," she said. I stood there and watched. I watched the people, who loved Lorraine for what she had brought to them; and watched Lorraine, who loved the people for what they brought to her. It was not, for her, a matter of being admired. She was being corroborated and confirmed. She was wise enough and honest enough to recognize that black American artists are a very special case. One is not merely an artist and one is not judged merely as an artist: the black people crowding around Lorraine, whether or not they considered her an artist, assuredly considered her a witness. This country's concept of art and artists has the effect, scarcely worth mentioning by now, of isolating the artist from the people. One can see the effect of this in the irrelevance of so much of the work produced by celebrated white artists; but the effect of this isolation on a black artist is absolutely fatal. He is, already, as a black American citizen, isolated from most of his white countrymen. At the crucial hour, he can hardly look to his artistic peers for help, for they do not know enough about him to be able to correct him. To continue to grow, to remain in touch with himself, he needs the support of that community from which, however, all of the pressures of American life incessantly conspire to remove him. And when he is effectively removed, he falls silent—and the people have lost another hope.

Much of the strain under which Lorraine worked was produced by her knowledge of this reality, and her determined refusal to be destroyed by it. She was a very young woman, with an overpowering vision, and fame had come to her early—she must certainly have wished, often enough, that fame had seen fit to drag its feet a little. For fame and recognition are not synonyms, especially not here, and her fame was to cause her to be criticized very harshly, very loudly, and very often by both black and white people who were unable to believe, apparently, that a really serious intention could be contained in so glamorous a frame. She took it all with a kind of astringent good humor, refusing, for example, even to consider defending herself when she was being accused of being a "slum-lord" because of her family's real-estate holdings in Chicago. I called her during that time, and all she said—with a wry laugh—was, "My God, Jimmy, do you realize you're only the second person who's called me today? And you know how my phone kept ringing before!" She was not surprised. She was devoted to the human race, but she was not romantic about it.

When so bright a light goes out so early, when so gifted an artist goes so soon, we are left with a sorrow and wonder which speculation cannot assuage. One is filled for a long time with a sense of injustice as futile as it is powerful. And the vanished person fills the mind, in this or that attitude, doing this or that. Sometimes, very briefly, one hears the exact inflection of the voice, the exact timber of the laugh—as I have, when watching the dramatic presentation, *To Be Young, Gifted and Black*, and in reading through these pages. But I do not have the heart to presume to assess her work, for all of it, for me, was suffused with the light which was Lorraine. It is possible, for example, that *The Sign in Sidney Brustein's Window* attempts to say too much; but it is also exceedingly probable that it makes so loud and uncomfortable a sound

because of the surrounding silence; not many plays, presently, risk being accused of attempting to say too much! Again, Brustein is certainly a very *willed* play, unabashedly didactic; but it cannot, finally be dismissed or categorized in this way because of the astonishing life of its people. It positively courts being dismissed as old-fashioned and banal and yet has the unmistakable power of turning the viewer's judgment in on himself. *Is all this true or not true?* the play rudely demands; and, unforgivably, leaves us squirming before this question. One cannot quite answer the question negatively, one risks being caught in a lie. But an affirmative answer imposes a new level of responsibility, both for one's conduct and for the fortunes of the American state, and one risks, therefore, the disagreeable necessity of becoming "an insurgent again." For Lorraine made no bones about asserting that art has a purpose, and that its purpose was action: that it contained the "energy which could change things."

It would be good, selfishly, to have her around now, that small, dark girl, with her wit, her wonder, and her eloquent compassion * * * I've very often pondered what she then tried to convey—that a holocaust is no respecter of persons; that what, today, seems merely humiliation and injustice for a few, can, unchecked, become Terror for the many, snuffing out white lives just as though they were black lives; that if the American state could not protect the lives of black citizens, then, presently, the entire State would find itself engulfed. And the horses and tanks are indeed upon us, and the end is not in sight. Perhaps it is just as well, after all, that she did not live to see with the outward eye what she saw so clearly with the inward one. And it is not at all far-fetched to suspect that what she saw contributed to the strain which killed her, for the effort to which Lorraine was dedicated is more than enough to kill a man.

I saw Lorraine in her hospital bed, as she was dying. She tried to speak, she couldn't. She did not seem frightened or sad, only exasperated that her body no longer obeyed her; she smiled and waved. But I prefer to remember her as she was the last time I saw her on her feet. We were at, of all places, the PEN Club, she was seated, talking, dressed all in black, wearing a very handsome wide, black hat, thin, and radiant. I knew she had been ill, but I didn't know, then how seriously. I said, "Lorraine, baby, you look beautiful, how in the world do you do it?" She was leaving, I have the impression she was on a staircase, and she turned and smiled that smile and said, "It helps to develop a serious illness, Jimmy!" and waved and disappeared.

WHAT IS SECURITY?

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 18, the Honorable Frank P. Sanders, Under Secretary of the Navy, addressed over 400 military, business and civic leaders of Tidewater Virginia at the annual Armed Forces Banquet held at the Fort Monroe Officers Club in Hampton, Va.

Under Secretary Sanders eloquently and persuasively set forth the vital need of maintaining the military strength of our country. He said:

I do not have to tell you that the best negotiator is a man who negotiates from a position of strength.

His remarks were so timely and so well received by his audience that I thought my colleagues here in the Congress would also be greatly interested in them. Therefore, I am placing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for their benefit:

WHAT IS SECURITY?

It is a real pleasure to be here on the Virginia Peninsula, surrounded by so many of the historic sites in the founding of our country and mindful of the precious heritage of independence and freedom which is ours because of that which was finally accomplished here. In all the years since, Virginians have been in the front ranks of America's development, both in peace and war. Today you are still there, working to keep our nation strong and secure.

Tonight, I would like to comment briefly on this matter of security, the role of the Armed Forces in this important area and set forth what I believe is your role and mine.

First, let us look at the world briefly. Not the world as you would like it to be but the way it is. If you were to ask the average American the one national goal to which we could aspire, I think you would find that goal to be peace. This is not new. It has always been our oft elusive but constant goal. A native Virginian, George Marshall, stated: "If man does find the solution for world peace it will be the most revolutionary reversal of his record we have ever known." The real key to world peace lies not in war or disarmament but through the peaceful resolution of conflicting national interests by negotiation.

This approach has recently resulted in far-reaching and successful initiatives in our nation's foreign policy—initiatives unprecedented in our time. In effect they have redefined reality.

We have already begun a second phase of talks with the Soviets looking toward more comprehensive agreements in the strategic arms area. Preparatory talks and initiatives have taken place for a Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and for talks between the NATO and Warsaw Pact nations on Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions in Europe.

Certainly, we have made significant strides on the long and difficult journey toward our elusive goal of peace. The success thus far achieved can be attributed, of course, to the willingness of the negotiating parties to accommodate conflicting interests. Let there be no mistake, however, that this willingness is directly related to the relative bargaining power of the parties concerned and—where we negotiate in the military area—bargaining power is synonymous with military strength. I do not have to tell you that the best negotiator is a man who negotiates from a position of strength.

As we approach our immediate goal of a generation of peace, we must avoid actions which those at the bargaining table, with us or across from us, will regard as weaknesses, or the loss of our will to be strong.

The President has forcefully presented such a position of strength in his proposed budget for fiscal 1974. Yet already we are hearing cries to drastically reduce that budget. Yet it is a budget which, if measured in constant dollars is \$8.7 billion below the pre-SEA budget of 1964.

Simply stated, as some clamor for shifts in priorities, I can only say that the priorities have already shifted and that we cannot look at the defense budget as a panacea to solve other domestic problems if we are to maintain the defense potential we require and that I feel the American people demand of us. As the President has stated, we must "never fall short of the minimum needed for security."

We have not and will not fall short of this minimum.

Our forces will be smaller than they have

been in recent years, smaller even than we had before the Vietnam War. For example: There will be a total of 16 active Army and Marine divisions at the end of FY 1974—3½ fewer than in 1964. We will have a total of 163 active Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps tactical fighter and attack squadrons at the end of FY 1974, compared with 199 squadrons in 1964. We will have a total of 253 active major combat ships (including attack submarines) at end FY 1974, compared with 407 in 1964. In sum, we will have a substantially smaller active force at the end of FY 1974 than we had before the Vietnam War.

This puts a premium on the modernization of our remaining forces. We are planning on that modernization. In the ground forces we will be taking several steps to improve anti-tank capabilities—to develop and procure a new MB tank. The purchase of additional MAVERICK air-to-ground missiles for the Air Force will also assist. We are developing the F-15 air superiority fighter for the Air Force and procuring the F-14 anti-air warfare fighter for the Navy. We are improving our close air support capabilities with the development, including advance procurement in this year's budget submission, of the Air Force's A-10 aircraft, and completing procurement of the Marines' VSTOL attack aircraft, the Harrier. In the strategic field we are proceeding with the B-1 Bomber and TRIDENT FBM system.

The Navy also has impressive plans for modernization. A significant step forward in Anti-Submarine Warfare capabilities is being made with the transition to the S-3A aircraft, the first jet carrier-based ASW aircraft. In shipbuilding, acquisition of 3 new nuclear carriers, the new Spruance class DD's, the nuclear submarine building program, plus new ship initiatives such as patrol frigate, patrol hydrofoil, sea control ship, will assure that we maintain our U.S. sea power as number one in the world against a Soviet threat that has benefitted from the greatest Naval buildup in history.

We cannot have the strong Armed Forces we need, however, unless we have the trained and dedicated people to give life and direction to it all. For armies, navies and air forces are not only tanks and ships and planes; those are hardware, cold and immobile without living, breathing people.

In this era of the All Volunteer Force—and make no mistake we are there now as draft calls have ended and we are completely dependent upon volunteers—there are two factors we must consider.

And this is where you come in.

First, your attitude and the attitude of our young people toward the Armed Services. We are trying to present to them the very real advantages of service, as preparation for life, as education, as a chance to contribute, but this will go for naught unless we—you and me—can show them with their strong motivation for the building of a better world, that their idealism is typified by men and women in uniform—that their contribution to the greatness of America is the devotion of their lives to keeping it strong through full time service—that they stand in the forefront of those ready to make the supreme sacrifice for the freedom which we sometimes take so much for granted. Only as we who are older manifest our respect for them and support the goals for which they stand can we expect our young people to reflect the same respect and to seek military service as a rewarding and satisfying career.

Secondly, we want everyone to know that opportunity in the Armed Services is real, solid opportunity.

The Armed Forces is a microcosm of the world around us—we are not perfect. But we are making strides.

Our efforts to interest, recruit and retain young men and women, including all minority groups, are proving increasingly successful. The opportunities are real, ready for the grasping.

We have better pay, more travel, and high potential for upward mobility. The average salary in the military services today is \$8,832, plus fringe benefits such as outstanding medical care, commissaries, post exchanges, housing and an excellent insurance program.

Education—at all levels—is our high selling point. In the Navy, for example, we spend \$680 million a year on education. Eighty-five percent of the skills for which Armed Forces train are directly transferable to the civilian market. A dollar for defense is not a dollar thrown away. It is a dollar multiplied for America many times over.

I say again—the Armed Services today represent very real opportunity.

Let me summarize then the situation in the world today and what we can expect for the future. We see the movement from an era of confrontation to an era of negotiations, looking toward a generation of peace. We have proven that we can maintain strong strategic position and enhance our security by agreeing on mutual arms limitation. We are committed to future negotiations of this type. They can be at least equally as successful only if we continue to depend on the military strength and the strength of the people of this country.

Throughout the long years of our nation's history we have depended on those two strengths. Our birth as a nation and our growth to world leadership today have been possible only through the united strength of our fighting men supported and guided by the strength and genius of our people. We saw this manifested in the bi-partisan foreign policy of the early post World War II years united with and supported by the national security policies of Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and their successors.

Today, we have the same requirement for unity between our foreign policy and our national security policy. We have the same continuing need for strong leadership to steer us through these still hazardous times. We are fortunate in our form of government—really I should say we are blessed with our form of government, as we Americans are blessed in so many other ways—that we have in the institution of the Presidency the unifying factor of foreign and national security policies. As we pay tribute to the Armed Forces tonight let us remember that it is the institution of the Commander-in-Chief, which, under our Constitution, has given us the strong leadership to meet challenges in the past. We citizens can allow no erosion of that institution—it must remain strong—for we will surely need it in order to meet the challenges of the future.

All of us here, public servants, private citizens, men and women of the Armed Services have a clear duty. We must help to keep America strong in every way. We must support the positive actions needed to continue America's efforts to make this a better, safer world. We must continue to act in positive, not negative, ways to meet the needs and to fulfill the desires of the American people.

There is a stirring of the breezes of peace, but it is a peace founded on our nation's strength, a strength which makes it possible for our President to negotiate from a position of power, not one of weakness. Those of us who are with or in the military service of our country know that a just and lasting peace must always be our ultimate objective. This is that to which the man in uniform is dedicated, even to the sacrifice of his own life to achieve it. This strength exists solely to secure the interests of the American people.

Earlier this year a lonely man walked down a ramp leading from an Air Force aircraft—the first time in over seven years his feet had touched land over which the American flag flew. Then very quietly Captain Jeremiah A. Denton, Navy pilot, former POW and father of seven, including two with service in Vietnam, speaking for these returning POW's, some of whom you honor here tonight and to

whom we owe so much, said: "We are honored to have the opportunity to serve our country under difficult circumstances. We are profoundly grateful to our commander-in-chief and to our nation for this day. God bless America."

When we are the recipients of such dedication we have no choice but to respond in kind.

How we respond as individuals and as a nation is the measure of the national security we will have. The choice is strictly up to us—to you and to me. I ask from you the same dedication and the same support for them and for those who lead us so that together we may continue to strive successfully toward our ultimate objective.

May God truly continue to bless America through our dedication to the ideals that have made this the greatest nation in the world.

THE BATTLE OVER COMBINATION DRUGS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the Food and Drug Administration has been provided with extraordinary and, often, arbitrary power with regard to the removal of drugs from the American market.

The Kefauver-Harris amendments to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act gave the Food and Drug Administration the responsibility of verifying not only the safety of drugs but also their "effectiveness" prior to granting approval to the marketing of new drugs.

On February 9, 1973, the FDA, through the Federal Register, declared its intention to remove 23 cough mixtures from the market. The Government claimed that it lacked "sufficient evidence" that all of the premixed ingredients contribute to the total treatment. This action is only part of a continuing effort by the FDA to eliminate the use of standard-dose combinations.

The decisions made in this field are the result of bureaucratic determinations from within the Food and Drug Administration and its advisory panels. Discussing these bodies the staff of Private Practice, the journal of the Congress of County Medical Societies, declared:

These organizations which have such great potential power over medical prescribing are almost totally devoid of practicing doctors who base their judgments on daily clinical evaluation in routine settings. The FDA has only 4500 employees. . . . Of these there are only approximately 200 physicians, 80 pharmacologists and 100 pharmacists . . . yet more than 300,000 practicing doctors and 200 million potential patients will be affected by the decisions made by . . . the FDA.

Discussing the merits of combination drugs Private Practice, whose editor is Marvin H. Edwards, noted:

The truth is, no pharmacist, operating in a corner drug store, without expensive equipment, could match the quality control provided by the painstaking and highly expensive manufacturing operations in every major pharmaceutical company—and whether he could or not, the cost of the medication would nearly triple.

Commenting upon the FDA's recent

action concerning combination cough medicines, Private Practice declared:

The argument that a combination should be removed from the market because it is no more effective than the combined effect of the individual medications taken singly is akin to suggesting that additives be removed from gasoline, hair sprays and pre-packaged foods—akin to suggesting that Betty Crocker cake mixes be banned from the market because the ingredients can each be purchased individually.

It is essential that we carefully review the extensive and often arbitrary authority which has been given to the Food and Drug Administration.

I wish to share with my colleagues the thoughtful discussion of, "The Battle for the Combinations," which appears in the April 1973 issue of Private Practice, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

THE BATTLE FOR THE COMBINATIONS

A patient comes to you with a cough—a painful, frustrating, irritating cough. It has kept him home from work for two days already. He feels miserable and he is making everybody around him feel miserable. To the patient and his family, it is a deceptively simple problem: hard to stop, perhaps, but nonetheless a simple cough.

But it is not so simple to the doctor, is it? You see the threat of Lysozyme attack on inflamed cells; you see dry membrane and the inability to expectorate; you see spasm and reflex—all things which you must treat.

Today you can respond quickly by writing a prescription for any one of a number of pre-mixed cough medicines—medicines which contain antiallergic ingredients and liquefying ingredients, which provide ingredients for bronchial dilatation, and ingredients to depress the cough reflex—all important parts of the treatment.

This wasn't always the case: many of you remember when you had to treat the ailment and symptoms separately—or with your own fixed-dose combinations. In those days most pharmacists were apt to have a thick card file of such brand name mixtures as "Dr. Smith's cough medicine," "Dr. Jones' cough medicine," "Dr. Davis' cough medicine," and so forth. When a patient came in with a prescription, the pharmacist selected the usual ingredients and began the mixing or compounding—or, if you were a heavy prescriber, took your pre-mixed combination from the shelf.

Because the mixtures were by hand, and in small quantities, there was apt to be a wide disparity between your cough mixture on Wednesday and another bottle mixed on Friday. Because the local pharmacist did not have expensive equipment, the mixtures themselves were bound to be unstable; poor suspension sent ingredients to the bottom of the bottle, and the patient's instructions always began "shake well before using." Depending on the vigor of the shaking, the patient might get a dosage that was straight alcohol or one that was heavy on one ingredient and light on another—and never the same as the time before.

The medicine was expensive, too. The pharmacist had to maintain a large inventory of unmixed ingredients, and had to spend more time and effort in filling each prescription. And each product had to be packed separately and shipped separately.

The treatment was uncertain: if you chose not to mix ingredients, but to prescribe separate medications, the patient might end up with four separate ingredients to be taken either separately or at the same time, three or four times a day. Sometimes the patient would take them all, diligently; sometimes he would give up and shove the medicine into the medicine cabinet; sometimes he would simply tell the pharmacist to fill one or two of the prescriptions—only so much as he could afford at the time—and he might

get the rest filled later—or he might not, deciding for himself what part of the treatment he would accept.

Like most medical practice of 30 years ago, the prescribing of cough medications was far inferior to the quality of care available today. But it may not be inferior to the care available tomorrow, because there is a great danger that cough treatment—like many other medical treatments—may regress rather than progress.

Most of you have probably never seen the Federal Register: in fact, most Americans have never seen it. Yet it affects every one of us in ways we will never know, for the Federal Register is a unique publication, issued every day, day after day, with hundreds of pages of small print regulating everything from the amount of red coloring in an apple to whether or not a new television transmitter can be built in Terrell, Texas.

It was in the Federal Register (volume 38, number 27, dated February 9 of this year, on page 4006) that the Food and Drug Administration announced its intention to remove from the market 23 cough mixtures.

This notice, buried among some 8,000 pages of fine print since the first of the year, gave the pharmaceutical industry and the medical profession just 30 days to protest and ask for a hearing, after which a simple notice in the same publication can, by bureaucratic decree, remove from your patients the benefits of every one of these important medicines.

The reason is simple: the government claims it lacks "sufficient evidence" that all of the pre-mixed ingredients contribute to the total treatment. It is a part of the Food and Drug Administration's continued hostility toward the use of standard-dose combinations, and is only one step toward the eventual removal of all fixed combinations, including some of the most important medicines available to us.

Where does the FDA get this power? From a law which neither the medical profession nor the pharmaceutical industry opposed—Public Law 87-781, passed by Congress in 1962. These are the so-called Kefauver-Harris amendments to the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, which provided that the Food and Drug Administration would have the responsibility of verifying not only safety but effectiveness prior to granting approval to the marketing of new drug products.

The truth is, the pharmaceutical industry was then already engaged in heavy research to assure effectiveness—extensive double blind, comparative human studies, with animal studies as backup. The amendments only formalized what was already a fact, and nobody objected. But some observers were uneasy. One was Dr. Jean Weston, who was then head of the AMA's Council on Drugs. The problem Dr. Weston feared was not in the law itself, but in the always fertile ground for bureaucratic interpretation and regulation.

Dr. Weston's discomfort has proved to be well-founded. The attempt to remove combination products from the market is based on this simple statement in the 1962 amendments:

"If the Secretary finds . . . that (1) . . . there is a lack of substantial evidence that the drug will have the effect it purports or is represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed . . . he shall issue an order refusing to approve the application."

By interpretation, that statement has been stretched to give the FDA authority to determine whether or not a product may remain on the market if it is composed of several ingredients, one or more of which may be considered non-essential in producing the effect claimed for the product.

There is no question that there may be cases in which a portion of a mixture may subject the patient to a risk that he need

not be exposed to for treatment of his individual case—but the physician, who has accepted the responsibility for the care of his patient, knows the patient's sensitivities and his therapeutic needs: in those few instances where prescription of a standard-dose combination would be more harmful than beneficial, it can be assumed that the doctor will prescribe another treatment—just as he decides dozens of times each day what course of treatment is safest and most effective for each patient.

There is also no question that there may be cases in which some portion of the pre-mixed combination is not harmful but is simply not needed. Nonetheless, by prescribing a cough mixture which is already prepared the doctor may give his patient access to the medications he does need, at a lower cost, and more conveniently packaged.

Who makes these decisions—the decisions that would deprive the patient of a simple, inexpensive, effective cough remedy? The Food and Drug Administration and its advisory panels from the National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council.

Yet these organizations which have such great potential power over medical prescribing are almost totally devoid of practicing doctors who base their judgments on daily clinical evaluation in routine settings.

The FDA has only 4500 employees, and less than half are professionals. Of these there are only approximately 200 physicians, 80 pharmacologists and 100 pharmacists. The physicians on the advisory panels are, almost without exception, drawn from the academic world—either from teaching hospitals or medical schools; few, if any, receive daily experience in watching routine patient reaction. Yet more than 300,000 practicing doctors and 200 million potential patients will be affected by the decisions made by these panels and the FDA.

The attack on combinations has not reached peak—it is just beginning. On September 20 of last year Senator Gaylord Nelson introduced into the Congressional Record a statement by Dr. Richard Burack, a prominent critic of the medical profession and the drug industry.

"Doctors," Burack said, "have been prescribing therapeutically unnecessary and unnecessarily expensive combinations of drugs, some of which are or may be ineffective . . ." In answer to the doctor's argument that combinations are more convenient for the patient, Burack simply states: ". . . most doctors are relatively affluent with respect to most patients who might well prefer a minor inconvenience in order to save some money."

What he seems to propose is that the doctor prescribe a single drug—which presumably would attack the major problem—and a couple of aspirins. But to prescribe a full range of products—a decongestant, a constricting agent, an antispasmodic agent—in other words, to provide the same quality of care—the doctor would not only have to cause his patient inconvenience, he would have to increase the cost of the medication both in terms of pharmacy labor and the cost of maintaining large stocks of individual drugs.

The truth is, no pharmacist, operating in a corner drug store without expensive equipment, could match the quality control provided by the painstaking and highly expensive manufacturing operations in every major pharmaceutical company—and whether he could or not, the cost of the medication would nearly triple.

The argument that a combination should be removed from the market because it is no more effective than the combined effect of the individual medications taken singly is akin to suggesting that additives be removed from gasoline, hair sprays and prepackaged foods—akin to suggesting that Betty Crocker cake mixes be banned from the market be-

cause the ingredients can each be purchased individually.

And, as always when excessive regulation threatens to reduce the quality of health care, it is the patient who will be hurt the most.

Unfortunately, too few patients and too few doctors are aware of these proposals until it is too late—until the removal has become an accomplished fact. As a result, the doctor loses another of the weapons he uses to fight illness and the patient suffers because a medicine is no longer available to help him.

There is something that can be done about it—and the threat to remove combinations offers as good a place as any to start doing something.

As soon as we learned of the notice in the Federal Register, Private Practice went immediately into action: we contacted members of Congress, who protested to the FDA; and we sent more than 1,000 telegrams to doctors, urging them to file written protests. The result has been a stream of letters urging the FDA to leave these important products—these 23 cough mixtures—on the market and in the drugstores for our patients.

We in the medical profession need to keep our colleagues aware of what is happening, and urge them to be on the alert to protest any FDA actions which threaten their ability to care for their patients.

SERVICE OF REMEMBRANCE

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 6 I took part in an ecumenical service in remembrance of 21 young men who died in Vietnam. It was a moving tribute and it was a fitting tribute.

To be sure, there has been much controversy over the Vietnam War, but this commemoration had the support of everyone in the community.

I hope that by bringing this event to the attention of my colleagues it will encourage other communities to have similar ceremonies.

At this point I would like to include in the RECORD an account of this commemoration by one of the organizers who is also a reporter. He wrote this story for the Woonsocket Call.

"SERVICE OF REMEMBRANCE" IN PRECIOUS BLOOD—1,000 PAY HOMAGE TO 21 VIET DEAD
(By Tim Manigan)

Homage was paid in an ecumenical offering of prayer and song by more than 1,000 persons who crowded into Precious Blood Church last night in remembrance of 21 young men from Woonsocket and North Smithfield who died in the Vietnam war.

Entitled a "Service of Remembrance," the program was attended by such persons as Sen. Claiborne Pell, Congressman Fernand J. St Germain, House Majority Leader John J. Skiffington Jr., other senators and representatives, Mayor John A. Cummings, North Smithfield Administrator Carl B. Sandberg and a long list of other dignitaries.

Those attending witnessed an hour-long tribute highlighted by a touching deliverance by the Rev. Robert A. Carpentier, acting pastor of St. Agatha's Church, and a candle lighting ceremony which hushed the church into the most solemn moments of the service.

A candle was lighted for each of the 21 veterans by a member of his immediate family—escorted by a military man in full

dress—as an act of faith in the belief that what the young men died for still lives.

As Father Carpenter put it in keeping with the theme of the service, "In remembering, we can bring dead men back to life; we can recall they cared enough to give the very best."

Father Carpentier, who lost a brother in the war, told the huge gathering, "One of the easiest and hardest things for a human being to do is to forget." He said forgetting, at times, can be like a "medicine."

"But sometimes we forget too easily," he cautioned, "we forget what should not be forgotten."

Calling death "the greatest mystery of all," the priest said, "we are proud to honor these men and their families today as a community."

Then Father Carpentier read a sermon he delivered almost five years ago, shortly before his own brother died, concerning the pains of a young man and his family parting at Logan Airport, Boston, as the young man left for Vietnam. It was, in all probability, based on his brother's departure.

AN ADDRESS OF REMEMBRANCE (By Rev. Robert A. Carpentier)

One of the easiest and one of the hardest things for us human beings to do is to forget. To forget can be something good or something bad. It can be like medicine that soothes the pain. It can lift us up from the darkness of painful days to the light of a better day. It can strengthen us to live the present with courage. But sometimes, we too easily forget what should never be forgotten. And so God, our loving Creator, has given to us one of the most beautiful powers we have as men . . . the power to remember. And this too, like forgetting, can either be good or bad. It is bad if, by remembering, we continually live in the past rather than the present. But to remember is also good. For it is by remembering that joy is brought to sorrow, that healing is brought to pain, that life is made stronger than death, that separation in some way, however slight, is bridged. In remembering, we can bring dead men back to life.

I guess this is why it is so fitting for us to come together this evening to remember, to call to mind the actions of twenty-one young men from Woonsocket and North Smithfield who have cared enough to give the very best . . . to give their own lives for us. Their sacrifices symbolize those of thousands of young men who served us in Vietnam. We are proud to honor them today as a community.

I remember, it was five years ago this month, Mother's Day May 12, 1968 to be exact, that in this very church, I delivered a sermon in which I tried to recreate the feelings that must have been the apostles as Jesus told them, "I must go away." To draw an analogy, I spoke about a young man and the feelings of his mother as he left for Vietnam. I very seldom write out a sermon, but I did this particular one. I would like to share with you what I said on that day. It was written before my own brother died in the war.

"There are just a few hours remaining. The flight from Logan Airport leaves at 11 PM. It's now nine o'clock and the last good byes are being given to those at home. Then the youngest son steps into the car, accompanied by his mother and two others. It's only a short drive to Logan, but on that evening, the drive seems shorter. All in the car are nervous but try not to show it. The radio is softly playing, the only sound that breaks the silence. And whatever words are spoken are just unsettled expressions that try to relieve the mind from the reality which is taking place. The traffic in Boston is very light. Within an hour, the car comes to a stop in front of the United Airlines Terminal.

In seconds and without too many words, the youngest son carries his duffel bag into the terminal and checks it on Flight 114. As hours sometimes seem like minutes, so now the minutes seemed like seconds. The terminal is practically deserted now except for the few night travelers. Then the loudspeaker blares out: 'Flight 114 from Boston to Chicago is leaving at Gate 3.' The son then says to his mother: 'Mom, don't worry, I have to go, but I'll be back soon. It's better for you and me that I go.' And so the boy, now a man, fades out of sight. And she still lingers a little while, empty, lost, hoping that the noise of the jet soaring towards the West and Vietnam will fill the sudden void. And the only words that bring any consolation are those of her son: 'I have to go. It's best for you and me.'"

Words such as these do bring consolation to us for we know that these men stood up and acted out of conviction, and they died in the process of carrying out what they felt was their responsibility in life. This is why we honor them today. However, the knowledge of this truth did not make the moment of separation any less painful. Many of you in this church have experienced that painful moment. But for some of you, that time of separation has been short, although it was filled with many days of anxiety and fear. However, these days look like fleeting moments now and are almost easily forgotten as these young men and their families have experienced the joy of reunion. We thank those men for their service in the persons of the Vietnam veterans who are present today.

For others, the separation became a living hell as a loved one became a prisoner, or worse still, as he was listed as "Missing in Action." However, for many of these men and their families, the time of waiting is over and the separation has turned into joyful reunions. We remember these men today in the person of Sergeant Dennis Teller and his mother and father and we thank them for their service.

But for many others, there will never be any reunion, and the most we can do is REMEMBER. Among the thousands of men who have died in Vietnam, there were twenty-one from Woonsocket and North Smithfield. This is quite a price to pay as small American communities. But the price is even greater for the families that are involved. These are the men, these are the families we remember on this special day.

These men are no longer with us, and, because of that, it is so easy to forget. For their parents, or wife or child or families, forgetting is not so easy. We, as a community, want to remember. And as we remember, these men live and continue to influence our lives. By remembering we say Thank You to them, and through our presence, we say Thank You to their families who have so intimately joined in the sacrifice of these men. To you, parents and families, we say to you that we will never be able to repay you for this gift of self that you have offered for us. But we hope that as we honor these men today, we are in some way soothing your pain, and that by our remembering, we are helping you to forget the pain of separation.

My brothers and sisters, we are told that life is a mystery . . . a mystery to be lived, not solved. Death is also a mystery, the greatest of mysteries. And death of itself makes no sense at all. We can only begin to understand it if we look at it in relation to life. As we look at the lives of these men, we see that they lived for us. Their lives became a beautiful song they sang for us. Their death begins to make sense because they lived for us. And they live today if we dare to let them sing their song again by remembering. In the song there is pain, but in their singing it we find comfort.

So we try to remember . . . for it is in remembering them that they live on. It is in

remembering them that they remain for us a light of hope. It is in remembering them that their lives go marching on.

Father Carpentier ended as the 40-member choral choir began leading the congregation in the "Battle Hymn of the Republic."

One of the candle ceremony's most touching moments came when the one was lit in memory of Spec. 4 Rene A. Bois, son of Armand and Eva Bois, both of North Smithfield. Specialist Bois was the only one of the 21 honored who was married at the time of his death. His wife, the former Sharon Benjamin, now of Millville, bore him a son, named after him, a month after the soldier was killed.

The son, now 4 years old, marched bravely to the altar with his military escort, Navy Chief Joseph J. Eckles, and lighted the candle for the father he has never known. Several members of the Bois family were present to witness the event.

Another of the most solemn moments came when Mrs. Shirley Labrecque of 2187 Diamond Hill Road, lighted two candles.

The mother is one of the very few in the country, possibly the only one in New England, who lost two sons in the war. They were Army Pfc. Robert W. Labrecque and Army Pfc. Paul E. Labrecque, both 18 at the times of their deaths.

A candle was also lighted by Mrs. Mary Ray of 84 Bourdon Blvd. in memory of her son, Army S. Sgt. James M. Ray who died of malnutrition in Communist captivity about 18 months after his capture March 18, 1968. Mrs. Ray had hoped for almost five years for her son's return.

Candles were also lighted in memory of Army S. Sgt. Henry R. Lambert, son of Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Lambert of 164 Ward St.; Army Spec. 4 Richard L. Lancot, son of Mr. and Mrs. Edouard J. Lancot of 231 Vose St.; Army Spec. Robert N. Lebrun, son of Mr. and Mrs. Norman L. Lebrun of 161 Burlington St.; Army Sgt. Richard M. Beauregard, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert A. Beauregard of 77 Grace Ave., and Army Pfc. Frederick T. Carter, son of Mr. and Mrs. Fred W. Carter of Follet St., North Smithfield.

Also, Army Pvt. Leon J. Atteridge Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Leon J. Atteridge Sr. of 71 Main St., Slaterville; Marine Cpl. Rene R. Coutu, son of Mrs. Jeanne Coutu of 127 South St.; Marine Lance Cpl. Richard E. Ducharme, son of Mr. and Mrs. Rustand Ducharme of 706 Harris Ave.; Marine Pfc. Paul L. Durand, son of Mr. and Mrs. Lionel C. * * * Army Second Lt. Dennis E. Burke, son of Mrs. Raymond Burke, of 127 Spring St.

Also, Army Pfc. Lucien G. Carpentier, son of Mr. and Mrs. Anatole Carpentier of 299 Morin Heights Blvd.; Army Sgt. Robert J. Frisk, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert R. Frisk of Slater Drive, Slaterville; Army Spec. 4 Robert W. Lauzon, son of Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Lauzon of 444 Wood Ave.; Cpl. Gerald H. Lavoie, son of Mr. and Mrs. Philias Lavoie of Tarkin Road, Nasonville; Airman 1. C. Alan D. Curtis, son of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth C. Curtis of 574 North Main St.; Marine Sgt. Paul R. Rivet, son of Mr. and Mrs. Aldor Rivet of 213 Greenville Road, and Army Pfc. Ronald J. Brissette, son of the late Alcee and Blanche Brissette.

Brissette's nephew, named after him, lighted the candle in his memory.

The Rev. Rene Gagne, Precious Blood pastor, officiated at the call to worship during which he welcomed the congregation, remarked he was impressed to see such a large gathering, and noted that it is gratifying to see "so many care."

As attention was drawn to the waiting candles on the altar, a large wreath especially designed with white flowers and 21 red ones and two color guards bearing flags of the U.S. and Rhode Island, the choir sang "The Impossible Dream."

The affirmation of God's word was delivered by the Rev. George Harvey, pastor of the

Slatersville Congregational Church, and the Rev. Lucien Rousel, pastor of Our Lady Queen of Martyrs Church, led the congregation in responsive readings.

The choir, which also sang "Let There Be Peace on Earth," was under the direction of William Cooper, organist. Soloist was Walter Polucha. A duet entitled "If We Only Have Love," was sung by Rachelle Belisle and Walter Crepeau.

Omer A. Sutherland, Woonsocket attorney, read letters from the White House and Sen. John O. Pastore, then sounded off the names of veterans during the candle ceremony.

Benediction was delivered by the Rev. Richard C. Leupold, pastor of First United Methodist Church, who said the veterans remembered "help us fulfill our dreams of love, peace and freedom."

Servicemen who volunteered as escorts, ushers and color guards include Sgt. 1C. Paul L. Rollins, Sgt. 1C. Hugh L. Buzzell, Sgt. 1C. Richard F. Silva, S. Sgt. Terence Rene, S. Sgt. Joseph F. Larose, Sgt. 1C. Harvey Van-Brooklyn Jr., Navy Chiefs Everett W. Charles, Gerald M. Butler, Normand A. "DJ" Dejardins, Eckles, Williams W. Kirtlink, Michael Rapoza, M. Sgt. John Casilli, Tech. Sgt. Conrad Paquette, S. Sgt. Joseph Flannery, S. Sgt. Francis Masse, Airman 1C. Norman Girard, Airman Ronald Cousineau, M. Sgt. M. R. Coyle, M. Sgt. R. Gordon, S. Sgt. Robert Quirk, S. Sgt. William Shinn, S. Sgt. Harold Brandenburg, and Sgt. Peter Castricone.

The service was the result of about nine weeks of preparation by a committee consisting of Father Carpentier, the Rev. Mr. Leupold, Father Roussel, Councilman Charles O. Bishop Jr. and Tim Manigan of The Woonsocket Club.

The brochures, wreath, corsages and boutonnières, limousine services, ushers and many other services which went into the program were donated by Woonsocket area businesses and private citizens.

The entire program was broadcast live over WWON.

VALUES, POLITICS, AND THE HUMAN COMMUNITY

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of a most thoughtful address delivered by Kenneth W. Thompson, vice president, Rockefeller Foundation, on the subject of "Values, Politics, and the Human Community."

Mr. Thompson's address was delivered at the annual conference of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs on May 3, 1973:

VALUES, POLITICS AND THE HUMAN COMMUNITY

(By Kenneth W. Thompson)

It is illusory to think that politics can be free of values. Those spokesmen of real politics whom we read long after the passing of their historical era called not for the repudiation but the reinterpretation of values. Machiavelli wrote of "virtu," Rousseau of "the noble savage," and the nationalists of "national glory." The debate over values, despite the claims of so-called value-free social science, has never been between one school of thought espousing values and another rejecting all values. Rather, almost always, it involves two groups with different sets and concepts of values—different perspectives on the nature and content of values. No one who lives in a human com-

munity can be wholly amoral if he would work with and deserve the trust and response of others. We recall the reference by Harold Nicholson to the classic definition of the diplomat as "a man sent abroad to lie and deceive in the interest of his country." Yes, said Nicholson, but also he must return to negotiate another day.

Part of our problem in gaining clarity on values in international politics is that most of us are endlessly tempted either to inflate or disparage the role of morality in politics and thus fall prey at opposite extremes to moralism or cynicism in our views.

MORALISM AND CYNICISM

The moralist inflates the place of values by sanctifying every short-term and parochial interest, absolutizing higher goals into rigid principles that obstruct the political process and raising moral formulations to the level of irrelevance. No moral disease is more commonplace than to impute final virtue to immediate and practical measures and, in western culture, liberalism has suffered most from this disease. While every act in statecraft, as in life, has its worth, the moralist errs by elevating the routine to the same level as objective truth. Thus, in statecraft, there are countless procedures and acts, such as issuing visas or preparing protocols, that are a vital part of the diplomatic process. Yet, what is to be gained by pretending that these important measures, which are part of the day's work, are sacred to the point of being beyond criticism and change? If it is wrong to deny the dignity and worth of the work-a-day world, it is also an error to equate it with all truth and justice and place it beyond the possibilities of change. There is too much arrogance in maintaining that every pragmatic move we make is endowed with some kind of ultimate virtue.

AMERICANS PLACE MORALS OUTSIDE POLITICAL PROCESS

A more serious failing of the moralist, particularly in the United States, is to absolutize particular ends and values, thus placing them outside the political process. Whenever political goals are cast in the language of absolute right and wrong, implementing them through the democratic process becomes difficult, if not impossible. The most fateful example of this was the breakdown of democracy at the time of the American Civil War. Once each side had framed the issue in terms of its total righteousness and the complete depravity of the other, the workings of democracy, with the necessary play of compromise and adjustment, became impossible. The Wars of Religion are an earlier example of absolutizing particularistic ends, and history attests that man is never so cruel and intractable as when he becomes a crusader for moral and religious goals. If liberals are more prone to sanctify certain immediate political and social interests, the religious and moralistic historically have been prime offenders in absolutizing values and goals.

MORALS OFTEN RAISED TO TOWERS OF IRRELEVANCE

If the doctrines of moralists can lead to rigidity and brutality, their habits and style can lead to irrelevance. For moralists are wont to raise ends and values to such towering heights as to give them a quality of irrelevance as respects all those practical and pressing choices that confound men in daily life. Thus, it was noble to talk, following World War I, about a new and better world, but, for those who sought to hammer out the peace in Paris, the towering doctrines of Woodrow Wilson bore little if any relationship to the harsh issues they struggled to resolve.

CYNICS CLOAK SELF-INTEREST IN IDEOLOGY

Yet, cynics are as misguided and destructive as the moralists when they approach issues of values. They are misled by the discovery that men are never as virtuous as they claim to be and interpret this as proof that in man there is no virtue. Sociologists,

such as Weber, identified the taint of deception in every virtuous act. We cover our self-interest with a tissue of ideological rationalization. We never do anything as individuals or nations for our own good but for the good of others, or as part of history's unfolding process. There are some blatant examples of this: Stalin's liquidating of the kulaks as a necessary and inevitable step in the history-fulfilling design of communism; Hitler's cremation of so-called inferior races as a necessary hygienic measure to assure continued Teutonic superiority; and some of the actions taken in China during the Cultural Revolution.

MEN ARE SELDOM AS MORAL AS THEY CLAIM

However, the less blatant examples may be more significant and all-pervasive. Whenever men and nations act, their claims of morality are larger than their actions warrant. If this is deception, it is apparently an almost inevitable form of self-deception since nations, no less than individuals, must persuade themselves that their deeds are legitimate because consistent with some larger frame of value. The parent never disciplines the child except for its own good. The powerful nation never goes to war except in the interests of peace and justice. The problem about these actions is not that they are all devoid of some residual justice nor that the claims of goodness never serve to lift men and groups above the selfish and the mundane. It is rather that we are seldom as moral as we claim to be, whether as self-righteous individuals or when we speak for the nation as a whole.

CYNICS AND MORALISTS DELUDE THEMSELVES EQUALLY

The irony of our self-righteousness is that there is virtue in our very self-deception about our righteousness. Hypocrisy is the tribute that vice pays to virtue and, by claiming some form of virtue for himself or his acts, the selfish man reaches up at least a little, toward a goal that is higher than his selfishness. Thus, the cynic who finds total depravity in man's self-righteousness is as deluded as the moralist who sees only shining virtue and goodness in man. The reductio ad absurdum of cynicism is the response of a diplomatist who, on learning of the death of a fellow diplomatist, asked, what can have been his motive?"

THE MORAL PROBLEM: NOT RIGHT AND WRONG, BUT RIGHT AND RIGHT

The difficulty we have in talking about values arises from the fact there is not one morality but many. Morals and values, at every level, cluster, compete and may be in conflict. Most debates about values are not debates between right and wrong but between rights and rights—and this makes their resolution so endlessly complicated. Thus, we believe in freedom of speech, but what about crying fire in a crowded theatre? We have faith in the freedom of inquiry and science, but does this extend to a graduate student building an atomic bomb in his kitchen? We strive for social justice and equality, but what do we do when systems of order and social stability crumble? In developing societies, how do we reconcile the goal of the civil society with the need, temporarily, it is said, for a military regime?

The moralist may take satisfaction from proclaiming to the hard-pressed citizen leader that there are obvious and clear-cut moral answers to such choices. The cynic, in turn, may find an opposite way out by boasting that he knows there are no moral answers. Caught up in the problem and the need for policy not rhetoric, the rest of mankind can indulge neither of these luxuries. They must find the best possible answers knowing, with Meinecke, that, "Every authentic tragedy is a shattering demonstration that moral life cannot be regulated like clockwork and that even the purest strivings for good can be forced into the most painful choices."

MIND IS A FRAGILE GUIDE WHICH MUST CHOOSE

Instead, the facile optimism of political and social scientists that models can be found for resolving problems at every social level is nearly as mischievous as that of the moralist or the cynic. We are involved in human endeavor in which the tragic element of life plays a part. The human mind is at best a fragile guide. For all the power of systematic disciplined scientific studies, we are dealing with stages in the historical process and individual acts that involve hubris. There are fatal flaws in our ability to choose; our best wisdom falls short of what is required. Raymond Aron quoted Montesquieu in a recent commentary on Henry Kissinger. Montesquieu wrote, "Even wisdom has its excesses." Aron applied this to Kissinger's valiant efforts to open up United States foreign policy to contacts with China. Aron asked Kissinger if he didn't feel that, in reaching out to his enemies, he was forgetting his friends; and according to Aron, Kissinger admitted there was that risk.

VIOLENCE IS BORN OF MORAL ABSOLUTES

Yet, even the fact of tragedy will not excuse us from acting. Perhaps the first step on the thousand-mile journey toward grappling with moral problems is understanding that violence is most often born out of a single value orientation. This form of seduction is a constant companion of all those who face moral choices. Whenever complexity exists, we seek to reduce it by focusing sharply on a single value. In the 1930's following the most painful economic depression in our history, reformers proposed that economic security would assure happiness and well-being for all the people. Intellectuals and scholars were urged to concentrate on business cycles and the needs of economic man, and "the best and the brightest" of that day assumed that progress on this front would be sufficient. The problems of the 1960's dramatize clearly that economic advancement has not been sufficient.

VIETNAM: PUBLIC POLICY ADRIPT FROM CULTURAL-POLITICAL MOORINGS

In the same spirit, we turned in the 1950's to programs of national security and defense long absent from national policy of a nation isolating itself from the struggles for Europe until the eleventh hour. Yet, national defense and international security systems cut adrift from cultural and political moorings are bound to flounder. We discovered in Vietnam that neither collective security nor military defense is sufficient if we fail to tie them to knowledge of political movements or the cultural context.

CULTURE CAN DEFEAT RAW POWER

The lesson for international politics is that, even for security policies, cultural factors may be more important than raw power. What is vital in international politics is our perception of ourselves and our interests as a people and nation, of the interests and commitments of others and of our common interests. And these perceptions are determined not by interests alone but by the cultural and value context of ourselves and others. For big countries, this is no less important than small countries. There is danger in war gaming—both academically and in international politics. All too often, it can give false assurance and false security; and we must be on guard against it. And the best way to be on guard is to keep our eye on values and the cultural context as we think about the moral problem.

MORAL DIMENSIONS: SOME DECISIONS MUST BE MADE

This leads to my final word. There are levels and dimensions at which the moral problem can be brought into focus. One is the level of a certain minimum concern for moral discrimination—falling here, we destroy ourselves and the society. Positively, the response to the needs of blacks and other minorities long the victims of racial dis-

crimination illustrates what a nation must do. Negatively, there are certain things a civilized people—whatever the ambiguities and pressures—must not do. Watergate may become the tragic symbol for this. If doubts arise that we have not measured up to this minimum standard, we destroy all trust and confidence—the cement that holds us together. The international equivalent is a decent respect for the opinions of mankind—and, we must add, the rights of mankind.

THE MARSHALL PLAN: ILLUSTRATION FOR A RULE

A second level is to seek common interests even in areas where values inevitably differ and conflict. This is the moral problem in foreign affairs. The values of individuals and groups are subject to different constraints. In the words of Cavour, "If we had done for ourselves what we did for the state, what scoundrels we would have been." The triumph of the Marshall Plan was that, for a brief historical moment, both moral and political interests drew Western Europe and the United States together. Today we hear talk of a wider European community, of trilateralism (Europe, Japan and the United States) and, I would hope, more and more talk of North/South interests in helping and learning from each other. What goes on at this level suggests that, where interests converge and problems loom large, there are possibilities for peoples of very divergent systems and ideologies to come together—in their needs.

COMMON INTEREST: UNIFY, RESPECT THE UNITY OF OTHERS

A final level is that of more intimate communities where both values and interests converge. The family is the classic example, but so is the human community at large. We need one another, yet we fear one another—and fearing, we hurt one another. If the years before and after World War II were filled with moralistic illusions about our similarities, we have become far too cynical about the consequences of our differences. Therefore, we said in the report, *Reconstituting the Human Community*: "Recognizing all mankind's differences, there are still unities from which we derive strength, as does the world community. This unity is a different sort than that which was talked about in too simple terms twenty-five years ago. It is a unity which assumes and takes advantage of lesser unities, such as constructive regionalism and the struggle for recognition by smaller groups within societies. They are unities which those outside a particular unity or unifying tradition have to learn to respect and to esteem, without envy, whether included or not. There will be unities within local communities which strengthen the larger community within a country. And the West, particularly the affluent West, must learn to recognize and welcome, as a sign of true progress, worthy of support, the growth of self-confidence and self-reliance in nations and societies elsewhere in the world and their search for new directions. This, after all, is one aspect, varying in time and place, of the growing fabric of the desired human community."¹

CONGRESSMAN YATRON AT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, an informal delegation from the House of

¹ *Reconstituting the Human Community*, (a report of Colloquium III, held at Bellagio, Italy, July 17-23, 1972 for the program of inquiries, Cultural Relations for the Future, sponsored by the Hazen Foundation), p. 50.

Representatives met in Strasbourg earlier this month with members of the European Community—Common Market. Discussions were held on security, trade, agricultural, and monetary questions with advance papers prepared by both sides for these meetings.

Congressman GUS YATRON of Pennsylvania, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and of the Subcommittee on Europe, which I chair, was one of our members who agreed to prepare an advance paper for the important discussion on "East-West Relations in the Context of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe." Mr. YATRON's paper was titled "Toward a More Equitable Sharing of the NATO Defense Burden" and it elicited an excellent response from both the American and European participants. I include below a copy of the summary of the paper which Mr. YATRON presented at this meeting.

I also include an editorial from the Reading Times of May 18, 1973, describing the reception given to Mr. YATRON's paper in Strasbourg:

GUS TELLS 'EM ABOUT NATO

What Congressman Gus Yatron, D-Reading, had to tell the European Parliament during that meeting last week in Strasbourg, France, needed saying.

Yatron—making his first foreign trip in an official capacity to present his white paper entitled "Toward a More Equitable Sharing of the NATO Defense Burden," to the representatives of nine European governments—jarred the parliament.

The local U.S. representative told his listeners point-blank that "A problem of major concern to the United States is whether the burden of NATO defense is now fairly allocated in order that the Europeans carry a larger share of the defense of their own continent."

"NATO now costs the United States \$17 billion per year," he told Times Staffer Michael Wentzel on his return. "I told them that they have to start picking up part of the tab. This had been discussed before, but no one had put it straight to the Europeans."

In his speech—part of a session on East-West security during the trip in which he and 13 other congressmen met in Brussels and Strasbourg with European officials—Yatron, quite correctly, said he was presenting the views of the people he represents.

And we think he did.

Until the United States' tragic involvement in Vietnam, perhaps many Americans paid little or no attention to this country's foreign policy and its various commitments.

But more and more, Americans are beginning to realize that to many foreign nations, Uncle Sam is just Uncle Sucker, going all out in aid and being far more generous than need be in picking up a disproportionate share of the tab involved in honoring various commitments.

What Yatron has done is lay it on the line—a flat statement that it's time for the Europeans to start carrying a realistic share of the burden in NATO. And we think many Americans will agree.

What he is asking is nothing more than a fair shake—that's certainly reasonable.

TOWARD A MORE EQUITABLE SHARING OF THE NATO DEFENSE BURDEN

In 1948, the 80th Congress of the United States debated an historic foreign policy resolution sponsored by the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg. This resolution put the United States Senate on record as favoring collective defense arrangements based upon continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid.

The adoption of the Vandenberg Resolution in June of that year paved the way for the Senate ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty and the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Today, a quarter of a century after the creation of NATO, the 93rd Congress seems likely to begin yet another great debate on the major question: Should the United States keep its 303,000 troops in Europe?

Pursuant to the principles of NATO, the United States has maintained a major military establishment on European soil since the early 1950's. Our nuclear power, as well as conventional forces, are available in support of this treaty commitment.

From the start, the United States has viewed NATO as a means to an end—not an end in itself. The long-range objectives were: To promote an all-European settlement ending the division of Germany; to encourage a united Europe capable of assuming responsibility for its own defense; and to foster European stability by knitting Germany into this larger community. When these goals had been reached, NATO was to have been either drastically remodeled or replaced.

Meanwhile, Western Europe itself, prosperous, mostly democratic, stable, and probably more secure than at any time in its modern history, has been preoccupied with the inevitable problems that are the by-product of affluence and rapid economic growth.

These concerns seem to have caused it to shift somewhat from the lofty goals of a unified Europe and Atlantic partnership to a more parochial stance today.

Beginning in the early 1960's, and in growing numbers as the decade progressed, many members of the United States Congress questioned the scale of the American military participation in NATO. They agreed that it was time to change for three basic reasons: 1) the Soviet threat had lessened; 2) Europe was now economically strong, politically stable, and ready to take on major responsibilities for its own defense, and; 3) the United States could not afford to spend the large amounts of funds which our troop commitment required.

Therefore, a problem of major concern to the United States is whether the burden of NATO defense is now fairly allocated in order that the prosperous Europeans carry a larger share of the defense of their own continent.

The United States continues to support the goal of a politically and economically integrated Europe. Economic integration has come far and there are indications that new moves forward may be developing. The most ambitious of the European regional arrangements—the European economic community—has already gone beyond the earlier conception of international cooperation to a new form of relationship among nation states.

This economic development is in direct contrast to the degree to which Europeans have met their predetermined NATO commitments. Economic progress should have been followed by increased military contributions. However, European nations have not done so and therefore, the arguments for increased burden sharing are strengthened even more.

The status quo has been safe and comfortable for our European allies. But, it has made them less interested in their own defense. It has distorted the relationship between Europe and the United States.

And it has resulted in a drain on our resources which has adversely affected not only our international financial position, but also our ability to deal with the urgent problems we face at home.

Therefore, there are three areas in which I feel our European partners can more equitably share the costs of the NATO defense structure.

First, the presence of substantial U.S. forces abroad contributes to our balance-of-payments deficit which would not occur

otherwise. When its general payments picture was in balance, the United States could afford to maintain this part of the cost without pressing for an offset of the foreign exchange losses. For years while there was a dollar "gap", the U.S. deliberately poured dollars—some \$13 billion of them—into Europe on the military account as a means of stabilizing the international exchange mechanism. But the problem of the American balance-of-payments deficit has now reached critical proportions not only in economic and financial terms, but also in political attitudes.

The cumulative deficit on the military account with western Europe alone in the past 17 years totals nearly \$20 billion. It would be larger, of course, if the early years of NATO were included. Accordingly, neither the man on the street nor Members of Congress can understand how Europeans can complain about their "Glut" of unwanted dollars on one hand and, at the same time, refuse to neutralize the chief contributor to the continuing inflow of those dollars; namely, the foreign exchange cost of maintaining the American NATO commitment in Europe.

Therefore, the need is for politically visible action now through an initiative by Europeans themselves to remove the balance-of-payments deficit from our NATO commitment.

Second, it is scandalous that the United States Government continue to pay millions of dollars annually to its NATO partners in taxes: Real property taxes, local and municipal taxes; business and trade taxes, excise taxes, and import taxes.

The General Accounting Office has found taxation to be particularly high in many NATO countries. We do not pay taxes to the States and communities in our own country where we have military installations; yet our European allies—the nations we spend billions to protect—have no qualms about adding these surcharges to our costs for their mutual defense. Clearly, the United States military commitment to NATO should be tax exempt.

Third, the substance of my burden-sharing legislation should be implemented. It is time for a thoughtful and comprehensive reassessment of the American commitment to NATO. In terms of both total costs and manpower, the United States is bearing an unfair and staggering burden in the defense of Europe.

It requires no special perception to observe that Europe today is not the rubble-strewn continent it was 25 years ago; or that its reconstructed, thriving economies can bear a much larger defense burden than was possible in the immediate post-war years.

Changing conditions demand changing responses. If the European nations do not accept their new responsibilities—and do so quickly—reductions in American troop levels will have passed the point of debate and will become inevitable.

The immediate goal of the United States should be, therefore, the cutting of its NATO expenses. With the United States facing severe economic pressures, with every American aware of the need for budgetary reductions, it is absurd for us to continue to shoulder expenses that rightfully should be borne by Europeans.

There are several identifiable areas in which our NATO allies could assume the cost from the United States: 1) the salaries of the 73,000 local nationals employed by United States forces; 2) construction costs of building used by Americans; 3) materials and equipment purchased in the local economy for use in that country; 4) transportation, power and various other related services; and 5) NATO infrastructure expenses such as roads and runways.

I do not mean to suggest that the United States will abandon its NATO partners. We have pledged to assist in the defense of Eu-

rope and will honor that pledge. Although this country values highly its close friendship with western European nations, one must realize that legitimate friendship is based upon equity and mutual self-respect. The American burden in the defense of Europe is patently inequitable. Were we to permit it to continue, it would reflect poorly on our judgment and leave our claim to world leadership open to serious question.

The time has passed when the United States could afford to devote \$16 billion to the defense of Europe and contribute \$1.6 billion to its own national debt. America simply does not have the financial capability to spend a greater percentage of its resources on the security of western Europe than does western Europe; nor are its citizens willing to demand more service from its young men in the defense of NATO than other nations demand.

The world has changed, but many of our commitments and much of our military presence have not adjusted to meet these developments. Our allies around the world are now strong, when once they were weak. There is governmental stability and economic prosperity when once there was chaos. We must ask our allies to do more for themselves and even reduce our own commitments to impress this point upon them. Our Nation needs these funds for domestic purposes and a modern foreign policy requires change which is attuned to the 21st century.

Thank you very much.

MINNESOTA'S "SUCCESSFUL SOCIETY" HAILED IN BOOK

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota's vital contributions to the good of our country are a matter of history. Minnesota has achieved a lasting place in our country's heritage through its natural beauty, its necessary resources, and its hard-working men and women. It also has contributed some of our country's greatest leaders.

It is both fitting and proper that this important place in our country's development, as well as its continued progressive outlook under the leadership of Gov. Wendell Anderson, has been recognized in a book entitled "The Great Plains States of America".

This book is an ambitious study of the United States. Ambitious in its scope and successful in its purpose. It is with a great deal of pride in my native State that I place in the RECORD a review of this book's analysis of Minnesota. It is with additional pride that the review of the book is written by a man who has been called by a competing newspaper the best of Minnesota's Washington correspondents—Albert Eisele of the Ridder Publication's Washington Bureau. An honored writer and author in his own right, I believe Mr. Eisele's review of the book reflects an honest analysis of the author's comments about the North Star State.

[From the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press, May 20, 1973]

MINNESOTA'S "SUCCESSFUL SOCIETY" HAILED IN BOOK

(By Albert Eisele)

WASHINGTON.—A monumental new study of the United States has singled out Min-

nesota as the best available model of the "successful society" in America and an outstanding example of "how a democratic society should be run."

The flattering assessment of Minnesota's social, political and economic climate is contained in a book published today that is the fourth part of a nine-volume examination of contemporary America.

The study, written by political scientist Neal Peirce and patterned after John Gunther's classic 1947 book, "Inside USA", cites Minnesota's "open, issue-oriented (and) responsible" political system as the key to the state's "unique character" and disproportionate national prominence in recent years.

In his latest volume, "The Great Plains States of America," (W. W. Norton & Co., New York), Peirce declares that despite a number of shortcomings, Minnesota is a state in which its people can take justifiable pride and . . . as good a model as one can find in these United States of the successful society."

Referring to Gunther's observation that Minnesota is a "spectacularly varied, proud and handsome" state with a progressive political tradition, Peirce concludes, "the intervening quarter century has done little to tarnish the bright image of the North Star State."

Peirce, who examines eight other Great Plains states in the same volume and finds that much of the region has become an economic and political backwater since World War II (in fact, Peirce suggests that financially hard-pressed North Dakota should merge with Minnesota), says he found many reasons for Minnesota's success in the face of this trend.

"But none is so convincing as perhaps the simplest," he writes: "These people appear to have control of their own destiny."

Declaring that no other Great Plains state "has tried to be so responsive to the needs of its people," Peirce, who visited every state in the union since beginning his project 4½ years ago, said Minnesota leaders responded with a "blank stare" when he asked who "runs" their state.

"No single industrial cabal, no bank group, no patronage-hungry courthouse crowd controls Minnesota," he asserts.

Peirce notes that special interest groups are active in lobbying at the state legislature, but adds, "None is consistently successful, and the crucial decisions of a public nature are made through the political process with few invisible powers lurking behind the throne."

"The political parties, constituted by an especially democratic process from local precinct caucuses on up, wield the significant power—and through them, the people."

Peirce, whose three previous volumes on the 10 largest states ("megastates"), the Pacific States and the Mountain States have been hailed by critics as the best works of their kind since the state guides produced by the Works Progress Administration (WPA) in the 1930s, is unsparing in his lavish praise of Minnesota.

"Its leaders . . . have played an increasingly prominent role in national life, far out of proportion to the state's modest 2 percent of the national population," he observes.

"Its political structure remains open, issue-oriented, responsible."

"Its state government has been a leader in services for people, even though citizens and corporations alike have had to pay a high tax bill for those services."

"Few states exceed Minnesota in the quality and extent of the education offered its citizens; none appears to provide health care of comparable quality."

"Economic growth has been strong and steady, encompassing the brain-power industries of the electronic era along with traditional farming, milling and mining."

"And Minnesota maintains a clear focus of economic and cultural leadership in her Twin Cities, towns whose great industries

have resisted the siren call of the national conglomerates."

In his analysis of Minnesota's political and governmental system, Peirce takes note of the "excesses" that occurred when supporters of Sen. George McGovern, D-S.D., took control of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor state convention in 1972 and forced through a platform "clearly unrepresentative of the broad mass of Minnesota Democrats."

But, he notes, "Usually the system works well, and as a general rule one cannot find another state in which party platforms and campaign promises are taken more seriously."

He cites Gov. Wedell Anderson's 1970 campaign promise to work for property tax equalization and a greater state share of school financing as an example, noting that Anderson later successfully pushed for enactment of a landmark school financing reform program.

The program was part of a "revamping of the entire fiscal relationship between the state and its localities so sweeping that the National Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations later hailed it as 'the Minnesota miracle'." Peirce states.

Peirce notes that following Minnesota's example, courts across the country began to invalidate the local property tax as the chief source of school financing and that the same change in the tax system was ordered in Minnesota by a federal judge in 1971.

"But in Minnesota, the court action was almost an afterthought," he writes. "The essential point is that in this state the issue had already been handled in its most appropriate forum, the political-legislative system not the courts."

Peirce cites numerous other examples of the "quiet revolution" that has taken place in Minnesota in recent years which he says "has been characterized by the replacement of the professionals" who have traditionally dominated the policy-setting boards in state and local government with "dedicated and interested lay citizens who are more concerned with the breadth and quality of services delivered than with special professional prerogatives."

These include "genuine citizen membership" on the new Twin Cities Metropolitan Council ("one of the most advanced regional government bodies in the country"), the nation's first statewide press council, and the Higher Education Coordinating Commission, the water pollution board, as well as most state licensing and standards boards.

"Minnesota is finding a reservoir of citizens able to assume these key policy-making roles in the society—leaving the implementation of programs, of course, to the professionals under their direction," Peirce asserts.

"The openness of Minnesota public life, the willingness of leaders to try new ideas, and the state's demonstrated capacity to handle money and programs well and honestly, bring dividends of many kinds," Peirce notes, adding that Minnesota's reputation has enabled it to become a testing ground for many new private and federal experimental programs.

"In sum," Peirce concludes, "Minnesota is a deceptively simple example of how a democratic society should be run."

Peirce, a Washington-based political writer since 1959 and presently a fellow at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars here, goes into considerable detail about other aspects of Minnesota life in his 40-page chapter entitled, "Minnesota—the Successful Society."

Among the factors he cites to justify that title are:

An adaptive and diversified economy with a high degree of local ownership and heavy emphasis on science-oriented, "intelligence-devouring industries";

A "deep orientation to change" among Twin Cities civic and business leaders, "and a determination not to be engulfed by that

change, but rather to make it work constructively";

A steadfast commitment to public and private education, to efficient, innovative government even at the cost of a heavy tax burden ("Minnesota is a high-tax, high-service state") and to cultural and recreational activities.

Ironically, Peirce's laudatory comments about Minnesota come in the wake of last week's announcement that the state has dropped from second in the nation to 13th in its overall "quality of life" ranking.

Peirce ends his Minnesota chapter by pointing out the unusually large number of Minnesotans on the national political stage. "Man for man, it would be hard to name a state which has contributed as many men of stature and depth to national political life in the post-war era as Minnesota," he states.

In the light of their accomplishments alone, Peirce observes, "Minnesota's role in the history of post war America seems assured a shining place."

SER WEEK

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, often in recent years we have become aware of many problems in manpower programs. But today I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to the outstanding performance of SER, Jobs for Progress, Inc., and to announce the observance of SER Week June 3 to June 10 in the 30th Congressional District of California. Similar proclamations of support and recognition of SER are being issued in the 14 States where SER is located by Governors, mayors, county officials, and Congressmen.

During this week, citizens, the business community, and elected officials will pay tribute to SER, the only national manpower program designed to serve the needs of the disadvantaged Spanish-speaking citizens of our country.

For the record, I would like to recognize the excellent performance of the West Los Angeles, Calif., SER project, which is directed by Mr. Rick D. Sanchez, a dedicated and farsighted individual.

This fiscal year alone, in the West Los Angeles SER, over 1,400 applicants will go through assessment and orientation sessions, and some 350 disadvantaged persons will benefit directly by being trained and placed in breakthrough permanent jobs.

SER came into existence through the efforts of individuals in two great Spanish-speaking organizations—the American G.I. Forum, and the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC).

Members of these two organizations, realizing the desperate need for manpower services for the Spanish-speaking, began voluntary job placement centers in Washington, D.C., Houston, and Corpus Christi, Tex.

In 1966, SER funded in a small way from private sources, the Office of Economic Opportunity—OEO—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Labor, began to

provide skills training and related bilingual and bicultural services to Spanish-speaking Americans of the Southwest.

As a national effort for Spanish-speaking Americans, SER has come a long way since 1966. At that time, Department of Defense officials noticed that not many Chicanos were applying for jobs in plants with Government contracts. They suggested to LULAC and G.I. Forum that they let the Mexican-American community know that jobs were available and that Government contractors had a legal obligation to provide equal employment opportunity.

The first SER offices, like those of today, were located in the heart of the barrios. Manned by bilingual volunteers, these offices were soon swamped with job applicants.

One notable result of this small-scale effort was a decision by the Manpower Administration and the Office of Economic Opportunity to fund SER jointly as an experimental and demonstration project. Still small in scale—funding was about 400,000 over a period of 2 years—SER began serving a larger geographic area. Moreover, SER was no longer just a volunteer placement effort, it was now in the manpower business—a program planner, administrator, recruiter, and counselor for low-income people.

SER's success as an experimental project led to its growth and present status as a major effort to draw the Spanish-speaking into the Nation's employment mainstream. It has become, as one Chicano described SER in its early days, "a dynamic engine of change" for Spanish-speaking people.

SER now has developed a significant amount of expertise in manpower. It has blended its intimate knowledge of the language, culture, and outlook of people in low-income Spanish-speaking communities with manpower program technology and it has discovered what works in the barrios, what does not work and why.

Its role is not an easy one. As a bridge between two cultures—the Anglo and the Spanish—SER is in the middle.

Today, SER is a dynamic organization that expanded beyond its original territory to meet the needs of people in cities such as Gary, Ind., and Racine, Wis., among others.

In addition to skills training through a variety of educational institutions and on-the-job training, SER provides the enrollee with supportive services to insure firm placement in a meaningful job.

SER is also conducting successful experimental programs such as Project Detour, a program for young first offenders, offering an alternative to court backlogs and imprisonment. Another innovative program is the SER Residential Youth Center in San Jose, Calif. Here an environment marked by drugs, hopelessness and crime is being replaced by a living situation which allows individual potential to flourish. These are just samples of the many innovative programs being developed to provide creative solutions to persistent problems unique to the Spanish speaking.

The purpose of SER is to help build a better America by breaking the barriers of traditional employment patterns and

by helping business and industry to understand that Spanish speaking people are a valuable resource.

A typical SER program operates in three functional areas: intake and counseling; education and training; and job development.

The initial part of the program is the selection of the people who can be most helped by the particular program and the referral of as many others as may be helped to the appropriate agency. Each enrollee is then assessed and counseled to determine his vocational goals and how they can be achieved. This results in an individual employment development plan for each enrollee detailing his ultimate employment goal and the various steps leading to its fulfillment.

Education and training provide the enrollee with the basic knowledge necessary to communicate with his employer and the basic skill necessary to perform his job. A variety of academic and vocational training courses are offered at SER according to the educational situation and the potential labor market of the individual community. The academic courses include Job Preparation, English as a Second Language, Adult Basic Education, and Advanced Adult Education. Vocational courses vary from site to site because of different local labor requirements, but often include courses such as licensed vocational nurse training, secretary-stenographer training, auto mechanic, keypunch operator training and electronics assembly training.

Job development is essentially a placement service that attempts to obtain long range commitments from employers. It differs from usual placement in that the jobs are sought at the time the enrollee begins training and are not filled until the enrollee completes training which may not be until months later. A second type of job development involves cooperation between the local program and the employer to provide on-the-job training for enrollees. In this case, part of the cost of job training is borne by the employer and part by SER.

A listing of the areas where SER has Manpower Training sites follows:

SITES

Arizona—Glendale/Phoenix, Tucson, and Yuma.

California—El Centro/Calexico, Contra Costa, East Los Angeles, Fresno, West Los Angeles, National City/San Diego, Norwalk, San Francisco, San Jose, San Bernardino, and Santa Ana.

Colorado—Colorado Springs, Denver, and Pueblo.

Illinois—Chicago.

Indiana—Gary.

Kansas—Topeka.

Michigan—Detroit.

Nevada—Las Vegas.

Nebraska—Scottsbluff.

New Mexico—Albuquerque, Las Cruces, and Santa Fe.

Texas—Austin, Brownsville, Corpus Christi, Dallas, El Paso, Galveston, Houston, Lubbock, McAllen, and San Antonio.

Utah—Salt Lake City.

Washington—Seattle.

Wisconsin—Milwaukee/Racine.

PERFORMANCE

Program statistics confirm that SER is the most effective and most efficient national manpower program in the United States. [All data used in discus-

sing performance is obtained from the U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration Management Information Report, Office of Financial and Management Information System.]

INTAKE

During fiscal year 1972, 35,043 persons applied for and were qualified for SER services. Of this number of people, SER was only able to serve 11,163 and because of lack of resources, 23,880 people were turned away.

Of the 11,163 people served, 5,305 were trained; 3,478 were directly placed without training on full time, permanent and meaningful jobs and 2,380 received supportive services. The number trained exceeds SER's contractual obligation to Department of Labor of 3,905 trainees by 1,400 people. This demonstrates SER's commitment to efficiently serve the Spanish-speaking community beyond what is required in the contract.

TRAINEE PROFILE

SER enrollees come from a broad cross section of the disadvantaged and this provides evidence that SER is representing and serving the community. SER is one of the few manpower programs which can and does successfully serve the following traditionally difficult clients:

(In percent)

Spanish-speaking	90
Head of Household	63
Female	42
High School Dropout	57
Elementary School Dropout	11
Welfare Recipient	12
Monolingual	8

QUALITY OF PLACEMENT

Out of every 100 enrollees who are placed on a job, 82 are placed on jobs for which they were specifically trained. The average starting wage for the SER placement is \$2.47 per hour, well above the Federal minimum of \$1.60 per hour. It is of significant interest to point out that the average wage of all enrollees prior to entering SER was only \$.95 per hour. This means that SER trainees are earning \$3,074 per year more than before.

TRAINING

SER is providing quality training to the enrollee. SER is operating at 101 percent of planned capacity demonstrating excellent planning and management on the part of the local project directors and their staffs. A mere 12 percent of the trainees are holding. Only 16 percent of the trainees terminated from the program early, as computed from total enrollment.

RETENTION AND REPLACEMENT

SER is placing 79 out of every 100 people trained. This is accomplished by careful assessment, counseling, education, training, and followup of trainees.

Retention statistics were: One month after placement, 88 percent were still working; after 6 months, 64 percent were still working.

The reasons for these successes in today's tight and competitive job market are varied. One reason is that SER continues counseling and other supportive help during training, then finds jobs for its graduates. Once at work these persons are followed up by SER counselors at regular intervals for a year. During these follow-ups, counselors help to iron

out problems that might hurt a worker's chances of staying on the job.

One very important factor is that SER attempts to maintain a cooperative and flexible relationship with employers. Basically, SER serves the employer by providing him with qualified workers, in so doing SER also serves the unskilled and unemployed.

Employers in many instances help local SER's in developing certain training courses and in turn, SER trains enrollees to meet specific employer's requirements for jobs. Once a good working relationship is established between a local SER and the business community, an exchange of expertise and information continues that results in a relationship of mutual trust and confidence.

Many of SER's placements were in new employment areas which previously have been traditionally closed to the Spanish-speaking. SER's excellent reputation with business and industry has made SER a direct and highly functional link from business and industry to a vast reservoir of talent and service. At the same time, the unskilled and unemployed are linked to breakthrough jobs in industry and business which they would not have otherwise been able to train and qualify for.

COST

One of SER's notable achievements is the cost per trainee figure of \$1,341. For every \$1 spent on an enrollee, the return to the community, in the form of increased earnings is \$1.24.

I am sure that my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD strongly concur in my support and recognition of SER and in the observance of SER Week, June 3 to June 10.

A PAPER CRISIS?

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, we are now being warned of another coming shortage—this time on paper.

Ralph W. Michaud, a researcher and recognized expert on the subject, told the Chicago Daily News the other day that the demand for paper products is running well ahead of supply and that the situation could become "severe" and remain so for at least 5 years.

Paper companies, Mr. Michaud explained, will need that much time to hurdle their pollution problems and build the plants necessary to expand production to the amount called for by the growing market.

This, it seems to me, is one threatening shortage which government at all levels can help ease. And it can do so directly. If government paper use all across our country were cut—triplicate copies down to just duplicates, for example—enough pulp and paper might be salvaged to spare the American public another hardship.

Imagine the tonnage saved if Federal tax forms were made simple—and easily understood, thus making scratch paper unneeded by the taxpayer! Or if govern-

ment regulations were reduced to plain language! My hope is that the public's need of paper napkins, paper plates, facial tissues, and all the other paper products will force these reforms upon us. I propose that the Federal Government begin acting now.

BRISTOL, CONN., PARKLAND—A JOINT EFFORT

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, it was with a keen sense of pride that on May 15 we received word from the Interior Department's Bureau of Outdoor Recreation that approval had been granted for \$500,000 in Federal funding to pay one-half the cost of purchasing 201 acres of proposed parkland in Bristol, Conn. The city of Bristol and State of Connecticut will each furnish 25 percent of the funding for this important project.

This approval was a clear example of the effectiveness of cooperation among various levels of government and representatives of the private sector. It is a tribute to the unselfish efforts of many of Bristol's community leaders who realized the benefits their city would reap from this beautiful acreage which includes Birge's Pond and is known to residents as "the Hoppers."

The spirit of cooperation of which I speak goes further than the language on government forms, or the common logic of contractual agreements. It involves a concern at all levels of government, as well as in the private sector for the welfare of the citizens of Bristol.

Mayor Frank J. Longo and Bristol's city government, state legislators, officials of the Department of Environmental Protection and the Citizens Advisory Commission worked tirelessly to insure that the Hoppers would be preserved as open space in Bristol.

Several private groups, such as the Bristol Jaycees, the town's historical society, and the Connecticut Nature Conservancy, contributed generously to the drive to preserve this beautiful green area. The Bristol Savings Bank, under the guidance of its president, Edward P. Lorenson, and the continuing work of bank director E. Bartlett Barnes and others, was truly magnanimous.

Last February, when it appeared that efforts to preserve the Hoppers might prove fruitless and Bristol might miss its chance for this park site, the Bristol Savings Bank purchased the land for \$1 million and announced its intention to hold title to the Hoppers until the city was in a position to purchase it. The bank made this transaction because of an overriding concern that the Hoppers remain intact to make possible the establishment of permanent park and recreation area.

The following comments by Bristol Jaycee president Roger Morin typify the feeling of appreciation held by all those involved in the Hoppers project with regard to the bank's unselfish effort:

For a private business to make such a sub-

stantial commitment for the benefit of all Bristol's citizens is an extraordinary display of civic pride and the spirit of involvement.

It should be noted that the Bristol Press recently reported the efforts of students from science classes at Bristol Central High School who cleaned up and removed debris from the Birge's Pond dam and spillway near the Hoppers.

It is with great pleasure that I bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding example of unstinting cooperation exhibited by so many people, both in and out of government, who have made it possible for Bristol, to get its parkland. Because of their cooperation and generosity, Bristol residents will reap the benefits described by the words of that city's park department superintendent Joseph J. Riley, Jr.:

Beautiful winding trails are wonderful for nature walks, while Birges Pond can be stocked for better fishing and used for ice skating in the winter. When conditions permit, the pond can be lowered so that youngsters can enjoy swimming in a spring fed pond such as their parents and grandparents did many years ago.

Truly this action represents not only the preservation of a priceless natural resource, it represents as well the triumph of cooperative action in the name of the people.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM MILLS

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, the death last Thursday morning of Representative William Mills of Maryland is a tragedy in the fullest sense of the word. I offer my condolences to Mills' wife and two children.

It was my pleasure to get to know Mills on a recent congressional trip to Africa and I was very saddened to learn of his death.

He had served the State of Maryland well for many years in both business and governmental capacities and he had served his country well, winning the Bronze Star for action in the U.S. Army during World War II.

As administrative assistant to Rogers Morton for 9 years, Mills gained the experience in government that earned him the support of the people on Maryland's Eastern Shore. He was elected to Congress in May 1971 when Morton became Interior Secretary.

A quietly conservative down-to-earth man, Mills knew many of the people in his area on a first name basis and concerned himself a great deal with local issues. The First District of Maryland has lost an able Representative.

PENSION LEGISLATION? WHEN?

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, many of us in

Congress are concerned about strengthening workers' assurance of their pension rights. The general Subcommittee on Labor has been looking into all aspects of possible legislation to accomplish this goal. On May 23, our colleague from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN), the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, delivered an address to the Association of Private Pension and Welfare Plans, revealing the lessons the subcommittee members have thus far learned from their studies and hearings. His remarks, I believe, provide an insight for all of us; and I commend them to our colleagues:

PENSION LEGISLATION? WHEN? AND HOW MUCH?

(Remarks by Representative JOHN N. ERLBORN)

You will be wise, I believe, to expect further Federal regulation of private pension plans in the current Congress, that is, before the end of 1974.

The title of my remarks this afternoon is, Pension Legislation: When? and How Much?

I have already answered the first question—the When?—and we could be out of here quickly if I could answer the second question as easily.

I can tell you that I welcome reform as it relates to some aspects of private pensions; but in my view, we need more information before we undertake an omnibus bill—more information and more time to digest what information we have.

I am the ranking Republican on the General Labor Subcommittee, and I note that you will hear later this afternoon from John Dent, who is our chairman, and a good one. He may have a slightly different answer to both of these questions.

In each of the past several Congresses, Chairman Dent has introduced measures aimed at correcting all ailments or supposed ailments of our private pensions plans. There are sections covering vesting, funding, termination insurance and portability—all the features of a pension plan that any working man could ask for.

I was able to convince Mr. Dent in 1971 that we ought to collect more facts before our committee could think of reporting out a bill. We embarked upon that study in 1972, and we still have a way to go with it.

I believe the study has helped both Chairman Dent and me. I think he now sees some of the pitfalls of a headlong rush into all-encompassing legislation; and I am coming to a realization that we must strengthen a worker's assurance of his pension rights. I believe we can do that while keeping the essentials of our diverse private pension programs.

In the eyes of business men, the need for federal legislation grows as various state legislatures show interest in pension problems. I doubt whether any companies in interstate commerce, or whether any national unions which negotiate with those companies, would relish the prospect of—let us say—25 differing pension laws in half of our states and an absence of any pension laws in the other half.

I think we could have passed a minimal pension law a long while ago. Everybody seems to agree that further regulation of fiduciaries would be good. In truth, I suspect that this improvement could have passed Congress several years ago, but has been held hostage by those who want a one-shot pension reform bill.

The same can be said about improved reporting and disclosure by the trustees. A law to compel a full showing, from time to time, by pension trustees of the fund's assets and liabilities would harm nobody except the faithless trustee. To the worker, it might provide a kind of distant early warning if there were possible difficulties ahead.

I emphasize "might" because we all know that only a small number of workers will read the reports. Disclosure will not prevent bad management of theft; but it will tend to discourage them.

Reporting might also give working people the chance to know what benefits they may expect upon retirement; and about their rights and the restrictions on them.

The Department of Labor has recently aided the employee's right to know with its D-1 supplement, which I regard as a step in the right direction.

I believe the laws in regard to fiduciaries can be strengthened without causing any trouble at all—except to the faithless trustees.

When we turn to vesting, funding, termination insurance and portability, however, I believe we must step more carefully. We can make changes in the law which might cause a lot of trouble—trouble to faithful workers, and trouble to faithful trustees.

They are medicines which may have some undesirable side effects. We must look for ways to cure the ailments without harming the patient.

Our General Labor Subcommittee held hearings, starting February 20 of this year in Washington; and they continued through March and into April in Washington and in several cities from coast to coast. I have been impressed by the quality of our witnesses.

Their testimony has contributed to my education in pension matters; and further contributions have been made by perceptive students who have written on this subject. These sources suggest that some minimal standards for vesting may be written into law—standards which would be beneficial at a cost which would be acceptable.

One of the Administration's pension bills proposes vesting by the Rule of 50, and it seems to me this is the most nearly balanced plan.

The Dent bill asks for a ten-year vesting program; that is, a worker gets no vesting until he has been a part of a plan for 10 years, then would get a fully vested interest in his pension.

Some witnesses have pointed out that, with such early vesting, portability becomes less important; and the complexities of portability are such that Mr. Dent's proposal takes on a new importance in my eyes.

I know that vesting—or any other feature that may be written into law—will cost something. The cost must be paid, no matter whether the worker is to get a vested right to his pension in 10 years or (as the Williams-Javits bill in the Senate would have it) by stages in 15 years, or at age 50.

I want to make sure that, when we pay this cost, we get our money's worth.

A lot of union negotiators assume that the employer will pay these costs and, for that reason, go all-out in demanding early vesting.

Our subcommittee commissioned a study of these costs last year by Dr. Winkelvoss, an assistant professor of actuarial science at the Wharton School of Finance in Philadelphia. He found that the cost of vesting, stated as an increase in the contribution, may vary from as low as one per cent to as high as 35 per cent, depending upon a variety of circumstances.

For instance, if a plan has no disability provision prior to adding a vesting benefit, the cost of vesting would be higher.

Let me suggest that an employer might concede a one per cent rise in his contribution to a pension fund without a very long argument; but when the talk suggests a 35 per cent higher contribution, or any considerable fraction of it, the argument is likely to last quite a while longer. I would expect, for example, that, before a company bargaining representative were to agree to an increased contribution of—even 15 per cent, he would demand some substantial concession from the union spokesman. In other

words, the workers, one way or another, would have to pay a goodly part of that increase.

Dr. Winkelvoss tried out six plans. He ran them through a computer and, thus, was able to simulate how these plans would work under varying assumptions over a 50-year period.

He concluded, among other findings, that a 10-year vesting program would be consistently a little more costly than the Williams-Javits graded 15-year provision where the benefit is lower; and that the Rule of 50 would cost about the same for many plans as the other two—but it would be more expensive in companies whose workers have older average entry ages.

The Winkelvoss study also dispels some of the fog surrounding the answer to the question, "Cost to whom?"

All of us know that, in devising a pension program, C plus E must equal B—contributions plus earnings must equal benefits. Experience shows that hardship is not far off when Contributions plus Earnings equal less than Benefits.

To devise a funding formula, or a vesting formula, projections must be made of benefit costs; and also projections of the contributions needed to pay for those benefits, based upon certain assumptions.

If the estimates are borne out by subsequent events, or if the estimates prove to be on the conservative side, then the plan has a good chance of meeting its benefit payments. On the other hand, if events deviate from the assumptions, the funding schedule may be inadequate.

Professor Winkelvoss points out that liberalized vesting properly is regarded as an addition to the benefit side. Now, C plus E must equal B plus V; contributions plus earnings must equal benefits plus vesting.

One way to keep the balance would be to make B smaller; that is, lower benefits.

Or one might balance the equation by liberalizing the assumptions, which would suppose that E is bigger than previously assumed. If it turns out that earnings are not bigger—well, we will have postponed worrying about that for a few years—but only a few years.

A third way would be an increase in the contribution level. In plans paid for by employers, this translates almost surely into higher consumer prices.

Nobody can predict which course would be followed by companies faced with a need to afford better vesting. A look at general practices, however, affords a clue.

First, to provide a hedge against the unexpected, actuaries tend to use conservative assumptions.

Second, most companies gear pension benefits to the amount they can contribute to the plan. In these cases, the actuary starts with that amount; and he computes the benefits which can be expected and the funding formula that will be necessary, using the population characteristics of the plan together with various assumptions.

If the patterns do not prevail as he forecasts, it is to be expected that the cost adjustment will be made either in the contributions or the benefits; but, because the contribution level is generally inflexible, or nearly so, we can more reasonably expect adjustments in benefits.

All this adds up to an over-simplification: Added costs will be paid either by the pension plan beneficiaries or the public.

TERMINATION INSURANCE

Both the Williams-Javits bill in the Senate and one of the Dent bills in the House have provisions for pension plan termination insurance.

They are looking for a way to prevent future occurrences such as the Studebaker pension program, which ended with the demise of Studebaker manufacturing in South Bend in the early Sixties. In order to prevent repetitions of that unhappy event, they would

have all pension plans which are supported by contributions from private companies pay premiums into a government-controlled insurance fund.

The Studebaker Company was regarded as the weakest of the auto manufacturers in the late '40's, when the United Auto Workers negotiated with the management for a pension plan. The agreement was made in the hope that times would get better, but the company's condition got worse, instead. This did not prevent the union from demanding more generous benefits.

Considering that the pension fund had been in existence for only 14 years, it paid out remarkably well.

At the same time, however, there were thousands of pension plans, both large and small, which started in '50's in good condition and got better. They, too, were new. They, too, were building up their reserves.

The advocates of termination insurance would tap these healthy, growing pension funds in order to make the Studebakers of the business world healthy, as far as their retirement programs are concerned.

Why?

Why should a company with a well-funded pension program pay for insurance it doesn't need? Why pay insurance premiums for the benefit of other pension funds?

In the Studebaker case, the United Auto Workers knew when it negotiated the pension agreement that it was shaky. I suspect that termination insurance would encourage unions to press harder for a pension agreement in the expectation that its workers could collect, come what may.

This, I submit, would increase the cost of this insurance, a cost which would be paid, in the long run, by the people who are doing things right.

Some have argued that there is almost no difference between bank insurance under the FDIC and termination insurance. That contention won't stand much scrutiny—not unless our pension insurance corporation is going to control pension benefits as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation controls the risk that it insures.

During our hearings, we learned of a Seattle paper mill which had two million dollars in its pension fund. Benefits were set at \$4.75 per month for each year of service. Then there was a strike, which was settled, in part, by raising that pension rate to \$9 per month. When the company announced it was about to cease operations, the result was predictable. There were a lot of early retirements, and there was an early depletion of the pension fund.

The FDIC has never had to insure a bank against a hazard such as that.

If there had been termination insurance, I suspect that there never would have been a strike at that mill. Knowing that it would be bailed out, the management would have yielded on the level of benefits almost automatically; the fund would have gone broke; the termination insurance plan would have made up the deficit.

Then it would have raised the premiums for the remaining pension plans.

I trust I have made clear to you some of the reasons why I am not eager to have Congress pass a law containing a termination insurance section.

I picked up another interesting thought at our hearings. James Curtis, a former president of this Association and a prominent West Coast actuary, suggests modifying the usual formula for distributing funds when a plan terminates. Typically, we tend to give first priority to those already retired; next to those with the right of early retirement; third, to those with vested rights; and finally (if there is anything left) to other participants.

Curtis would have all beneficiaries and workers share equally—by law.

I am not sure this is the answer to the termination problem, but it does seem that the typical termination schedule lacks

equity—and Jim Curtis' suggestion is intriguing.

Time and again in our hearings, we have heard it said that a worker's best guarantee of getting his pension lies not in termination insurance, but rather in a good funding program.

FUNDING

Proper funding not only is a form of termination insurance, but it has the delightful advantage that there is no premium to pay.

As a matter of fact, money in the pension trust fund earns money and this makes possible larger retirement benefits or a lower level of company contributions.

I believe a law requiring a certain minimum level of funding would be beneficial and at a moderate cost.

Mostly, in talking about funding, I am talking about an upward adjustment—and how quickly must the employer bring the reserves into balance with the new requirements.

There are, of course, some pension programs which are not funded or are only partly funded; and presumably the same provision which would bear on added benefits could be applied to this type of unfunded liability. Daniel F. McGinn, another West Coast actuary, told our committee that an unfunded liability might be amortized over, perhaps, 30 years and still give the worker reasonable assurance that, when he is ready to retire, his pension will be ready for him.

Others have spoken well of a 40-year amortization. Either arrangement seems all right to me, provided the amortization plan be reviewed every two or three years. If a deficiency were to show up in one of these reviews, it could be easily rectified.

Multi-employer plans, of course, would present some different problems; a fact which needs to be taken into account in any funding arrangement which may be required.

Let me turn for a moment to public pension plans. I have long opposed requiring them to be funded, but I am weakening. A recent suit filed in my home state of Illinois has been an eye opener. The Illinois Teachers' Association has demanded that the state be required to fund the state teachers' pension plan. The Illinois Attorney General, in replying, asked the court to order a 50-year amortization, and estimated the unfunded liability at two billion dollars.

When we Illinois taxpayers are two billion dollars in the hole, I agree that it's time to start climbing out.

PORTABILITY

Some pension programs provide a limited portability with no trouble at all; and these are the multi-employer programs. Other employers, however, support pension plans in order to hold their people. They want experienced and skilled workers with the company; and the prospect of a good pension can act as a deterrent to worker mobility.

The Williams-Javits bill would provide for portability. It is voluntary—or perhaps it more properly can be said that it appears to be voluntary. It would have the Secretary of Labor set up a system of individual accounts for those who want them.

If this were written into law, the day would not be far off when portability would become a common subject for collective bargaining, and at that point, the voluntary aspect fades from view.

This section of the Williams-Javits bill has another defect, as I see it; and a puzzling one. It would require that these portable funds be kept in depositories insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Do they have in mind any particular banks? Any particular savings and loan associations? If this were to become law, even Wright Patman might want to start a bank investment portfolio.

One of the Dent bills has a portability re-

quirement which is not voluntary—a compulsory portability.

Either of these portability schemes would give the departing employee a prior claim on the pension fund—priority over that of the worker who stays with the firm until he reaches retirement age. The departing worker would be assured of his benefits, while the worker who stays on the job might get his full pension or might have to settle for some fraction of it. A law such as either of these would compel prudent pension trustees to keep larger amounts of cash on hand, and that probably would reduce the investment return.

I question the workability of these provisions, and I expect they would be expensive—costly far beyond the advantages they would afford.

A point which needs to be kept in mind in this connection: Some witnesses have mentioned that, as the level of vesting rises, the need for portability lessens; and the only cost to be paid is that of vesting.

Another of the Dent proposals would have the employer reporting to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare when a worker leaves the company. This report would show the pension benefits that worker has accumulated—benefits which would be awaiting him upon retirement.

Think for a moment how many people leave their jobs every day. The employers wouldn't have to report all of them to HEW, of course, because only about half of the nation's employees in private industry are working toward pensions. But the paper work involved here would be formidable, to say the least.

I can conceive of some modifications of this scheme which would enable the departing employee to keep track of his vested benefits so he could claim them when the time comes to retire.

The Administration has come forward with a proposal which I look upon favorably. It would encourage voluntary retirement security. It would afford tax incentives for retirement savings and, in that regard, might be called an extension of the Keogh Plan. It would be another form of portability and, while it has some of the disadvantages of other proposals, it would be less costly, simpler, and capable of being tailored to individual cases.

When one considers the immense diversity of pension programs, it is hard to imagine a worker's transfer from one plan to another without somebody getting hurt. The great variety of assets, liabilities, assumptions, fundings, purposes—yes, and hopes—of these programs make the job of doing justice to a departing employee almost impossible, and doing justice to the pension fund he leaves behind him is equally hard.

To me, a portability law, as suggested by Williams and Javits, or by Dent, would cost a lot more in frustration and controversy, in litigation and red tape, than it would be worth in richer retirement and peace of mind.

YOU CAN'T EAT YOUR CAKE

Something frequently overlooked in all the talk about improving our pension plans is the purpose for which the plans were started.

Workers and their spokesmen made a conscious decision many years ago to move away from money-purchase plans. By their very nature, these plans provide early vesting, and full funding, and probability. There was only one trouble—the pension benefits were meager.

The workers decided they preferred bigger pensions, so they turned to the system we now have—defined benefits which mean the possibility of greater returns to the person who qualifies for a pension. They have foregone negotiating for vesting—or, at least, for portability and insurance—knowing that funds diverted for these attractions could not be used to pay benefits.

It's a gamble.

If a worker leaves his job before he has

vested rights, or if he dies before his benefits have equalled the contributions made in his behalf, what he loses is available to pay greater benefits to somebody else.

Now, the unions are trying to tell us that their members ought to be able to eat their cake and have it too. Senator Williams, and Senator Javits, and Congressman Dent, say, in effect, that this can be done.

But it can't.

There is no law we can pass that will magically produce the money needed to provide these extras. There must be trade-offs.

CLOSING

I have been more than pleased with our subcommittee's study so far, and with our hearings during the winter and spring. I think I see signs that Chairman Dent has moved a little closer to my cautious position; and I am sure I have moved a little closer to his belief that private pension plans can do a better job than they have done in the past—and they've accomplished a lot.

All these pension plans, numbering in the thousands, combine in my opinion to make one of the finest contributions that American business has provided for the workers whose service has done so much to make business profitable.

Everybody needs something to worry about, but not too much.

People over 65 have enough aches and pains to keep their quota of anxieties filled.

I want to encourage more companies to set up pension programs so that more men and women at retirement age will have only their health problems to worry about—so that they'll be relieved of money worries.

I believe it is possible that we can pass a law to enhance their hopes and to improve their prospects. Such a law is possible, but it must be devised with great care.

I am reminded of the carpenter's advice to his apprentice: Measure twice before you saw once.

MR. DILLON GRAHAM RETIRES

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. FULTON, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my very best wishes to Mr. Dillon Graham, somewhat of a pleasant fixture in the U.S. House of Representatives, who retires tomorrow after 44 years service as a newsman with the Associated Press.

Some 25 years of this time has been spent right here at the Capitol as correspondent for the Associated Press.

Mr. Graham has earned a deserved reputation as a conscientious, accurate, and fair reporter. Always a friend of the House he has, nevertheless, never hesitated to play his stories straight and let the facts speak for themselves, the high watermark of integrity in any reporter.

Best wishes to Mr. Graham and his wife, Gigi, for many, many happy years of retirement.

WHAT IS COMMUNISM?—LESSON I

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today and each subsequent Wednesday I

shall include in the RECORD a step-by-step analysis and discussion of a subject of utmost importance to every American citizen. It shall not be my purpose to incite or inflame, but rather to educate. I seek not to persecute nor to confuse, but rather to remove the confusion, the emotion, and the extremism that have heretofore clouded the truth. In short, I seek to examine communism—what it is as an ideology and political system.

Everyone has an opinion about communism, but is that opinion based upon fact or hearsay? What is communism? Would your definition coincide with the answer given by Leonid Brezhnev, or Khrushchev, or Lenin? The time has come, then, to bring to an end the stereotypes and clichés, and to seek a meaningful, logical, and unemotional comprehension of communism—and that shall be the purpose of this series which begins today.

I

Communism is first and foremost, communism is a systemic whole, made up of its various parts—ideological, political, social, economic, et cetera. Communism might be compared to a complete football game; while its various parts might be compared to the players, timekeepers, referees, et cetera, of the football game. A clear realization of this point is absolutely essential to a meaningful understanding of communism.

A concentration of attention on or the ignoring of one or more aspects would create a distorted image of the whole system. In essence, the understanding of the whole can only be derived from an understanding of each of the parts. An understanding of one or more of the parts may not necessarily lead to an understanding of the whole. A good understanding of the parts and their relationship to the whole will point out the ambiguities and inconsistencies between Communist theory and practice.

Communism as an ideology stresses: Marxism-Leninism as the primary interpreter of values. Morality is guided and inculcated by the Communist Party—the vanguard—and is determined by whatever serves the survival and growth of communism.

Although Marx stated—

Religion is the sight of the oppressed creature, the heart of the heartless world, just as it is the spirit of the spiritless situation. It is the opium of the people.

Communism is in essence an atheistic religion. Communism has its "missionaries" and "evangelists" in the form of Communist Parties and organizations which can be found in almost every country, the purpose being to promote the Communist doctrine, that is, to gain and hold power. In theory, the ultimate goal is to achieve a completely classless society of workers where all private property—and therefore advantage—is abolished.

Communism as an ideology is composed of the following important elements:

The dialectic. An idea espoused by Friedrich Hegel to explain the process of change whereby an entity passes over into and is preserved and fulfilled by its opposite. Hegel applied his concept to the

development of ideas—that is, an existing idea—thesis—gives rise to an opposing idea—antithesis—from which comes a new idea which is a combination of the first two elements—synthesis. The synthesis becomes the new thesis and the process starts all over again. Hegel theorized that this process would continue ad infinitum. Marx borrowed the dialectic theory, but unlike Hegel who applied the concept to ideas, Marx applied it to institutions. Marx used the dialectic to explain the history of mankind—he said feudalism gave way to mercantilism, which gave way to capitalism, et cetera. Unlike Hegel, Marx theorized that this process would ultimately stop when mankind arrived at its ultimate destination—communism—which would be the perfect, static society.

Economic materialism. Also known as economic determinism, Marx believed that only material things were important to the evolutionary development of mankind. Morals and ethics could not be regarded as important factors. In essence, changes in production would change class structure and produce new ideologies. Marx combined his materialistic philosophy with the Hegelian dialectic method to thus explain the advance of history toward communism.

Labor theory of value. Borrowing from the anarchist Proudhon, Marx embraced the concept that all value is created by labor—the capitalist steals the surplus as "profit."

The class struggle. Marx also theorized that the history of all societies has been a struggle of the classes. He reasoned that capitalism has reduced society to only two classes: bourgeoisie, capitalists, and proletariat workers.

RETIRES AFTER 44 YEARS OF SERVICE WITH ASSOCIATED PRESS

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow one of Washington's most distinguished newsmen, Mr. Dillon Graham, will retire after some 44 years of service with the Associated Press. For the past 25 years he has covered the legislative branch of our Government with integrity, courtesy, dedication, and, above all, fairness.

In recent months much has been said about "slanted" and "biased" reporting. But, in the years I have known Dillon Graham, I can honestly say that he has always exemplified in the very strictest sense what it means to be an objective, responsible newsman—and an uncommon gentleman as well.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join with Dillon's family, friends, and many colleagues in wishing him the very best in his retirement years.

MILITARY WASTE IS SHOCKING

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, a letter from one of my constituents who served as a medic in South Vietnam during our military withdrawal brought to my attention some shocking news about the destruction of medical supplies.

The story he told involved the closing down of several dispensaries, during which time the medical supplies stored therein were destroyed apparently due to the fact that the medical depot refused to take back any supplies other than machinery. Rather than give the supplies to the South Vietnamese, based on the fear that they would end up on the black market, the military ordered them to be burned.

I could continue to vent my wrath on this ridiculous situation, but one sentence from my constituent's letter stands out as an eloquent and complete appraisal of my feelings:

I really think by this type of wasteful destruction we are also destroying tax dollars and insulting the integrity of the people of America as well as to the starving and underprivileged people of many of the underdeveloped countries.

I am in complete agreement with this young man, and intend to send his letter, and my remarks to the Government Accounting Office for their use in the hope that it will spark an investigation into this matter. For the benefit of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I include this man's letter to be printed in its entirety following my remarks.

The letter follows:

DALY CITY, CALIF.

DEAR SIR: I was recently discharged from the Army in August of 1972, and I am now writing you concerning the thousands and thousands of dollars, "tax dollars," that I have seen literally wasted while serving in the Republic of Vietnam. The really sad part about this is that it could have been totally avoided.

I was a medic during my tour of duty in Vietnam and due to President Nixon's withdrawal program I was subject to moving from one unit to another quite frequently. In less than 9 months I had helped close down 7 dispensaries during stand-down procedures. All those dispensaries received medical supplies from 32nd Medical Depot in Long Binh. During stand-down of all these dispensaries 32nd Medical Depot would refuse to take back any medical supplies outside of Machinery that a dispensary had. Since all the units didn't have the authority to give excessive stored medications to the Vietnamese because of the black market, they had only one other alternative and that was to destroy them. So since 32nd Depot refused to take back and reallocate supplies, thousands of dollars of medication went up in smoke. Only once did we give away these medications for proper use and that is when I was with 185th Medical Detachment we gave our left over medications to a Korean Hospital in Vung Tau.

It is really aggravating to know that there are many people in the United States and in the world today who are paying marked-up prices for drugs today or are doing without them because of their inability to afford them, and we are here literally destroying drugs and depriving people of them simply because a medical supply depot refuses to do

the excessive work in taking the supplies back.

My fiancée paid \$6.50 for 10 erythrocine tablets (an antibiotic) the other day and I can remember destroying several thousand of them.

I really think by this type of wasteful destruction we are also destroying tax dollars and insulting the integrity of the people of America as well as to the starving and underprivileged people of many of the underdeveloped countries.

If the Army can not make a better suggestion as to how to make better use of the tax dollars allotted to them concerning the disposition of medical supplies, I can assert two propositions of my own. One, widely distribute un-used drugs to the people of the world who really need them or, two, re-sell them at government fixed prices to the people back in America, thus providing more governmental funds and a chance to lower the tax dollar.

Sir, I wish to thank you sincerely for taking the time to read my letter and I would appreciate your cooperation in trying to conserve the tax dollar.

Yours truly,

CHARLES W. TIBBOTS.

CALIFORNIA BUILT HOMES
TOKYO-BOUND

HON. ANDREW J. HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I have been told by a practiced traveler in the Pacific that the knowledgeable and informed man of that area holds in high esteem three worldly treasures: A Japanese wife, a Chinese cook, and an American house. To some, this might seem slightly less than the end goal for a good and pleasant life for all. But it is interesting to see that in housing the American holds a position comparable to the cuisine of China.

As we approach the new era where the challenge for export competition becomes an imperative in the search for a better balanced economy, we should certainly seek to market this highly regarded technology—housing.

I am proud to announce, Mr. Speaker, that a small and newly formed corporation in my 39th District of California has recently launched a vigorous effort to impact the Japanese housing market, and will also seek to expand to other major market areas of the world in partnership with the Mitsubishi Corp.

It is particularly pleasing to point out the success of this local company, as it is an example of an aggressive, positive response to the challenge in the export-import battle of international trade.

We must do more of this sort of dynamic and active responding to the market penetrations accomplished by our trading partners. We have not bent our industrial efforts toward exporting, nor have we forged strong national policies to support such efforts. We must do both.

It should be of some interest to note the basic component of the houses being exported is a self-supported panel of a gypsum compound which uses a minimum of the now expensive and hard to get lumber. Further, the compound provides side benefits because it has qualities

for fire prevention, noise abatement, and energy conservation.

In Japan, where panel construction is centuries old, such qualities, added to a familiar mode of construction, are extremely welcome. It seems likely that conditions in our own country may make this component highly attractive, too.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to salute an enterprise in my district, which has scored a major impact on the international market, while also holding high potential for a major contribution to the construction of much-needed housing in the United States.

I insert the attached article from the Santa Ana Register:

COUNTY-BUILT HOMES TOKYO-BOUND—IRVINE-BASED FIRMS, MITSUBISHI CORP. AS PARTNERS

(By Anthony Gentle)

"It will be displayed on a lot in downtown Tokyo where millions can see it. The exposure is fantastic."

Chairman W. Max Binswanger of Irvine-based Insulation Systems, Inc. could hardly contain his enthusiasm as he spoke of a licensing arrangement with Mitsubishi International Corp., Japan, one of the world's industrial giants.

What's Binswanger so enthused about? It's a house—made in Orange County—which he hopes will open the door to the vast Japanese market.

Within the next few weeks three complete houses, developed and marketed by subsidiary Plastonium International, will be erected and shown in and near Tokyo. The downtown model will be on a leased lot valued at \$16 million, Binswanger said.

Everything that goes to build a fully integrated 3-bedroom, 2-bath, 1400 sq. ft. house was shipped some weeks ago in a package container to Japan from the port of Los Angeles.

A first for Orange County's export trade business, the shipment included roof, trusses, plumbing, appliances, drapes, carpets, and all other needed items, to the last nail—all made in California. Door frames, walls, sidings, windows were pre-cut and measured on metric scale for easy on-site assembly.

The houses, ready for move-in and including a garage, will be field erected and completed in just nine days, Binswanger said.

The mood is bright at Insulation Systems. The stakes are high—in the millions of dollars, the chairman indicated.

Binswanger contends that his company, supported by the international marketing deal with well-financed Mitsubishi and its extensive dealer network resources, will be embarked on a dynamic world-wide course in the housing business.

This affiliation with a big money Japanese firm is a real plum for a small, but growing Orange County firm. "We feel we have one of the biggest international businesses as a partner," Binswanger said.

PLASTONIUM KEY TO MART

Main component of the firm's panel framing system is a core material, named Plastonium (registered trademark) which is highly fire and sound resistant. The material is sandwiched either between wood or metal skins. Exclusively developed by Insulation Systems, the Plastonium core the past few years had been used only for fire doors and noise-deadening partitions. Now it has been developed as the core material for a fully structural panel housing system which, Binswanger said, will cut housing cost considerably, while providing more, not less, in many areas.

What is Plastonium? It's a gypsum-based resin compound which as a slurry is treated to harden into a cast form. From its solid state it is easily cut to size. Light weight,

Plastonium passed heat tests as high as 1,000 degrees, Binswanger said. Manufacturers have been using the core material for fire doors and partitions in hospitals, apartments, government and office buildings and theaters.

Although manufacturing of the structural panels will be accomplished in Japan, the Plastonium core shipments will mean a very high money return to Orange County, Binswanger predicted.

Insulation Systems is the manufacturing and housing system parent company of two other affiliated companies, Plastonium Systems and Plastonium International. Plastonium Systems handles the domestic market while Plastonium International is the worldwide marketing agent. All offices are located in the Irvine Industrial Complex.

In addition, the Orange County firm owns Insulation Systems Research and Development Laboratory in Fountain Valley which develops new applications and product lines, including special programs for the U.S. government which Binswanger said is "classified."

OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, often in recent years we have become aware of many problems in manpower programs. But today I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to the outstanding performance of SER, Jobs for Progress, Inc., and to announce the observance of SER Week June 3 to June 10. Similar proclamations of support and recognition of SER are being issued in the 14 States where SER is located by Governors, mayors, county officials, and Congressmen.

During this week, citizens, the business community and elected officials will pay tribute to SER, the only national manpower program designed to serve the needs of the disadvantaged Spanish-speaking citizens of our country.

For the record, I would like to commend Ricardo Zazueta, national director of SER, for his farsighted and dedicated leadership of SER.

During his administration, SER has not only expanded in the number and types of programs which SER provides to the Spanish-speaking, but as important, more efficient and effective allocation of resources and manpower within SER has resulted in a substantial drop in the cost per client served. In other words, SER has far exceeded all contractual obligations, some by as much as 112 percent above specifications. A trusted and firm rapport with the Spanish-speaking community indicates SER's success in its unique bicultural and bilingual approach. Mr. Zazueta has indeed provided enlightened and innovative leadership which has inspired the entire SER organization.

SER came into existence through the efforts of individuals in two great Spanish-speaking organizations—the American G.I. Forum, and the League of United Latin American Citizens—LULAC.

Members of these two organizations,

realizing the desperate need for manpower services for the Spanish-speaking, began voluntary job placement centers in Washington, D.C., Houston, and Corpus Christi, Tex.

In 1966, SER funded in a small way from private sources, the Office of Economic Opportunity—OEO—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Labor, began to provide skills training and related bilingual and bicultural services to Spanish-speaking Americans of the Southwest.

As a national effort for Spanish-speaking Americans, SER has come a long way since 1966. At that time, Department of Defense officials noticed that not many chicanos were applying for jobs in plants with Government contracts. They suggested to LULAC and G.I. Forum that they let the Mexican American community know that jobs were available and that Government contractors had a legal obligation to provide equal employment opportunity.

The first SER offices, like those of today, were located in the heart of the barrios. Manned by bilingual volunteers, these offices were soon swamped with job applicants.

One notable result of this small-scale effort was a decision by the Manpower Administration and the Office of Economic Opportunity to fund SER jointly as an experimental and demonstration project. Still small in scale—funding was about \$400,000 over a period of 2 years—SER began serving a larger geographic area. Moreover, SER was no longer just a volunteer placement effort, it was now in the manpower business—a program planner, administrator, recruiter, and counselor for low-income people.

SER's success as an experimental project led to its growth and present status as a major effort to draw the Spanish-speaking into the Nation's employment mainstream. It has become, as one chicanero described SER in its early days, "a dynamic engine of change" for Spanish-speaking people.

SER now has developed a significant amount of expertise in manpower. It has blended its intimate knowledge of the language, culture, and outlook of people in low-income Spanish-speaking communities with manpower program technology and it has discovered what works in the barrios, what does not work, and why.

Its role is not an easy one. As a bridge between two cultures—the Anglo and the Spanish—SER is in the middle.

Today, SER is a dynamic organization that expanded beyond its original territory to meet the needs of people in cities such as Gary, Ind., and Racine, Wis., among others.

In addition to skills training through a variety of educational institutions and on-the-job training, SER provides the enrollee with supportive services to insure firm placement in a meaningful job.

SER is also conducting successful experimental programs such as Project Detour, a program for young first offenders, offering an alternative to court backlogs and imprisonment. Another innovative program is the SER Residential

Youth Center in San Jose, Calif. Here an environment marked by drugs, hopelessness and crime is being replaced by a living situation which allows individual potential to flourish. These are just samples of the many innovative programs being developed to provide creative solutions to persistent problems unique to the Spanish speaking.

The purpose of SER is to help build a better America by breaking the barriers of traditional employment patterns and by helping business and industry to understand that Spanish-speaking people are a valuable resource.

A typical SER program operates in three functional areas: intake and counseling; education and training; and job development.

The initial part of the program is the selection of the people who can be most helped by the particular program and the referral of as many others as may be helped to the appropriate agency. Each enrollee is then assessed and counseled to determine his vocational goals and how they can be achieved. This results in an individual employment development plan for each enrollee detailing his ultimate employment goal and the various steps leading to its fulfillment.

Education and training provide the enrollee with the basic knowledge necessary to communicate with his employer and the basic skill necessary to perform his job. A variety of academic and vocational training courses are offered at SER according to the educational situation and the potential labor market in the individual community. The academic courses include job preparation, English as a second language, adult basic education, and advanced adult education. Vocational courses vary from site to site because of different local labor requirements, but often include courses such as licensed vocational nurse training, secretary-stenographer training, auto mechanic, keypunch operator training and electronics assembly training.

Job development is essentially a placement service that attempts to obtain long-range commitments from employers. It differs from usual placement in that the jobs are sought at the time the enrollee begins training and are not filled until the enrollee completes training which may not be until months later. A second type of job development involves cooperation between the local program and the employer to provide on-the-job training for enrollees. In this case, part of the cost of job training is borne by the employer and part by SER.

A listing of the areas where SER has manpower training sites follows:

SITES

Arizona—Glendale/Phoenix, Tucson, and Yuma.

California—El Centro/Calexico, Contra Costa, East Los Angeles, Fresno, West Los Angeles, National City/San Diego, Norwalk, San Francisco, San Jose, San Bernardino, and Santa Ana.

Colorado—Colorado Springs, Denver, and Pueblo.

Illinois—Chicago.

Indiana—Gary.

Kansas—Topeka.

Michigan—Detroit.

Nevada—Las Vegas.

Nebraska—Scottsbluff.

New Mexico—Albuquerque, Las Cruces, and Santa Fe.

Texas—Austin, Brownsville, Corpus Christi, Dallas, El Paso, Galveston, Houston, Lubbock, McAllen, and San Antonio.

Utah—Salt Lake City.

Washington—Seattle.

Wisconsin—Milwaukee/Racine.

PERFORMANCE

Program statistics confirm that SER is the most effective and most efficient national manpower program in the United States. [All data used in discussing performance is obtained from the U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration Management Information Report, Office of Financial and Management Information System.]

INTAKE

During fiscal year 1972, 35,043 persons applied for and were qualified for SER services. Of this number of people, SER was only able to serve 11,163 and because of lack of resources, 23,880 people were turned away.

Of the 11,163 people served, 5,305 were trained; 3,478 were directly placed without training on full-time, permanent, and meaningful jobs and 2,380 received supportive services. The number trained exceeds SER's contractual obligation to Department of Labor of 3,905 trainees by 1,400 people. This demonstrates SER's commitment to efficiently serve the Spanish-speaking community beyond what is required in the contract.

TRAINEE PROFILE

SER enrollees come from a broad cross-section of the disadvantaged and this provides evidence that SER is representing and serving the community. SER is one of the few manpower programs which can and does successfully serve the following traditionally difficult clients:

(In percent)

Spanish-speaking	90
Head of household	63
Female	42
High school dropout	57
Elementary school dropout	11
Welfare recipient	12
Monolingual	8

QUALITY OF PLACEMENT

Out of every 100 enrollees who are placed on a job, 82 are placed on jobs for which they are specifically trained. The average starting wage for the SER placement is \$2.47 per hour, well above the Federal minimum of \$1.60 per hour. It is of significant interest to point out that the average wage of all enrollees prior to entering SER was only \$0.95 per hour. This means that SER trainees are earning \$3,074 per year more than before.

TRAINING

SER is providing quality training to the enrollee. SER is operating at 101 percent of planned capacity demonstrating excellent planning and management on the part of the local project directors and their staffs. A mere 12 percent of the trainees are holding. Only 16 percent of the trainees terminated from the program early, as computed from total enrollment.

RETENTION AND PLACEMENT

SER is placing 79 out of every 100 people trained. This is accomplished by

careful assessment, counseling, education, training, and followup of trainees.

Retention statistics were: One month after placement, 88 percent were still working; after 6 months, 64 percent were still working.

The reasons for these successes in today's tight and competitive job market are varied. One reason is that SER continues counseling and other supportive help during training, then finds jobs for its graduates. Once at work these persons are followed up by SER counselors at regular intervals for a year. During these follow-ups, counselors help to iron out problems that might hurt a worker's chances of staying on the job.

One very important factor is that SER attempts to maintain a cooperative and flexible relationship with employers. Basically, SER serves the employer by providing him with qualified workers, in so doing SER also serves the unskilled and unemployed.

Employers in many instances help local SER's in developing certain training courses and in turn, SER trains enrollees to meet specific employer's requirements for jobs. Once a good working relationship is established between a local SER and the business community, an exchange of expertise and information continues that results in a relationship of mutual trust and confidence.

Many of SER's placements were in new employment areas which previously have been traditionally closed to the Spanish-speaking. SER's excellent reputation with business and industry has made SER a direct and highly functional link from business and industry to a vast reservoir of talent and service. At the same time, the unskilled and unemployed are linked to breakthrough jobs in industry and business which they would not have otherwise been able to train and qualify for.

COST

One of SER's notable achievements is the cost per trainee figure of \$1,341. For every \$1 spent on an enrollee, the return to the community, in the form of increased earnings is \$1.24.

I am sure that my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD strongly concur in my support and recognition of SER and in the observance of SER Week, June 3 to June 10.

SOUTHBURY, CONN.

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, a full 300 years ago, over a century before the birth of this Nation, a small band of 16 families journeyed by raft and boat up the Housatonic River in the colony of Connecticut. Led by the Reverend Zachariah Walker, they went from Stratford in the south to Pomperaug Plantation farther to the north in the wilderness known as Ancient Woodbury.

This small group of settlers had split with the Congregational Church in Stratford, and buying the plantation

from the friendly Pootatuck Indians had set out to start a new and independent life.

Legend has it that the settlers missed the turn for the Pomperaug River and by mistake continued up the Housatonic to the Shepaug River and Roxbury Falls. As a result, they had to backtrack for 2 days before reaching the large white oak tree. There they camped and began the settlement of Southbury, Conn.

This week the residents and friends of Southbury are engaged in the gala celebration of that town's tercentennial, a true milestone in the long and distinguished history of a great Connecticut town in the Sixth District.

Over the years Southbury residents have built on the sturdy foundations provided for them by their colonial forebears. Today, the people of Southbury display the industry and creative vigor which is a heritage from those early settlers.

Reverend Walker and his followers took to tilling the soil as their first primary occupation, and indeed farming continues to be very much a part of Southbury. Through the years, the town has retained the country charm of its expansive New England landscape, and the solid architecture of colonial days.

Abundant water power brought light industry to the region in earlier times, but as more versatile means of needed energy were utilized, industry in Southbury diminished.

Southbury residents have shown a reverence for Old New England concepts of citizens in government as attested to by their involvement in numerous commissions and boards, which direct local affairs under the aegis of the traditional town meeting and selectmen form of government. The townspeople contribute to a bedrock sense of community through their many and varied social and church related activities. The cultural heritage of the area has been preserved through a respect for the arts that has been manifested in preservation of colonial crafts and the development of craftsmen of skill and renown.

Southbury has become a haven in recent years for those who work in nearby cities but prefer life in a more peaceful country-like setting. The town's population of nearly 10,000 is almost 10 times what it was at the turn of the century.

Southbury also serves as the site of the Southbury Training School, a State-run facility for the rehabilitation of the mentally retarded and Heritage Village, a 1,000-acre planned adult residential community.

Yes, the people of Southbury have always been forward looking individuals. At the same time, they have had a keen understanding and a particular reverence for the traditions of the past. This is clear in their continuing efforts to preserve the priceless heritage of the past which has been a prolog to new achievement and endeavors. It is especially evident in the marvelous celebration they have organized to commemorate Southbury's 300th birthday.

I would like to take this opportunity to wish Southbury and its residents a continuation of unparalleled accomplish-

ment befitting the town's motto "Unica, Unique," the one and the only.

WATERGATE: TOWARD A TRUE UNDERSTANDING

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration, one could say, is not best characterized by its honesty or respect for the American people.

This is clearly symbolized by the Watergate mess. But it is even better symbolized by the President's fiscal policies and the wholesale slaughter of the war on poverty.

Vernon Jordan, the executive director of the National Urban League, dealt with this recently in his syndicated column. I place this column in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues.

TO BE EQUAL

(By Vernon E. Jordan, Jr.)

The Watergate scandal is one that has rocked the very foundations of our society. It has paralyzed the government, damaged relations with other countries, and called into question the very credibility of our political institutions.

But I fear that the concentration on who did what to whom and why may obscure some of the deeper meanings of this affair.

For example, Watergate can be seen as a symbol of a view of our society and the political process that is founded on suspicion and mistrust. In the Watergate affair, men in high places apparently believed that the ends justified the means, even when those means were illegal. It stands for the very opposite of the open society we have been taught is the goal of a democracy.

OTHER EVENTS LACK CREDIBILITY

If Watergate is symptomatic of such a distrustful view of society, then its ultimate importance might be in examining some other recent events that share that discredited view.

The systematic dismantling of social programs, the disengagement of the government from the war on poverty, the stress on what has been called "law and order," and other examples of indifference and even antagonism to the needs of poor people and minorities share with Watergate a mistrust of the masses of people and of their democratic institutions.

Coupling Watergate and the budget cuts may seem strange to some, but they are both indicative of a concern for ends without consideration of the means. They are both—in the flagrant abuse of power as well as in heartlessness towards the poor—subversive of a free and open society.

FREE EXCHANGE OF IDEAS NECESSARY

Such a free society must be one in which contending political ideas may freely circulate without harassment, and one in which individuals, families and minority groups are not penalized by poverty and discrimination.

While Watergate was dominating the headlines, a Senate report said that some twelve million Americans are still malnourished and indicated that their numbers may increase because of the rise in food prices. To me, this is as much of a scandal as Watergate. And neglecting those hungry twelve million is part of the mind-set that can tolerate bugging, stealing files, and other actions that undermine democracy.

Everyone seems to agree that the Water-

gate disclosures have severely damaged the country, but too few people also realize that the country is damaged if it rolls back the social reforms of the 1960s. Scandals and investigations make good headlines, hunger and want do not.

Long after the Watergate mess fades into the history books, it will be seen that the failure of our time was not in its lapses of political morality, but in its failure to do something about the pervasive social and racial conflicts that divide this society.

It should be remembered that Watergate is a "white folks' mess," not because black people are innately better or are incapable of abusing power, but because no blacks were part of the federal and party hierarchy. Thus, even in this, blacks are notable by their exclusion. To abuse responsibilities, one must first be in a responsible position.

I hope the lessons of Watergate will be learned—and quickly. Already there seems to be a new awareness of the importance of a free press, of the basic strength of the democratic institutions that exposed the scandal, and of the need for a more open government.

ENLIGHTENED ATTITUDE DESIRABLE

It is my hope that this will be reflected further in a new, more enlightened attitude toward black Americans by the Administration, and by a revised view of the basic social programs it planned to end.

Watergate is being fully exposed. Now it's time to turn the spotlight on the unmet needs and unfulfilled dreams of America's poor and its minorities.

TORNAPOPOWER

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, whilst breezing through the appendix of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an item inserted by the junior Senator from Alaska favoring windpower caught my eye. For only \$1,800, a man up in Maine built a windpower machine and is selling people plans for the thing. Then a few pages beyond the Senator inserted another article about a \$400 windpower machine built by another chap. Somehow that all reminded me that some people for some reason have somewhat irreverently sometimes referred to the appendix as the Cave of the Winds.

That, of course, is a thought totally unconnected with the Senator's insertions other than by random association. The Senator is troubled by impending power shortages as we all are. In the same issue of the appendix he also gave a boost to garbagepower in an article "Heat Your House With Garbage" and to trashpower in articles discussing refuse as a supplementary fuel.

Some people may take such exotic suggestions as these lightly. The fact is that they may not be doing so soon when energy shortages commence to impose very real burdens on the American public.

In a complex, energy dependent society such as ours man has only a marginal capability even for survival if he lacks to a substantial degree the energy he customarily consumes to support his way of life. The weakest members of society, the very old and the very young, would go first. Then others would follow.

Hopefully we can avoid energy short-

ages which reflect themselves in the mortality tables. But those we will not avoid will reflect themselves with a harsher impact than mere annoyance and inconvenience.

The scramble by millions of people to avoid the burdens of these shortages upon themselves and instead shift the impact of these other millions of people who are strangers will set in motion some rather severe political, social and psychological, stress and turbulence. The impact of this continuing kind of crisis will go far beyond the physical and could impact upon the Nation's institutions.

Meanwhile, and in possibly a whimsical vein, those who struggle with the energy problem may be illumined by the following item which has had some minor circulation on the intellectual fringes:

BREAKTHROUGH REPORTED IN HARNESSING TORNAOES

A major technological breakthrough in harnessing the energy of tornadoes to generate electricity was announced today by Dr. Seymour F. Cloghn, president of Texas Energy Research Associates (TERA).

In testimony prepared for the Senate Select Committee on Energy Conversion, Dr. Cloghn said that scientists at TERA's laboratories in Gravelville, Texas, have successfully demonstrated that man can create and to some degree control tornadoes.

"Creating, sustaining and controlling tornadal energy to produce electrical power is a realistic near-term alternative to fossil fuel generation and nuclear power," Dr. Cloghn said. "Based on current technology, we believe we can create full scale tornadoes capable of supplying pollution-free electrical energy to a city the size of Dallas within 6-8 years."

Controlled tornado research (CTR) has been underway at TERA and the State University of Iowa for three years under a program jointly-funded by NASA and the Environmental Science Services Administration (ESSA).

Dr. Cloghn said that TERA scientists have built and tested a laboratory scale system to generate small tornadoes. Initial experiments in December achieved an electrical output of approximately 125 watts.

Phase I studies have been devoted to laboratory investigations and development of computer models, and fabrication of a prototype energy transfer system, consisting of spectropanels seeded with silicone-germanium crystals and multiple banks of variable discharge capacitors.

A follow-on grant for Phase II studies is expected to lead to field tests next fall at Ames, Iowa, Dr. Cloghn said.

"We are primarily interested in further research into the possibility of operating multiple funnels and refining techniques to accurately predict the paths of man-made tornadoes," he added.

Tornadal energy, like solar, tidal and glacial energy, offers a potential for large quantities of peaking power free of the emission consequences of fossil fuels and the radiation safety problems of nuclear power. The process is considerably less costly than solar energy because the integrated spectropanel grid will be only one square mile, compared to estimates of up to 500 square miles for solar reflecting mirror configurations.

Under spectral shift technology developed by Academician Ripov of the Ubrezk Institute in the Soviet Union, nonreflective spectropanels are emplaced around a central reflective coral panel. Solar reflection creates an updraft, similar to the process by which tornadoes are generated in nature. Air collapsing into the void created by the updraft results in a man-made tornado.

The electrostatic charge generated by the

funnel is transmitted at the touchdown point via pressure sensitive thermocouples to the banks of capacitors, which convert the static electricity into direct current.

The funnels are confined within the grid by an electromagnetic restraint system, which is the only energy dependent phase of the process. Control of the tornado is limited to confinement under present technology, Dr. Clogh said.

A demonstration funnel 1000 feet in height with wind velocities of 225 mph and a ground speed of 45-55 mph would produce up to 500 mwe for 72 hours before the energy of the tornado is dissipated.

Dr. Clogh urged an intensive U.S. research effort aimed at meeting 25% of the nation's power needs through controlled tornadoes by 1980. He estimated a cost of \$500 million over eight years.

"It is a remarkably small requirement for a program which could eliminate strip mining, thermal pollution, radiation emissions and air pollution," Dr. Clogh said.

Dr. Clogh was the recipient of the 1971 John Gofman Award for Environmental Engineering from the International Atmospheric Engineering Association.

His interest in tornadography was sparked by the pioneer work of Dr. Nicholas Cristoforo of Lawrence Radiation Laboratory (Livermore) in predicting the Argus effect. This phenomenon of nuclear explosions at exoatmospheric altitudes is responsible for radio-communications blackouts caused by entrapment of beta particles in the earth's magnetic lines of force.

Dr. Clogh theorized that in atmospheric altitudes the rapid interception of these same lines of force by materials trapped in vertically oriented tornadal columns could generate useable electricity. From this postulation his research focused first on perfecting Ripov techniques to create, sustain and control tornadoes on a predictable basis and then upon channeling the resultant electrostatic discharges into commercial electrical distribution systems.

"The force of winds which once powered sailing ships may soon again supply dependable power for a major fraction of our modern, energy-oriented technological society," Dr. Clogh concluded.

THE SUPPORT OF SCIENCE

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in the *RECORD* the text of an editorial in the June 1, 1973, issue of the journal, *Science*.

The author of the editorial, "The Support of Science," is Dr. Arthur Kornberg of the Department of Biochemistry at the Stanford University Medical Center.

The text of Dr. Kornberg's article follows:

THE SUPPORT OF SCIENCE

The results of the massive support of biomedical science during the past 20 years have exceeded even the most optimistic predictions. No one imagined that we would acquire so quickly the firm grasp we have today of the basic designs of cellular chemistry and its regulation. The nature of heredity, clouded in abstract genetic language only 20 years ago, can now be described in explicit chemical terms. In the next 20 years application of chemistry of genes could transform the image of health and disease as dramatically as any advance in the history of medicine.

Nevertheless, those of us who do research in medical science and train young people for such work have witnessed in recent weeks the most calamitous decision a government of the United States could make for the future of medicine and the welfare of our country. Were there an intentional effort to undermine health and economic welfare of this country for the coming generations, I could imagine nothing more devastating than to stop training our best young people to do research in basic medical science. Yet this is precisely what has been done, and the consequences of the decision have not been foreseen.

In my scientific lifetime I have seen a very low tide of science support during the 1930's before World War II. Then there followed a strong high tide for 20 years after that. For the past 5 years, the support of science has been visibly ebbing. Funds for important research have been cut at a time when inflation and advanced technology require increases; the support for the training of our best young scientists has been abruptly eliminated. This support for research and training cannot be finely regulated. When the flow of science support is turned down, the stream of progress dries up and cannot be restored for years.

Surely the decision cannot be ascribed to economy. The science training programs cost about \$300 million annually. This is less than one-half of 1 percent of the budget for welfare or for defense. For weapons research and development alone, \$20 billion a year is being spent. This is to protect us against the possibility of attack by a hostile country. But now we have been told we can't afford to spend even 1 percent of this amount to train young people to fight diseases for which crusades have been proclaimed and that we know for certain will kill millions of our citizens each year.

Although in the past 20 years some scientists were influential in advising the government, the major forces in urging the support of science came from the Congress and citizens testifying before its committees. The support of science, so absolutely vital to our future, has been and must remain the responsibility of society. It is too important and too complex a problem to be left to scientists.

There are two compelling reasons why society must support basic science. One is substantial: The theoretical physics of yesterday is the nuclear defense of today; the obscure synthetic chemistry of yesterday is curing disease today. The other reason is cultural. The essence of our civilization is to explore and analyze the nature of man and his surroundings. As proclaimed in the Bible in the Book of Proverbs: "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

America's strength is not in mineral resources, in hydroelectric power, or in agriculture. It is not in the accumulation of a huge weapons arsenal either. America's strength is in the moral and intellectual resources of the people.

MCCORMACK NOTES ESTABLISHMENT OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT PANEL BY ENGINEERS JOINT COUNCIL

HON. MIKE MCCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased to learn of the formation of a technology assessment panel by the Engineers Joint Council.

The council, whose membership includes 15 member societies, 20 associate societies, and over 180 industrial affiliate members, has established the panel to work with both the legislative and executive branches of Government to provide liaison and technical backup for technology assessment.

The panel provides a focal point for communication—both ways—between the newly created Office of Technology Assessment and professional and technical groups. It is a welcome and vitally important addition to our national effort to assess needs and developments in the field of technology.

I include in the *RECORD* at this point the description of the purpose of the panel that was provided by the council at the time of the panel's establishment:

TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT PANEL

Dr. Robert J. Raudebaugh, President of the Engineers Joint Council, . . . announced the formation of a Technology Assessment Panel created especially to establish and maintain liaison with the federal government in the critical area of technology assessment. In announcing establishment of the Technology Assessment Panel at today's General Assembly meeting of EJC at the Hotel Biltmore in New York, Dr. Raudebaugh also said that Robert J. Mayer, Vice President of the A. T. Kearney Co. and the EJC representative to the Society of Manufacturing Engineers, will serve as Panel Chairman.

The Panel itself will be composed of representatives of the member societies of the Engineers Joint Council. The member societies and their representatives to the Panel are listed in the attached roster.

"Specifically," Dr. Raudebaugh explained, "EJC will work closely with those agencies of the legislative and executive branches of the federal government that are concerned with technology assessment. Such liaison will assure effective and credible response by the engineering profession to the needs of the federal government."

In its initial stages, the EJC Panel will be primarily concerned with establishing a working relationship with the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) recently created by Congress. Senator Edward M. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, is Chairman of the Congressional Board.

Walter A. Hahn, Senior Specialist for Science and Technology, of the Library of Congress, and President of the International Society for Technology Assessment, addressed the General Assembly on the subject of technology assessment. He pointed out the need for close cooperation from the professional and engineering community and the contribution that EJC could make by serving as the focal point in providing technical input.

In keeping with its overall objectives, the EJC's Technology Panel is expected to function as a resource and referral agency for studies requiring specialized expertise as found so readily among the members of engineering societies. The Panel will also be expected to provide technical consultation to participate in studies under grants sponsored by OTA and other government agencies. This will permit the evaluation of ongoing technology assessments in order to identify their impact on industry and to make recommendations to assure positive results.

"The development of new technology has always been one of the major strengths of the United States", Dr. Raudebaugh said. Its development, however, has not been without numerous positive and negative side effects in social and environmental areas."

With the increasing pace of technological development and application in today's com-

plicated life, the assessment of the "side effects" of technology has become increasingly important to the total community. Technology assessment as defined by the OTA is the full and balanced analysis of all significant primary-secondary, indirect and delayed consequences for impacts present and foreseen of the technological innovation in society environment for the economy. Technology Assessment is not intended as a deterrent or mechanism to halt or slow the development of technology.

The Congress of the United States today is faced more and more with highly important political decisions based on highly intricate technical matters closely related to technology and its use. The need to pass

legislation on such items as new missiles, super-sonic transports, environmental pollution, health and safety, etc., requires objective expert advice to guide these decisions. This need resulted in the passing of the Technology Assessment Act in 1972 which created the Office of Technology Assessment.

Because the engineering profession is concerned with the impact of technology on the economic and social structure and fully accepts its responsibility as a contributor to the implementation of technological change, the Engineers Joint Council felt it was a matter of extreme importance to create the Technology Assessment Panel which would then serve as a focal point to marshal the

total resources of the engineering and professional community.

The Engineers Joint Council is a Council of professional engineering societies. The total membership in these member body societies is approximately 600,000, all of whom are directly connected with the engineering and professional communities, and are intimately concerned with the development, use and application of technology in industry.

The following societies will serve as active members, through their representatives, on the Technology Assessment Panel: SES, ASCE, ASME, ECPD, SFPE, SAE, AFCA, AIAA, ASQC, IEEE, AIEE, SME, ISA, ASM, AICE, AIME, ASHRAE, ASME, NACE, and SPHE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 31, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Honorable WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III, of Indiana, offered the following prayer:

This is the day which the Lord hath made. Let us rejoice and be glad in it.

Let us pray.

O Thou Eternal God, our loving Heavenly Father, we do thank Thee for the opportunities that come to us to serve Thee and to serve our country, and we pray that in our day and in our generation, through our ministry in this House of Representatives, we may perform something worthy to be remembered by the people of this great Nation and by You, our Father. And to You be the glory and the praise, now and forever, world without end. 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 with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6912. An act to amend the Par Value Modification Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 6912) entitled "An act to amend the Par Value Modification Act, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. TOWER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ERVIN, and Mr. PERCY to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1317. An act to authorize appropriations for the U.S. Information Agency; and

S. 1501. An act to amend the Water Resources Planning Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1974.

INCREASE IN PRICE OF NATURAL GAS

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it appears that step No. 2 in the administration's efforts to have Government cave in to the oil and gas companies came yesterday with the Federal Power Commission's decision to allow a 73-percent increase in the price of natural gas.

Step 1 was the administration's hint Tuesday that the gas tax might be increased.

The gas price increase approved yesterday—from 26 cents a 1,000 cubic feet to 45 cents—will yield the three gas companies who received the increase—Belco Petroleum, Tenneco, and Texaco Oil—a 27.5-percent rate of return on total investment.

For the Government to guarantee that kind of return is outrageous, especially when the companies specifically refused to guarantee that any additional profits from the increase will be plowed back into additional exploration and development efforts.

When the companies imply—as they have—that they will not be doing more exploration and development for additional gas reserves, unless the prices they get are substantially increased, then it is time for the Government to say: "To hell with you, we will do the job ourselves."

Mr. Speaker, when the present price of natural gas was increased to 26 cents in 1971, industry indicated it would increase its exploration and development to ease the gas shortage.

The result instead has been decreasing gas reserves and increasing gas shortages, for which the companies are now being rewarded with an increased rate of return and no doubt increased profits.

If the major oil and gas companies had paid as much attention to research over the past 5 years as they have to advertising and promoting their own cause, we might not be in as serious a bind as we are today.

ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everyone in this Chamber was thrilled by the recent news that major league baseball apparently will be returning to the Nation's Capital next year.

But I am pleased to announce today that the fans in this great Chamber will not have to wait until next spring to see topnotch baseball played as it has rarely been played before.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am referring to that annual exhibition of Capitol talent, that refreshing exercise of brain and brawn, that storied struggle of titans, that summer outing that causes flutters in the hearts of little children and grown men alike—yes, Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the annual congressional baseball game.

The mere fact that there will be no major league games in Washington this year is not a big enough obstacle to block the annual congressional battle.

Once again this year, the game will be played—if that is the right term. The memorable night will be July 30 at Baltimore's Memorial Stadium, and the game will be a prelude to a major league contest between the Baltimore Orioles and the Detroit Tigers.

While this will necessitate a short bus ride up the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, all the traditional hoopla and outstanding talent that have marked previous congressional games will again be provided.

Despite losing the last nine consecutive games to my slick fielders and heavy hitters, my colleague from Pennsylvania and opposite number on the diamond, Mr. CLARK, promises to field enough Democrats to fulfill at least the numerical requirements for a team.

If they can do that in spite of their recent adversity on the ballfield, surely every Member of this body should match their sacrifice by coming out to the game July 30 to see the Republicans' 10th consecutive victory in this glorious series.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 6912, TO AMEND THE PAR VALUE MODIFICATION ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6912) to amend the Par Value Modification Act,