

H. Res. 459. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANDALL (for himself, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROBINSON of New York, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. STEELE, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. THONE, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WINN, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. YOUNG of Illinois):

H. Res. 460. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HEINZ (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUDE, Mr. REES, and Mr. PRITCHARD):

H. Res. 461. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 462. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "Reform of our Correctional Systems"; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 463. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "Organized Criminal Influence in Horse Racing"; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

263. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to no-fault insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

243. The SPEAKER presented a petition of John H. Leach II, Newport Beach, Calif., relative to redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HOMETOWN, U.S.A., IS BOTH VITAL AND VIABLE TODAY

### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, over the past few weeks there have been thousands of graduation ceremonies and commencement speeches. Most of these speeches have been predictably optimistic, designed to inspire young people on to greater heights of achievement. In recent years, however, it has become fashionable to downgrade the future, to paint a picture of gloom and doom and to rail at the system and the establishment. As a result, many young people are impressed into an attitude that is negative and foreboding. They feel that their life ahead promises only a dubious existence barren of exciting discovery, without chance or challenge.

Earlier this month I was privileged to deliver the commencement address at Salem High School, my native town in West Virginia. I told the graduating seniors:

Over the past half-century, Americans have proven they are the masters of technology. Our moon walks, satellite communications and medical marvels are the envy of the world. We have shown that we can build a life of quality unparalleled in history. We have created a society of such super-abundance that we are choking under 125 million tons of air pollutants a year, and a billion pounds of garbage each year threatens to bury us.

The challenge you face in the next half century is to build a life of quality, a life that offers an opportunity and something of grace for all—a life based, not on just machines and gadgets, but on human dignity and individual worth.

We know that life on this Earth is finite, and that the present expenditure of energy and the consumption of food coupled with a quantum leap in population every 35 years threatens to turn our planet into a mass of misery. Evidences of this macabre equation already are cropping up: Flooding and starvation in India; drought and famine in central Africa; the diminishing fish schools off heavily populated continents; blackouts and shortages and revolutionary violence—all pieces to the great puzzle of the future.

In the United States, 85 percent of our

people occupy only 2 percent of our land. These mass concentrations have led to growing crime, delinquency, drug abuse, and escalating welfare. Yet, across America, there are thousands of small towns and communities who eagerly seek new industries, new neighbors and new job opportunities for their young people. These are the grassroots which hold the hope of the future if America is to remain the land of promise. We must, in our national policies and programs, strive to strengthen the undeveloped regions of our country so that all Americans can have a free choice of where they want to live. We must keep the Salems of our Nation vital and viable if we are to meet the challenge of building a life of quality for all.

The ceremony at Salem High School this month was duplicated hundreds of times throughout our country. Principal Haymond Plaugher introduced the guests, including Dr. and Mrs. K. Duane Hurley, president of my alma mater, Salem College. Mrs. Paul Green played the processional, the Honorable Mike Greer of the West Virginia House of Delegates gave the invocation; the benediction was delivered by the Reverend Robert Wheeler. Class officers were introduced. They are: James Bradley Davis, president; Janet Carol Murphy, vice president; LuAnne Hersman, secretary; Lance Cameron Sulsona, treasurer; Michelle Ann Davis, historian; and Patricia Ann Martin and Joseph Lynn Johnson, members of the Student Council.

The valedictorian address was given by Daniel Harris Underwood, and Lillian Allesio gave the salutatorian address. Mr. Underwood, in speaking of his hometown, gave what I think is a valuable profile of Smalltown, U.S.A. He told of its strengths and weaknesses, its proud history and unpredictable future. I feel some Members of the Senate, in reviewing his words, may recall their own smalltown origins, and remember the tranquil existence of another day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the brief valedictorian address of Daniel Underwood be placed in the RECORD.

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

#### THE SPIRIT OF SALEM

When he enters the streets of a town he has not before known, a newcomer catches dis-

tinguishing qualities of the town and forms an impression. Most outsiders, when they first arrive in Salem, have a negative impression. They see one curve-plagued, narrow street edged with ancient buildings, a railroad track, and two high hills. "But," said one Salemite, "I left in the spring after a winter's stay never to return and found that by August I could not wait to get back."

Every town, every institution has a tone, something that since it is an abstraction, has nothing to do with streets or walls of buildings, but is far more important. Maybe I could call this atmosphere the spirit of a place, and as Melville said, "It is not on a map. True places never are." The Salem I bring to you tonight is not on a map; neither can it be photographed. But the Salem which I deliver to you is a real place that although it cannot be touched, is in the minds of many of the people in this room.

Salem, settled by Christian people, has always had Christian brotherhood and a mountain spirit of make do, both helped along by the lack of affluence in the town. One philosophic resident expressed the fact thus: "The greatest virtue of Salem is its poverty." We are a simple people too, because no one can be too uppity with his own family members. And most of us are really kin either by inheritance or long-time associations. When the thought of kinship occurred to me, I looked at myself, and discovered I was a direct descendant of the man who originally owned all the land in Salem, a name so common in the town that the Senator present tonight will recognize me as Atwell's great grandson sooner than if I would use Atwell's surname. When I took a survey of the class, I learned that of the thirty members, twenty-five are direct descendants of early residents of the community. We have stayed put; outsiders have had a tendency to circumvent our rugged terrain.

In the 1880's many of the young people left Salem to attend distant colleges and never returned. To keep youth in the community, the Salem people started, in 1887, an academy that eventually developed into a college. So along with friendliness, humility born of little wealth, and community kinship, a bit of culture found its way to our hills.

Many artifacts and institutions in existence today attest to the energy and progressive spirit of Salem people who have never numbered more than 3,000 individuals.

A group of businessmen in 1896 bought a hundred acres of land west of Salem to entice the state to locate in the town the West Virginia Industrial Home for Girls, secured the institution, and inadvertently founded the third ward of the city.

In 1951 the citizens of Salem raised \$10,000 to finance the deepening and widening of the creeks and thereby attracted federal attention. The Congress appropriated money for several pilot flood control dams. Salem had

the first watershed program of the ones to be completed.

Today Salem has 10 active churches, six fraternal lodges, eight service clubs, a volunteer fire department, and a thriving community center with a pool and a ball park.

Salem people work together with a steady stream of activities to keep all the town's institutions functioning. But busy as we all are, we know that if anyone hears of a new endeavor that will in any way improve services to our people, we shall organize it tomorrow. Although students in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades will travel a few miles east to study for six hours a day next school term, they will be answering during the other eighteen hours Salem's fire calls; they will be working in the churches, they will be assisting at the recreation center. They will be here, for Salem is where the action is!

#### ARNOLD A. SALTZMAN AWARDS

#### HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. Speaker, on June 8, the Arnold A. Saltzman journalism award was presented by Senator BIRCH BAYH to Jon Olshaker, a District of Columbia Wilson High School student. I am very pleased that one of the prizes was awarded to Alan Salant, a student at Forest Hills High School in Forest Hills, N.Y. for his editorial in the *Beacon*, entitled "Tolerance and the Voice of Reason."

In order to inform my colleagues in the House on the importance of these awards and the content of the winning writings, I am placing the text of the news release and the award winning entry of Alan Salant in the RECORD:

D.C. STUDENT WINS NATIONAL JOURNALISM CONTEST—SENATOR BAYH TO MAKE AWARD

The Arnold A. Saltzman Journalism award was presented today by Senator Birch Bayh to Jon Olshaker, a D.C. Woodrow Wilson High School student. The luncheon ceremony on Capitol Hill was attended by Congressmen, D.C. political officials, and community leaders.

Olshaker was awarded First Prize from over 75 entries throughout the country. Second Prizes were awarded to Jose Alvarez of Miami, Florida and to Alan Salant, Forest Hills, New York. Third Prizes went to Robert Hanselman of West Caldwell, New Jersey and Paul D. Schreiber of Port Washington, N.Y.

Presiding at the awards ceremony was Harris Wofford, President of Bryn Mawr College. The awards were made in conjunction with the 1976 Studies Program of Bryn Mawr to mark the 1976 Bicentennial.

The awards are named for Arnold A. Saltzman, co-founder of the 1976 Studies Program, and President of Seagrave Corporation in New York.

These national awards were open to High Schools throughout the country who were invited by Harris Wofford to submit entries "which contribute to an understanding of some aspect of the Declaration of Independence in today's society."

Jon Olshaker's winning entry entitled, "D.C. Home Rule Vital", compares the fight for Home Rule to the American Revolution. "All of those conditions that brought the American Revolution are prevalent today in the District of Columbia", wrote Olshaker. "Washingtonians have continually petitioned Congress", he continued "and they have tried to work within the system, but in return have received only political rhetoric. Washingtonians like the Colonists are tired of being pushed around."

Two second prizes were awarded: one to the *Miami High Times* of Miami Senior High School in Miami, Fla., for an editorial by Jose Alvarez calling for the nation to turn, as it did 200 years ago, from war to the building of a free and peaceful nation. The other second prize winner is *The Beacon* of Forest Hills High School in Forest Hills, New York, in which editorial-writer Alan Salant asked whether the problems of the nation today are "insufferable," as they were to the colonial revolutionaries, or whether they could be solved through the democratic process.

Two third prizes were also awarded: to *The Wire* of West Essex High School in West Caldwell, N.J., whose editor Robert Hanselman wrote, "We ought to prepare now for the second coming of Jefferson. Not with plans to sell souvenirs, trinkets, hot dogs and hoopla, but with a national reaffirmation of our faith in each other . . ." And Matthew Klein of the Paul D. Schreiber High School in Port Washington, N.Y., wrote in *The Schreiber Times* of the way in which thievery and vandalism infringed on the "inalienable rights" of all citizens by promoting fear and suspicion.

One entry in the contest won a special commendation: a "Spirit of '76" issue of the *Redskin Review*, a newspaper published by the seventh and eighth grades of Pequannock Valley School in Pompton Plains, N.J. The five editors, four of them girls, supervised the recreation of a Revolutionary War newspaper, complete with dispatches from the front lines, commentaries on the Continental Congress debates and, for the women on the home front, a recipe for corn bread.

The judges include Creed Black, Editor of the *Philadelphia Inquirer*; Andrew Hershell, Chairman of the Board, Time, Inc.; John J. Johnson, Publisher of *Ebony* and *Jet*; and Meg Greenfield, Deputy Editor of the *Washington Post*.

#### TOLERANCE AND THE VOICE OF REASON

(By Alan Salant)

The following clause appeared in Thomas Jefferson's "Rough Draft" of the Declaration of Independence:

... All experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed.

Uncompromised by editing, the clause earned a position in the fourth paragraph of the official Declaration. It represents the voice of reason, the moderating influence which, possessing a knowledge of history, decries senseless revolution. It challenges the radical to prove that existing ills are insufferable. If he cannot meet this challenge, his revolt is doomed to failure.

#### THE EXTENT OF TOLERANCE

In 1776, Thomas Jefferson was a crusader; he faced the challenge of his own words. His response, the "List of Grievances," asserted that British rule was no longer tolerable. Many colonists continued their support of the existing system; they rejected Jefferson's proof. But the Declaration gained wide enough acceptance to enable the colonists to overthrow the British contingents and to establish a new nation.

Almost two hundred years have passed. As preparations are being made for the celebration of our Bicentennial, the American system is once again undergoing a thorough examination. What are the evils that plague this nation? Are they sufferable? Are they serious enough to condemn our accustomed form of life?

The last two questions might be applied to our divisive involvement in Indochina. Our response thereto has been that we found this involvement sufferable, and, hence, inadequate as a cause for revolt.

#### IGNORING THE PAINFULLY OBVIOUS

One might also ask whether the simultaneous existence of poverty and affluence is a

cause for rebellion. Evidently it is not, since most Americans seem impervious to the problem. Public opinion to effective welfare plans, and our reluctance to support extensive programs for the care of the elderly, the handicapped, and the sick, indicate that, to our nation as a whole, economic disparity is sufferable.

Or one might ask whether our present crime frequency is sufficient cause to overthrow the system. Obviously it is not. Our trend is toward harsher punishment, rather than toward the study and elimination of the causes of crime. People simply stay at home at night, in secure houses, and absorb the entertainment provided by the mass media. The evidence is that we will lock ourselves indoors, rather than rebel against the conditions that produce this state of terror.

#### INSURMOUNTABLE IMPASSIVENESS

One might advance other possible causes of revolt: racial inequality, censorship of the press, excessive taxes, expansion of the executive power, political corruption, an overwhelming growth of public discontent. Such motivations may become persuasive in another age, but not now. For the erosion of constitutional guarantees is a sufferable evil in our country today.

Finally, one might allude to the many environmental hazards. The sociological effects of overcrowding do not move us. The effect of pollutants upon vegetation and animal life does frighten us. The spread of respiratory disease does not limit the sale or use of automobiles. The publication of "The Limits of Growth," by the Club of Rome, does not influence us to alter our life-style. Studies of the dangers of worldwide overpopulation warn us but do not stir us to action. The evidence seems to be that ecological perils are still a sufferable evil.

Thomas Jefferson's words have proven to be prophetic. Today our country faces many grave problems. But we consider them to be sufferable. Therein lies the significance of Jefferson's clause. Since we do not believe our present evils to be insufferable, the concept of revolution is irrelevant. But this does not mean that we can ignore the evils and let them become insufferable. As we prepare for the Bicentennial, and in fulfillment of the Declaration of Independence, let us work toward real solutions to our contemporary problems, while retaining the democratic forms "to which we are accustomed."

#### MICHIGAN NEWSPAPER URGES PHASEOUT OF NUCLEAR POWER

#### HON. MIKE GRAVEL

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, Charlevoix, Mich., is one of the rural spots where a small atomic power plant was completed in 1963. The Big Rock plant is only 70 electrical megawatts, compared with 1100-megawatt plants under construction today.

In an editorial of April 11, 1973, the *Charlevoix Courier* endorsed a moratorium on the construction of new atomic power plants, and a phaseout of existing plants.

The editorial includes passages from the booklet, "The Case for a Nuclear Moratorium" which is available from the Environmental Action Foundation, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that major excerpts from the *Courier* editorial be printed in the RECORD.



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

[From the Charlevoix (Mich.) Courier, Apr. 11, 1973]

**UNTIL WE CLEAN UP A-WASTE, MORATORIUM IS ONLY SANE SOLUTION**

Since the first newspaper "scare" over the addition of plutonium to fuel rods at Consumers Power Company's Big Rock Point nuclear plant, literally pounds of informational material relative to atomic energy as a source of electrical power have crossed the editor's desk at the Courier.

We have digested as much of the material as possible, and have come to a couple of conclusions which may, on the surface, seem conflicting.

First, we are convinced that Consumers Power Co., has done everything and is doing everything in its power to make the Big Rock Point plant as safe as humanly possible. Certainly the young men and women who work at the plant must feel so, too, or they would not expose themselves daily to deadly radiation or allow their families to live in close proximity to a potential "bomb".

Secondly, however, we have been aghast to learn that neither Consumers Power Co., the Atomic Energy Commission or any of the high-powered brains at any of the nation's many nuclear laboratories has come up with an acceptable solution to the problem of atomic waste.

For all practical purposes, such waste must be stored FOREVER on this planet under eternal surveillance, while suffering mankind keeps its fingers crossed that the atomic garbage dump remains untouched by calamities man-made or natural for untold generations to come.

We do not believe that the present generation is in a position to place such an awesome responsibility on generations yet unborn. And until we can come up with a means of purifying and neutralizing atomic waste, we believe a moratorium on the construction of nuclear power plants is the only sane avenue open to the United States and other nuclear nations.

"The Case for a Nuclear Moratorium" is well stated in a booklet by that name published by the Environmental Action Foundation. Listen what the authors have to say:

Dr. Hannes Alfvén, Nobel Laureate in Physics, writing in the May, 1972, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists:

"Fission energy is safe only if a number of critical devices work as they should, if a number of people in key positions follow all their instructions, if there is no sabotage, no hijacking of the transports, if no reactor fuel processing plant or reprocessing plant or repository anywhere in the world is situated in a region of riots or guerrilla activity, and no revolution or war—even a 'conventional one'—takes place in these regions. The enormous quantities of extremely dangerous material must not get into the hands of ignorant people or desperados. No acts of God can be permitted."

John W. Gofman, M.D., Ph. D, professor of medical physics at the University of California and a former associate director at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory: "Plutonium-239, the most poisonous element ever handled in quantity by man, is the very heart of the nuclear power industry, breeder or non-breeder . . . Dispersed as fine insoluble particles (about one micron in diameter), one pound of plutonium-239 may represent the potential for some nine billion human lung cancer doses. Given the 24,400-year half-life of plutonium-239, any plutonium dispersed into the biosphere presents a major carcinogenic hazard for more than the next thousand human generations. The annual handling of plutonium-239 in a fully developed nuclear power economy will be in the one-hundred-ton category, or some 200,000 pounds annually. Comparing this with the one pound that can provide an

intolerable potential lung cancer burden, we estimate that better than 99,999 percent containment of plutonium-239 is hardly good enough to avert disaster."

Dr. Alvin Weinberg, director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory: "We nuclear people have made a Faustian bargain with society. On the one hand, we offer an inexhaustible source of energy. . . . But the price that we demand of society for this magical energy source is both a vigilance and a longevity of our social institutions that we are quite unaccustomed to."

Mike Gravel (D-Alaska), member of the U.S. Senate since 1968 and author of a nuclear power moratorium bill: "The nuclear power issue is essentially a moral issue, not a technical one. Radioactive nuclear pollutants which escape into the environment can kill and maim living creatures for centuries after we have enjoyed our electricity. One of the well-known effects of exposure to extra radioactivity is extra genetic injury. As John Francis of the Scottish Council of Churches has said: 'the minimum morality of man is to leave the gene-pool of humanity intact.'"

"Nuclear power plants today are creating long-lived radioactive poisons which will have to be kept out of the environment for 100,000 years. Unless stopped, the plants in the U.S. alone will have produced enough radioactive garbage and plutonium in the next thirty years to kill or maim almost every living thing on earth. Will our generation make the future of life subordinate to the future of the nuclear power industry? Shall we make the future of life depend on the success or failure in containing the radioactive by-products of nuclear electricity? In effect, the nuclear power industry has started to use the entire planet as a laboratory for its radioactive containment experiment, and us as its involuntary guinea pig."

"The 150 nuclear plants already planned or operating will produce more long-lived radioactivity in this country every year than about 130,000 Hiroshima bombs. Ask any nuclear enthusiast what gives him such confidence that imperfect human beings will manage to keep 99.99 percent of that radioactivity under perfect and perpetual control and then evaluate the vacant answers carefully."

"When those in business understand that a single nuclear accident can do twice the property damage of Hurricane Agnes, totally ruin the economy of a huge region of this country, and lead to an unplanned nuclear shutdown from coast to coast, they may consider an immediate moratorium the only responsible position."

The authors of "The Case for a Nuclear Moratorium" point out that the world is still far removed from the point where nuclear energy is the only alternative to no energy at all. They point to coal reserves that will last several hundreds of years in the United States alone. They also suggest that our electric utilities are putting all of their eggs in the atomic basket, while other potential sources of energy—such as geothermal and solar energy—have been ignored.

Don't get us wrong. We have no quarrel to pick with our good friends at Consumers Power. But we feel strongly that until the problem of disposing of atomic waste is solved, the United States and other atomic powers must declare a moratorium on the construction of new nuclear plants and a phase out of existing plants.

In the meantime, the know-how of our scientific community should be exerted in either findings ways to clean up atomic waste or researching alternate methods of power generation.

The risks involved in the continuous stockpiling of nuclear debris in hopes that a solution will be found at a future date are risks that mankind should not be forced to take.

We fully realize that billions of dollars already have been expended in the develop-

ment of nuclear generating plants. But we also realize that billions of dollars mean nothing when weighed against the fate of the human race.

**INTERNATIONAL TRADE PROBLEM**

**HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, as the Ways and Means Committee considers trade legislation I would like to bring to my colleagues attention a situation that has arisen in my congressional district which demonstrates the need for the United States to protect its interests in the trade markets.

Since the end of World War II a sizable market has developed for furniture made from rattan. Rattan is a wood product that is grown in the Philippines. Indeed 50 percent of all the rattan in the world is in the Philippines.

The largest rattan furniture company in the country is in Cincinnati, Ohio. The Ficks Reed Co. has 300 employees and an annual payroll of \$1.5 million.

The Philippine Government has recently announced that it will no longer allow the exportation of any rattan poles. If this decision is not changed it would effect the 300 employees in my district and the 3,000 other employees who work in rattan furniture companies across the country.

The proposed trade bill submitted by the administration contains language which would permit the President to act when a nation takes an unjustifiable or unreasonable action which would burden or restrict U.S. commerce. It is my hope that when the committee takes final action on the trade bill it will consider actions such as the one taken by the Philippine Government.

I would like to insert in the RECORD a statement made by the International Association of Rattan Manufacturers and Importers:

**INTERNATIONAL TRADE PROBLEM**

THE FOLLOWING IS INTENDED TO PRESENT THE POSITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RATTAN MANUFACTURERS AND IMPORTERS

**BACKGROUND**

The current status of the American Market for rattan products is excellent. The product is in demand by all forms of retailers at all price ranges. At the present time, there are 16 manufacturers of rattan products who manufacture using imported poles. In addition to the above, there are numerous small manufacturers who buy in small quantities and only supply a local market. The above 16 manufacturers distribute their products nationally. In addition there are four firms who import rattan to sell to these manufacturers, as well as a substantial amount of rattan is imported directly by the manufacturers. Almost without exception, the manufacturers are operating at capacity levels. There are again in addition to the above, three manufacturers who import frames and parts, some of which are rattan frames and some of which are woven. Many of the firms using rattan poles in the United States produce a product of a type and in such quantity that it is doubtful that the manufacturing facilities in the Philippines would be capable of supplying the market. The market for rattan products fur-

ther in the United States is such that the domestic manufacturers are continually being forced to make style changes which necessitates the building of inventories much more quickly than can be done if one has to produce and ship from the Philippines. In light of the above, I think it is important that we carefully look at the following facts:

1. The supply of rattan poles from the Philippines at the present time is very good. Manufacturers and importers located in the United States are continually being offered poles for sale. There is a substantial question as to whether the trade ministry adequately researched the supply situation prior to its ruling, or merely took the word of private interests, who might very well feel that if rattan poles were not exported the local price might drop. The net effect of this in the long run is to produce less dollar income for the Philippines.

2. There are numerous alternate varieties of rattan in other countries which can be used to manufacture the same products we are currently making. There are a number of large companies in the United States who do not believe they can effectively import frames or parts and maintain their current level of output and quality who would have no choice but to use these other varieties. Further these companies have millions of dollars in capital investment in plant and equipment in the United States which as long as there is an alternate raw material available, they will use. The net effect of this again is less dollar revenue for the Philippines.

3. Over the last many years the unprecedented demand for rattan products in the United States has been built through the advertising and marketing expenditures of the large companies located in the United States. If the funds spent on advertising were to be withdrawn by these companies and the subsequent exposure lessened, the American market for rattan products both manufactured here and in the Philippines would diminish very rapidly.

4. It is entirely possible with the current able to produce a product for sale in the rapid increase in ocean freight rates that the Philippine manufacturers would not be United States at a price which would be attractive to the medium priced and lower priced rattan market. If this were to happen, there is a distinct possibility many stores which currently sell rattan products would no longer handle them. The current strength of the rattan industry in the United States is based on having a wide variety of merchandise in different price ranges. If manufacturers were unable to supply due to ocean freight rates, products in the medium and lower price ranges, the basis of this market would dissolve. Currently ocean freight rates represent 33% of the selling cost and if this would become substantially higher rattan would become, because of the price, unattractive to a large percentage of the buying public. This naturally would seriously affect the export of rattan and rattan frames from the Philippines and further diminish the dollar revenue for them.

5. Fewer and fewer companies in the United States are importing set-up furniture from the Philippines. This is largely indicative of the ocean freight rate problem, which would similarly affect any attempt to export frames made in the Philippines. As pointed out earlier, it is just not possible to produce set-up furniture in the Philippines and sell it profitably in the medium price and promotional market in the United States.

In summary, if the manufacturers in the Philippines have made the assumption that they are going to absorb the entire market for rattan furniture, this is simply not true. As pointed out earlier, American manufacturers are going to make every attempt to minimize their loss by using alternate sources of raw material. Ocean freight rates on set-up furniture prohibit reaching a large part of the market with set-up imported furniture. The established manufacturers in the United States are no longer going to be in a position to give the adver-

tising support to Philippine products which they have in the past.

A realistic appraisal of the above factors can only lead to one conclusion. The Philippines, in the long run, would lose not only the dollar revenue from the importation of rattan poles, but in addition, a large percentage of their current market for parts and set-up furniture. Therefore, the assumption that the Philippines would actually gain this market is highly questionable.

Respectfully Submitted.

GERALD J. FICKS, Jr.,  
President.

#### NUCLEAR POWER: MONEY AND PUBLIC OPINION

#### HON. MIKE GRAVEL

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, suppose that nuclear power opponents had had as much money as nuclear power advocates to present their views for the past several years? I think public opposition to nuclear powerplants might be overwhelming by now. In fact, the Senate might be ready to pass a bill like S. 1217, the Nuclear Power Moratorium Act of 1973.

The controversy over nuclear power today is not a fair fight in a fair forum where the best case might win. It is an unfair fight in which only one side has the money to spread its message widely and repeatedly to the public.

What is the size of the AEC's public information campaign? John Harris, AEC Director of Information Services, has recently supplied the following information at my request:

TABLE—AEC INFORMATION SERVICES

Category	Fiscal 1971	Fiscal 1972	Fiscal year 1973 (estimate)	Fiscal year 1974 (request)
Technical information.....	\$4,616,000	\$4,719,000	\$4,466,000	\$5,050,000
Exhibits and museum program.....	685,000	604,000	745,000	1,100,000
Audiovisual.....	234,000	243,000	225,000	225,000
Press releases, speeches, symposia.....	14,000	21,000	25,000	25,000
Major international conferences.....	354,000	344,000		
Total.....	5,903,000	5,931,000	5,461,000	6,400,000

#### 4,000 FILMS AND 1,500,000 BOOKLETS

The following figures are also from Mr. Harris:

In Fiscal 1973 the Office of Information Services expects to spend approximately \$120,000 for the production of popular level and educational films... There are 120 educational and general information films in circulation today which deal with the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The number of prints of those films in circulation is about 4,000.

We estimate that approximately 3.5 million persons saw these films in 1972, exclusive of TV. About 155 television airings were achieved.

In Fiscal 1973, we expect to spend \$60,000 for the preparation and printing of information booklets. Approximately 1.5 million booklets were distributed in Fiscal 1972...

In Fiscal 1973, we expect to distribute approximately 1.5 million information booklets... [In addition] we estimate approximately 4.9 million individuals will be reached through the exhibit, science museum and audiovisual activities funded under the Fiscal 1973 budget.

That represents the product of a single year. The cumulative AEC public information product is even more overwhelming.

#### THE GOSPEL ABOUT THE PEACEFUL ATOM

In a speech on February 11, 1970, the AEC's Assistant General Manager at the time, Howard C. Brown, described the AEC's unrelenting effort to promote the peaceful atom:

We've had a public information program for 20 years and a lot of effort has gone into it. For example, we've put out something like 10,000 press releases. We have a film library of some 11,000 prints. We've put out some 50 annual and semi-annual reports.

We've made hundreds of speeches over the years, held scores of news conferences, and have circumnavigated the globe many times over spreading the gospel about the peaceful atom.

In June 1970, I received a few additional details from the AEC Chairman, then Glenn Seaborg. At that time, the AEC had 66 films in circulation, and

these films were seen by approximately 4.5 million people in 1969, "exclusive of television use, which is large." Between 120,000 and 240,000 copies each of several booklets in the AEC's "Understanding the Atom" series had already been distributed as of June 1970, including 140,000 copies of "Nuclear Power and the Environment."

Although the AEC's nuclear promotion campaign all by itself could swamp the efforts of citizen opponents who must sometimes rely on handranked Mimeograph machines, the Government campaign is dwarfed by the industry's efforts.

#### RAISING \$6,400,000 PER MESSAGE

More and more utilities are enclosing pronuclear propaganda with their bills. The Potomac Electric Power Co. recently sent a 12-page pamphlet touting nuclear power into every home in its domain.

It would cost citizen opponents at least \$6.4 million to mail a different point of view just once into each of the



country's 64 million households—while utilities can do it "for free" with the bills again and again.

Some nuclear utilities even have billboards and tourist centers, and they contribute to national pronuclear magazine advertisements through the association of investor-owned electric light and power companies. National magazine advertisements for nuclear power can cost over \$50,000 per shot, and there have been many of them in the last 2 years. A few TV spots promoting nuclear power have also been broadcast.

In addition, the nuclear industry supports the information program of the Atomic Industrial Forum in New York City; the forum, which has several hundred members, describes itself as "a not-for-profit association of business, professional, education, labor, and governmental organizations concerned with the peaceful applications of nuclear energy."

#### VIOLATING A SENSE OF FAIRPLAY

For the nuclear opposition to match the nuclear promotion campaign of Government and industry combined, citizens need well over \$10 million a year—not handranked Mimeograph machines.

Why do decent individuals in Government, industry, and the general public tolerate a contest in which one side has all the best equipment money can buy, and the other side has all the handicaps? That alone should offend our common sense of fairplay.

It seems that many people confuse the gallantry of "underdogs" in a fair fight with the degradation of citizens in an unfair fight. Perhaps people cannot admit to the real humiliation involved when they not only accept unfair conditions, but also feel grateful for simple permission to participate at all.

In the contest over nuclear fission, what is at stake is not the sale of one toothpaste instead of another. Citizens have every right to participate fully, because the stakes involve personal safety and survival, genetic integrity of the human species, health, national security, personal property, and the right not to be made into involuntary guinea pigs in a giant radioactive containment experiment. These are inalienable rights which even a majority may not properly take from a minority.

#### A GOOD BET

If public policy in a democracy is to be determined by majority opinion, however, and if majority opinion is to be determined by the advocates with the most money for public information and advertising, then it is a good bet that big government and big business will continue prevailing on almost every issue in this country.

Is that what we want? The nuclear fission controversy is not unique in this situation. Unequal access to "the public mind" is a major flaw in the whole democratic process today, regardless of the issue. Big Government and big business can use tax-dollars and consumer-dollars to overwhelm the message of critical taxpayers and consumers.

Unless self-respecting citizens insist on a remedy for this abuse of their money and their minds, democracy could become a complete joke.

#### WINNING A NUCLEAR MORATORIUM

In spite of all this, I believe that a nuclear power moratorium can be won, because I believe the need for it will ultimately unite diverse groups on the same side of the line—labor, nonnuclear business, farmers, religious groups, health people, civil liberties defenders, environmentalists, peace-doves and hawks.

While these groups will not drop their special pursuits in order to win a nuclear moratorium, they may donate some space in their newsletters and journals to the need for it. That is beginning now. Eventually, the combined circulation of such newsletters and journals may reach as many people as the mass-media resources of nuclear promoters.

Meanwhile, citizens who want protection of their lives and land from the nuclear experiment will have to sacrifice much of their precious free time to do battle against the lavishly funded nuclear-promotion campaign of the AEC and the nuclear industries.

#### WHY JOIN AN UNFAIR FIGHT?

It is not fair, and the only reason I have the nerve to ask people to join an unfair fight is because an irreversibly poisoned planet would make every other issue trivial by comparison.

The moratorium is so urgent that we cannot afford to postpone the fight for it until the rules are fair.

But in the longer run, free people can not afford to let big government and big business use dollar power to dominate public policy. If we tolerate that, we will deserve whatever we get.

#### WALLACE ARROWSMITH RETIRES AS CITY MANAGER OF WAYNE, MICH.

#### HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, a most remarkable career will come to an end, when Wallace Arrowsmith retires as city manager of Wayne, Mich., in my congressional district.

Wally Arrowsmith, during the past 30 years, has served at four levels of Government—Federal, city, village and township—and has earned respect and admiration at every point.

He first entered public service in 1943 with the Federal Public Housing Authority, serving as assistant manager of the Norwayne Housing Project in what was then the village of Wayne.

Three years later, at the end of the Second World War, he made his first and only bid for elective office, and won election as Treasurer of Nankin Township, now the city of Westland. In 1949, he became Village Manager for Wayne, launching the community into the most progressive and innovative period of its long history.

A major accomplishment for Wayne, and for Wally Arrowsmith, was the incorporation of the Community as a city in 1960. During the difficult and complex transition period, it was the guiding

hand of Arrowsmith that helped make the changeover with few problems.

In the intervening years as a city, Wayne has retained Arrowsmith as city manager, through many changes in administration and elected offices. The community has grown and prospered.

Mr. Speaker, the city-manager form of government has never become widespread nor popular in Michigan for a variety of reasons. The city of Wayne, with Arrowsmith as city manager, has been an outstanding exception.

In addition to his remarkable achievements in the community, Wally Arrowsmith has won recognition in other areas. He has served as president of the Michigan International City Management Association, and has been extremely active at the National and State levels of the organization. He has also served on the Board of Trustees for the Michigan Municipal League, and has contributed his time and services generously for committee work and other activities.

In 1955, he spearheaded a move which led to the creation of a five-community Central Wayne County Sanitation Authority, one of the most effective authorities serving a major urban area in Michigan.

Arrowsmith was honored in 1969 when he was among six persons selected from throughout Michigan as recipients of the Governor's Award for Distinguished Public Service.

A life-long resident of Wayne, Arrowsmith was a charter member and is a past president of the Wayne Jaycees; a member of the Rotary Club, and an active participant in the annual United Community Services Drive. His wife, Mildred, and their sons, Owen and Brian, are also active in the community. Brian was elected last year to the Wayne County Board of Commissioners.

#### THIRTEEN CAROLINA UNIONS SUPPORT NUCLEAR POWER MORATORIUM

#### HON. MIKE GRAVEL

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, a brief and lucid statement endorsing a national nuclear power moratorium was passed by the Catawba Central Labor Union—AFL-CIO—in Rock Hill, S.C., on March 12, 1973, and was forwarded on April 7 to the AEC by the union's president, Melvin Burris. The Catawba Central Labor Union represents 13 local unions with a membership of 7,000 individuals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Burris' letter to the AEC Safety and Licensing Board be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

APRIL 7, 1973.

Chairman Max Paglin and Members of Atomic Energy Commission Safety and Licensing Board:

I, Melvin Burris, President of Catawba Central Labor Union, P.O. Box 10957, 134 N. Wilson Street, Rock Hill, S.C., wish to state

the position of our membership of 7,000 citizens who work and live in the Rock Hill—York County area.

On March 12, 1973, at our monthly meeting, Union leaders and Delegates from thirteen local unions voted unanimously to go on record opposing the licensing and construction of the Catawba Nuclear Station sited for Lake Wylie in York County. We also at this time voted to support the Carolina Environmental Study Group to represent our interests in the intervention against the construction of this plant. We are in support of national moratorium on construction, licensing and operation of all atomic power plants and reprocessing facilities until the major health and safety issues have been fully resolved. Until this time we advocate use of fossil fuels and development of solar energy and clean energy sources.

We are specifically opposed to the proposed Catawba Nuclear Station because of the serious risks surrounding the question of the untested safety systems, waste transport and disposal methods, possibilities for sabotage and hijacking, possible consequences of severe health damage from low level radiation, and loss of peace of mind that will come from living near two large reactors that are relatively experimental. We in the state of South Carolina are already burdened with more nuclear facilities and potential dangers than citizens of any other state.

We believe the burden of proof and potential health and property damage should not be placed on the shoulders of the average citizen and business community who stand to lose all that is vital to their lives and existence if an accident occurs.

Our members are also concerned about the possible death of Lake Wylie from the possible heating by the proposed Catawba Nuclear Station up to 103 degrees F., if cooling towers are not installed. Under these conditions most of the fish would be killed and the water would be bad for both drinking and recreational purposes. Property values would be damaged as well as the quality of living in this area and business operations relying on water cooling sources from the lake.

Very truly yours,

MELVIN BURRIS,  
President, Catawba Central Labor Union,  
P.O. Box 10957, 134 N. Wilson Street,  
Rock Hill, S.C.

## PRISON REFORM IN NORTH CAROLINA

### HON. IKE F. ANDREWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, for many years, one of North Carolina's leading newspapers, the News and Observer, in Raleigh has featured many deserving citizens in its Sunday column "The Tar Heel of the Week."

On Sunday, June 10, this honor went to a man named John Campbell. In the article headlined, "A Man Who's Seen Prison Life From Both Sides Now," Mr. Campbell was described as "one of the best examples in recent times of rehabilitation working in the North Carolina prisons system."

Described in this feature article is a most remarkable success story, and I am pleased to share this with my fellow Members of Congress by including it at this point in the RECORD:

## A MAN WHO'S SEEN PRISON LIFE FROM BOTH SIDES NOW

(By Bob Joyce)

"I've still got some bad habits," John Campbell said with a smile. He had found the door to his office locked, and now stuck his comb past the catch, trying to by-pass the lock.

He had to twist it a couple of times, but in a second the door came open.

"I must be rusty," he said, smiling again. Campbell is one of the best examples in recent times of rehabilitation working in the North Carolina prisons system. He is now a counselor at the Sanford Advancement Center (a correctional institution), a state Jaycees officer, and an active community citizen.

### TRAGIC START

And he can joke now about breaking in, but not too long ago robbery became a tragically serious matter for him.

In early 1970, Campbell, then 28, was running a bill collection agency in Statesville. He was having personal and family problems he couldn't seem to shake, and was drifting toward alcoholism.

On January 22, he and his brother-in-law decided to rob a grocery store in Winston-Salem. Two days later they robbed the Friendly Supermarket in Stoneypoint. Twenty minutes after the second robbery, a police roadblock caught them.

The two armed robberies netted them just over \$700.

It wasn't long before Campbell was tried and given a 15-18 year sentence. He went to the maximum security section of Central Prison in May.

Just after his trial, he reflected on what had happened to him in a letter to the Winston-Salem Sentinel.

"How much money is freedom worth?" he wrote. "The freedom to travel, to select the foods you enjoy, the clothes you like to wear, a kind word, a sincere smile, the joy of watching a child play, the pleasure of a beautiful day, the physical love of a mate, or the satisfaction of a job well done?"

"Why would anyone risk all these riches for the same of some quick money?"

"The defendant (at the trial) knew no answer. I was that defendant. I hope you are not the next one."

At the prison, he was put in a maximum security dormitory, where 90 inmates lived in a room for 50. He deeply resented being there.

"For the first six or eight months I was bitter toward the world. I was thrown in with all sorts of people in horribly crowded conditions. I considered myself an outcast," he said recently.

### INTO SLAVERY

"It's kind of like a free man being captured and forced into slavery. You are told what to do, how to do it, and when to do it. The only way to describe it is hell."

After those months of bitterness, his attitude started to change. He learned of a Jaycee program in the prison which makes inmates full members of the Jaycee organization, and sponsors programs of self-help in the prison, and community relations outside.

"That was when I decided that my future had to be up to me," he said.

He was soon elected president of the chapter inside Central Prison.

During Gov. Bob Scott's initial tour of the prison which led to a two-year study by the State Bar Association and call for prison reform, Scott met Campbell at work in the Jaycee office in the prison. He urged him to keep up the good work, and a good attitude.

Campbell began to see changes within the prison as a result of the Jaycee work as more prisoners got involved, in part through his own work.

"The program has made a change in the attitudes of the people there (in the prison). It used to be completely cat-and-dog! Everybody was after each other. The Jaycees have given many of them a spirit of cooperation. It's a very healthy thing."

One example of the change is a breakdown in the old inmate's code which decreed that no prisoner would talk to a guard, or report anything that happens among the prisoners.

Campbell said that the main advantage of the Jaycee program is that it is geared toward action by the inmates rather than the prison staff.

"A man gets his feet wet helping solve his own problems," he said. Volunteers from the community come in to sponsor an inmate, to take him out of the prison regularly, to give him the chance to participate in a successful and happy family life, to have a model to pattern his life after when he gets out of prison.

Campbell's sponsor was Fred Morrison, then state Jaycee president, and current legal aide to the governor. Morrison has been a moving force behind the expansion of the prison Jaycee program to include presently over 40 chapters statewide and 1,000 inmate members, almost one prisoner in ten.

### BEGAN TO TRAVEL

While still a prisoner, Campbell began to travel with Morrison through the state encouraging the new Jaycee programs, and working up enthusiasms within the communities.

In July, 1972, Morrison appointed Campbell Associate Secretary of the N.C. Jaycees, the first inmate to hold a statewide office. It is the highest office ever held by an inmate Jaycee in the nationwide program.

At about this same time, Campbell began a "New Careers" program, receiving an education in counseling. The program was conducted by North Carolina State and Florida State universities. He began to look forward to parole and a new job.

In November, the parole came and Campbell went to work at the Sanford Center, where he is one of six counselors for 42 residents.

He continued his work with the Jaycees, and in February, 1973, he was awarded the George Randall Rookie Correctional Officer of the Year Award.

"The nomination for the award came from the residents here at Sanford," he said, "That meant more to me than the award itself."

The nomination was written by Terry Sneider, a Sanford inmate. It said that Campbell "has opened up new channels of communications and his example offers hope to many inmates who could not see a better future, for the men in prison live mainly on hope and through John Campbell's success, we can all see that any void may be filled, that it takes a lot of hard work but any man can succeed if only he tries. It's a great example for us all."

Ironically, the same weekend Campbell received the award the president of the Odum Prison Jaycee Chapter walked away from the meeting, and allegedly killed a young boy and raped a girl in Western North Carolina.

The incident was a blow to the Jaycee program, but after a thorough review, all volunteer programs were put in full swing again.

In response to the incident, Morrison appointed Campbell Institutional Chapter Representative of the Jaycees to work with the 44 prison chapters.

"As Jaycees," he wrote to the prison chapter members, "are we going to let one incident, even a tragic and regrettable incident, cost us ground that we have won by sheer hard work and faith in our organization? Are we going to let one individual destroy the progress we have made?"

"Hell, no! I think we have the guts and determination to prove our faith in this organization that has done so much for us."



## DEFINITE VIEWS

As a man who has seen prison life from both sides, and who now counsels prisoners about their personal and family problems, Campbell has some definite view on what needs to be done in prison reform in North Carolina.

He is careful to point out, however, that he thinks conditions generally are improving, both within the walls, and within the attitudes of the people outside in the communities of North Carolina.

First, he says, there is need for some personnel changes at the prison-unit supervisor level and higher.

"Some of these men have the old chain-gang attitude," he said. "But they are usually locally prominent people politically who have been there 15 or 20 years. How do you get rid of them?"

The number of supervisors who fit this category is steadily decreasing, however, he adds.

Second, those working within the prison should be paid an incentive wage for work they do.

As it is now, a prisoner who has an interested family outside the prison who can send him money regularly has a tremendous advantage over the man with no one helping him.

"Those men feel that they are confined against their will with no chance to do anything for themselves to get a small amount of money to purchase a few simple things, really necessities, like soap or cigarettes," he said.

Third, conjugal visits should be allowed in those prisons where the men are not allowed out.

"Confinement is enough punishment. We're not doing him any service by cutting him off from a normal heterosexual relationship, forcing him to accept values that society doesn't normally, like homosexuality.

## HEALTHY RELATIONSHIPS

"And there is tremendous need to maintain healthy family relationships so he can be accepted when he gets out."

Fourth, he wants expanded vocational training programs. Too often, he said, prison work is make-work, which fosters poor work habits and trains the man for nothing when he gets out.

Campbell is currently under consideration for a national Jaycee award for outstanding work among inmates. Morrison thinks he will get it.

"I'm no crusader," Campbell said. "I just enjoy helping people. And now I look forward to getting up every morning."

# FLOWSHARE AND TEST-BAN TREATY

## HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the following statement was prepared by Mr. Gary Largo, son of Mr. and Mrs. Al Largo of Rawlins, Wyo., a summer intern on my staff. It effectively correlates the AEC's Plowshare program with problems in negotiating a Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty. The material which Gary has assembled is highly relevant today with Soviet Leader Leonid Brezhnev's visit and our impending consideration of the AEC authorization bill. I congratulate Mr. Largo on this excellent, scholarly, effort and offer it for the perusal and consideration of my colleagues:

# FLOWSHARE AND THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST-BAN TREATY

(By Mr. Gary Largo)

Two major treaties, which the United States has signed, commit us to the seeking of a Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty (CTB) which would outlaw all nuclear testing. These treaties are the Partial Test-Ban Treaty (PTBT) of 1963 and the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons Treaty (NPNWT) of 1968. Quotes from these documents which provide for negotiation of a CTB follow:

"Seeking to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time, determined to continue negotiations to this end..."<sup>1</sup>

"Recalling the determination expressed by the parties to the 1963 treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in space, and underwater in its Preamble to seek to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions for all time and to continue negotiations to this end..."<sup>2</sup>

Support for a CTB has come from the United Nations in the form of a resolution calling for a moratorium on nuclear testing to begin in August of 1973, the tenth anniversary of the signing of the PTBT. Strong Congressional support is present for a resolution calling upon President Nixon to negotiate a CTB with Soviet Premier Brezhnev during the current summit talks. Many Congressmen feel all testing should be suspended in the interim, provided that the Russians reciprocate.

Limitations placed on arms by SALT I, especially in the ABM field, have greatly reduced desires for testing of more nuclear arms. With only 200 interceptors allowed each side, it is almost impossible to justify any further improvements in warheads for this purpose.

Effects of the ABM Treaty also apply to warheads used for offensive purposes. Without any effective ABM force to penetrate, the need for new warheads disappears. There is no further need for testing of warheads built to withstand high-altitude nuclear explosions since the allowed number of ABMs could be overwhelmed with a small fraction of the existing strategic forces.

Additional testing is necessary only for a first-strike force able to destroy the enemy's missiles in their silos. Standing U.S. policy has been to avoid construction of such a force so as not to provoke the Soviet Union into another round in the arms race.

On the other hand, a complete test ban would help to assure the U.S. that the Soviets were not working to improve their warheads.

The benefits of SALT I are not limited to the weapons development part of the problem alone. The ABM Treaty creates a mechanism by which explosion verification problems can be solved.

Verification provisions of the ABM Treaty afford a means of bridging the gap between U.S. demands for on-site inspection and the Soviet's reluctance to agree to such inspections. In this treaty, both nations agree to use technical means of verification; that neither nation will interfere with such means; and that neither will use concealment to impede verification.

The primary problem in verifying an underground test is the difficulty in differentiating seismic signals from earthquakes and explosions. Now with greatly improved seismic methods and computer processing, it is possible to classify almost any detectable seismic event as an earthquake or an explosion.<sup>3</sup>

New environmental developments have negated the need for on-site inspections for verification purposes. As a part of last year's environmental agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union, earthquake measuring devices will be installed in Russia by American scientists. These developments are best summarized in a statement by a committee of the Federation of American Scientists.

"Given recent improvements in seismology and other means of detection, we believe that the U.S. would detect Soviet violations of a test-ban treaty before they could carry out enough tests to score a breakthrough that would threaten the stability of a nuclear balance. . . . Without on-site inspections, clandestine cheating is far less plausible now than it would have been in 1963 with on-site inspections."<sup>4</sup>

The use of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes is now generally realized, at least in the U.S., to have few economic advantages and many environmental and safety problems. This program, Plowshare, has been a block to a CTB because it could provide an ideal cover for the testing of nuclear weapons.<sup>5</sup>

After exploring a number of uses for nuclear explosions, Plowshare has shown only that methods other than nuclear have fewer consequences environmentally, economically, and politically. Since the potential benefits of Plowshare explosions now appear to be marginal—if they exist at all—the program should not be an impediment to a ban on underground testing.

CTB would not necessarily stop the Plowshare Program. Peaceful uses for nuclear explosions could continue with on-site inspections being made at the blast site.<sup>6</sup> However, elimination of the Plowshare program might be the price required to be paid for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.<sup>7</sup>

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Partial Test-Ban Treaty ratified 10 October 1963.

<sup>2</sup> Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons Treaty ratified 1 July 1968.

<sup>3</sup> Scoville, Herbert Jr., "After SALT, A Total Test Ban?" Washington Post, February 4, 1973.

<sup>4</sup> Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., Speech on the floor of the U.S. Senate, February 20, 1973.

<sup>5</sup> Scoville, op. cit.

<sup>6</sup> Report by the office of Senator Philip A. Hart, Congressional Record, June 11, 1973, pp. 18985-92.

<sup>7</sup> "Prospects for a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty," Staff report by the Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Law, and Organization of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, November 1, 1971, p. 9.

# FURTHER LIMITATION OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE FORCES

## HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to have inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the recent agreement—along with White House fact-sheet—between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics pertaining to further limitations of strategic offensive forces. Obviously, I have not yet been able to make an exhaustive evaluation of these agreements; however, even a cursory review raises several questions which greatly concern me.

The Nixon-Brezhnev agreement sets the stage for the early conclusion of various accords on the limitation of strategic offensive forces. Accords may be reached on an interim basis prior to the conclusion of a permanent agreement detailing limitation of strategic offensive forces for 1974.

Principle No. 6 of the new agreement permits supplementary agreements that

might be concluded immediately or in the very near future, even before the negotiations on the permanent agreement are completed; under this principle a specific area of competition could be temporarily halted, in order to hold open the possibility of permanent limits.

It is my impression that this statement definitely tends to support the reports I have received and which I outlined to the House on June 7 that some type of MIRV limitations may be an early result of this exercise. The most important "specific area of competition" is counterforce-capable MIRV.

What is even more disturbing to me is that, if limitation on MIRVing of the land-based Minuteman III is a short-term goal of the agreement, as principle No. 6 suggests, then consideration may well be being given to limitations on MIRVing of Poseidon and Trident missiles as part of the later permanent agreement.

On the average, about 65 percent of the total U.S. strategic offensive nuclear forces on alert and available for immediate use are ICBM's. Recent Soviet emphasis on improved ballistic missile guidance and control systems make the development of a Soviet threat to U.S. ICBM's the most immediate "area of competition" to which an interim accord is likely to be directed. For example, test flights of the Soviet's Stellar-inertial guidance package for their 4,000-mile-range SSN-8 submarine system, Star-track, was terminated in 1969 because its great accuracy would arouse Soviet "first strike" fears. Allowing the Soviets to improve their ability to target U.S. ICBM's would place nearly two-thirds of the U.S. strategic offensive forces in jeopardy.

In my remarks on June 7 I suggested that, having been frozen into a position of quantitative disadvantage by the SALT I accords, we were now considering agreements which would lock us into a qualitative disadvantage, as well. One form which qualitative limitations could take would be a halt in Minuteman III MIRV deployment at or near current deployment levels. Since the United States has not deployed counterforce-capable reentry vehicles on board its Minuteman III missiles, it could be argued that there is no threat to Soviet strategic forces from a modest Minuteman III deployment.

We now have in place about 300 of the programed 550 Minuteman III's. This is a particularly attractive proposition to many people who have opposed MIRV from the outset, because a halt in U.S. ICBM MIRV deployments could be described as a mechanism to "preserve the option" of eliminating MIRV completely in any permanent agreement. In actual fact, however, this would constitute an abandonment of the most important qualitative advantage of the most numerous component of our strategic offensive system without any diminution in the Soviet threat to the United States.

Against this background, two factors with regard to the new agreement are of greatest concern to me. One is the total inadequacy of the "National Technical Means of Verification" to police the kind of agreements which now seem to be in

the works. The other is the fact that we still do not know whether the number of existing Soviet missiles which we accepted as the basis of the first accords was accurate. These are extremely vital matters and I will discuss each of them briefly.

As regards the "National Technical Means of Verification," it is purely and simply not feasible, within the confidence limits the Congress would require, as a means of verifying the qualitative characteristics of a MIRV ban. Acceptance of such a monitoring system for qualitative parity would not be consistent with the security interests of the United States and I do not believe Congress would support an agreement limiting MIRVs which depended on that mechanism for monitoring. Put very bluntly, we cannot agree to a MIRV ban without adequate on-site inspection. To my knowledge, no adequate method has been developed that would enable us to determine whether a Soviet missile has or does not have MIRV in an operational silo.

Testimony taken in 1970 by the Congress on the possibility of a MIRV ban through limitations on flight tests revealed the difficulty of such an enterprise. It is possible, for example, to detect missile test launches within the Soviet Union, but it is equally possible for the Soviets to conduct flight tests on low trajectories so that the flight itself cannot be observed with the ease of a missile launch. Such flights can test missile guidance, improved rocket propellants, reentry vehicle radiation hardening, command and control, et cetera.

To date the Soviets have been very adamant that any and all agreements exclude on-site inspections. Perhaps that situation has changed. It would seem that in order to develop treaties or agreements based on the principles enunciated in yesterday's agreement, the Soviets must have agreed to some type of on-site inspections. But the question must be asked and answered before any MIRV ban agreement is accepted by Congress.

With regard to the other point of my concern, the Soviet leaders have never confirmed the accuracy of the data we have relied on as to the numbers and types of strategic weapons systems they have deployed. We have only their word as to the quantity of ICBM's they actually have. Given this fact, we may be compounding an error if we assume the numbers agreed to in the first accords are correct. I feel very strongly that if we are to continue to negotiate in good faith with the Soviet Union, they must at least confirm or deny the accuracy of the quantitative data on their strategic missile systems. If we are wise we will insist that those figures be objectively verified.

Finally, I will allude only briefly to yet another point of concern. Principle No. 5 allows for modernization of individual weapons systems as well as their replacement; thus, both sides, over time, can retain confidence in their capabilities, but the conditions for introducing more modern systems and replacing old ones will be carefully negotiated.

It has not been widely noted that some such weapon systems can be deployed very rapidly. Thus, unless we can moni-

tor research and development, the flexibility envisioned in principle No. 5 is full of dangers and pitfalls. A 1974 deadline for negotiating an agreement which will not undermine U.S. security in this area is, in my opinion, totally unrealistic.

In short, Mr. Speaker, I am more concerned than ever that we are entering into plans which will result in locking us into qualitative as well as a quantitative disadvantage.

During the next few weeks I expect to be reviewing these agreements further, and I plan to present to the House additional questions which I feel must be answered in order to satisfactorily reach agreements that will result in an enduring peace—not merely the chimera of peace.

I expect, too, to work for a coalition of Members of this House who will reject any agreement which does not adequately deal with the problems I have already outlined and those I will be outlining in the future. The general outlines of future arms limitations, roughly sketched in this new agreement, may establish the framework for a defense posture which would be appropriate to an era of warm United States-U.S.S.R. relations. But it would become dangerously inappropriate in the event that a change in Soviet leadership, goals or tactics causes storm clouds to appear on the horizon. In short, it provides at best the framework for a "fair weather" agreement. I will be working to see that Congress does not entrust our national security to a "fair weather" agreement.

Text of agreement and fact sheet follow:

#### BASIC PRINCIPLES OF NEGOTIATIONS ON THE FURTHER LIMITATION OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS

The President of the United States of America, Richard Nixon, and the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, L. I. Brezhnev,

Having thoroughly considered the question of the further limitation of strategic arms, and the progress already achieved in the current negotiations,

Reaffirming their conviction that the earliest adoption of further limitations of strategic arms would be a major contribution in reducing the danger of an outbreak of nuclear war and in strengthening international peace and security,

Have agreed as follows:

*First.* The two Sides will continue active negotiations in order to work out a permanent agreement on more complete measures on the limitation of strategic offensive arms, as well as their subsequent reduction, proceeding from the Basic Principles of Relations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics signed in Moscow on May 29, 1972, and from the Interim Agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of May 26, 1972 on Certain Measures with Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms.

Over the course of the next year the two Sides will make serious efforts to work out the provisions of the permanent agreement on more complete measures on the limitation of strategic offensive arms with the objective of signing it in 1974.

*Second.* New agreements on the limitation of strategic offensive armaments will be based on the principles of the American-Soviet documents adopted in Moscow in May 1972 and the agreements reached in Washington in June 1973; and in particular, both



Sides will be guided by the recognition of each other's equal security interests and by the recognition that efforts to obtain unilateral advantage, directly or indirectly, would be inconsistent with the strengthening of peaceful relations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

*Third.* The limitations placed on strategic offensive weapons can apply both to their quantitative aspects as well as to their qualitative improvement.

*Fourth.* Limitations on strategic offensive arms must be subject to adequate verification by national technical means.

*Fifth.* The modernization and replacement of strategic offensive arms would be permitted under conditions which will be formulated in the agreements to be concluded.

*Sixth.* Pending the completion of a permanent agreement on more complete measures of strategic offensive arms limitation, both Sides are prepared to reach agreements on separate measures to supplement the existing Interim Agreement of May 26, 1972.

*Seventh.* Each Side will continue to take necessary organizational and technical measures for preventing accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons under its control in accordance with the Agreement of September 30, 1971 between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

#### THE WHITE HOUSE FACT SHEET—BASIC PRINCIPALS OF NEGOTIATIONS ON THE FURTHER LIMITATION OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS

In today's agreement the President and General Secretary Brezhnev reinforced their commitment to permanent limits on strategic armaments and to an intensification of the negotiations. The two leaders signed a document of seven principles that provide fresh guidance to the negotiating teams, instructing them to work out a permanent agreement over the course of the next year, with the objective of concluding it in 1974. The principles contain the basic outline of a new agreement, that will now be filled in at the talks in Geneva.

#### Background

The negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms began in Helsinki in November 1969, dealing with both offensive and defensive strategic arms. The negotiations continued until May 1971, when the President and General Secretary Brezhnev reached an agreement that broke a deadlock over the scope of the agreement and the priorities to be followed. Negotiations resumed and continued through the summit meetings in Moscow last May. On May 26, 1972, the President and General Secretary signed the first two agreements limiting strategic weapons: a treaty restricting the deployment of anti-ballistic missile systems, and an Interim Agreement limiting intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and submarine launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs). The Interim Agreement has a duration of five years. The two agreements came into force officially on October 3, 1972 with the exchange of instruments of ratification of the ABM treaty in a ceremony in the White House, with the President and Foreign Minister Gromyko participating.

The negotiations resumed in November 1972 in Geneva, and recessed on June 12 to await the outcome of the discussions at the summit. The negotiations have been thorough and the progress in the talks thus far was noted in the preamble of the Basic Principles signed today.

#### OUTLINE OF THE PRINCIPLES

##### The first principle

Sets a target date of 1974 for completing a new agreement;

Affirms the intention of both sides to continue active negotiations over the course of the next year and to make a serious effort to work out a permanent agreement that is

more complete in its limitations and that provides for subsequent reductions in strategic offensive arms.

##### The second principle

Establishes that the fundamental guidelines for a permanent agreement will be a mutual recognition of the equal security interests of each side and a recognition that efforts to obtain unilateral advantage would be inconsistent with strengthening U.S.-Soviet relations; these guidelines are drawn from the Basic Principles signed in Moscow in May 1972; in effect they direct the negotiators to deal with each other's security interest, broadly defined, and not only with limits on individual weapons; agreements that effect or harm the interests of other countries would be ruled out by the Basic Principles of last May and by this principle.

##### The third principle

Allows for limits on both the numbers of strategic weapons as well as on the qualitative characteristics of these weapons; whereas the first agreement dealt with limiting the number of ICBMs, including limits on heavy ICBMs and a ceiling on SLBMs, the permanent agreement will be broader in nature and involve limits on certain technical capabilities, such as multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles (MIRVs).

##### The fourth principle

Records the agreement that any limitation must be subject to adequate verification by national technical means; this confirms the basic approach to verification taken in the ABM treaty and the Interim Agreement.

##### The fifth principle

Allows for modernization of individual weapons systems as well as their replacement; thus, both sides, over time, can retain confidence in their capabilities, but the conditions for introducing more modern systems and replacing old ones will be carefully negotiated.

##### The sixth principle

Permits supplementary agreements that might be concluded immediately or in the very near term, even before the negotiations on the permanent agreement are completed; under this principle a specific area of competition could be temporarily halted, in order to hold open the possibility of permanent limits.

##### The seventh principle

Reaffirms that both sides will continue to implement the agreement of September 30, 1971 that was designed to reduce the dangers of accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons; its reaffirmation is intended to stress that this agreement remains part of the continuing process of strategic arms limitation.

In sum, this agreement on Basic Principles is a solemn commitment at the highest political level:

To limit strategic offensive arms permanently;

To complete an agreement in 1974;

To broaden the scope of an agreement to include limits on qualitative improvements as well as numbers of weapons, and to provide for subsequent reductions;

To allow for immediate agreements in areas where limiting competition may be urgent.

VICE ADM. HYMAN J. RICKOVER  
HONORED

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1973

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a justly deserved honor for Vice Adm. Hyman J. Rickover, U.S. Navy (retired) that the President now has the authority

to promote him to the grade of full admiral on the retired list.

Admiral Rickover presently has the status of being a retired officer recalled to duty. It is typical of this man's distinguished military career that he would come back to active duty when his country needed him.

Although I am only a freshman member of the House Armed Services Committee, it did not take long to realize the great contributions Admiral Rickover has made not only to our nuclear submarine power, but to our entire national defense system.

The Nation will be forever indebted to the keen foresight of Admiral Rickover, and I add my appreciation to him for his outstanding service to his country. Our vote authorizing his promotion to full admiral status gave a grateful Nation the opportunity to thank him.

FRANK LEAHY OF NOTRE DAME

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of one of the great figures of American football, Frank Leahy, who died yesterday in Portland, Ore.

Mr. Speaker, as Representative in Congress of the district where the University of Notre Dame is located, I know first hand of the extraordinary leadership of Frank Leahy as coach of Notre Dame football.

At Notre Dame his teams won 87 games, lost 11 and tied 9. In six of his seasons Notre Dame went undefeated.

Frank Leahy stood in the tradition of great Notre Dame coaches like the legendary Knute Rockne and today's Ara Parseghian.

But, Mr. Speaker, more than a football coach of remarkable success, Frank Leahy was a man of deep loyalty to his church, to his family, and to Notre Dame.

From boyhood days, I watched Frank Leahy's Notre Dame teams play winning football and in later life I had the privilege of coming to know him.

All those who knew Frank Leahy will miss him, and I take this opportunity to pay tribute to his memory and to extend my sympathy to Mrs. Leahy and their six children.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of an article about Frank Leahy in the Washington Post of June 22, 1973:

FRANK LEAHY, NOTRE DAME COACH, DIES

(By Kenneth Denlinger)

Frank Leahy, one of the giants of collegiate football, died yesterday at Good Samaritan Hospital in Portland, Ore. He was 64.

Mr. Leahy, who had six undefeated seasons at Notre Dame and maintained the tradition established by his former coach, Knute Rockne, had been suffering from several ailments, including a heart condition and a pre-leukemia blood condition.

A player and assistant under Rockne at Notre Dame, he became coach of the Irish in 1941 and compiled an 87-11-9 record before retiring because of poor health in 1953.

His overall winning percentage, which in-

cluded a 20-2 performance at Boston College before he assumed the Notre Dame position, was a remarkable .888.

While a student at Notre Dame, Mr. Leahy played both center and tackle for two seasons before a knee injury forced him to miss his senior season in 1930.

A native of Nebraska who received his early education in the appropriately-named Winner, S.D., Mr. Leahy was an assistant at Georgetown, Michigan and Fordham universities, where one of his pupils was Vince Lombardi.

When he became head coach at Boston College in 1939, a local newspaper headlined the story: "B.C. Signs Unknown Leahy." He was not unknown for long.

His first team lost just one regular-season game and the Cotton Bowl to Clemson. In 1940, Boston rocketed to the Eastern championship with 10 regular-season victories and a Sugar Bowl triumph over Tennessee.

The next year, with the coaching spot open because of the retirement of Elmer Layden, Mr. Leahy returned to Notre Dame and cautioned giddy supporters who predicted he would be "another Rockne."

"We'll do our best and you'll be proud of your team, but the day of the undefeated Notre Dame team is over," he said. The Irish were 8-0-1 that year.

His coaching career at Notre Dame was interrupted by World War II, when he served in the Navy and rose to rank of lieutenant.

Scrapping the traditional Irish box formation for the T formation, his teams of 1946-49 went 38 games without a loss.

"When you are a coach at Notre Dame," he said in 1949, "you don't control your personal life. You belong to the people, to the priests, to the radio. I notice now that I become fatigued a little earlier each day. My family would be happy if I decided to discontinue coaching."

"During the fall, I get home twice a week. The other nights I stay at the university. In 1947, during the winter months, there was one stretch when I was home only six nights in 90. The rest of the time I was out, speaking."

Among the well-known football players Leahy coached at Notre Dame were Angelo Bertelli, Johnny Lujack, Bob McBride, Terry Brennan (who succeeded Leahy as Irish coach), Ralph Guglielmi, Leon Hart, Connor, Bob Dove, Creighton Miller, Bill Fisher and Johnny Lattner, George Emil Sitko.

In 1953, during his final season as coach, Mr. Leahy collapsed during the second half of the game with Georgia Tech and was given the last rites of the church. He later recovered.

He seconded Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's presidential nomination at the Republican convention in 1956 and was made a Knight of Malta by Pope Pius XII. He was elected to the National Football Foundation Hall of Fame in 1970.

"Everyone here at Notre Dame and thousands of Frank Leahy's friends, teammates and players mourn his passing," said longtime Notre Dame athletic director Edward (Moose) Krause. "We all cherish his dedication, friendship and his love for Notre Dame."

There were many memorable Notre Dame games under Mr. Leahy and one was the 0-0 struggle in 1948 against the Glenn Davis-Doc Blanchard Army team in Yankee Stadium.

The record of his 1946 team was marred only by one tie, as were the performances of his 1948 and 1953 teams. The Irish were 4-4-1 in 1950.

In 1947 and 1949, the Irish went unbeaten and untied, scoring 291 points and allowing 52 in '47 and scoring 360 points and allowing 86 two years later.

Mr. Leahy was a promising amateur boxer who seriously considered a professional career after graduation from high school. But Rockne came along and persuaded him to enroll at Notre Dame.

He chose Notre Dame, Mr. Leahy once said,

after listening to Rockne make an after-dinner speech.

Mr. Leahy once recalled an incident when he was playing tackle under Rockne and was assigned to open a hole against the scrubs. Three times, the back never got past the line of scrimmage.

"Then Rockne called me over and let me have it," Mr. Leahy said. "He said, 'Leahy, I never knew how really fine a defensive tackle you were until just now. You've just succeeded in stopping three of our own plays while playing on offense.'"

In his last season, when they finished second to Maryland in the wire-service polls, the Irish stirred a terrific controversy when feigned injuries gave them a 14-14 tie with Iowa.

"There was nothing wrong with feigning an injury until we did it," Mr. Leahy said. "Now it's a sin."

After retiring from Notre Dame, Mr. Leahy became associated with various business ventures, then returned to football in 1960 as general manager of the Los Angeles Chargers of the American Football League.

After a year in professional football, he re-entered the insurance business. He moved to Lake Oswego, Ore., a Portland suburb, in 1963 and continued as an executive vice president of Canteen Corp., which operates refreshment dispensing machines.

Only last week, Mr. Leahy was unable to attend an annual award dinner in his honor in Chicago because of illness. "I was absolutely crushed over the fact that I couldn't participate," he told the group via telephone.

A hospital spokesman said Mr. Leahy was admitted Wednesday and developed complications early yesterday.

He is survived by his wife, Florence, and six children, Frank Jr., Gerald and Christopher, all of Lake Oswego, James, of Pasco, Wash., Mary Leahy, of Lake Oswego, and Sue Muostakas, and Florence Harter, both of Chicago.

#### PUBLIC TV—GOOD SERVICE

### HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, soon we will be debating the future of public broadcasting in the United States.

The following editorial from the May 26, 1973, Paris Post Intelligence in Paris, Tennessee, gives a good idea of how the people in my district feel about public broadcasting.

#### PUBLIC TV—GOOD SERVICE

The Public Broadcasting Service, a non-commercial television service which is financed by the government, is providing the public with excellent coverage of the Senate hearings on Watergate. Beginning at 7 o'clock in the evening, PBS starts a rerun of the entire day's proceedings with a gavel-to-gavel account of the hearings.

This is a good public service because many citizens interested in the Senate hearings do not have the opportunity to view it during the day when they are on the networks live. The PBS program is on TV Channel 2 from Nashville, thus giving the viewers the option of watching Watergate or their favorite entertainment program on the commercial network.

The Public Broadcasting Service was incorporated in 1969. It was incorporated by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which was, created by Congress in 1967 to funnel federal funds to public, noncommercial radio and television stations throughout the country. The 15 members of the corporation board

are appointed by the President to serve six-year terms.

To insulate against political influence on programming, the CPB corporation formed and incorporated PBS and gave it authority to select, schedule and promote public television shows. But there has been some dissension in the ranks recently. Thomas B. Curtis, who President Nixon appointed as chairman of the board of Corporation of Public Broadcasting, resigned because he felt CPB has taken over control of PBS and is dictating what programs it may and may not schedule. Curtis did not approve of all decisions being made by the CPB board of 15 political appointees in Washington. He wanted it kept the way it was, when 234 local public television stations in the country ran PBS nationally, and he resigned when the CPB board rejected a compromise he had negotiated with the local stations under which CPB and PBS would share control over the network.

The viewing public has little to say about all this but the future of the network that brought you "Sesame Street," "Civilization" and "An American Family" is at stake.

These programs obviously are of a scope and quality that are utterly beyond the ability of a local television station to produce exclusively for its own use.

A public television network is needed. PBS has made great strides. It has also made mistakes. A better balance in its public affairs programs may be needed.

But canceling programs like the conservative William F. Buckley Jr.'s "Firing Line" and centralizing all control of the network in Washington are not the answer.

Maintaining the independence and freedom of a television network that is heavily dependent upon government money is a matter of great difficulty and sensitivity.

Restraint is required on both sides—the network and station managers on one side, the politicians on the other.

### PAUL MORPHY, LOUISIANA CHESS WIZARD

### HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the history of chess stretches far back into human antiquity, and since the founding of our own country, many famous Americans have been devotees of the game. Most Americans are aware of the feats of Robert "Bobby" Fischer, who brought the world's chess championship home from Iceland last year. Few realize, however, that "Bobby" Fischer is not the first great chess champion that the United States has produced.

Over a century ago the world of chess stood amazed at the prodigious talents of another young American, a native son of my own State of Louisiana, Paul Morphy. Morphy's bright genius carried all before it over the chess board for 3 dazzling years, only to be then suddenly, and finally, extinguished.

Today I would like to take note of the 136th anniversary of Paul Morphy's birth which occurred in New Orleans on June 22, 1837.

Morphy, who was of mixed Irish, French, and Spanish ancestry, was the son of a high court judge and learned to play chess at the age of 8. Possessed of a sharp and ready mind, he



completed his study of law and was admitted to the bar before turning 20. Still too young to start a practice he gave over all his time to the pursuit of chess.

In 1857 he played as an unknown in his first major tournament in New York and scored a stunning upset, finishing first. Then at the urging of his friends he embarked on a sensational European tour in which he decisively defeated the best players of England, France, and Germany. Toasted and lionized everywhere he went he was acclaimed as the best player the world had ever seen.

Returning to the United States in 1859 he passed his time writing chess theory and analysis before resettling in New Orleans in November 1860. At this point his career came to a strange and abrupt end.

His mother, who believed that chess was a frivolous pastime, unworthy of a gentleman, pressed upon Morphy her conviction that it was now time for him to follow more serious pursuits. Finally she extracted from him a promise, which he kept, never to play chess publicly again.

Thereafter Morphy's life story became a melancholy saga of waste and decline. The Civil War, and its ruinous aftermath in the south, frustrated Morphy's attempts to build a successful law practice. Frail and introverted, he was almost alone among his contemporaries in failing to enlist in the Confederate cause. He also seems to have been unsuccessful in love. According to one story he was deeply wounded by the scornful reproach of a lady who rejected the idea of marriage to a "mere chessplayer."

Withdrawn and increasingly alienated, Morphy turned into a virtual recluse in his mother's house, emerging only to take a walk or go to the opera. Obsessed with paranoid delusions he finally succumbed to a stroke on July 10, 1884.

In his short but brilliant period of activity Morphy was responsible for a large number of important innovations in chess strategy. Today his games are still replayed and admired by chess enthusiasts the world over. In the words of the noted chess analyst Fred Reinfeld "a chess wizard who has not studied Morphy's genius is about as queer a concept as an engineer who is unable to count."

A man of transcendent promise, only half fulfilled, Morphy's career has earned him the title of "the Pride and the Sorrow of Chess."

#### THE DOLLAR-MARK-YEN CRISIS, FEBRUARY-MARCH 1973

**HON. RICHARD T. HANNA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the dollar crisis is on the lips of very Member of this body and of most Americans. While it is of no less concern to me than to other Members, I would like to point out to my colleagues that the dollar does not exist in a vacuum and that the dollar crisis is only a small part of a larger problem of international finance.

I think that this point is clearly made in the following article, reprinted by the American Enterprise Institute from the SAIS Review, by Dr. Gottfried Haberler. I strongly urge my colleagues to read and ponder his remarks:

THE DOLLAR-MARK-YEN CRISIS, FEBRUARY-MARCH 1973

(By Gottfried Haberler)

(NOTE.—Dr. Haberler is a Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute and the Galen L. Stone Professor Emeritus of International Trade at Harvard University.)

#### I.

The world has just passed through the second post-Smithsonian currency crisis. The first one was in June 1972 when Britain was forced to float sterling.

The recent crisis is usually called a dollar crisis. And so it was. But it was also a German mark and a Japanese yen crisis. We would speak of a pure dollar crisis if the dollar were overvalued with respect to all or most other currencies, so that a devaluation of the dollar was all that was needed to correct the imbalance. We would speak of a pure mark and yen crisis if the mark and the yen were undervalued with respect to all or most other currencies, so that an upvaluation of the mark and the yen was all that was needed to correct the imbalance. Actually the recent crisis was a mixture. The dollar was devalued with respect to many but not all currencies. The mark and the yen were upvalued with respect to many but not all currencies.

It is important to understand that even in case of a pure mark and yen crisis the dollar would be prominently involved. If any one or two important currencies are undervalued and appear ripe for upvaluation, dollars from all over the world, not only from the U.S., will rush into those currencies. Therefore, the crisis will take on the appearance of a dollar crisis. This follows from the fact that the dollar is—still is!—the world's foremost reserve, official intervention and private transaction currency.

#### II.

It will be instructive to carry this thought one step further. Suppose the dollar were replaced as the foremost international reserve and official intervention currency by SDRs or gold. That SDRs should become the principal reserve medium is being widely demanded and was in principle accepted by the recent gathering of the finance ministers of the countries comprising the Committee of Twenty of the IMF, charged with making proposals for international monetary reform. (Communiqué of March 27, 1973.) That gold should take the place of the dollar after its price has been tripled or quadrupled is demanded by some gold stalwarts.

I do not believe that SDRs will soon be put in place of the dollar and I am sure gold will not. I only say: Assume it were done. Assume further that again two important currencies get out of line and appear ripe for upvaluation. The consequences would be exactly the same as at present: SDRs or gold and dollars would rush into the undervalued currencies. I say "and dollars" because the dollar would remain the most important private transaction currency even if it lost its role as the most important international reserve and official intervention currency.

It follows that replacement of the dollar by SDRs would not help much. This confirms the now widely-held view that improvement of the balance-of-payments adjustment problem of reform.

#### III.

Why is it that in our time currencies get out of line so frequently? In other words, why is it that stubborn deficit and surplus positions, which require parity changes, arise so often, and why can they not be adjusted more smoothly?

The short answer is that the world consists of independent sovereign states, each

with its own monetary, fiscal, and wage policies, with divergent priorities and attitudes concerning major policy objectives, such as full employment, growth and price stability. This results in different rates of inflation and the more inflationary countries are likely to get into balance-of-payments deficits and the less inflationary into surpluses.

But differential inflation is not the whole story. Take the U.S. If we had less inflation our balance of payments would be stronger. From 1958 to 1965 prices in the U.S. were remarkably stable and there was a great improvement in the balance on goods and services from \$0.3 billion in 1959 to \$8.6 billion in 1964. But some foreign countries, e.g. Japan, have persistently had much more inflation than the U.S., as measured by the consumer price index. Somehow, however, Japanese export prices have risen much less than ours.

Apart from inflation, the basic reason for the prolonged weakness of the dollar is the fact that other countries have caught up with the U.S. in industrial development. After the war the U.S. economy was dominant. This supremacy has been lost. Furthermore, practically all currencies have been depreciated vis-a-vis the dollar at one time or another, the French franc as late as 1969.

That does not mean that the dollar is lost or that inflation does not matter. But it does mean that in order to have maintained equilibrium at an unchanged parity of the dollar our inflation performance would have had to be much better than it was—or Japan, Germany and others would have had to inflate much faster.

The upshot is that to avoid currency misalignments which require parity changes, there would have to be a far-reaching coordination among different countries of monetary, fiscal, full employment and wage policies. This coordination—or centralization of policy—exists inside every country. That is the main reason why we never hear of balance-of-payments difficulties of California or New England. But it is virtually impossible between independent states. How difficult it is, is demonstrated by the fact that the members of the European Economic Community (Common Market) have not been able to coordinate their policies sufficiently to prevent currencies from getting out of line, although "monetary integration" with fixed parities is a high-priority objective towards which the Europeans have been working hard for a long time. If the closely-knit EEC countries are unable to avoid parity changes, it follows a fortiori that serious disequilibria are virtually unavoidable in wider circles.

#### IV.

Having explained why currencies often get out of line and require parity changes, we now have to ask: Why are these adjustments almost always preceded and accompanied by currency crises, that is to say by massive flows of funds which threaten to disrupt trade and payments? And why have these crises shown such a marked tendency to become more spectacular?

The answer is simple: Our method of changing parities has been defective. It is the method of the "adjustable peg," under which exchange rates are kept stable as long as possible by pegging. The central banks of the deficit countries—the Federal Reserve in the U.S.—sell gold or foreign exchange from their reserves to prevent their currencies from declining in the exchange market. The central banks of the surplus countries buy dollars to prevent their currencies from going up. Pressure builds up and at some point the exchange rate is changed with a big bang by a large amount.

This system offers an easy target for the speculator. He knows that an overvalued currency cannot go up and an undervalued currency cannot go down. If the speculator has guessed right, that is, if parties are changed, he makes a large profit. If he has guessed wrong, that is, if there is no change

in parities, he loses only a little (transaction costs and interest)—heads he wins a lot, tails he loses only a little.

Governments have been trying to stop speculation by all sorts of controls and regulations which cannot be described here. Experience has shown again and again that when the imbalance becomes large and therefore the inducement to speculate is strong, speculation can be contained only by draconian controls which governments have been reluctant to apply because from some point on they tend to stifle trade and legitimate speculation.

Currency crises accompanying exchange rate changes have become more spectacular because frequent parity changes have alerted more and more business firms and individuals to the opportunities of reaping profits and avoiding losses by anticipating parity changes.

The only effective way to make parity changes smooth is to stop pegging and let the exchange value of a currency float, that is to say, to let it be determined by demand and supply in the market. How it works can be illustrated by a few recent episodes. In 1969 the German mark appeared to be ripe for upvaluation. The Bundesbank bought billions of dollars to keep the mark from rising. Upvaluation became a political issue in an election, which heightened the speculative fever. After the election (September 1969) the new government decided to let the mark float. It shot up in the market, but, lo and behold, speculation stopped, because it had become too risky. Once a currency floats the speculator can no longer be sure which way it will go.

A month later the mark was stabilized at a 9% higher value in dollars. The Bundesbank lost a lot of money because when the speculators took their dollars home they paid a lower price in marks than the Bundesbank had paid a few weeks earlier.

One would have thought the Germans had learned their lesson. But in May 1971 they made exactly the same mistake. First they bought billions of dollars, then they let the mark float. Speculation ceased but the Bundesbank lost several billion marks. And in February 1973 the game was repeated once more but with higher stakes—larger gains for the speculators and losses for the Bundesbank.

The Swiss had learned their lesson quicker. In 1971 they made the same mistake as the Germans. But in 1973, when they saw the dollar avalanche coming, they let the Swiss franc float up and the dollars rushed into Germany.

The Canadian dollar has been floating from 1950 to 1962 and again since 1970. There has been no disruptive speculation at any time during the clean float and the huge American trade with Canada, our largest trading partner, has remained undisturbed. Canada is a special case, it is said; it pursues responsible internal policies—not much more inflation than in the U.S.—hence the floating Canadian dollar has been a fairly stable dollar (no wild fluctuations).

Let me give a counter-example from a country with not-so-responsible policies. Brazil has had a lot of inflation—20% a year for the last five years. (Now it is down to 15%). Brazil has therefore had to depreciate the cruzeiro from time to time, or else she would have lost her exports fast. Until 1968 she had the adjustable peg. Every six or seven months the cruzeiro was devalued with a big bang. During the intervals pressure built up, speculation was rife and black markets flourished. In 1968 she adopted not a floating rate but a close substitute to floating, what has become known as a "trotting peg." Under this system the currency is devalued by 1½ or 2% every five or six weeks. This has worked very well. There has been very little speculation because it does not pay to speculate on

a parity change of 1-2%, if the precise date and magnitude is not known, when interest rates are over 30% (as they have to be under a highly inflationary situation).

The moral is not that inflation does not matter—the country would be better off without inflation—but that the potentially disastrous consequences of inflation on foreign trade can be avoided or at least greatly mitigated by flexible exchange rates.

If flexibility works under high inflation—expected inflation at that!—it surely will work under the more favorable—less inflationary—conditions in the industrial countries.

v.

What is the outlook for the future? We surely have to assume that from time to time imbalances will arise which require parity changes between major currencies. We cannot count on countries being able to adjust and coordinate their monetary, fiscal and wage policies, inflation rates, etc. sufficiently to maintain permanent equilibrium at fixed parities.

Will floating become general? I doubt it. The ministers and governors who were gathered in Washington in March to ponder the reform of the international monetary system agreed that exchange rates ought to be "stable but adjustable." That sounds like more of the same, although they did not exclude floating "in particular situations." (Communique, March 27, 1973.) Ministers and governors propose, but market forces may dispose differently. However, by clinging too long to over- or undervalued parities, governments have it in their power to create currency crises of any magnitude.

I am nevertheless optimistic for the following reasons: We should not forget that the international monetary system is not an end in itself, but a means to facilitate international trade and capital flows in the interest of the economic welfare of all countries. Now it is a fact of the utmost importance that world trade has grown by leaps and bounds throughout the postwar period. This growth was not interrupted or even slowed down by any of the many recent currency crises, including the last one.

This is in contrast to what happened in the 1930's. Then currency crises—devaluations of sterling, the dollar and practically all other currencies against gold—went along with, and greatly contributed to, a catastrophic contraction of world trade. Many critics of the postwar monetary system, the "dollar standard," predict that history will repeat itself, that the collapse of the dollar standard will cause a worldwide depression just as the collapse of the gold standard in 1931 did. Advocates of a return to the gold standard on the right, and proponents of an international paper money issued by an IMF turned into a world central bank on the left, are united in their prophecies of impending collapse and disaster.

There has been no collapse so far. True, the mighty dollar has been devalued twice in 14 months (in December 1971 and in February 1973), but world trade is still growing fast and the dollar, although it has lost some of its lustre, still plays a vital role in the world economy. Why this contrast between now and the 1930's? A brief analysis of the reasons leads to moderately optimistic conclusions for the future.

In the 1930's there was a severe depression in practically all countries, which in the U.S., the dominant economy, was home-made although in smaller countries it was to a large extent imported. In the postwar period there was no real depression anywhere. Mild recessions and inflation yes, but deflation and severe depression are a thing of the past. On that most economists are in agreement.

In the 1930's under a regime of fixed exchange rates, depressions especially the American one, spread from country to country. Deficit countries clung to their parities and reacted by deflation, import restrictions

and exchange control. Surplus countries also clung to their parities and tried to ward off imports from the deficit countries when the latter in the end devalued. In our time, too, countries hold on to their parities too long, but deficit countries have not reacted by deflation (unless one calls mild anti-inflationary moves deflation) and have avoided sharp import restrictions. The adjustable peg is clumsy and too sluggish and induces speculation, but it is much better than the fixed pegs of the 1930's. (The fixed pegs were eventually changed but only after they had done enormous damage.)

My conclusion then is that the present system is not perfect, far from it, but that it is an enormous improvement over what we had in the 1930's. We need and we will get smoother adjustment through greater flexibility of exchange rates. But a collapse or a sharp contraction of world trade is most unlikely. It would require incredible mismanagement to bring it about.

True, protectionism is on the increase, especially in the U.S. The Burke-Hartke bill, reflecting ignorance and disregard of economic principles by some of the top leadership of organized labor, is a saddening and depressing development. (This disregard also manifests itself in their advocacy of price freezes, rollbacks and high minimum wages, which create high unemployment among underprivileged workers—all highly disruptive, short-sighted and damaging policies.) Fortunately, in the Administration, in Congress and also in labor circles the resistance to extreme protectionism is strong, so that a protectionist explosion is unlikely. Experience has shown that protectionism becomes irresistible only in depressions with high unemployment.

Another condition which tends to breed trade restrictions is balance-of-payments difficulties. For that reason it is so important to improve the adjustment mechanism by greater flexibility of exchange rates. What are potentially very dangerous are the reactions of deficit countries, because they are tempted to restrict imports. Import restrictions by surplus countries, on the other hand, would make their embarrassing surpluses even larger; no surplus country has reacted in such an irrational manner. What they do is impose capital import controls against speculative inflows of funds. Unless carried to extremes, such controls are not a serious threat to world trade. They do not create vested interests for their perpetuation (except on the part of the controlling bureaucracy), as trade restrictions do. It is therefore easier to get rid of them than to get rid of trade restrictions.

Surplus countries should nevertheless promptly appreciate their currencies or let them float, or liberalize their import restrictions in order to help the deficit countries put their external balance in order.

I conclude that we can expect a continuation of the growth of world trade. Whether the international monetary system will be reformed in a formal manner by a grand revision of the Articles of Agreement of the IMF (the Bretton Woods charter) or in an informal way by the IMF acquiescing in, and trying to supervise, frequent extensive floats of numerous currencies, is not terribly important. The greatest contribution the U.S. could make for a better working of the system is to curb inflation. If there were another flare-up of inflation in the U.S. there would be trouble, flight from the dollar and another devaluation. But even in that case there would be no collapse of the whole system. Paradoxically, the fact that foreign central banks now hold between 60 and 70 billion dollars as part of their international reserves is a stabilizing factor. It is impossible for foreign countries to get rid of so many dollars without letting their currencies appreciate sharply, which they hate. But the U.S. should regard it as a duty to keep the



dollar fit for its great role in the world economy by preventing any further erosion of its purchasing power.

## LET THE AGED LIVE ON RHETORIC

### HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, as of July 1, America's older people will be required by the Nixon administration to pay 50 cents more monthly for their part B medicare premiums. The President has proposed added increases in costs of health services to be paid by individuals under medicare. In effect, the administration is seeking to reduce health care services to the Nation's senior citizens.

These proposed cutbacks were presented to the Congress in January of this year when the President made his budget for fiscal year 1974 public. Over 23 million Americans would be affected by these reductions, which would increase the total health bill to be paid directly by the elderly by some \$700 million. This was not the intent of the Congress when it passed medicare.

Under the President's proposal, there would be an increase in the present deductible of \$72 for the first day of hospital care to the actual charges of the first day. The medicare patient would pay 10 percent of all charges thereafter—now without cost to the beneficiary for the first 60 days.

For those covered under the voluntary part B doctor's insurance, our elderly would have to pay the first \$85 instead of \$60 of doctor's services covered by medicare. They would also pay 25 percent more for all services above this amount. Premiums paid for this part B insurance would increase from \$5.80 to \$6.30.

The administration team rationalizes this proposal by claiming that it will increase cost-consciousness among the elderly. If any of these wonder boys ever emerged from the isolation of their present environment and actually got to know the average American on social security, they would be astounded to discover that they are perhaps the most budget conscious people in the country. If they ever had to survive, and that is the word, for 30 days on a social security check, they might discover that misery is their daily lot too often, that leftovers and stale bread compose many diets and that every day is a struggle to make ends meet. Nor does their rhetoric feed or comfort them.

Such a plan should not, however, surprise us. This is the same administration that opposed with might and main a 20-percent increase in social security last year.

The President's penuriousness towards the elderly does not extend into other areas of concern. He is generous to a fault to Thieu of South Vietnam. He spends American tax dollars liberally on Cambodian bombing, when both the House and the Senate have said "no." He does not blink an eye lash at the questionable windfalls allowed major grain companies over the Russian grain deal.

But we must teach the elderly to be

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

more cost conscious. We have to drive home the lesson of thrift. Some lesson.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the Congress will allow such a proposal to become law. Already, a number of Members of both bodies have expressed opposition to such a move. My vote shall be cast against such an outrage, should it reach the floor of this House.

### SKYLAB'S RECORD

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today is an historic day in the Space Age. Today, Astronauts Conrad, Kerwin and Weitz will return to the earth after 28 days in Skylab 1, the longest record of men in space.

These brave and dedicated men should be an inspiration to all of us as to what can be accomplished when man sets his course in the positive.

The Evening Star and News had an excellent editorial yesterday entitled "Skylab's Record," I recommend it for must reading:

#### SKYLAB'S RECORD

Astronauts Conrad, Kerwin and Weitz deserve a rousing welcome, and solid recognition of their record-setting feat, when they return to earth tomorrow after 28 days in Skylab 1, the nation's first orbiting space laboratory.

On Monday, after a bit less than 24 days aloft, they had lived and worked in space longer than any other humans, beating the record of three Soviet cosmonauts who died on the way down because of a leaky hatch. The endurance mark represents more than a sporting victory, the medical experience of the American trio, one of them a physician, will be invaluable in determining the feasibility of longer-duration, manned space missions.

The three Navy officers also demonstrated the irreplaceability of men in certain kinds of space tasks, at least given the present state of the robot art. By fixing severe heating and electrical-power problems that threatened to turn Skylab into a \$2.6 billion disaster, they did more than salvage their own mission. They saved the space station for future habitation by two successive crews aiming to stay 56 days, and they also saved the nation's space program from a drastic cutback born of disillusionment.

Other benefits of the first tour of duty in Skylab will come from the nonmedical experiments carried out by the astronauts, including observations of solar phenomena and earth resources. These will add to the substantial fund of otherwise unobtainable knowledge already accrued from the manned space program, including the dramatic explorations of the moon.

It is discouraging to some advocates of the space program that the present mission has been observed so casually by the American people, overshadowed as it has been in the headlines by Watergate, the Brezhnev summit and the price freeze. This comparative lack of attention is one of the costs of America's long string of successes in space. We tend to forget about the courage and skill required of the men we send into orbit and beyond, the ingenuity of their monitors on the ground and the billions we all have invested in the effort. These factors are worth reflecting upon as the country reassesses its future ambitions in space.

The immediate task is to get the Skylab trio back safely, to find out what they and

their medical conditions can tell us about man's durability in space. We will be more than repaid for the cost and worry of sending them there.

## SOVIET JEWS: THE WORDS AND THE DEEDS

### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's New York Times carried an article by Anthony Lewis wherein Mr. Lewis ably points out the great disparity between the continuing arbitrary treatment of Jews seeking to emigrate from Russia and the assurances of Soviet Communist Party General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev.

I, along with others who sent telegrams protesting the treatment of Mr. Yevgeni Levich, son of a famous Soviet scientist, was informed by the State Department that:

We regret we are not in a position to intervene directly in cases where Soviet citizens wish to go to third countries, as with the Leviches.

The administration has responded similarly to other pleas. I believe that it is not inappropriate for the United States to take the opportunity of Mr. Brezhnev's visit to recommend the attention of his government to the rights of Soviet citizens due them under the Soviet Constitution on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The article follows:

#### SOVIET WORDS AND DEEDS

(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON, June 20.—Dmitri M. Segal is a young Soviet scholar of extraordinary brilliance and breadth of interest. His field is linguistics, but he has worked also on folklore and anthropology. He has written on language theory, on mythology, on the structure of Edward Lear's limericks.

His works have been published in the Soviet Union, Poland, the Netherlands, Britain, Italy. He won an Italian prize for his studies in Russian folklore. His work is known to such Western figures as Claude Lévi-Strauss.

Last Dec. 26 Dmitri Segal and his wife, Elena Dmitrievna Segal, applied at the visa office in Moscow for permission to leave the U.S.S.R. for Israel. Months later they got the answer: No. The reason given was "lack of parental consent."

Dmitri Segal is 36 years old, his wife is 29—and the age of majority in the Soviet Union is 18. Those who have seen the official form on which Soviet citizens must apply to emigrate say that it says nothing about parental permission. But when the authorities want to, they simply impose that condition, no matter what the age of the applicants.

The problem for the Segals is her father, Dimitri Tolstol, who is the son of the Soviet writer, Aleksei Tolstol. After giving his consent for his daughter's departure, he changed his mind under circumstances that are not clear. He then circulated an "open letter" saying that members of "prominent families" should not be allowed to leave the U.S.S.R.

Immediately after they applied for visas, the Segals were deprived of their work—as is the regular practice. Friends who have seen them recently describe them as desperate.

The case of Elena and Dmitri Segal throws some realistic light on Leonid Brezhnev's

assurances to members of Congress about Soviet treatment of would-be émigrés. He said that 95 per cent of the Jews who asked to leave have been allowed to; only 738 recent applicants had been turned down, 149 on grounds of national security; the suspended exit tax would not be reimposed.

Such assurances from the leader of the Soviet Communist party carry great weight. That he should even talk with American politicians about what the U.S.S.R. has always considered an internal matter is highly significant. There are some practical constraints now on Soviet handling of the emigration problem—constraints imposed by the desire for better economic and other relations with the United States.

But the realities remain, and for the human beings involved they can be terrible. Not that a national judgment should be made on the basis of one injustice. The point about the Segals' case is its demonstration of continuing arbitrary treatment that simply does not fit the assurances.

There is, for example, no "national security" reasons for denying exit visas to the Segals. Nor is theirs some old case that would be handled differently now: The refusal of their visa was confirmed to them just one month ago, on May 18, by a Colonel Verein of the Soviet Interior Ministry.

And of course there are many other cases of entirely arbitrary denials of exit visas, hundreds known in the West and probably many more unknown. Characteristically, the obstacle is not the tax or any other general rule but some special legal device such as the demand for "parental consent."

When Prof. Benjamin Levich, the great Soviet scientist, sought to go to Israel, his son was drafted. The young man has recently been reported to be suffering from a stomach tumor at a remote army post.

A pupil of Professor Levich's, Victor Yachot, was also called up for military service when he sought to emigrate. He refused to go, saying that he had renounced his Soviet citizenship. He was thereupon sent to one of the notorious prison psychiatric "hospitals" used to punish dissidents. But he was fortunate: After protests from the West he was allowed to go.

It would be foolish to think that the United States as part of its new relationship with the U.S.S.R., can force early or dramatic changes in Soviet legal practices—indeed, in the whole Soviet view of law and authority, Mr. Brezhnev and his colleagues cannot and will not abandon their system of power.

But it would be just as wrong for U.S. officials to pretend that all is well when it is not. American pressure can make some difference, as we have already seen. And in a larger sense, greater freedom of movement for people and ideas is perhaps the most important concrete objective for the West in the new relationship with the East—a goal to be kept in mind in all meetings and negotiations.

#### FOREIGN AIRLINES SUBSIDIZED BY THEIR GOVERNMENTS

**HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.**  
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, the problems that our domestic airlines face, in terms of foreign competition, are well known to us all. However, what is not so well known is the severity of the problem, and the fact that it becomes more severe all the time.

The basic problem, of course, is that all foreign airlines are subsidized, in whole or in part, by their governments, and thus are in the favorable position of having virtually no financial problems.

Additionally, since foreign airlines do not observe the same cautions we do because of antitrust laws, they are in a position of competing with our airlines on two distinct levels.

While I do not favor nationalizing any industry, it is apparent that some intermediate steps will have to be taken, such as a review of our antitrust laws and preferential tax treatment, to insure that domestic airlines maintain a competitive posture in the world market.

To illustrate this point, I submit an article, entitled Taking Off, which appeared in the April 15 issue of Forbes magazine, for my colleagues serious consideration:

#### BRITISH AIRWAYS—FUELED BY BRITISH GOVERNMENT MONEY

There's a new international airline coming over the horizon, and it spells trouble for the existing international carriers, particularly Pan American World Airways. It will have the most comprehensive route network in the world, nearly 500,000 miles to 200 airports in 84 countries, vs. Pan Am's 90,000 miles to 120 airports in 82 countries. Its 220 planes will make up the largest international fleet, and it will be the largest carrier in both seat-miles and ton-miles. And behind it will be the British government's financial resources.

British Airways is being formed by a merger—not yet completed—of British Overseas Airways Co. and British European Airways, whose combined assets total \$1.1 billion. These assets will reach \$1.7 billion in the next five years. That's not a prediction; it's a certainty. The British government, which owns 100% of BOAC and 100% of BEA, naturally will own 100% of British Airways, and the government plans to buy enough newly issued stock in the new company.

"We will be a formidable competitor," says David Lancaster Nicolson, 50, BA's half-Canadian, half-English chairman.

That's a typical British understatement. Not only will British Airways route structure give it a great advantage over its competitors; its financial structure will give it a terrific advantage over U.S. carriers. If they have to buy equipment, U.S. carriers must borrow the money from the banks or else float convertible debentures, as Pan Am did recently—at a heavy interest cost.

BA can also make deals with other airlines that U.S. carriers, for antitrust reasons, cannot. For example, it has a joint operations arrangement with Qantas, the Australian line, and has set up another with Air India. And it is discussing with Russia's Aeroflot the prospect of a joint London-Moscow-Tokyo route.

British Airways will particularly hurt Pan Am because BEA has an unparalleled network in Europe. It has long been a feeder line for Pan Am. Pan Am Chairman William T. Seawell is certain his company will lose some—unspecified—business it has been receiving from BEA.

Question: How long can U.S. international carriers take this kind of competition?

#### SUPREME COURT DECISIONS ON OBSCENITY

**HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the decisions handed down by the Supreme Court yesterday regarding obscenity. Once more the people of this Nation are afforded some legal protections against the barrage of filth pro-

duced for exploitative purposes. Once more the States and communities can crack down on pornographers without fear that their efforts will be overturned by a higher court.

Under the old standard of judgment—whether pornographic material was "utterly without redeeming social value"—we have seen our communities faced with an influx of these materials; helpless under a vague first amendment interpretation by the courts. I do not believe that the writers of the Constitution ever meant the protection of free speech to go to this extent, and I am sure that they would not have wanted the express will of the States and cities to be thwarted in the process.

The Court has now agreed with this position. Chief Justice Burger has observed that prior interpretations demeaned the first amendment by equating "the free and robust exchange of ideas and political debate with commercial exploitation of obscene material." In place of the old broad guideline, almost impossible for a prosecutor to prove, the Court has established three new standards.

If a pornographic work "taken as a whole, does not have serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value," and "taken as a whole, appeals to the prurient interest in sex" and is "patently offensive" in its content, it can be banned and purveyors prosecuted.

Even more important for the people of this great Nation, their own judgment on the nature of pornographic materials is now to be taken directly into account. The Court has held that "community standards" of decency may be those of a local area, rather than a nationwide standard. The States can thus establish their own standards or can permit local options. Chief Justice Burger noted that the questions of offensiveness and appeal to prurient interest are "essentially questions of fact" which local judges and juries can decide.

Mr. Speaker, I am overjoyed at this new set of standards, and at the decision to rely on the good taste of the American people. For too long, the Constitution has been used to protect the rights of the few at the expense of the majority. We are now headed back in the right direction with this decision to protect the public dignity against the assaults of bad taste.

#### EXPERT CRITICISM OF PLOWSHARE

**HON. TENO RONCALIO**

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the June 8 Salt Lake Tribune, based on an interview with Mr. David M. Evans, director of the Potential Gas Agency, Mineral Resources Institute, Golden, Colo., may be of particular interest to Members in their consideration of AEC authorizations for fiscal year 1974.

I have the highest regard for Mr. Evans and his professional criticism of the AEC's Plowshare program. It is in



this vein that I commend this article to my colleagues.

#### GAS AGENCY'S HEAD PROTESTS RIO BLANCO N-TESTS

(By Robert H. Woody)

GOLDEN, COLO.—David M. Evans is director of the Potential Gas Agency of the Colorado School of Mines in Colorado.

He is a 1936 geology graduate of the college, which scarcely has the reputation of producing "eco-freaks."

But as a representative of the Colorado Open Space Council, an organization of more than 40 environmental organizations, Mr. Evans strongly protested the Rio Blanco nuclear tests.

#### CONTINUES TO PROTEST

Twenty-one days after the test—involving the detonation of three vertically placed 30-kiloton nuclear explosives to stimulate natural gas production in formations more than a mile underground in western Colorado—Mr. Evans continues to protest.

His protest is on two fronts: Economic and health.

#### SEEN AS RIDICULOUS

The Atomic Energy Commission and other corporate parties to gas stimulation, admit that the wellhead price of gas produced by Rio Blanco or future tests would be anywhere from three to eight times more than the current commercial wellhead average.

It is ridiculous then, Mr. Evans argues, for one federal agency—the Atomic Energy Commission—to sponsor a technology that will produce gas at least three times the current price when another federal agency—the Federal Power Commission—keeps a firm hand on the price of wellhead gas.

Why not simply have the Federal Power Commission lift the price control on gas at the wellhead? If the price were trebled, you'd get the exploration and discovery needed to bring the nation's natural gas stores back in balance with demand, he says.

#### URANIUM EXAMPLE

That's what happened during the uranium boom. The AEC increased the price it would pay for uranium to build up a U.S. supply for military needs. The Colorado Plateau swarmed with prospectors, and the necessary discoveries were made.

But with the wellhead price controlled, nobody wants to drill for gas. Too costly and too risky. Result, the total footage of drilling for oil and gas wells slipped from 235 million feet in 1958 to a low of 125 million in 1971.

As for the health hazard, 48 radioactive elements are created in a fission explosion involving uranium, he says. Particularly deadly and long lived are Strontium 90 and Cesium 137.

#### READILY DISSOLVED

These two elements are readily dissolved in water, and should there be water leakage into the nuclear cavity and migration of the water into an adjacent drill hole with a blowout—"Consider what happened recently at Williamsburg, Mich."—then the elements could contaminate surface water.

It should be noted here that not all geologists share Mr. Evans' apprehensions on the accidental migration of the water soluble radioactive materials. The AEC has said that on the basis of its tests at the Las Vegas testing site and because of the tightly compacted nature of the western Colorado gas formations, such an occurrence is nearly impossible.

#### POINTS TO IRONY

Mr. Evans finds a certain irony in the AEC's recent proposal that hydraulic fracturing be tested in Piceance Basin of western Colorado near where the nuclear fracturing testing took place.

"That's about like having General Motors find a substitute for the automobile."

Hydraulic fracturing—involving pumping into tight formations under pressure to break them up—has been used by oil and gas field service companies for years, he says.

In the early years, water was the medium. More recently, the medium is liquid carbon dioxide.

#### PINK SHEET REPORTS ON HISC HEARINGS

#### HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, many of our returned POW's have told us of the adverse effect on their morale produced by the appearance in Hanoi of American citizens active in the antiwar movement. Returned POW's have testified before the House Committee on Internal Security that they were tortured to compel them to meet with American antiwar activists. Our committee has just published the transcript of hearings on "Restraints on Travel to Hostile Areas" held May 9 and 10, 1973.

This week's issue of the Pink Sheet on the Left dated June 25, 1973 carries a report on those hearings. The Pink Sheet has been a source of valuable information on developments in the extremist movements for the past 2 years.

The Pink Sheet article follows:

#### GOVERNMENT INTERNAL SECURITY COMMITTEE RELEASES REPORT ON "JANE FONDA" LEGISLATION

The U.S. House Committee on Internal Security has just released the transcript of its hearings on a bill to restrict travel to countries in armed conflict with the United States.

This proposed legislation has been nicknamed the "Jane Fonda" bill by supporters. It is tailored to prevent Jane Fondas of the future from traveling to combat zones and making anti-American propaganda.

The proposed legislation will be voted on by the full House of Representatives within the next few weeks.

The high spot of the recently concluded HISC hearing on the bill was the testimony of Ramsey Clark, a late '72 visitor to Hanoi and a former U.S. Attorney General.

Ramsey Clark, testifying on his own behalf and that of the American Civil Liberties Union, stated that he was opposed to any travel restrictions and had gone to North Vietnam solely as an individual. Committee Chairman Richard Ichord (D., Mo.) led off the questioning by sharply challenging Clark's statement that he visited North Vietnam as an individual. Ichord introduced documentary evidence that Clark was a member of a delegation organized by the Communist front Stockholm Conference on Vietnam.

Congressman John Ashbrook (R., Ohio) pointed to Clark's hypocrisy by revealing that when the witness was Attorney General his Justice Department had favored such travel restrictions and Roger Zion (R., Ind.) forced Clark to admit that picture distributed by North Vietnamese showing Clark standing next to an unexploded bomb near a hospital was phony propaganda. Had the bomb really been dropped at that location it would have penetrated the ground.

Expressing the attitude of most of the Congressmen present, Herbert Burke (R., Fla.) severely—and properly—reprimanded

Clark for allowing himself to be used as a propaganda tool by the Communists.

Copies of the Committee hearing are available free by writing to your Congressman. Urge him also to vote in favor of the Ichord travel bill which will prevent American citizens from traveling to areas where soldiers or insurgents are fighting against the United States. A similar bill sponsored by Senator Strom Thurmond will be coming up in the Senate. So please let your senators know about your feelings on this, too.

#### LAND REFORM IN THE PHILIPPINES

#### HON. JOEL PRITCHARD

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have been deeply concerned with the problems of rural development in less-developed nations, and with the close relationship of these problems to the basic issues of agricultural production and mass violence in these areas. Last December I visited the Philippines and spent several days in the deep rural areas where the vast majority, 70 percent in fact, of the Philippine population still lives. There I spoke with a number of tenant farmers as well as with government officials, landowners, and others affected by the land situation.

The deep grievances of impoverished, landless farmers have again and again threatened disruption and disintegration of Philippine society in the generation since independence. Furthermore, these grievances are not only dangerous, they are a dead weight against agricultural production and overall economic development.

The problems of rural development—the threats of large scale violence, the lack of development, and the low agricultural productivity, which by the way drives up prices here by creating demands on our own disappearing surpluses—are many and complex.

Because of my concern with these problems, I was very pleased to see in the New York Times for Sunday, June 10, an extensive section, paid for by the Philippine Government, presenting that government's plans and policies for the "New Society." The presentation highlighted and emphasized the absolute determination of the Philippine Government to proceed with a very large scale land reform program which would provide land for at least two-thirds of the tenant farmers.

The presentation contains one of the most candid recognitions of a major social problem that I have ever seen in a formal government statement, especially one directed largely to potential investors. It also embodies one of the most direct and public pledges for an effective solution to that problem. I believe that the Philippine Government should be praised for the highly public commitment to the vital land reform program.

JOHN J. LANG

**HON. JOSHUA EILBERG**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1973, the Northeast Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce will be experiencing a most tremendous loss—the retirement of its executive director, Mr. John J. Lang.

During his 10 years as executive director, John has done an outstanding job in building the chamber of commerce into the vital community service organization that it is today. He has been an invaluable help to me each year in organizing my annual business seminar in Philadelphia. Whenever community organizations needed assistance, John could always be counted on to get the job done. He always found time to talk to groups in the community and to become involved in promoting their projects.

The people of northeast Philadelphia will miss John Lang.

At this time I enter into the RECORD an article about John that was published in the Evening Bulletin in Philadelphia:

**SURPRISE FETE HONORS RETIRING CHAMBER AIDE**

Nearly 100 business and civic leaders yesterday paid tribute to John J. Lang who is retiring June 30 as executive director of the Northeast Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce.

Lang, who has held the post since his retirement as an official of the Philadelphia Gas Works 10 years ago, was honored at a surprise luncheon hosted by the Frankford Kiwanis Club.

The luncheon was held at the Shack, 7133 Roosevelt Blvd.

In addition to working as full-time executive director of the chamber, Lang served as managing director of the Philadelphia Textile Association and secretary of the Northeast Manufacturers' Association.

He retired at 65 as a public relations representative for PGW in 1963 after 49 years with the company.

Prior to assuming the full-time executive director's job, Lang served as a director of the chamber for eight years and was active on a number of its committees.

"John should be known as Mr. Northeast Chamber of Commerce for his efforts in building the organization into the community force it is today," Robert E. Putney, chamber president, said.

A former president and member of the Frankford Exchange Club, Lang is a member of the Frankford Luncheon Club, founder of the Inter-Service Club Jug Golf Tournament and a former director and member of the North Hills Country Club.

**MISS CLARA SHAUGHNESSY, 1973  
WINNER OF THE CORBETT-FULTON AWARD**

**HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago Federal employees in the

Pittsburgh area established an award in memory of two former colleagues of ours in the House, the late Robert J. Corbett and James G. Fulton. This award is presented annually to a Federal employee who displays the highest degree of skill and ability in the administration of his or her duty.

The 1973 recipient of the Corbett-Fulton Award is Miss Clara Shaughnessy, who attained national recognition for her efforts in having the position of claims representative in the Social Security district upgraded. This action effected more than 5,200 employees throughout the United States. Miss Shaughnessy also was recognized for her work in the writing of a contract geared to the needs and conditions of social security district and branch offices in Pennsylvania.

In announcing the award winner, Miss Mary M. Stock, secretary-treasurer of Pittsburgh's American Federation of Government Employees, described Miss Shaughnessy as "the union representative's union representative and the Federal employee's employee."

The Corbett-Fulton Award was a highlight at a recent dinner sponsored by the Pittsburgh Federal employees, the Federal Executive Board and the Federal Business Association. The dinner itself observed the 90th anniversary of the U.S. Civil Service Commission and kicked off a day-long labor-management conference.

Principal speaker at the dinner was Royal L. Sims of Philadelphia, national vice president of the AFGE-AFL-CIO. Mr. Sims paid tribute to Federal employees, noting they administer the affairs of Government which touches, in some way, the lives of every American. In discussing the relationship of labor and management in Federal service, Mr. Sims astutely pointed out there should be no such division. As he so aptly put it: "We all own part of the rock."

He did, however, touch on areas he felt are vital to continued improvement in our system: Awareness of involvement in great issues of society; a sensitivity to intangible outside issues and forces; an understanding of not only management's public mission but the social, economic, and cultural environment in which it must be achieved; a knowledge of the employee's ability and potential and their development; the need for intelligence, commonsense, and human warmth in knowing how to motivate employees.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Pittsburgh branch of AFGE, under the capable leadership of Robert W. Huffman, president, should be commended for not only recognizing the individual achievement of one of their own but also for bringing employees and supervisors together in a conference to understand and solve mutual problems.

I would like to extend these commendations to those who took part in the conference: Peter M. Smith, personnel officer of eastern administrative office, Bureau of Mines; Rev. Jerome A. Duraczynski of the VA Hospital; John F. McKune, Director of Organization and Per-

sonnel Management, Department of Interior; Arlow L. Julian, Jr., chief, eastern administrative office, Bureau of Mines; Clyde M. Webber, national president, AFGE; Mr. Sims; W. J. R. Overath, Regional Administrator, Labor-Management Services Administration, Department of Labor; Howard W. Solomon, Executive Secretary, Federal Services Impasses Panel; Harold Kessler, chief, program division, Federal Labor Relations Council, and Jerome H. Ross, national representative, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

**CONNECTICUT BUSINESSMAN  
FIGHTS INFLATION****HON. RONALD A. SARASIN**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the action of a Fifth District, Connecticut, businessman who has taken direct and positive action to combat rising prices and inflation.

Wilton, Conn., automobile dealer Bob Sharp, one of the leaders in his field on the east coast, has voluntarily reduced the labor charge on all repair work done at his establishment by \$1.

This reduction, representing a lowering of these charges by approximately 8 percent, was undertaken in response to President Nixon's recent televised address regarding the economy.

Mr. Sharp, who is also well known for his accomplishments on the auto racing circuit driving for his own Bob Sharp racing team, admitted his individual action would have little national impact in controlling inflation, but expressed the hope that other auto dealers would follow his lead and that a broad segment of the public could benefit from lower automobile maintenance and repair costs.

Mr. Sharp stressed that this reduction of costs would be absorbed by the company and that his employees' paychecks would not be affected.

I bring this action to the attention of my colleagues as an example of truly public-spirited behavior by a businessman.

Mr. Sharp has demonstrated a real concern for our present problems and has given more than lip service to dealing with them. I offer him my congratulations and I hope more businessmen in Connecticut and throughout the Nation will be moved by his example to deal directly with one of the major root causes of inflation.

Such individual initiative by the businessmen of America, if carried out nationwide, would be the surest and fastest way of dealing with the rampant inflation threatening our economy.



# THE HIGH PRICE OF FOOD: A MATTER OF TASTE

## HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, every now and then even the Washington Post prints something worthy of being repeated.

Such is the case, in my opinion, of the article in the Friday, June 22, issue written by columnist George Will on the subject: "The High Price of Food: A Matter of Taste."

I compliment Mr. Will on the clever and effective way he has pointed out the basic and most important factor bearing upon our Nation's economic problems today. I doubt if many of my urban oriented colleagues will find this article very pleasing, since it pulls away the false curtain of hypocrisy behind which so many have hidden when blame had to be fixed. They still like to make the poor old farmer the whipping boy.

The article follows:

### THE HIGH PRICE OF FOOD: A MATTER OF TASTE

(By George Will)

A few months ago when Meat Boycott Chic was in full flower, the media featured housewives incandescent with rage because high meat prices were "forcing" them to subsist on "hot dogs and TV dinners." If American consumers are too dim to understand that hot dogs are a dreadfully expensive way to buy protein, or that the price of a TV dinner includes about as much for the preparation as for food, then Mr. Nixon can be partially forgiven for treating us like "a child in the family."

In his June 13 economic speech the President did just that. He eschewed "seemingly simple gimmicks." Instead, he "froze" just about everything, saying: "We must not let controls become a narcotic—and we must not become addicted." He promised that the freeze will be followed by "a new and more effective system of controls" designed—you guessed it—"to get us out of a controlled economy."

Mr. Nixon probably understands that whiney, spoiled, irrational consumers have no objection to the national penchant for talking flapdoodle about the economy. But surely it is sensible to distinguish between general inflation and some of the more conspicuous price rises that are not just manifestations of the general inflation.

The principal cause of general inflation is government spending. It is understandable that Mr. Nixon did not dwell on this fact in his speech. It is an unpromising topic for the author of an FY 1974 budget that calls for spending twice as much as LBJ spent in 1966 even while LBJ was escalating wars against North Vietnam and poverty. Mr. Nixon's latest budget calls for spending \$19 billion more than was spent last year—an increase larger than the sum of all federal budgets from 1789 through 1966.

Yes, sure, this budget was announced by Mr. Nixon and denounced by his critics as an austerity budget. More flapdoodle, all around.

The public is grouching most about a few prices it considers "unreasonable," especially food and gasoline prices. These prices contribute to the general inflation statistics, but they are not just part of the general inflation, any more than is the price paid a scalper for Redskins tickets. These prices have to do with uncomfortable—but inevitable and pre-

dictable and irreversible—supply-demand situations.

Tastes are changing. Paychecks, like people, are getting fatter. Today people want to eat more, and to eat more expensive things. And they want to buy a convenience component in what they insist on thinking of as a simple food bill.

Mr. Nixon says he wants to "make it possible to produce meat and eggs and milk at prices you can afford." But he must know that most of those who are complaining loudest can afford to pay today's prices—and more—for good diets. In 1930 Americans spent 23.4 per cent of their incomes on food. In 1960, 20 per cent. Until recently, 15.7 per cent, and only 12.3 per cent on food prepared in the home.

The "problem" today is that more Americans—and more disagreeable foreigners—can afford to pay more for more and better food. Give a man here or abroad milk and the greedy wretch will want beef. And soon the American consumer starts complaining about the consequences of a demand (including his own) that is growing faster, worldwide, than the food supply. Such complaining is not realistic.

Regarding gasoline, Mr. Nixon promises Phase IV "measures" (not, of course, wicked controls) to stabilize (without, of course, controlling) the price of gasoline. These measures will try to insure that excessive demand does not lead to price increases that would dampen the large U.S. portion of the soaring worldwide demand that is causing the scarcity. That is not realistic.

But the *vox populi* is hitting C over high C about food and gasoline prices, and Mr. Nixon is not deaf. Would that he were!

Keeping down gasoline prices will stimulate consumption—and oil imports. That will hurt the balance of payments as will the proposed restraints on agricultural exports. So perhaps there will be another devaluation, with another increase in the cost of imports, and another easing of competitive pressure on domestic industries. As an anti-inflation program, this is not realistic.

Liberals, most of whom favor controls, accuse conservatives, most of whom oppose controls, of being "unrealistic" about the dynamics of social change, and of wanting to "turn back the clock." It is true that conservatives often are not *au courant* concerning the most recently discovered laws of social behavior.

But conservatives do have a firm grasp on one arcane law, to wit: when peoples' appetite for something is increasing faster than the supply of that something, the price often goes up. And if it goes up far enough, people usually don't want so much of it. Or, as the boys at the serious quarterlies say, most demand is price elastic.

As for "turning back the clock," that is Mr. Nixon's stunt, and his liberal critics are merely complaining that he did not turn it back far enough. He turned it back by mandating prices at the June 1-8 levels, but his critics say prices were "unreasonably" high then.

I will leave it to Mr. Nixon and his fellow controllers to argue about the day or week or year or decade in which prices were at a level "reasonable" for today. But it might be jolly good fun for Mr. Nixon next time around (and there will be a next time) to mandate prices at levels prevailing (say) June 1-8, 1933, when there was a sort of heavy economic frost on everything.

Unrealistic, you say? Well, God forbid unrealism in economic policy. The grim women of the meat boycott would not stand for it.

Today some of these women can be seen in Chevy Chase supermarkets, complaining all the way from the meat counter to the checkout counter about paying an extra quarter for a steak. Then they plunk down 50 cents for a lottery ticket, load their sacks of potato chips and soft drinks into a large

station wagon, roll up the power assisted windows, turn on the air conditioning, and start complaining again about "unreasonable" prices.

## MINIMUM WAGE BILL

### HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, following the adoption of the minimum wage bill in the House of Representatives, several overzealous political persons decided to project themselves into the picture by criticizing my vote. I note that one politician, in particular, who is currently seeking reelection to the New Jersey Assembly this coming November was quite critical of my vote but distorted the fact that I have supported the minimum wage projections on a more orderly progression of scale. It is quite apparent that this is why he is in the lower House of the New Jersey Legislature because without any equivocation he has exhibited his unknowledgeable intemperate mouthings without regard to the whole story.

May I call to your attention, Mr. Speaker and to all of those who are interested, an editorial that appeared in the Detroit Free Press on June 11, 1973. It is a well-known fact that the Detroit Free Press is not a conservative subscriber to the news media but to find such a frank explanation should leave no doubt in the minds of those who are critical as to what we were trying to accomplish in the House. It is deplorable that the shortsightedness of some of my colleagues may cause the loss of employment to those persons who work in the domestic field and to the youth of America who need jobs to augment their school money.

I also include a copy of the remarks of Congressman JOHN N. ERLBORN of Illinois that adequately explain the position I took on the floor of the House: [From the Detroit Free Press, June 11, 1973]

#### EDITORIAL ASSAULTS HOUSE PACKAGE

Like the decision to double the President's recommendations for Social Security benefits made by the last Congress, this new Congress has gone far beyond Mr. Nixon's own high but reasonable recommendations.

The President had supported a proposal to increase the minimum hourly wage from \$1.60 to \$1.90 this year, \$2.10 a year later and \$2.20 after two years. He would not have included any new workers in the coverage, and advocated a "youth differential" for beginners or summer job-seekers.

The House went way beyond it. It voted for a \$2 minimum this year and \$2.20 next year. It jacked up the rate for agricultural workers, who now get a minimum of \$1.30 an hour, to a schedule which would reach the same \$2.20 rate in 1976.

It included an estimated one million household domestics, not now covered, and put them on a schedule which will reach the \$2.20 level in 1975. It extended coverage to about five million federal, state and local government employees, and by a narrow margin beat down the youth differential.

It will affect those it was designed to help, but the effect, we fear, will be disastrous. It will, quite simply, price a lot of

jobs out of existence, invite evasion of the law and, at the same time, increase the pressure by those already at or above the minimums for greater inflationary increases.

No one needs to be told there is a shortage of jobs for teenagers this summer and, we imagine, there are plenty of teenagers who would be willing to work for \$1.50 or \$1.60 an hour. But if an employer is forced to pay \$2, the job will cease to exist. Most supermarket baggers have already vanished, and the restaurant busboy is an endangered species. This proposed 24 percent immediate increase in the minimum wage could well finish them off.

We question whether the inclusion of domestic helpers is even constitutional. Congress derives its power to set minimum wages from the interstate commerce clause. It taxes the imagination to consider domestic help interstate commerce, even if the maid in Toledo spends some time dusting Grand Rapids furniture or watching a television set made in Japan. The same constitutional question applies to state and local government workers.

Even if it is constitutional, it is damaging. . . . Call it slave labor if you will, but \$5 or \$8 a day is considered the going rate in much of the nation. If the legal rate goes up to \$16 for an eight-hour day, the jobs will disappear in whole or in part, or householder and helper will collude to break the law.

Further, over the long run, this bill will force wages and prices up all along the line. The worker now getting \$2 will, reasonably enough also want a 25 percent increase to \$2.50. The worker getting \$2.50 will hardly be content.

Fortunately, the key vote on the bill, a Republican substitute, was only defeated by a fairly slim margin, 218-199, although the record vote on the bill itself was 287-130. This means that if the Senate passes the House version and Mr. Nixon vetoes it, his chances are good of being upheld in the House.

We think he should and expect he will.

A minimum wage bill on which I have worked hard for nearly three years lost out in the House of Representatives June 6. The Democratic majority on the Education and Labor Committee had reported a bill to raise the minimum from its present \$1.60 to \$2 almost immediately, and on to \$2.20 a year afterward.

Following the practice of last year, I had fostered the Erlenborn Substitute which would have raised the minimums at a more leisurely rate. The substitute was defeated 199 to 218 in the first vote of a long afternoon and evening.

Finally, at 8 p.m., the committee's bill passed 287 to 130. I voted against it.

The question has been before our General Labor Subcommittee since 1971; and I have been advocating the more moderate approach, as expressed in the substitute. From the start, I have been urged not to seek a compromise. "The minimum wage is too high now," this argument goes. "Raise it and you will only cause employers to hire fewer people in low-paid jobs. Don't compromise; just vote No."

The margin of defeat explains why I did not take this advice. When I offered the compromise last year, I won by 26 votes. This year, I lost by 19 votes; and when I simply voted No, I lost by 157.

Senators Peter Dominick of Colorado and Robert Taft of Ohio will try for a moderate bill in the Senate, so we still hope for some measure of success.

If the bill which passed the House becomes law, however, there will be some marked changes in the American economy, and they will be felt in some surprising places. Several classes of workers will be affected for the first time, among them, employees of federal, state, and local governments, and domestic workers. Additionally, transit work-

ers will come under a special overtime provision for the first time.

Transit companies are in a precarious position, and may be hard hit if they must change their traditional way of handling overtime.

The inclusion of government workers will have a spotty effect. Federal workers will be exempt from overtime provisions, and so will police and firemen. Even so, the House-passed bill will markedly raise the cost of state and local government.

Most urban and suburban domestic workers (except baby sitters) apparently are now paid more than the minimum wage. What impresses me here is the enforcement problem. A domestic worker may have five or six employers, and even a dozen employers for one worker are not unusual. It will be interesting to see the number of bureaucrats required to enforce this section.

The big battle concerned the youth differential. It is a key part of the Erlenborn Substitute. It would provide that a 16- or 17-year-old youth could work for six months at a lower rate (usually 80 per cent) than older workers. The youth rate also would apply to full-time students.

Unemployment among young people is disproportionately high—presently at 15 per cent for all, but at 30 per cent for non-whites.

The bill which passed the House would continue student work provisions which are so bound up in red tape that only 37,000 students get the advantage of them.

#### PUBLIC COMMITMENT TO A WAR ON POVERTY

##### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, all public opinion polls, I know, are closely scrutinized and carefully considered by my colleagues in Congress.

I would like to bring to the attention of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD readers, the details of a television poll conducted by George Gallup, Jr.

I feel certain that these findings will be of great interest to those of us who attempt to forge and implement public policy.

POVERTY PROJECTS FAVORED IN A POLL—REGIONAL PLAN SURVEY FINDS STRONG TREND FOR THEM

(By John Sibley)

A television poll of the New York metropolitan region shows that citizens strongly favor a broad range of public programs to alleviate poverty.

Among other things, 81 per cent called for expanded pre-school education and daycare for children of working mothers.

A majority favored changes in school attendance boundaries for more integration within walking distance.

Guaranteed jobs for all who want to work were approved by 51 per cent. And 36 per cent favored Government jobs for some of the unemployed.

The survey was one in a five-part series conducted by George Gallup Jr. for the Regional Plan Association, entitled "Choices for '76." The questions were presented in a one-hour telecast over virtually every television station in the region from New Haven to Trenton.

The pollsters have acknowledged that their respondents are not a representative sampling of the region's population.

"What we have," Mr. Gallup said recently

"is the opinion of people who tend to be citizen activists. They are likely to belong to civic and political organizations and to know how to make their views felt."

In the survey on poverty, 51 per cent said the government should guarantee a minimum income for everybody in need.

Asked what the minimum should be for a family of four, 12 per cent said it should be \$2,400, 21 per cent said \$4,200, 11 per cent said \$5,000 and 8 per cent said \$6,500.

However, 41 per cent said there should be no minimum income and the remainder said they had no opinion.

Asked whether they favored higher Federal income taxes for "people with higher incomes," 71 per cent voted "yes," 24 per cent "no" and 5 per cent "no opinion."

Asked whether state and local authorities should rely less on sales and property taxes and more on income taxes, the respondents were 61 per cent in favor, 32 per cent opposed and 7 per cent undecided.

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

##### HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, there can be no question that Lyndon B. Johnson was one of the most extraordinary public figures in American history.

A Member of the House of Representatives, majority leader of the Senate, Vice President and, finally, President of the United States—Lyndon Johnson brought a combination of energy and intelligence and compassion to his responsibilities unusual to find in any person.

Everyone who came to know the late President will have his own recollections of him.

But, Mr. Speaker, I remember particularly the visit President Johnson made to my hometown of South Bend, Ind., in early 1964 to survey the impact on our community of the shutdown in late 1963 of the Studebaker automotive plant. And I continued to be grateful for the assistance he provided to help the people of St. Joseph County recover from that economic blow.

And I remember as well, Mr. Speaker, another visit President Johnson paid to my district, to the small community in Elkhart County, of Dunlap, which had been devastated by a tornado, and I recall with continuing appreciation the comfort the presence of the President of the United States meant to the citizens of that small community.

In terms of President Johnson's leadership on crucial national issues, I am sure that what most impressed me—and many others—was the depth of his commitment to improving education and health for the American people, to the eradication of the curse of poverty in a wealthy land, and to the translation into reality of the American dream of equality of opportunity for all citizens, regardless of their race or color, their religion or national origin.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that the great tragedy that afflicted the Presidency of Lyndon Johnson was the war in Vietnam.

But no matter our views on the war, all Americans can, I believe, applaud



Lyndon Johnson and pay tribute to his memory for his remarkable and gifted leadership in so many ways to make a better nation for all our people.

# FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT

## HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will soon be asked to put its final stamp of approval on the proposed Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 as House and Senate conferees resolve differences between the respective versions of S. 502. I am concerned lest the bill finally approved by the conference contain a provision in it designed to exempt a project in San Antonio, Tex., from Federal law.

The project is the controversial "North Expressway" part of the proposed relocation of U.S. Highway 281. A 9.6 mile section will serve the north-south traffic corridor between downtown San Antonio and the San Antonio International Airport by connecting Interstate Highway 35 and existing U.S. 281 and Loop 410. The current plan is to construct the expressway through the Olmos Basin and Brackenridge Park areas. The park complex contains the San Antonio Zoo, San Jacinto Park, Olmos Basin picnic area, two golf courses, an open air theater, sunken gardens, Franklin Fields, the Alamo Stadium, playing fields, hiking trails, and undeveloped lands.

The Texas Highway Department and the city of San Antonio seek special action by Congress to exempt the project from the requirements of section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. section 1653 (f)) and the National Environmental Policy Act.

In approving section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, the Congress said:

It is hereby declared to be the national policy that special effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside and public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, and historic sites.

Section 4(f) directs that the Secretary of Transportation not approve any program or project which requires the use of the above resources unless there "is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of such land" and such program "includes all possible planning to minimize harm" to such park, recreational area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site resulting from such use. The Congress reconfirmed its intent to afford priority protection to park lands and similar areas in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968.

In 1969, the Congress approved additional landmark legislation—the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. section 4321 et seq.). In this act, Congress articulated the need to examine and evaluate the impact of all types of federally assisted projects. The Congress determined, that—

It is the continuing responsibility of the federal government to use all practicable means consistent with other essential consideration of national policy to improve and coordinate federal plans, functions, programs and resources to the end that the Nation may . . . preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity, and variety in individual choice.

To achieve this end, the Congress directed in section 102(2)(C) of the act, that all agencies of the Federal Government shall:

(C) include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official on—

- (i) the environmental impact of the proposed action,
- (ii) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented,
- (iii) alternatives to the proposed action,
- (iv) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and
- (v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

Both sections 4(f) and 102(C) clearly require only the rational approach to physical and social planning that the citizens of this Nation have demanded and expect—full knowledge and understanding of the total effect of a public works project—highway, airport, reservoir, or other facility. What are the long-term benefits? Are the long-term costs, public and private, worth paying? In the absence of this information no major public project—Federal, State, or local should be authorized or allowed to proceed.

On August 13, 1970, the Secretary of Transportation, upon request of the State of Texas authorized Federal participation in the North Expressway. The State of Texas thus voluntarily submitted itself to Federal law with full knowledge of the controversial nature of the project and applicable Federal statutes. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit has subsequently enjoined the Texas Highway Department from constructing the proposed North Expressway through the Brackenridge-Olmos parklands for failure to provide the proper environmental impact statements.

Now the Texas Highway Department and the city of San Antonio seek special legislation by Congress to permit it to "repay" the Federal aid received to date for the North Expressway and complete construction within the parks utilizing State and local funds.

In response to a plea from the State the Senate-passed version of S. 502 contained a section terminating the Federal-aid relationship for the North Expressway. The House, wisely, I believe, avoided immersing itself in such controversial issues by not adopting a similar provision in the House bill. However, I am concerned that the Senate provision will be incorporated into the conference report. Such legislation would be a dangerous precedent with serious national ramifications. Congress will have begun

the task of undercutting, on a case-by-case basis, its own environmental safeguards.

The North Expressway/Brackenridge Park and Olmos Basin conflict has been described as "a unique problem." Yet data available from the Federal Highway Administration and the Council on Environmental Quality do not support this assumption. Highway encroachment of parklands, recreation areas, historic sites, and wildlife refuges has been and continues to be a widespread national problem.

From January 1, 1970, through December 31, 1972, the Council on Environmental Quality reported 85 completed environmental impact statements and 161 draft statements specifically dealing with highways routed through parks and similar areas. This is a total of 246 highway/park encroachment situations over a 3-year period.

In 1972 alone, 107 draft and 64 final section 4(f) statements were either in process or completed. Each statement, both draft and final, generally refers to a specific situation where a highway is impacting on a park or similar area. Thus, in the last calendar year, 171 situations similar to Brackenridge Park were developing.

The courts have been and continue to be an effective forum through which to resolve conflicts similar to that in San Antonio. According to a compilation by the Federal Highway Administration about one-third of the cases in which individuals or groups have challenged highway routing decisions have been completely resolved, and most of the others are in various stages of resolution. To exempt the San Antonio case from the judicial process would encourage disputants to seek similar congressional intervention and would subvert the existing mechanism for resolutions of these proliferating conflicts. If Congress intercedes in this case we will have established the precedent of intervening in specific highway disputes whenever a State highway department finds itself enjoined for failure to comply with the laws. If the Texas Highway Department is granted specific relief here then other State highway departments now under an injunction could demand similar legislation. On what basis could we refuse their requests?

### CHRONOLOGY

This matter was under consideration in the 92d Congress. At that time, Congressman JOHN DINGELL described the series of events surrounding the San Antonio controversy. Following is the pertinent section of his statement with an update of the events since last year—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 118, part 24, pages 31872-31873:

### HIGHWAY INTERESTS SEEK TO SUBVERT AND UNDERMINE ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS

The San Antonio highway was first suggested in the midfifties by the San Antonio City Council. In 1960 the Texas Highway Department recommended two alternate routes for the road—one of which would go through the Brackenridge-Olmos Parklands.

In 1961, a bond issue passed for acquisition of the right-of-way. But, according to our distinguished former colleague, now a Federal judge, Homer Thornberry, "No particular

route was specified on the proposition as it appeared on the voters' ballots."

In 1963, the State settled on the park route.

After Congress enacted section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, which is aimed at preserving our parklands, the San Antonio Conservation Society in 1967 requested that a different route be selected. When their request was denied, the society filed a lawsuit in December 1967.

In January 1968, the then Secretary of Transportation said there had been no approval by DOT for this right of way, and in April 1968 he sought an analysis of the project.

On September 23, 1968, the DOT Secretary gave conditional approval, but it never was effective, because in February 1969 the State refused to accept the conditions.

On December 23, 1969, DOT Secretary John A. Volpe approved two end segments outside the park, but not the middle section in the park, and called for a study of the park section. But in January 1970, the State objected to this approval and in April 1970 refused to make the study.

But on August 4, 1970—after enactment of NEPA—the State reversed itself and agreed to the study if Federal funds would be available immediately for the two end segments.

On August 13, 1970, Secretary Volpe agreed and on August 24, 1970, bids were authorized.

On September 1, 1970, when the citizens learned of this, the lawsuit was revived "claiming they had found out about the Secretary's action only through the newspaper."

The August 18, 1972, Senate report on S. 3939 states—Senate Report No. 92-1081, on page 42:

"The State obtained initial route approval from the Federal Highway Administrator and purchased all right-of-ways and completed all relocation with approximately \$7 million in State and local funds prior to the changes in Federal law which now involve it in legal controversy. The Secretary of Transportation approved the letting of construction contracts prior to recent Federal court decisions defining the standard by which the administrative approval was to be reviewed. Thus, the project has twice been caught by changes in Federal law and procedures affecting its completion as a Federal-aid project."

According to our former colleague, Judge Thornberry, the State did not obtain any approval from the Federal Highway Administrator prior to enactment of section 4(f) or NEPA. Moreover, DOT's approval of construction contracts for the two end segments occurred 8 months after NEPA was enacted into law on January 1, 1970, and well after the court case had been filed.

Thus, the project was not "caught," either twice or even once, "by changes in Federal law and procedures."

In the lawsuit—*Conservation Society v. Texas*, Civ. No. 30915, Aug. 5, 1971, 2 ERC 1872—Judge Thornberry of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals described the parks in question and concluded:

II. Preservation of Parklands: The Brackenridge-Olmos Basin Parklands are unique park and recreation areas situated at the headwaters of the San Antonio River and surrounded by a densely populated urban area in San Antonio, Texas. The Parklands contain Sunken Gardens, an open air theater, two golf courses, the San Antonio Zoo, picnic areas, nature trails, and many acres of green, open space. While there is a factual dispute concerning the exact number of acres threatened by this proposed expressway, it appears that the expressway will require the use of between 116 and 250 acres of parkland.

III. Noncompliance with the Statutory Law: Our task is simplified greatly to begin with because it is undisputed that the Secretary of Transportation complied with none of the above-quoted statutes in his approval

of the two "end segments" of this expressway. No environmental study under N.E.P.A. has been made with respect to these two "end segments," and the Secretary has demonstrated no effort by anyone to examine the section 4(f) "feasible and prudent" alternatives to the route followed by these two "end segments," which come right up to, if not in to, the Parklands from both the north and the south. Thus, it requires no discussion to establish that there has been no compliance with any of the above-quoted statutes.

Moreover, Judge Thornberry said that—"Section 4(f) 'does not authorize' DOT to separate a 'project' into 'segments.' In short the Secretary acted beyond the scope of his authority."

He then said: "By the Secretary's own admission, he adopted this piecemeal solution in order to defuse a controversial situation by attempting to strike a compromise between those who were determined to build the highway and those who were determined to save the Park. The problem with the Secretary's solution to the controversy is that he misconceived his role. The conflict between Parklands and Highways has already been resolved in the Halls of Congress, which is the proper place in our system of Government for priority decisions to be made. And, as the statutes here in question make clear, parklands and environmental values are considered paramount. See *Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe*, 401 U.S. at —, 91 S. Ct. at 821-22 [2 ERC 1250] (1971)."

Following the decision of the Court of Appeals, the State of Texas renewed its effort to circumvent Federal law by seeking to have the court dismiss the suit on the grounds that it was proceeding solely with State funds. The motion was denied, and both the Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court refused to overturn the judgment.

On January 10, 1973, the U.S. District Court ordered the Texas Highway Department and the U.S. Department of Transportation to "proceed diligently and with all speed reasonable under the circumstances to prepare the statements and reports required by Federal statutes and regulations."

There has been no indication to date that the State has complied with this order.

#### LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION ACT

#### HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted for the Legal Services Corporation Act, not because I believe it is the best bill that I have seen, but rather to insure that the poor of this Nation will have continued access to legal counsel.

I would also like to state for the Record that had I been present for rollcall No. 256, on an amendment to prohibit administrative advocacy by legal services attorneys, I would have voted "nay." Legal service attorneys have the same right to work for legislation favorable to their clients as private attorneys do for the corporations which retain them.

I was not present at that time as I was meeting with several constituents, attending the national conference of the

Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council, who were concerned that the Nixon-Brezhnev meeting would be detrimental to the Russian Jewry emigration.

#### ILLEGAL DEATH

#### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as Americans today are stunned by the blatant disregard for the law as exhibited by President Nixon's closest aides in the Watergate affair, Mr. Nixon is exhibiting an equal ignorance of the law in his handling of the controversy over the Office of Economic Opportunity.

While Congress appropriated Federal funds for the continuation of OEO, President Nixon appointed Howard Phillips as Acting Director, with the singular goal of terminating the agency.

Recent court rulings concerning these actions have clearly shown that the President has acted in an illegal and unlawful manner.

A recent New York Times editorial entitled, "Illegal Death" dealt with this subject.

It is high time that we, in Congress, assert our constitutional strength. In this light, I have introduced, in the House, H.R. 8468 which will appropriate funds for OEO for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. I fervently hope that swift and decisive action is taken on these matters pertaining to OEO.

The editorial follows:

#### ILLEGAL DEATH

Since January, when President Nixon disclosed in his budget message that he was requesting no funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity in the next fiscal year, the Administration has slowly been putting the agency to death. Programs have been phased out, employees fired, and money that Congress appropriated to wage war on poverty has been left unspent.

Such actions are in violation of existing law. In April a Federal court in the District of Columbia ruled that the President cannot order any agency dismantled when Congress has legally established the agency and appropriated funds to carry out its legislated purpose.

As part of this illegal plot to confront Congress with an accomplished fact, the White House refused to nominate a new head of O.E.O. when the last director quit. Instead, Howard Phillips was given an "interim appointment" as acting director.

Four members of the United States Senate filed a suit challenging this maneuver. The court has now ruled that Mr. Phillips holds office "unlawfully and illegally." A President normally makes an interim appointment only when Congress is not in session. But Congress has been continuously in session since Mr. Phillips was named four and one-half months ago. The court found that a President's power to make interim appointments, "if it exists at all, exists only in emergency situations. No claim has been made that the appointment of Phillips was necessitated by any emergency situation and the court finds that there was none."

The Administration's desire to dismantle the Federal antipoverty agency when millions still live in poverty is a serious mistake in social policy, but policy is always open to reasonable disagreement. What is profoundly



dismaying is the Administration's willingness to circumvent the law and defy Congress in order to put its policy into effect. Such executive arrogance breeds lawlessness and subverts free and orderly government.

It is now up to Congress to appropriate the money for the coming fiscal year, thus giving substance to O.E.O.'s existing authorization. If Congress fails to assert itself promptly, it will find that the Administration has succeeded in killing O.E.O. More important even than the fate of the antipoverty program is that Congress back up the courts and induce the President to fulfill his constitutional mandate to see to it that the laws are faithfully executed.

#### 1974 PORK SUPPLY DWINDLING

### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am getting calls from my district telling of farmers starting to sell pregnant sows and gilts—animals that should be producing our pork supply for next year. The result will be less pork at the supermarket meat counters in 1974.

The reason those animals are being sold is simple: With ceilings on red meat prices, farmers now see little prospect of profit. So the pregnant sows are going to the slaughterhouse.

Instead of letting the price system do its work of increasing supplies and bringing prices into line, Government edict is dictating prices and decreasing supplies. What looked like a prospect for moderating prices now has changed. The outlook is for high prices and/or shortages. This is just one example of the dangers of substituting Government rules for price signals from consumers.

I do not like the direction we are going. Another person who put it very well recently in remarks before the American Agricultural Editors Association in a session in the New Senate Office Building June 19, 1973, was Warren Lebeck, executive vice president of the Chicago Board of Trade.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the remarks of Mr. Warren Lebeck before the American Agricultural Editors Association in the Record at this point:

#### REMARKS BY WARREN LEBECK

American agriculture is being called upon as never before to help supply the food needs of the entire world. Free world and communist nations alike.

This should tell us something. At the risk of oversimplification, it should tell us our system must be working better than their systems.

Some of the reasons are pretty obvious. One of them is that we have a free and continuous flow of information. Information about new and better ways to produce. Information about supply and demand and prices and other things farmers need to know to make the necessary adjustments. You can take a big share of the credit for this. You do your jobs well.

Another reason is the way we achieve desired economic results. We do it mainly through a system of competitive markets, through the interplay of supply and demand. Price changes very quickly tell producers—and tell them in a way they respond to—whether more production or less production is needed.

The beauty of this system is that it works.

Not that it is always perfect. It may not produce instant results. Sometimes it coughs and sputters. And sometimes it may even swing too far in one direction and then too far in the other before it strikes just the right balance.

But it does work.

Unfortunately, some people become impatient with it. Their impatience leads to criticism. Their criticism leads to panic. And their panic leads to meddling.

They suggest, in effect, that it would be so much easier and faster simply to mandate economic results. To proclaim by decree that prices should be at this level and production at that level. As though saying it could somehow make it happen. The people who believe this obviously don't know the same farmers I know.

Frankly, this kind of thinking worries me. I hope it worries you.

The reason this kind of thinking worries me is that it would make our system just like those of many of the nations we are now helping to feed.

Then who would feed us?

With that question, I again thank you for being with us.

Hoping the answer is clear.

#### PRIVATE PENSION SYSTEM

### HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in February I testified before the Task Force on Welfare and Pension Plans, General Subcommittee on Labor, House Committee on Education and Labor on the subject of strengthening and improving the private pension system.

Since this subject is still being actively considered by the Congress and since it is a subject about which we are all deeply concerned, I am inserting into the Record my testimony of earlier this year:

#### TESTIMONY OF REPRESENTATIVE JACK EDWARDS

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, every member of Congress is aware of the pressing need for reform of the private pension system. This committee in particular has applied its energy, leadership, and wisdom to this problem, including your hearings in April of 1971, your far-reaching investigation of the private retirement system in past months, and now through these hearings in the early days of the 93rd Congress. Chairman Dent's legislative efforts in this area have provided the stimulus for discussion and debate throughout the country, and his bills serve as a strong pivotal point for these hearings.

We have all received moving letters from constituents who share with us their disappointment and distress produced by a faulty private pension plan. I recall one letter in particular. My constituent told of working for more than twenty years in the same industry. During this twenty years, he paid into two different union pension plans. When he changed unions, he found he lost twelve years of contributions. He now finds that the terms of his present pension plan are being altered to lower his benefits.

This letter is typical of others, but I know it is not necessary to convince this committee of the social tragedy which has occurred and which will continue to occur unless improvement is realized.

Vesting is the main pillar of the private pension problem. That is, when does the worker obtain an irrevocable right to receive benefits upon reaching retirement age? It is

estimated that about 70% of private pension plan participants are not now vested. This means that if these participants leave their present jobs, their accrued benefits will go down the drain.

And 34% of private pension plan participants 50 years old or older do not have a vested right to retirement benefits. I single out this age group because these are the people that probably suffer the greatest losses when anticipated benefits for one reason or another are taken away. These individuals are generally in a much poorer position than the younger worker to find another employer and another pension plan, hopefully one which will vest.

More than 30 million working men and women, close to one half of our total work force, participate in private pension plans. The assets in private pension plans approach \$150 billion in unregulated money.

I would urge this committee to consider carefully rapid vesting for older workers, not to the exclusion of younger workers, but with an eye on the special situation of older participants. My own bill, H.R. 186, employs the so-called "Rule of 50" as to vesting (50% vesting is required when any combination of age and years of covered service equals 50, with vesting of an additional 10% each year for the next five years after vesting begins) and would reduce greatly the number of participants age 50 and over who are not vested.

Certainly there are problems other than vesting which must be examined and solved. While adequate disclosure of a pension plan's administrative and financial affairs is vital, we must avoid creating an impenetrable thicket of forms and paper work which would be particularly burdensome to the small businessman. The creation of a tangled web of red tape would dampen the incentive to create new private pension plans and would stifle those plans already in existence.

We must consider setting up a minimum funding standard for pension plans and a national insurance program to protect against loss of benefits caused by the termination of pension plans. As this committee is aware, the President directed the Treasury and Labor Departments in December of 1971 to undertake a full study of the benefit losses caused by pension plan termination. At the present time, we know very little about the magnitude of the problem of inadequate funding and plan termination. This Treasury/Labor study should, upon its completion, be factored into all legislative approaches to these problems.

The question of portability requires careful study with close attention to the problems of standardization of plans and the administration of transferred pension credits.

We should keep in mind the fact that some private retirement plans are well run and efficiently administered. We should strive to minimize the effect of governmental regulation on these plans.

We should make every effort to avoid provisions which would directly or indirectly burden the young worker by withholding large amounts from his wages at a time when he or she needs current income much more than retirement income.

One voice which this committee should give every opportunity to be heard on this vital subject of private pension reform is the Honorable Peter J. Brennan, the newly-appointed Secretary of Labor. Secretary Brennan is still organizing his department and its programs at the moment, but his thinking and an adequate input from his department are essential to good legislation. I hope the committee hearings will not be closed before the Department of Labor has had a reasonable opportunity to make a meaningful contribution.

Mr. Chairman, retirement in America can be marked by loneliness, desperation, and a sense of helplessness. Or, it can be characterized by independence, self-reliance, and dignity. As President Nixon pointed out in his message to the Congress in December of

1971, the deciding factor is usually an adequate post-retirement income. It is up to us in the Congress to see that an important provider of that post-retirement income, the private pension system, is strengthened and expanded.

The working men and women in America form the backbone of our nation. They pay the taxes and they keep this country moving. We cannot tolerate a system which forgets the contribution they have made and which turns its back on them when the day of retirement arrives.

I am confident that the wisdom of this committee and the collective energies of the Congress will succeed in providing American workers with the private pension plan protection they deserve.

#### THE 40,000 AMERICANS—TROOP LEVEL IN SOUTH KOREA CHALLENGED

#### HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, a prominent member of the San Diego community has brought to my attention an article by Washington Post Correspondent Don Oberdorfer which appeared in the Los Angeles Times.

Mr. Hamilton Marston cites a reported outlay of \$584 million in 1972; the price tag for pay, upkeep, and operation of our 40,000-man military force in South Korea. In addition, some \$326 million has been expended over the past 15 years by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—this for various military construction projects in that Asian country. New barracks are being prepared to last 20 to 30 years. Also, the United States has recently guaranteed occupancy of high-rise apartments and ranch-style rentals by military families until 1983. This seems to suggest continued maintenance of present troop strength.

The contention that our presence prevents Communist activity in that area demands closer scrutiny. It has been said that we carry a military burden which Japan recognizes is necessary, and provides a tremendous psychological relief to the South Korean Government. This argument is unconvincing. Were our presence necessary to bolster a weak or inferior South Korean army, perhaps these huge expenditures might be justified. But in fact the Republic of South Korea maintains a highly trained and well-equipped standing army of 600,000. This is about 200,000 more men than the total North Korean force.

Especially in light of our past tragic involvement in Southeast Asia, the desirability of committing ourselves in a "trip-wire" fashion is open to challenge. Equally serious—our continued presence in such numbers may hamper progress toward reconciliation of differences between the two Koreas.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Marston for his interest, and to draw the attention of my colleagues to a section of Mr. Oberdorfer's article:

U.S. TROOPS IN KOREA BATTLE DAILY FRUSTRATION—20 YEARS AFTER ARMISTICE, 40,000 GI'S ARE "TOO MANY WITH TOO LITTLE TO DO"

(By Don Oberdorfer)

ABOUT \$584 MILLION TAB

According to the Pentagon, the pay, upkeep and operating costs of U.S. forces in Korea was \$584 million in fiscal year 1972, the latest period for which figures are available. This is a larger sum than the State Department spent for all of its operations throughout the world during the same period, more than the total sum spent during the year by the federal government for rural development in the United States and more than the sum spent by the federal government for vocational education. In addition to direct military spending, South Korea received \$192 million in U.S. economic assistance and \$155 million in military assistance in the same period—bringing the cost for the year to nearly \$1 billion.

Despite all the recent changes in a swiftly changing Asian scene and the "Nixon doctrine" of limited American military involvement, there is no sign that the large U.S. constabulary in Korea will soon be substantially reduced or withdrawn.

The principal function of the American troops here today is to provide a "trip wire" guaranteeing nearly automatic U.S. military involvement in any resumption of the war in Korea. Beyond this function of being immediately engaged and perhaps overrun in case of attack from the north, the U.S. forces are far less important to the actual defense of South Korea than is generally supposed.

The 38th parallel truce line of this often-battled peninsula is the dividing line between the tough, well-trained 400,000-man armed force of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea) and the tough, well-trained 600,000-man armed force of the Republic of Korea (South Korea). At the demilitarized zone the South Korean military maintains eight divisions and a marine brigade—about 145,000 men. The United States maintains one reinforced company—about 200 men.

The U.S. ground combat force in South Korea is the 2nd Infantry Division, made up of 13,000 Americans plus 2,000 attached Koreans. Nearly all of them are in reserve positions north of Seoul. Farther south is a U.S. Air Force contingent of 8,300 men—about a third the size of the South Korean air force. Just outside of Seoul is a U.S. headquarters garrison of about 6,000 men, including 11 generals in mostly administrative and support jobs. The U.S. logistical command with another 6,100 men has its headquarters still farther south at Taegu. The American "tripwire" is wrapped in a very heavy covering of administrative, logistical and other non-combat elements.

#### TRIBUTE TO FRANK E. BATTAGLIA—FAITHFUL SERVANT OF THE HOUSE

#### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Frank E. Battaglia who has served this body faithfully and ably for 30 years is retiring from public service.

As the Dean of the Corps of Official Reporters of Debates of the House of Representatives, Mr. Battaglia has proved himself most helpful to all Members of the House.

Frank is most personable and genial, as well as a most capable and efficient public official.

As he has devoted 30 years of his life

to recording the volumes and reams of words uttered by the 435 Members of the House, certainly it is fitting at long last that he receive this well-deserved relief and escape from this torrent of verbiage—he has earned his freedom, believe me.

Seriously, I want to take this opportunity of commending Frank for his years of dedication and wish for him the very best of good luck and success in his retirement.

#### LEMOORE CELEBRATES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

#### HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call to the attention of my colleagues the 100th anniversary of Lemoore, Calif., which is located in my district and is without a doubt one of the finest communities in California and the United States.

In 100 years, Lemoore has grown from desolate swampland to a community of splendid beauty matched only by the outgoing friendliness of its residents. The rich and fertile farmlands have made the community a major agricultural center, vital to the California economy. Serving as the home for the Lemoore Naval Air Station, the community plays an important role in providing critical support functions in the Navy's defense and training mission.

Dr. Lee Moore laid out a few lots and called his town La Tache in 1872. Shortly after Moore's initial development, homes and business enterprises were constructed, which eventually required the establishment of a post office. In 1873, the Post Office Department authorized a branch, but under the name, Lemoore. Thus, 1973 marks the centennial celebration.

The early years saw a community grow through the efforts of energetic pioneers who were responsible for laboriously digging the canals that transformed swampland into highly productive farmland.

Today's residents are still energetic and enthusiastic, undaunted by problems facing today's communities. They are a dynamic and hard working breed of individuals, always eager to face the challenge that confronts them.

More recently, they have been asked to absorb the population influx of NAS Lemoore and to find jobs for the farmers and farmworkers whose jobs have become part-time due to mechanization. They have successfully met these obstacles, as both the town and base readily attest to the excellent relationship and rapport which exists between the two. A 300-job industry will soon open which will help alleviate unemployment.

The just completed \$1,500,000 water project helped attract the new industry and should assist in bringing additional industry. Residential growth will be provided for, via a \$900,000 sewer project. I am happy to say that on both counts the Federal Government assisted the community in realizing these goals.



Lemoore is symbolic of the quality of excellence found in communities throughout America. I am proud of my many friends in Lemoore and honored to represent the community in California's 36th Congressional District. I know my colleagues join me in congratulating the people of Lemoore on their centennial celebration and wish them a second century of equal accomplishment.

#### REALITIES BEHIND THE OIL CRISIS

### HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, our Nation today is facing a vitally important energy challenge, and if action is not taken to check current trends, the present situation could develop into a genuine energy crisis.

There are many conflicting reports or theories as to what prompted the present situation, and there is a wide divergence of opinion as to the precise extent and seriousness of present conditions and as to what should be done to resolve the issue.

I recently ran across a very thought-provoking interview conducted by Lowell Thomas between Ed Wimmer, president of Forward America, Inc., of Covington, Ky., and John "Mike" Kunnen, president of the Greater Cincinnati Gasoline Dealers Association, Cincinnati, Ohio, which develops one particular point concerned in this total issue of energy availability, and I would like to share this with my colleagues:

#### REALITIES BEHIND THE OIL CRISIS

(Interview with Ed Wimmer-Mike Kunnen)

ED WIMMER. Thank you, Lowell Thomas, for that fine introduction, and I hope I can do as well in introducing the man sitting across from me at my desk at Forward America, Inc., here in Covington (Ky.): Mr. John (Mike) Kunnen, President of the Greater Cincinnati Gasoline Dealers Assn., who is as familiar with the gasoline business as the "experts" who have been making the headlines.

Mike is not only a dealer himself, but he has been a student of the petroleum industry for 29 years, and his appearances before investigative committees has brought commendation from government officials that is enjoyed by few people. We, in all these years at Forward America, could count on him in any attempt to eliminate trading stamps and other abuses in the oil industry, and especially those affecting the independent gasoline dealer.

Before turning you over to Mike, however, I want to lay some groundwork by quoting a few rather sensational remarks by John McLain, Chairman, Continental Oil Co., from statements he made in September 1972. Listen please:

"There are enough potentially recoverable oil reserves in the U.S. to last for 65 years. . . . Potentially recoverable gas reserves in the U.S. to last 50 years—at present rate of consumption.

"Measured coal reserves, 300 years. Uranium reserves sufficient for electric power needs for 25 years. Recoverable shale oil reserves (and here is something to think about) sufficient to last 35 years after all other natural reserves are exhausted—at present rate of consumption.

"The total resources in the U.S., alone, are enough to supply all our needs (at present rate of consumption) for 300 years.

"Present trends indicate mobility to meet these needs which are going to be doubled by 1985—a period in which domestic production will decline 30%—in the next 15 years. By 1975 we will be 50% below median gas needs; imports of crude oil will have to be quadrupled—which we cannot do."

Mr. McLain emphasized that he wants private enterprise to be allowed to meet this crisis, and future needs, and in his final statement, he said:

"We have an adequate source base. Our problem is to get new supplies at a faster rate."

Lowell, perhaps we can clear up what seems to be some striking contradictions here, and what bothers me, if we have domestic resources in such quantity, what has happened to exploration and development, and why are we risking a balance of trade crisis in getting imports that could border on a monetary disaster?

LOWELL THOMAS. First of all, Mr. Kunnen, what can we expect in the price of gasoline, this year and next?

Mr. KUNNEN. I can go only by estimates which at the moment run from 4-to-10-cents a gallon more, but who can really foretell the future in all this energy confusion. I hate to say it but I think we will find some planned shortages in this picture to cause a price increase.

We need to consider that in the State of Ohio there are five billion gallons of gas sold annually by all suppliers. If the state collects 7 cents a gallon in taxes, and if supplies are reduced, what is the state going to do but increase the tax to offset the deficit? Estimates of 2 cents a gallon have already been made. Most of the states around us are already collecting 9 cents a gallon.

There also is the problem that if a retail dealer suffers a loss through allocation, his income will be substantially cut, which means increased prices in order to stay in business.

LOWELL THOMAS. True, but, Mike, what happens if consumers start boycotting gasoline dealers as they did with meat, and drive less?

Mr. KUNNEN. Our fears are that boycotts will do with gasoline what meat boycotts did to the weaker dealers and already distressed smaller suppliers. They will hit the canvas, which we have seen on a wide scale in gasoline even without boycotts or shortages. Most big suppliers created their own price-cutting outlets, and these people are suffering widespread cut-offs and closings.

LOWELL THOMAS. What is your answer, Mike, to the charge that some of the majors in the oil industry are using this situation to put the independents out of business?

Mr. KUNNEN. No one in this industry wants to believe such charges, but we all know, and Congress knows, that this sort of thing goes on. But I see the picture in a broader light; the Alaskan Pipeline controversy, for example; the recent cut in the depletion allowance; the change in import quotas—are all factors needing more exploration. Crude oil from Venezuela cost us 10c a barrel 10 years ago. It is now headed for \$3 a barrel, which is only one warning that we've got to speed up exploration in this country.

LOWELL THOMAS. Ed, you have been talking about the effects of devaluation, in your broadcasts, and the dollars piling up in the hands of oil exporting countries. How do you view this situation?

ED WIMMER. According to the exporters, devaluation has cost them an 11% loss, and they claim they are asking for only 50% of the loss. What seems to worry a lot of Congressmen at the moment, are the billions of so-called floating dollars they hold which they get rid of by increasing their already tremendous holdings in this country.

Population in most oil producing countries is too small to absorb our goods in amounts

that would even far our unbalanced trade situation, so why not follow the pattern of British Petroleum, and get control of American corporations? Look at the hold the Japanese are getting in this country with their surplus dollars, and you will get some idea of what all this multinational, corporate empire-building is going to do to the whole world.

The Japanese made a joking statement they didn't know whether to buy GM or IBM, and the oil producing countries have more of our dollars than Japan. We have reached a point where even the Swiss bankers are predicting a dollar crisis of unimaginable proportions; so how can we treat this situation with anything but the deepest concern?

Another factor at least suspected by most informed people, is the subservience of "Big Oil" to many governments of countries in which they do business. How can they carry the American Flag anywhere today and do business, or be loyal to any private enterprise ideals they might hold? The bigger they are the greater their involvement in foreign governments, so where does that leave the United States?

So why shouldn't this country have been spending the \$30 billion a year mentioned by Mr. McLain, in domestic exploration and development? He said we are spending only \$14 billion; yet, the depletion and special depreciation allowances of the last few years make that figure look like peanut money. Some of the biggest paid—virtually no federal income taxes, so where did the money go? You know where a lot of it went: into mergers with insurance companies, opening shopping centers, chains of restaurants and motels; land development; billions into unneeded service stations, catalogue businesses, et cetera, et cetera; but let Mike pursue this thought.

Mr. KUNNEN. An outstanding study in this field was done by Dr. Walter Adams, Michigan State University, in which he said there are 25 major oil companies that control 95% of all petroleum sales—which companies have bought up 226 other assorted companies. This money should have gone into exploration and development, so what happens? . . . To help meet the crisis, the President lifts the oil import quotas which didn't do anything because the facilities are not available to process any flood of imports. Instead, we should be creating facilities to meet such a situation.

This may sound like I am anti-oil industry. I'm not, but no one can tell me that an industry as powerful and as integrated as petroleum could not have foreseen exactly what is happening, and what could happen to the motoring public in this decade. It all points to a man-made crisis. Listen to the oil industry as they shout fuel crisis, so everybody with the news media estimates gasoline prices up to \$1 a gallon. Suppose it goes to 50c—a 7c increase, but multiply that by billions of gallons of gasoline, and what do you come up with? You come up with consumers screaming and independents going broke, and the "bigs" getting richer and bigger. What we are going to see is an investigation of the oil industry that will blow the lid sky high.

ED WIMMER. I am glad you mentioned Dr. Adams. He has been a longtime friend of mine, and is one of the strongest advocates of decentralization and protection of independent enterprise we have in this country.

Mike, we ought to bring out at this point that all we have is one month's supply of petroleum needs. This seems critically low to me, and I repeat: Where were the oil experts and government officials while all these conditions were building up? Where were their million-dollar computers? Why no preparation, no alarm, five years ago?

Answers will have to be found soon, and they won't come from any attacks oriented against big business. We already know that monopoly exists, and we should have had a second Standard Oil-type breakup a long time ago. This challenge will have to be faced. There is a lot of sentiment against bigness per se in this country, and if we

don't watch ourselves, the demand for public controls will spread until the whole structure of private enterprise could suffer irreparable damage.

Where the problem comes in, is how do you talk about the evils of monopoly power, which exist in every industry, in agriculture, banking, labor unions—without appearing to be anti-bigness?

LOWELL THOMAS. Mr. Kunnen, how would a 10% cut in supplies across the board affect the independent dealer?

MR. KUNNEN. There is a failure rate right now in our retail business of 35%. That should answer your question; and look at the staggering number of terminal operators and jobbers who have gone down in the last few months.

ED WIMMER. I can certainly attest to that, Mike, because Forward America, like your Association, gets its revenue from independents, and, believe me, the people battling for the smalls these days, are in trouble—just when they are needed the most. We saw this process in the fall-out of the wildcatters these past several years, who were once the backbone of the discovery of petroleum, gas and other hidden resources. Consider what happened when Standard Oil was broken up in 1911. Over 2500 new companies sprung up out of nowhere, and wildcatters were like gophers. Imagine the competition that would exist if that situation existed today.

Biggest need of the hour is all-out decentralization of economic and political power whether we are talking about food, clothing, energy, labor, government, or any other area of the body economic and body politic; and if it doesn't come, there will be another 'watergate' in this country that will drown whatever hopes we have of celebrating a Republic on July 4, 1976.

MR. KUNNEN. I say restore the depletion cut and confine it to exploration and development, and increase it if necessary. This will turn the wildcatters loose, and you will increase incentive and build up domestic resources—which would keep foreign imports at reasonable price levels and protect our balance of payments. Since 1974 the so-called wildcatter has gone down more than 50% in number, and we ought to learn the reasons why.

Instead, we get such silly proposals as reducing speeds to 50 m.p.h. which would create traffic jams on super-highways that would burn twice what could be saved. We need to expedite traffic, unless we take half the cars off the expressways, not jam it.

## RIISING PRICES, MAESTRO STEIN, AND AN UNCOMIC OPERA

### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

MR. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the jumps in the consumer price index this year have been dramatic. None of us has doubted that. But I did not think that they would move the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Herbert Stein, to set the statistics to music.

Yet, yesterday, as the Labor Department announced yet another increase in the prices people pay for food and other necessities, Maestro Stein likened the freeze to an overture. It is an overture, he said, "necessary to create the atmosphere for the opera that follows."

Then he went on to explain that the opera is phase IV—just in case we missed the metaphor.

Well, we get it, Mr. Stein. We are all too familiar with the scenario. We can

follow the libretto very well. In the first part of the year consumer prices climbed allegro. The conductor has been signaling diminuendo with his baton. But the horns and the percussion in our economic orchestra fails to respond. Instead, prices continue to build toward crescendo.

And the administration's optimism, oft-repeated, draws out into a perilously thin tremolo.

The May consumer price index is news that Mr. Stein should have given us sotto voce—instead of displaying his familiar baritone.

I look forward to the climax of this particular opera with considerable apprehension. The administration's new economic policy may turn out to be a crashing Götterdämmerung.

## SILENCING THE CRITICS

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

MR. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the balance between corporate interests and public interests has become a question of increasing concern. Citizens who attempt to act on issues of social concern often find themselves pitted against the enormous power and resources of big business.

The following editorial from the June 19, 1973, New York Times presents some provocative insights into the constitutionality of existing Federal tax laws and IRS rules as they affect public-interest groups:

## SILENCING THE CRITICS

The Center on Corporate Responsibility, a small public-interest group that conducts research and litigation to improve business behavior in such areas as environmental protection, minority hiring and product safety, is struggling for its life against the Internal Revenue Service. The I.R.S. has denied the group tax-exempt status which will cut it off from the support of tax exempt foundations and reduce the contributions it can hope to raise from individuals.

The main reason given by the I.R.S. for this action is that the center has many of the same directors as the Project on Corporate Responsibility, an action-oriented group that wages proxy contests over corporate directors and campaigns for changes in company policies at meetings of shareholders—activities that disqualify it from tax-exempt status.

This I.R.S. ruling against the center could be used to weaken or destroy many other tax-exempt organizations that have been associated with groups that have given up their tax-exempt status so that they could lobby or otherwise engage in direct efforts to support social aims. In contrast, business organizations are permitted to treat their proxy fights as tax-deductible business expenditures on lobbying or on wage penses.

This situation raises questions about not only of existing Federal tax and I.R.S. rules in denying citizens equal protection under law. Tax regulations may also be unconstitutional in interfering with the freedom of speech of charitable, religious, educational and public-interest groups.

American tax and corporation laws have in fact created a dangerous imbalance between corporate and public interests. In the harsh light that Watergate has shed upon the way special interests are able to influence only the fairness but the very constitution-

political decisions, Congress and the courts need to reexamine tax laws and rules that apply so unequally to business organizations seeking to further their self interests and to groups seeking to further social interests.

## JEFFERSON'S SECOND COMING

### HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

MR. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, among the many highly promising young residents of the 11th Congressional District of New Jersey is Robert M. Hanselman, of the West Essex High School, West Caldwell. His editorial in the school newspaper, the Wire, recently won third prize in the 1976 studies editorial contest for secondary school student newspapers. The 1976 studies program is a 4-year series of seminars and symposia exploring the "self-evident truths" of the Declaration of Independence and their application to modern America.

Because it is deserving of our colleagues' attention, I would like, at this point, to insert Mr. Hanselman's perceptive editorial in the RECORD:

## JEFFERSON'S SECOND COMING

Preparations are already underway for the celebration in 1976 of the 200th anniversary of our independence. One wonders what Jefferson would think if he were able to see the product that traces its origin to his political and philosophical beliefs?

Jefferson's practical side would undoubtedly marvel at our advanced technology. After all, he was the gadgeteer who invented such things as the spiral staircase and the dumbwaiter. One can easily imagine his delight with an automobile. His knowledge of mathematics and his love of science would prompt from him ecstatic commendations for the development of the computer and space travel. If he could see our libraries, universities, and museums (after his founding of the University of Virginia) he would bestow upon us his most erudite blessing. And to Jefferson, the student of the violin, our present-day stereophonic music would certainly be enthralling.

The grain fields of our midwest would amaze this man. He would take pleasure in chatting with a farmer about the produce and productivity of his land. There is no question that Jefferson would find much to his liking in America today.

But, what would he say about the horror of traffic-choked New York or Los Angeles, the stagnant and polluted rivers we have come to know today, and the foul and impure air of our larger cities? Would the Potomac River bring forth his ardor or his anguish? Would he be pleased at the status of black Americans? How would he react to Wounded Knee? Or the plight of the migrant farm worker in the South?

Would he wonder about the poverty of many in the midst of plenty? Would he be distressed by the drug culture? What words would he use to describe the assassinations of the Kennedys and Martin Luther King? Would he support Nixon's rejuvenated death penalty; applaud his "peace with honor" in Vietnam; or endorse his impounding of federal funds? How would he assess Spiro Agnew's many speeches concerning civil liberties and the position of freedom of the press in our society today?

There is much pain in the land of Jefferson. In 1776, when he wrote "that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men," he unmistakably had a strong



faith in people because he went on to say that those governments derive "their just powers from the consent of the governed." Did Jefferson place too much trust in the elected or in the electorate? Almost two hundred years ago, he also said that "the whole of government consists in the art of being honest." What might he say in 1973 on the Watergate affair?

We ought to prepare now for the second coming of Jefferson. Not with plans to sell souvenirs, trinkets, hot dogs and hoopla, but with a national reaffirmation of our faith in each other as fellow citizens and as fellow human beings. Let us rededicate ourselves to those ideals with which Jefferson is identified. "All men are created equal," he wrote long ago. Let us strive to remember that still.

**REMARKS OF DR. LAMAR EMPEY ON RESEARCH AT THE ETHEL PERCY ANDRUS GERONTOLOGY CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, FEBRUARY 13, 1973**

**HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker on April 14, I joined my colleagues on the Select Subcommittee on Education, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMANS) and the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN) as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL) to conduct an oversight hearing on the Older Americans Act at the Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center of the University of Southern California.

I believe that my colleagues will read with interest a description by Dr. LaMar Empey, associate director for Research at the Andrus Center, of the many research programs conducted under the auspices of this magnificent institution. The description was delivered during the February dedication ceremonies of the center's new facilities.

I am sure that those of us concerned with older Americans will be encouraged to know of the significant research activities, on behalf of Americans aged 65 and over, underway at the Andrus Center, and similar research institutions across the land.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Dr. Empey's remarks at this point in the Record:

LAMAR EMPEY, PH. D., "THE RESEARCH PROGRAM AT THE ETHEL PERCY ANDRUS GERONTOLOGY CENTER." ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE DEDICATION OF THE ANDRUS CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., FEBRUARY 13, 1973

Those of us who are charged with the research program of the Andrus Gerontology Center are all too aware of the extent to which a concerned nation expects us to provide some relevant and immediate solutions to the many problems of growing millions of older people. Yet, we are also aware that, because until very recent times, the average life-span of all mankind was short indeed, aging was not viewed as a serious problem. The serious problems instead were associated with helping people to survive beyond the age of childhood. Not until we became affluent, and not until we conquered a host of childhood diseases, did we then become concerned with the degenerative disorders, and the economic and social problems, that are associated with growing numbers of older people. Hence, if one interacts with scientists from a host of different fields—biology, sociology, economics, or psychology—he soon

discovers that no one of these disciplines really has anything approaching a comprehensive understanding of the aging process. Is there a "normal" biological process associated with aging, or is it disease-like and idiosyncratic in character? As an even larger proportion of our people grow older, what economic, social and political adjustments will have to be made to account for their needs? What must be done in our society to make the advanced years a time of dignity, grace and learning?

It is not enough to say that remedial programs should be implemented—we all agree with that—but we must also seek a greatly expanded base of knowledge upon which sensible solutions can be sought. We cannot simply be concerned with physical, but with social and spiritual needs as well. Yet, it we have little knowledge to begin with, we have too few guidelines upon which to proceed.

In viewing the ill-conceived social programs that are commonly implemented—not just in the field of aging, but in the fields of crime, health care or poverty—I am often reminded of Victor Borge's famous boast about one of his relatives. "You know," he said, "my uncle was a famous chemist. Once he invented a cure for which there was no disease. Unfortunately, his wife caught the cure and died." Like Victor's uncle, we often find ourselves not only inventing cures for which there is no disease, but which make the disease, itself, worse.

Since, as a result, we at the Andrus Center are terribly concerned about the "cures" we invent, we have attempted to address three major issues in implementing our research program.

**RECRUITMENT**

First, in order to increase the body of knowledge about aging, we have found it necessary to recruit interest from faculty and students in a wide variety of fields—fields in which little interest in aging has been expressed heretofore. In many disciplines, it has not been the subject of investigation. Many people have only vague ideas as to what "gerontology" means.

I can now report, however, that no fewer than thirty-six faculty members, representing the fields of anthropology, architecture, biochemistry, biomedical engineering, neurobiology, physiology, experimental and social psychology, social work, sociology, and urban planning (note that I placed these in alphabetical order so that I would not get in trouble with any of my colleagues) are now engaged in research on aging in the Andrus Center. Added to this list, are 55 current doctoral students whose research will also be concerned with problems of the life cycle. Moreover, from earlier groups of students, 23 doctoral dissertations and 21 masters theses have been produced. Even though this is a pittance in terms of the overall need, more research on aging is represented in these works than all those produced in our west coast universities combined a few years ago.

I hasten to add that noteworthy by their absence from the above list are such disciplines as economics and political science. I am pleased to report, however, that, while members of these disciplines are not now participating in Center research, they have joined with us in seeking funds by which their research and more of their personnel can be added to our activities.

**COMMUNICATION ACROSS DISCIPLINES**

A second major issue to which our research activities have had to pay attention is the task of cultivating communication and research across disciplines. No single approach, no single discipline, can possibly address the complexities of the life cycle. Hence, we are forced to ask inevitable questions: In what way, for example, can the research of the biologist on the brain functioning of any person be related to the interest of the psychologist in the way that individual behaves, or to that of the sociologist who is concerned with the norms and

values that prescribe the individual's expected patterns of conduct no matter how well his brain functions? To such questions very few persons have paid attention.

This past semester we conducted a graduate seminar, entitled "Theories of Aging", in which 12 faculty members presented their ideas to a group of students representing several different disciplines. Although much was learned, we soon discovered that before we could successfully conduct much collaborative research, we would have to learn each other's language, and, begin developing some expanded, yet common, frames of reference. More effort and time, not less, will probably have to be added to the 9 or 10 years of university preparation that go already into the production of a Ph.D. scientist.

Perhaps you would enjoy a little side trip into the scientific jargon of different disciplines so that you might share with us some of the problems we face. Just for fun, I took some titles from three doctoral dissertations and tried a rough translation of them. I trust that the investigators in question will not mind a little levity at their expense.

Here is the scientific title from one of our physiologists:

"An Electromyographic Analysis of Skeletal Neuromuscular Fatigue with Special Reference to Age."

Roughly speaking, this investigator was asking, "Why do older men get tired?" Some of you fellows may have a ready answer, but just to indicate that one cannot oversimplify that question, "getting tired" was defined by our physiologist as the "rate of increase of integrated MAP activity brought about by recruitment of additional motor units and/or the increase in frequency of contraction of those motor units in maintaining a constant isometric contraction." You can see why a sociologist research director like me is going to have to learn something besides sociology.

Sociologists have their jargon too. A recent study was entitled:

"The Effects of Generation, Religion and Sex on the Relationship of Family Vertical Solidarity and Mental Health in Lebanon."

Translated that means, "Things aren't so hot in Lebanon either."

Finally, the biologists give us the biggest trouble of all. Just listen to this title:

"Changes in Leucine Transfer Ribonucleic Acid and Leucine Transfer Ribonucleic Acid Synthetase During Catecholamine Senescence."

Would you believe, my secretary came back to me twice with that title before she would type it because she thought I had copied it incorrectly.

Imagine my surprise to learn that this title means that "Soybeans have trouble remembering also."

The point I am trying to make is that, as the boundaries of knowledge are expanded, the task of comprehending and tying together that knowledge into an integrated package is not a simple task. We are excited by the prospects of attacking it, but we want you to share with us an awareness of its complexities.

**RESEARCH FUNDING**

A third issue that has preoccupied our attention is that of finding funds by which to conduct research. Interest alone is not enough. The research-scientist must also be an entrepreneur, seeking funds to finance his activities from both private and public sectors. Endless hours, days and weeks are spent in that task, and as research funds in many areas are now being cut back, it has been made even more difficult. Nevertheless, I am proud to report, on behalf of my colleagues, that many interesting and provocative studies are being conducted.

**BIOLOGICAL STUDIES**

In the biological area, one set of studies by Prof. Caleb Finch and his associates is concerned with the way brain cells function during aging. A very practical question with which they are concerned is whether there are any cellular changes during aging which

are not due to such diseases as hardening of the arteries in the brain. By first using animals in this research, an attempt is being made to determine whether there is a loss of function that may be due, not to diseases, but to other factors that are a normal function of aging—factors that might eventually be impeded or altered in some way.

A second body of studies being conducted by Professors Slavkin, Bekhor, Mooser and Denny are concerned with the problems of developmental biology. How do such dissimilar tissues and organs as the lung, spleen, heart and brain develop, and carry out different functions? How do these tissues communicate with each other? How do they become defective?

These scientists are also concerned with genetic development, and the way that genetic development is regulated; with the way in which our taste buds develop and function; as with the development of tumors in man and how their growth might be inhibited.

Many of us are concerned, as we grow older, with an increase in fats in our blood stream. Prof. Margaret Morehouse is studying the ease with which fats are digested and absorbed, and the height to which they elevate the blood fats during these processes.

In the laboratory for Human Physiology and Health Assessment, Profs. Fred Grodins and Stanley Yamashiro and their associates are studying the effects of smog and other pollutants on the heart and lungs, and with the effects of aging and the heart. Obviously, such research is of concern to all of us. Incidentally, pollutants are supplied free of charge here in L.A. We do not need research grants to supply them.

#### SOCIAL SCIENCES

Professors Galbraith and Walker in Psychology are studying the organization and mechanisms of the brain and are seeking to determine how these are likely to affect the perceptual and thinking capacities of older people. Are there differences in the way the brains and nervous systems of various people are organized, and, if so, how do these differences affect behavior?

Since we are all social beings, we are concerned with the amenability of different people and age groups to social influence—whether they are conformists or deviants. Prof. Ronald Klein, a social-psychologist, is studying these phenomena, and is seeking to determine how they are affected by age groups.

In the Environmental Studies Laboratory, an interdisciplinary group of architects, urban planners, and behavioral scientists—Profs. Pawley, Newcomer, Roberts, Acoc, Caggiano, Lasswell and their faithful students—are concerned with two major sets of problems. In the design of housing for the elderly, or of full-care centers, what works of architectural design are most likely to produce healthy relationships, a sense of well-being, and personal satisfaction? In the larger societal context, they are concerned with the location and distribution of older people in our communities—whether they are integrated with other age groups, or isolated, and whether, through more skillful planning, better living arrangements might be designed for them.

In recent years, we have heard a great deal about the "generation gap." In their study of several hundred three-generation families, a group of sociologists—Profs. Bengtson, Black, Ransford, Lubeck and many students—have sought to determine the effects of family cohesion, similarity and difference upon psychological adjustment and well-being. Contrary to popular assumption, their findings do not bear out the popular stereotype of generation gap. Similarity, not difference, seems to be the dominant pattern when comparing parents and children.

In a large study just now being initiated, a group of sociologists—Profs. Empey, Bengtson, Ragan, Kasschau, and other staff to be

added—will be concerned with a study of aging as it relates to the formation of social policy. One part of this study will gather data from middle-aged and elderly people in three ethnic groups—Black, Mexican American and White—in an attempt to highlight the ways that these different groups adapt to aging in America—what their particular problems and wishes are, their relationships to families, to the political process, and to the delivery of social services. We feel that social problems are not likely to be very effective unless their points of view are better documented.

#### PUBLIC POLICY

A second part of the major study will involve a survey of societal policymakers—politicians, bureaucrats, business and union representatives and professionals—in an attempt to determine how they are likely to respond to the complex economic, political, and social issues that are associated with implementing a more effective policy. Their responses should provide an interesting backdrop to the way older people see these issues themselves. We want to understand the political and social realities that must be confronted in bringing about change.

As a third part of this large study, a team of four anthropologists—Profs. Moore, Simic, Myerhoff and Abarbanel—will go abroad to Italy, Tanzania, Yugoslavia, and Israel to determine how these people are responding to the problems of aging. By noting the policies and practices—the strengths and weaknesses of other countries—we might then be in a position to put those of our own nation into better perspective.

As a final example of our research, Profs. Davis and Black of our staff, and Dr. Edwards of the Veterans Administration, are studying the use of television as a means of providing more effective services to the elderly, not only in full-care centers, but in their own homes where useful information on health, nutritional and other needs might be transmitted more efficiently to them.

#### CONCLUSION

Although this has been a long survey of our research program, it has also been a sketchy one. Hence, I am certain that I have left important projects and people, especially students, out of the listing. For that I apologize. I hope that they are feeling charitable.

Before concluding, however, I should like you to know that, participating with us in our research and community projects, are many interested and helpful community groups, many minority as well as elderly persons. For the first time we have solicited their help, or they have forcefully reminded us that we need it. Hence, they have spent many hours with us in trying to improve the quality and character of our research. To them, we are grateful.

It is our intention that, as our research findings are accumulated, we will participate with them in seeking the most effective means by which to make those findings of use to older as well as to policymaking groups. They will share with us, and the community-educational wing of our Center, in designing programs for the utilization of research, for presenting findings to legislative groups, and for increasing the flow of information outward.

#### TECHNOLOGY EXISTS TO CLEAN UP COKE OVEN POLLUTION

**HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, an article published in the Los Angeles Times of June 11, 1973, quotes steel company officials as saying that the technology does not presently exist to enable

them to meet the pollution control standards set by Public Law 91-606—the Clean Air Act of 1970—before the end of 1975. They contend that emissions from coke ovens cannot be eliminated within the Government deadline.

It has come to my attention, Mr. Speaker, that this contention is virtually uncontested in article after article printed on this subject during the last 2 years.

For the RECORD, I wish to state that such technology does exist and in fact is presently in various stages of installation for commercial production of coke at three separate locations within the United States as well as in England. At each of these locations, devices are being installed and put into operation that not only remove virtually all of the pollutants, but also increase the efficiency of the coke ovens at the same time.

REMARKS OF DR. BERNICE NEUGARTEN ON AGING AT THE DEDICATION OF THE ETHEL PERCY ANDRUS GERONTOLOGY CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, FEBRUARY 13, 1973.

**HON. PATSY T. MINK**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, in February of this year, the University of Southern California dedicated splendid new facilities for its Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center, a center for research and training in the field of aging.

During the dedication ceremonies, Dr. Bernice Neugarten, Chairman of the Committee on Human Development at the University of Chicago, and one of the country's pioneers in the scientific study of aging, delivered an address entitled, "Changing Images of Aging."

I want to share Dr. Neugarten's thoughts with my colleagues, for she made several provocative comments with respect to the problem of discrimination against older Americans, which she termed "agism."

And while Dr. Neugarten professes to offer no solutions to these problems, she concludes:

We should ponder such questions as we look ahead to the future of aging and to the status of the aged in the year 2000, and to the hope of achieving them—if not now—an age irrelevant society.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Dr. Neugarten's address at this point in the RECORD.

BERNICE NEUGARTEN, PH. D., "CHANGING IMAGES OF AGING," ETHEL PERCY ANDRUS GERONTOLOGY CENTER, FEBRUARY 13, 1973

#### MARRIAGE AND THE ELDERLY

As I thought about what I would talk about today, I picked up the latest issue of Modern Maturity which I presume all of us in this room read with some regularity, and after reading through the very nice description of these dedication ceremonies which were to occur and a description of the new building which you now have seen, I would answer the magazine. My eyes fell upon a picture which was entitled "Happy, Happy." It showed Senator Thurmond who as you know is a 69 year old Senator from South Carolina holding his new-born son along with his young beautiful wife holding their 18-month old daughter. Now it did not say how



old that Mrs. Thurmond is but she looks 30 or less. It reminded me of a newspaper clipping which I keep in my files and which I read to my students each year when I am trying to teach them about age expectation, and age constraint.

The clipping refers to the fact that Supreme Court Justice Douglas had just married a very beautiful 23 year old co-ed. There were some very nasty things said in that newspaper story. Five members of the House of Representatives had introduced resolutions calling on the House Judiciary Committee to investigate the moral character of Douglas. One said he should be impeached. Another said the marriage clearly demonstrated that this Justice was not devoting a fair part of his judging ability to the interpretation of the law. And another said that the Douglas marriage "points up a weakness in our Judicial system that permits the removal of a Judge only upon conviction of a crime". Now I realize, of course that Justice Douglas' critics were politically at odds with him and that the venom in the attacks were not purely because of his marriage. I also realize that this was Justice Douglas' fourth marriage. Yet I feel quite confident that if Justice Douglas had been marrying a woman of 50 or 60 there would have been no outcry. I do not know what Modern Maturity said about Douglas' marriage, if it said anything at all. If there were editorial comment and if that editorial comment were favorable, it certainly seemed to me that this month the editor of Modern Maturity was looking with favor upon Senator Thurmond's marriage and new parenthood.

In any case, whatever Modern Maturity might have done, the press in general was not favorable to Justice Douglas' marriage. Now I recognize also that the rest of the country is not as enlightened as the editor and the readers of Modern Maturity, and there must be many persons today who find it if not immoral at least imprudent or foolish when they read about marriages between persons of very different ages.

I am aware also there is even a stronger sanction against an older woman marrying a young man. But the important point I want to make is the contrast in the degree to which the public seems to have accepted the same or at least parallel case in the difference of only 6 years. I doubt, in other words, that the story about Justice Douglas' marriage if it appeared today would seem quite as hostile in tone as it did only 6 years ago.

#### DIVERSITY OF THE ELDERLY POPULATION

In any case, the difference in the public reaction to these two marriages serves to illustrate the theme of my comment today. For in commenting upon the changing images of aging, there are two related points I would like to make. First, images are changing and they are changing in the direction of reality—and reality means diversity. Older persons are coming to be recognized for what they are, namely, a very heterogeneous very diverse group of people. And my second point, now that while we are in a period of history in which age has become increasingly important in looking at economic, political and social aspects of life. And age groups are becoming increasingly sharpened. Nevertheless, there are signs that we are moving toward a society in which age will become less relevant. Or if I might try to coin an awkward phrase, an age irrelevant society. I am, of course, speaking of adults only. We have not and I presume we shall not create age irrelevancy from birth on, but at least from adulthood on.

The stereotypes are beginning to break down. Older people used to be regarded as poor, isolated, sick, unhappy, desolated and destitute or, on the contrary, as powerful, rigid reactionaries.

The first of these inaccurate images usually inadvertently repeated through the mass media came from the persons who

served the poor, the lonely, the isolated, and from the physicians, the psychiatrists and social workers who saw the physically ill and mentally ill. Plus many of our current stereotypes have been based on a picture of the needy rather than the more typical older persons, but now we are catching up with reality.

As a hypothetical young person walking down a hypothetical street in a city, one out of every ten persons that young person will see will be over 65. Some of those persons he will see will be slow-moving but others will be quick, vigorous and energetic. With ten percent of our population now over 65, and with nearly half of them great-grandparents, a very large number of young people, young children, young adults and middle-aged adults are interacting with older members of their families. They are seeing grandparents as young and only great-grandparents as older. And with grandparenthood itself coming in the 40's and the 50's and with more than half of all women in that age group in the labor market, this means that little children are more often seeing their grandmothers go to work every day and their mothers staying home.

#### EXPLODING MYTHS

The image, then, of the old man in the rocking chair is being matched now by the white-haired man on the golf course and some of the old myths are therefore being exploded. They are even being exploded on television, Mr. Abernethy.

We now have, for example, Maude, who is a middle-aged woman, intelligent, forceful, liberal, a kind of counter-image to Archie Bunker. A woman who has been married several times; she gets into paradoxical situations which she comes through with very flying colors.

Or we have a program called "A Touch of Grace" with an elderly widow being courted by an elderly man and the comedy situations that occur in her family. And where both older people are being sympathetically handled and treated as real people.

Or we have another in which there is a black father and son shown in a close and neutrally supportive relationship in which the old father emerges as the older, wiser and more astute, as the student of human nature whose long life experience gives him the edge over the young.

Now these everyday realities which all of us know from experience are being at last mirrored in the mass media and, to repeat, we are catching up with reality.

#### THE GENERATION GAP

Now let me say something about my second point on relevancy or irrelevancy of age as a dimension of social organization. We have heard a good deal in the past few years about what some of us have called "agism." That is, negative or hostile attitudes toward an age group different from one's own.

Our attention has been focused on various forms of the generation gap. To what extent is it real? And to what extent is it just a creation of the mass media? In some ways it would look as if it were the latter. In studies, and for instance this University has been one that has made such studies, it is found over and over again that young people will say "Older people in general are very different from us, but of course my own parents are okay." Or parents will say, "It's terrible what the kids these days are coming to but of course my own kid is okay."

Now these attitudes—when they turn out to be held by most people as we are finding—is a case of what social psychologists like myself call pluralistic ignorance. We all presume that we alone are different from other people.

We are asking if the conflicts between generations are increasing and if so are they appearing in both directions. That is, not only between the young and the society at large but also between the old and society at

large. Is there a new age divisiveness appearing and new antagonisms between young and old?

It has been said that we in modern western societies went through a century of struggle for political right and then a century of struggle for economic rights, and that now we may be in a century of struggle for age rights. That both the young and old are struggling for equality with the middle-aged. It can also, of course, be said that this is the century of equality struggle between racial groups and for equality between the sexes.

#### LOSE THE VOTE AT AGE 70

If agism is increasing, this is a struggle being joined not only by the young but also by the old, who might otherwise become its victims. Now agism is taking new forms. I saw an editorial in a metropolitan newspaper only three days ago which was headed "Budget Story, Bonanza for the Elderly" and it went on to say that America's public resources are increasingly being mortgaged for the use of a sole group within our country, the elderly. Clearly, the article went on, this trend cannot continue for long without causing a bitter political struggle between the generations. Then it went on about the sharp increase in payroll taxes to pay for the latest 20% increase in Social Security, with which you are familiar.

Here is another new example of agism towards the old. Two years ago there was an article in the New Republic. The author, in reviewing changes which were happening in his native California, said, "We face a serious constitutional crisis. California faces civil war if we continue to allow the old an unlimited franchise. All persons should lose the vote at retirement or age 70, whichever is the earlier."

One writer has published a social satire describing a society in which people, when they reach 50, are automatically segregated from others, even from their own children, and then painlessly put to death when they reach 65. Another writer has described what he thinks a solution might be in opposite terms. Where the old are in control and where the small proportion of young who are allowed to be born seek ways to accelerate their own aging in order to take their place in the society of elders, a society in which social change has slowed to a snail's pace.

These parodies, and that is all they are, are examples of agism carried to the extreme. The first instance, where we would automatically have people die at 65, is an example of agism in the extreme directed toward the old. In the second instance, agism is directed toward the young.

#### AGE AND EDUCATION

I want to skip other such examples because we may have time later and I want merely to end by asking if indeed we are engaged in a struggle for age right. And if it is not merely a creation of the mass media. It is a struggle which will probably end in greater freedom for both young and old; greater freedom from the constructions of age norms. For example, we have lived with a long tradition that youth is the time for education, adulthood and middle age is the time for work and old age is the time for leisure. But with social and economic changes that are now occurring along with technological changes, we are leading ourselves to a shake-up of these old traditions and we now know that education, work and leisure are being provided for people in a greater mix than before. We have a greater age mix in our educational institutions as well as in our work institutions. The future will probably see greater experimentation and greater flexibility in the timing of education, work and leisure as, for one thing, young people seem more sophisticated and more mature than in earlier decades and the old are being recognized as being younger in body, mind and spirit than in earlier decades.

## A FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION

I want to ask one final question, and that is this. One of the ways in which all of us in this room have been fighting for an end to discrimination to older people, and what today I have been talking about as agism, is by creating advocacy groups of old people and for old people. One of the ways in which old people have, as it were, entered the struggle against discrimination is by organizing. AARP is one and a very powerful one such organization.

I would like to raise a question, however, in the following sense. If we were to reduce agism, let us remember it must work in both directions. For the young as well as for the old. This will not be easy. For those young people who would wish it, shall we help them to live without work? Shall we encourage, let us say, those communes for young people like retirement communities for old people where people will work—not for remuneration or productivity in the sense of the Protestant ethic but for the spontaneous creativity and for self-fulfillment? Or shall we live in a society where we maintain the value that only those who have worked for it first can later enjoy the benefits of leisure.

In objecting to agism and seeking to reduce this discrimination, might it also be paradoxically that some of the advocacy groups now constituted of older people, or for older people, might unwittingly themselves add to agism. Or is age separatism a necessary stage in winning full equality? Perhaps it is a necessary stage in the 1970's but hopefully not by the 1990's.

These are not easy questions and I do not know the answers anymore than anyone else in this room but I think we should ponder such questions as we look ahead to the future of aging and to the status of the aged in the year 2000, and to the hope of achieving then—if not now—an age irrelevant society.

## POSTAL SERVICE PLANS INCREASES IN EVERYTHING BUT SERVICE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the postal hike presently being threatened by the U.S. Postal Service would increase first class mail rates to 10 cents per letter, without the slightest indication of a possible improvement in mail service.

In a recent newsmagazine interview, the Postmaster General Elmer T. Klassen, expresses concern over whether air mail service can even be continued. Citizen impatience with the flagging performance by the Postal Service's handling of the mails has increased substantially, despite Mr. Klassen's remarkable pronouncement that service today "is as good or better than it's been in recent history."

He pointed out that even though postal workers has gotten substantial raises in pay over the past 2 years, a new 11 percent across-the-board wage hike for postal employees is scheduled for July 21. A reported total of some 600,000 workers, already averaging about \$10,000 annual income, would be boosted to \$11,000 over the next 2 years, with additional automatic cost-of-living increases thrown in.

The \$10 billion taxpayer subsidized operating costs of the Postal Service

would be inflated by another \$1 billion from the new wage increases.

The amount of additional revenue to be derived from the planned postage tax increase would just about equal the new pay demands.

If the past is any teacher, the postal patron cannot expect to receive even 2 cents worth of additional service from the 2 cents a letter postage hike.

I include the following related newsclipping:

[From the Washington Post, June 22, 1973]  
POSTAL RAISES MAY SEND COST OF STAMP TO 10 CENTS

(By Lawrence Feinberg)

The U.S. Postal Service agreed yesterday to grant substantial wage increases, costing an estimated \$1 billion a year, that officials said could lead to a boost in the price of first class mail to 10 cents a stamp by January.

The wage increases, agreed to in negotiations with four postal unions, include a \$700-a-year across-the-board raise, starting July 21, plus a \$400 raise one year later.

Annual wages for the 600,000 postal workers affected, including 12,000 in the Washington area, now average about \$10,000, making the average wage increase 11 per cent over the two-year contract period.

In addition, the agreement calls for automatic cost-of-living increases every six months, amounting to a \$50-a-year raise for each 1 per cent increase in the consumer price index with no upper limit.

It also raises the Postal Service share of health insurance costs to 65 per cent by July, 1974. Currently, the Postal Service pays 40 per cent of average insurance costs, the same share that the federal government pays for regular civil servants.

"These are the best wages and fringe benefits we've ever had," said James H. Rademacher, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, "and it (the agreement) also has the job security we need."

Rademacher and other union leaders, who disclosed the contract terms, said the Postal Service had dropped its demand to rescind a no-layoff clause, which will continue to forbid the firing of any postal worker for economy reasons.

A Postal Service spokesman refused to discuss specific contract terms, but he estimated that the settlement would add about \$1 billion to the Service's \$10 billion annual costs.

The spokesman also read a statement made earlier in the week by Postmaster General Elmer T. Klassen that "in all likelihood" he would seek to cover rising wages by asking the Postal Rate Commission in September for a 2-cent increase of the present 8-cent cost of a first-class stamp, effective next January.

Workers covered in the union agreements include letter carriers, mail sorters, clerks and other craft employees.

In addition, the Postal Service has about 91,000 supervisors and postmasters, whom Klassen has promised will receive the same raises as union workers.

Yesterday's agreement was hailed by Francis Filbey, president of the American Postal Workers Union, as "an excellent contract that compares favorably with anything that's been negotiated in the past two years in the private sector (since wage and price controls were first imposed)."

"With the no-layoff clause," he added, "it's better than anything in the private sector."

Postal wage and rate increases, like other wage and price changes, may be trimmed by the Cost of Living Council. Its guidelines for annual wage increases now call for a 5.5 per cent ceiling, plus 7/10 of 1 percent for fringe benefits.

Yesterday a Council spokesman emphasized that the wage guidelines are flexible, and said it is "much too soon to tell" what action the Council might take on the postal workers in-

creases. Rules for allowable price increases after the current two-month freeze are still being formulated.

Negotiators for three unions gave full approval to yesterday's settlement: the American Postal Workers Union (312,000 members), the National Association of Letter Carriers (195,000), and the National Rural Letter Carriers Association (31,000).

The fourth union in the negotiations, the Mail Handlers Division of the Laborers International Union (48,000 members) also approved the wage and fringe benefit package but is still seeking work rule changes.

Rank and file members of all the unions must vote to ratify the contract before it is effective, but union leaders said they are confident it would be ratified.

## DETAILS OF THE LAWSUIT FOR A NUCLEAR POWER MORATORIUM

HON. MIKE GRAVEL

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, a suit to shut down 20 of the country's 31 operating atomic powerplants was filed on May 31, 1973, by Ralph Nader and Friends of the Earth. The 11 plants not covered by the suit are either relatively small—less than 400 electrical megawatts—or are already in similar litigation.

On June 11, according to the Associated Press, AEC Chairman Dixie Lee Ray told the American Nuclear Society that "the Nation can survive" the closing of the plants since only 4 percent of the country's total electricity is produced by nuclear powerplants. She also said that the AEC would appeal immediately if the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia grants an injunction closing down the plants. Oral arguments on the petition for a preliminary injunction have been scheduled for June 28, 1973.

EXCERPTS FROM THE COMPLAINT AS FILED

The Weekly Energy Report of June 4 reported as follows:

Lawyers for affected nuclear vendors and utilities were trying to decide by week's end whether they should intervene in the suit.

In general, they were skeptical about its chances of success. They said that the courts had a history of not wishing to make technical judgments, and not wishing to interfere in agency rulemaking procedure.

On the other hand, paragraph No. 37 of the Nader-Friends of the Earth complaint states explicitly as follows:

Plaintiffs do not seek to have this Court adjudicate the underlying technical issues governing Emergency Core Cooling System effectiveness. Rather, plaintiffs seek to have this Court declare as illegal defendants' continuing to permit the operation of the nuclear power plants which are the subject of this Complaint under circumstances in which, as a matter of law, such action is unlawful.

Mr. President, because this is an important lawsuit which should be understood by every Member of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that major excerpts from the complaint as filed be printed at the end of these remarks, as well as a table prepared by Friends of the Earth.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
(See exhibit 1.)

"MASSIVE COVERUP OF SAFETY PROBLEMS"

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I would like to quote four points made by David Brower, president of Friends of the Earth, when he announced this lawsuit:

Friends of the Earth and Ralph Nader have today filed suit in federal district court in Washington against the Atomic Energy Commission. We are asking the court to shut down 20 large nuclear power plants now operating in 12 states. Overwhelming scientific evidence has shown that the lives of millions of people are being threatened by the operation of these plants . . .

Friends of the Earth has been working closely with the Union of Concerned Scientists on this nuclear reactor safety issue. We have concluded, and we have scientific documentation to demonstrate, that a massive cover-up of most urgent reactor safety problems has been practiced by the AEC for years . . .

In fact, the large majority of the AEC's own safety experts have profound misgivings about the adequacy of the present emergency core cooling systems.

Our lawsuit asserts that the AEC has violated the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 by continuing to permit operation of nuclear power plants pursuant to regulations which require an effective Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) when in fact the experts who advise the Commission have stated that the ECCS has not been established to be effective.

LIKE LOADING PASSENGERS ON UNTESTED AIRPLANES

The fact is that there has never been a single large-scale test of the ECCS, because the test-program is years behind schedule. There is general doubt about the soundness of the computer models—doubt which increased after 6 out of 6 miniscale tests failed in late 1970—a fact which did not come to light until the middle of 1971.

In March 1971, when I testified before the Oregon State Legislature in favor of a nuclear power moratorium, I warned the legislators as follows:

The most essential system of all which stands between the public and a radioactive calamity—a system called the Emergency Core Cooling System—has never once been actually tested.

That is still true, more than 2 years later. For nuclear advocates to boast that we have not had a nuclear catastrophe yet is like pointing to a block of houses less than 5 years old and suggesting that they must be fireproof since they have not burned down yet.

To impose untested nuclear emergency systems on the public is like forcing the public to fly in airplanes whose emergency systems have never been fully tested outside a computer.

WOULD CONGRESS CANCEL A COURT-ORDERED MORATORIUM?

I think that the Nader-FOE lawsuit is important, though it cites only one of the several major problems in the nuclear power program. While moratorium supporters will naturally welcome this suit, they should not imagine that there is a shortcut around Congress on this issue, however.

If the moratorium suit is successful in court, there is no doubt that Congress will be swiftly asked to pass legislative relief from the court's decision. A moratorium won in court has little chance of survival if Congress is determined to have nuclear power. Ultimately, the moratorium can be secured only by heavy constituent pressure on Congress.

torium won in court has little chance of survival if Congress is determined to have nuclear power. Ultimately, the moratorium can be secured only by heavy constituent pressure on Congress.

THE HEART OF THE NUCLEAR CONTROVERSY

Members of Congress should pay close attention to the attitude of the AEC Chairman toward nuclear hazards.

On the Washington News Conference February 25, 1973, Dr. Ray said:

We certainly have to know more than we do now, but not to the extent where we have to stop everything and wait until answers are got . . .

On an ABC network broadcast May 31, 1973, Dr. Ray said:

We never know enough, particularly when we are dealing with a technology at the edge of knowledge. How do you find out? We know of no way of learning except by trying things out, as carefully, as prudently, as we can. And that's the way society and human beings and individuals do learn.

I admire the way Dixy Lee Ray gets to the core of the nuclear controversy, which is philosophical, not technical. The disagreement centers on what is a morally responsible policy to promote after one has acknowledged that there are uncertainties with today's huge experimental powerplants, that—according to Senator BAKER—they probably represent "the biggest single risk that any civilization has ever taken," and that they create the potential for complete and irreversible poisoning of the planet.

EXHIBIT 1

EXCERPTS FROM VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Ralph Nader, Washington, D.C., and Friends of the Earth, 529 Commercial Street, San Francisco, California, and 620 C Street, S.E., Washington, D.C., Plaintiffs, versus Dixy Lee Ray, James Ramey, William Doub, Clarence E. Larson, and the United States Atomic Energy Commission, all of 1717 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

CAUSE OF ACTION ALLEGED

Statutory and regulatory framework

12. Prior to 1954, only the United States Government could produce or use atomic energy. In 1954, Congress amended the Act to permit private industry to develop and use atomic energy, subject to strict and specific regulation by the Commission. The defendants' regulatory authority is subject to the paramount obligation imposed by the Act to regulate nuclear power plants in a manner that affirmatively protects the public health and safety from the inherent dangers associated with the operation of such plants. 42 U.S.C. §§ 2011a, b, g, and i; 2012c, d, and e; 2013 and 2133a and b(2).

13. The Act does not permit defendants to issue a license for the operation of a nuclear power plant unless a showing is made that the operation of the plant "will provide adequate protection to the health and safety of the public." 42 USC § 2232a. Whenever "... any report, record, or inspection or other means" indicates that the operation of a licensed nuclear power plant no longer provides "adequate protection to the health and safety of the public," the defendant Commission is required by the Act to revoke the license and prohibit operation of the nuclear power plant. 42 USC § 2236a.

14. Pursuant to the requirement that defendants' regulations carry out the affirmative purposes of protecting the health and safety of the public (42 USC §§ 2201b and p), the defendants' regulations require that before a license is granted for operation of

a nuclear power plant, the defendant Commission must find that the plant has been constructed and will operate in accordance with the provisions of the Act; that there is reasonable assurance that the plant can be operated "without endangering the health and safety of the public"; and that the issuance of the license "will not be inimical . . . to the health and safety of the public." 10 CFR § 50.57a (1) (2) (3) and (6). The defendants' regulations also require that a license to operate a nuclear power plant be revoked and that the plant cease operation whenever conditions are "... revealed by . . . any report, record, inspection, or other means, which would warrant the Commission to refuse to grant a license to an original application . . ." 10 CFR § 50.100.

15. Accordingly, under the Act and its own regulations the Commission has no authority to license the operation of a nuclear power plant, or to permit a licensed plant to continue to operate, under circumstances which fail to assure operation without danger to the public health and safety. By reason of the extent of the risks involved, hereinafter alleged in more detail, and the nature of the Commission's obligations under the Act, the Commission is precluded as a matter of law from permitting operation of a nuclear power plant when such assurance is lacking.

An uncontrolled loss-of-coolant accident

19. In normal operation of a nuclear power plant, the reactor core—which contains enormous amounts of highly radioactive material produced by the fissioning of uranium—is kept covered by water at a temperature of approximately 600° F. This nuclear core must be kept covered by water or it will rapidly overheat and melt into a large radioactive mass that would be impossible to cool or contain.

20. Among the serious accidents which can occur at a nuclear power plant is a sudden failure of piping in the complex plumbing or steam supply system. Because the steam supply system contains water under high pressure, a large pipe break would result in rapid expulsion, in some cases within one minute, of the same water which is supposed to keep the nuclear core constantly covered. Such an accident is commonly called a "loss-of-coolant accident."

21. A loss-of-coolant accident rapidly becomes "uncontrollable" and the nuclear core melts into a radioactive mass, if emergency water (or coolant) does not replace the lost water normally available.

22. There is no known device to contain the radioactive mass which has melted down as a result of an uncontrolled loss-of-coolant accident. Such a radioactive mass would melt through all of a nuclear power plant's steel and concrete structures and release enormous amounts of radioactivity into the environment with catastrophic consequences.

23. In 1957, under the sponsorship of the defendant Commission, the Brookhaven National Laboratory released a study entitled WASH-740, which analyzed the adverse consequences of a major release of radioactivity from a nuclear power plant. This study showed that such a release of radioactivity to the environment could produce 3400 deaths, 43,000 injuries, 7 billion dollars of property loss and radioactive contamination of 150,000 square miles of land. On May 7, 1973, the acting Secretary of defendant Commission confirmed that a 1965 re-examination of the 1957 Brookhaven Study produced conclusions respecting death, injury, danger and contamination from a major release of radioactivity which paralleled those of the 1957 study. The size of nuclear power plants currently being licensed and operated (and those which are the subject of this action) are several times (in some cases, ten times) the size of the nuclear power plant which was the subject of the aforesaid study by the Brookhaven National Laboratory.

24. Because of the enormous amount of radioactivity routinely contained within nuclear power plants of the size in operation today, including those which are the subject of this action, release to the environment of only a few percent of the radioactivity within the nuclear core would result in catastrophic consequences to life and property, within a large geographic area proximate to the point of release, at least as great as the consequences disclosed in the 1957 Brookhaven Study. Accordingly, the consequences of an uncontrolled loss-of-coolant accident at one or more of the nuclear power plants which are the subject of this Complaint are almost unimaginable.

#### Requirement for an effective "ECCS"

25. Protection against the consequences of an uncontrolled loss-of-coolant accident is required in order to provide the protection of the "health and safety" of the public called for by the Act and is a necessary prerequisite to the permissible operation of a nuclear power plant. Such protection is supposed to be provided by a system commonly referred to and described by the defendants as an emergency core cooling system ("ECCS").

26. The Commission has adopted "General Design Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants" characterized by the Commission as establishing "minimum requirements" for the principal design criteria for nuclear power plants. Criterion 35 dealing with emergency core cooling provides in part:

"A system to provide abundant emergency core cooling shall be provided. 10 CFR Part 50, App. A, Criterion 35.

Thus, the purpose of an ECCS is to assure that emergency cooling water is available to recover the nuclear core during and after a loss-of-coolant accident within a time frame (measured in seconds) that will prevent the nuclear core from overheating, melting down into a radioactive mass and subsequently being released to the environment.

27. The Commission may not validly license a nuclear power plant for operation under the Act or under its own regulations unless the plant possesses an ECCS whose effectiveness is established. Continued operation of a nuclear power plant under the Act and Commission regulations requires assurance of an effective ECCS.

28. On June 29, 1971, the Commission promulgated a statement of policy providing so-called "Interim Acceptance Criteria" ("IAC") for ECCS. The IAC became effective upon publication in the Federal Register on June 29, 1971. 36 F.R. 12247. Under the IAC the Commission "judges" an ECCS to be acceptable, i.e., presumes the effectiveness of an ECCS, if it is constructed and analyzed in accordance with standards set forth in the IAC. The IAC states that the Commission "believes" that the IAC provide reasonable assurance that an ECCS will be effective in the event of a loss-of-coolant accident. A true and correct copy of the IAC is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit A.

29. Each of the nuclear power plants which are the subject of this action has an ECCS which has been "judged to be acceptable" pursuant to the IAC and is currently operating pursuant to defendants' Interim Acceptance Criteria. The effectiveness of the ECCS to prevent an uncontrolled loss-of-coolant accident in each of such plants was presumed by the defendants upon their determination that the ECCS complied with the requirements of the IAC.

#### No assurance of ECCS effectiveness

30. Notwithstanding the defendants' "belief" that compliance with the IAC provides assurance of the effectiveness of an ECCS, there is, in fact, no such assurance, and virtually all of the defendants' own scientific advisors have come to that conclusion. In particular:

(a) The operating heads of the ECCS research programs at the Commission's primary safety research centers (Oak Ridge

National Laboratory and Aerojet Nuclear Company) have stated that compliance with the IAC does not assure effectiveness of an ECCS and that there is insufficient scientific evidence to support the conclusion that an ECCS of current design (including those installed on the nuclear power plants which are the subject of this action) will, in fact, operate as intended. Thus, William B. Cottrell, the Director of the Nuclear Safety Program at the Commission's Oak Ridge National Laboratory, sent a letter on December 6, 1971, subsequent to the adoption of the IAC, to the Commission's Director of Regulation in which he stated on behalf of his Safety Division that:

"We are not certain that the interim criteria for ECCS adopted by the AEC will, as stated in the Federal Register, 'provide reasonable assurance that such systems will be effective in the unlikely event of a loss-of-coolant accident.'"

Thereafter and on March 19, 1972, a colleague of Mr. Cottrell's at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, C. G. Lawson, stated that: "There exists at this time [March 19, 1972] such a limited amount of information . . . that a conclusion of the adequacy of these emergency [core cooling] systems would be speculative."

In August, 1971, subsequent to the adoption of the IAC, the research group, under the direction of George Brockett at Aerojet Nuclear Company, primarily responsible for ECCS research for the Commission submitted to the Commission a major status report on ECCS and its effectiveness. Contained within that report was a summary table that set forth the status of available information needed to analyze loss-of-coolant accidents in nuclear power plants. A true and correct copy of this summary table is attached to the Complaint as Exhibit B. As indicated by the summary table, in one vital area after another, information needed to establish the effectiveness of an ECCS is indicated to be "inadequate," "incomplete," "preliminary," "unverified," "imprecise" and "uncertain."

(b) The Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, a statutory committee created by Congress (42 USC §§ 2039 and 2232(b)) to monitor and advise the Commission on nuclear safety, believes that compliance with the IAC is an insufficient basis upon which to establish the acceptability of an ECCS of the type installed on the nuclear power plants which are the subject of this Complaint, and it has so advised the defendant Commission pursuant to its statutory obligation on January 7, September 15, and November 15, 1972, all subsequent to the adoption of the IAC.

(c) Members of the Regulatory Staff of the Commission have stated that compliance with the IAC is insufficient to assure ECCS effectiveness and that the IAC is insupportable by reference to scientific or experimental data. Thus, Dr. Morris Rosen, Technical Advisor to the Director of Reactor Licensing, and his former deputy, Robert Colmar, wrote in June, 1971, in a memorandum internal to the defendant Commission, that:

"The consummate message [from available analyses] is that the [ECC] system performance cannot be defined with sufficient assurance to provide a clear basis for licensing."

Thereafter, and on April 12, 1972, subsequent to the adoption of the IAC, Dr. Rosen confirmed that:

"Present knowledge [concerning ECCS effectiveness] is not sufficiently adequate to make licensing decisions for the approximately one hundred reactors now operating or under construction."

And finally:

(d) Commission officials who have been delegated overall responsibility for ECCS safety research and analysis have stated in documents internal to the defendant Commission that ECCS of present design (in-

cluding those installed on the nuclear power plants which are the subject of this action) are not established to be effective to prevent meltdown of the nuclear core and an uncontrolled loss-of-coolant accident and that compliance with the IAC is insufficient to assure the effectiveness of an ECCS and hence the protection of the public health and safety. Thus, Milton Shaw, the Commission's Director of Reactor Development and Technology, wrote in February, 1971, prior to the adoption of the IAC, that:

"No assurance is yet available that emergency coolant can be delivered at the rates intended and in the time period prior to . . . melting [of the nuclear core]. . . ."

Mr. Shaw, while in charge of the Commission's overall program involving reactor safety research, wrote in November, 1971, subsequent to the adoption of the IAC, that:

"Present experimental data and analysis techniques are not now sufficient to provide the degree of ECC [emergency core cooling] assurance deemed necessary by the AEC [Atomic Energy Commission]."

31. The lack of assurance of ECCS effectiveness revealed in the matters alleged in paragraph 30 above still persists as of the filing of this complaint.

32. By reasons of matters alleged in paragraph 30 above, as a matter of law the IAC does not provide assurance of the effectiveness of an ECCS. The members of the Commission themselves, as individuals, lack scientific expertise comparable to that possessed by their scientific advisors referred to in paragraph 30 above, and the statutory and regulatory requirement to protect the public health and safety cannot, as a matter of law, be complied with and is violated by Commission action that, on a matter essential to protection of public health and safety, flies in the face of the virtually unanimous view of its own scientific advisors.

33. Notwithstanding such virtual uniformity on the inadequacy of the IAC as above alleged, the Commission has licensed and continues to permit the operation of the nuclear power plants which are the subject of this Complaint on the basis of compliance with the IAC which does not provide assurance that the ECCS in such plants are in fact effective.

34. The operation of the aforesaid nuclear power plants without assurance of an effective ECCS does not provide adequate protection to the health and safety of the public, results in a failure to protect the public health and safety and does not provide reasonable assurance that the plants can be operated without endangering the health and safety of the public, all in violation of the Act and the Commission's regulations.

35. Under these circumstances, the continued operation of the aforesaid nuclear power plants represents final administrative action beyond the Commission's statutory authority and results in a gross breach of the Commission's mandatory obligation pursuant to the Act and its regulations to protect the public health and safety and to provide reasonable assurance that the nuclear power plants can be operated without endangering the health and safety of the public.

36. The matters alleged in paragraph 30 above represent "reports, records, or inspections or other means" which require the defendants to exercise their obligation to revoke the licenses and halt operation of the nuclear power plants identified in paragraph 8 above. 42 USC § 2236a; 10 CFR § 50.100. The failure of the defendants to revoke the licenses and cease operation of the subject nuclear power plants is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, and not in accordance with or authorized by law. 5 USC § 706.

#### REQUEST FOR RELIEF

41. Plaintiffs request that this Court:

A. Declare that the continued operation of each of the nuclear power plants identified in paragraph 8 above is illegal under the



Atomic Energy Act and Atomic Energy Commission Regulations, that the continued operation of such nuclear power plants, under the circumstances here presented, represents a breach, as a matter of law, of the Atomic Energy Commission's affirmative obligation to protect the public health and safety, and that the failure of the Atomic Energy Commission and the individual defendants to revoke the license and to halt the operation of said nuclear power plants represents the unlawful withholding and unreasonable delaying of required agency action;

B. After reasonable notice and hearing, permanently enjoin the Atomic Energy Commission and the individual defendants from permitting the nuclear power plants identified in paragraph 8 above to operate until such time as the Atomic Energy Commission fully complies with its affirmative obligations to protect the public health and safety and by such relief compel agency action unlawfully withheld and unreasonably delayed;

C. Upon short notice and hearing and upon proper motion, issue preliminary, temporary injunctive relief pursuant to Rule 65 of the

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, until such time as the Court has heard and adjudicated plaintiffs' request for permanent injunctive relief; and

D. Grant such other relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

Wherefore plaintiffs, Ralph Nader and Friends of the Earth, respectfully request the Court grant them the relief requested herein.

Ralph Nader and Friends of the Earth, by their attorneys: Myron M. Cherry, Anthony Z. Roisman, Alexander Polikoff, Robert Volen, Robert L. Graham, and Albert K. Butzel.

## EXHIBIT 2

TABLE.—NUCLEAR REACTORS NAMED IN SUIT BY FRIENDS OF THE EARTH AND RALPH NADER

Unit name	Location	License date	Rated capacity (in MWe)	Percent capacity performance in 1972	Actual 1972 performance (in MWe)	Reactor shutdowns in 1972		Percent plant availability in 1972
						2d quarter	3d quarter	
1. San Onofre-1	San Clemente, Calif.	Mar. 27, 1967	430	74.5	320	X	X	77.4
2. Haddam Neck	Haddam Neck, Conn.	June 30, 1967	575	85.9	494	X	X	87.7
3. Oyster Creek-1	Toms River, N.J.	Apr. 9, 1969	640	80.0	512	X	X	81.3
4. Nine Mile Point-1	Scriba, N.Y.	Aug. 22, 1969	625	60.5	378	X		70.2
5. Ginna-1	Ontario, N.Y.	Sept. 19, 1969	420	64.1	269	X		69.1
6. Dresden-2	Morris, Ill.	Dec. 22, 1969	809	47.4	393	X		59.8
7. Robinson-2	Hartsville, S.C.	July 31, 1970	700	80.4	563	X		85.2
8. Monticello	Monticello, Minn.	Sept. 8, 1970	545	74.5	405		X	79.4
9. Point Beach-1	Two Creeks, Wis.	Oct. 5, 1970	497	69.4	345			72.5
10. Millstone Point-1	Waterford, Conn.	Oct. 7, 1970	652	54.9	358		X	59.9
11. Dresden-3	Morris, Ill.	Jan. 12, 1971	809	72.8	589	X		85.0
12. Surry-1	Gravel Neck, Va.	May 12, 1972	788	47.3	373			24.1
13. Turkey Point-3	Turkey Point, Fla.	July 19, 1972	693	7.6	57			27.5
14. Maine Yankee	Wiscasset, Maine	Sept. 19, 1972	790	74.8	591			100.0
15. Palisades	South Haven, Mich.	Oct. 16, 1972	700	57.0	399	X	X	57.0
16. Quad Cities-1	Cordova, Ill.	Dec. 14, 1972	800	64.0	512		X	69.6
17. Quad Cities-2	do.	do.	800	39.4	315		X	55.0
18. Surry-2	Gravel Neck, Va.	Jan. 30, 1973	788	(1)	(1)			
19. Oconee-1	Seneca, S.C.	Feb. 9, 1973	841	(2)	(2)			
20. Turkey Point-4	Turkey Point, Fla.	Apr. 11, 1973	693	(2)	(2)			
Total			13,595		6,873			

## Key:

Rated capacity: Design output of the nuclear powerplant.  
Percent capacity performance: 1972 output as a percentage of optimum designed output.  
Actual performance: Actual output converted to MWe (rated capacity times percent capacity output).  
Reactor shutdowns: X means the plant shutdown in that quarter; — means the plant was not operating then.  
Percent plant availability: Percent of the year that the plant was able to produce power.  
Plants started in 1972 are rated from the date of 1st electrical generation.  
1 Not applicable. May operate at 92 percent capacity.  
2 Not applicable. May operate at 5 percent capacity.  
3 Not applicable. May operate at 93 percent capacity.

Notes: The capacity performance in 1972 is a function of the demand made on a nuclear powerplant during the time it was available—when accidents, repairs, refueling, service or AEC orders did not halt electrical generation. There is no guarantee that these plants will be operating during times of peak load. All but one of the plants shut down sometime during the times when peak load was most likely to occur last year. There is no data yet for the three newest plants. Maine Yankee is restricted to run at 75 percent capacity. 3 other plants—Vermont Yankee, Point Beach-2, and Pilgrim-1—are not named in this suit because they are the objects of individual suits of a similar nature. It is interesting to note that the actual 1972 power performance by the 20 plants listed in the suit was not much greater than the 6,100 electrical megawatts needed now by the AEC's three uranium-enrichment plants to make nuclear fuel.

Source of data: 1972 AEC Annual Report to Congress and AEC publication WASH-1203-74.

## TEXANS AND THE METRIC SYSTEM

## HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today all of the major countries of the world except the United States have officially adopted the metric system of measures or are in the process of conversion to it. The enclosed article by J. Bryan Adair, entitled "Texans and the Metric System," appearing in a recent issue of the Texas Business Review is not only an excellent article on the metric system's history and background but it also shows how the advantages of conversion can benefit the economy of an individual State.

I am pleased to place this interesting and informative article in the Record and recommend it to my colleagues?

## TEXANS AND THE METRIC SYSTEM

(By J. Bryan Adair)

Texans, through three of their congressmen, may significantly influence the probable upcoming conversion to the metric system of measurement in the United States.

Three representatives from Texas, Olin E.

Teague (6th Congressional District) J. J. (Jake) Pickle (10th District and Dale Milford (24th District), are members of the Science and Astronautics Committee, which handles all legislation concerning national scientific research and development, scientific scholarships, the National Science Foundation, NASA, the National Bureau of Standards, and all matters relating to outer space or to astronomical research and development.

It was the National Bureau of Standards that recently published the *U.S. Metric Study*, a three-year in-depth survey of the metric system and its potential impact on the United States. Legislation being considered by the committee is largely based on the findings of that study. In fact, during the second session of the 92nd Congress, the Senate passed a measure—by unanimous vote and with no debate—that would make metric measurements mandatory within the federal government in ten years and would encourage voluntary conversion throughout the country during the same time span. However, the action came late in the session and the House never brought the legislation to a vote. Another bill has been introduced into the Senate this year and is being considered by the Commerce Committee.

Eleven bills dealing with metrication were introduced in the House between January 3 and March 23, 1973. Four of those bills were coauthored by Texas congressmen, two by Congressman Teague (who is chairman of the committee) and two by Congressman

Pickle. Bills promoted by both Texans have conversion to the metric system within ten years as a goal, but the rigor of implementation sought by the bills differs somewhat. One Pickle bill calls for the establishment of a nine-member U.S. Metric Conversion Coordinating Commission and declares that after ten years the international metric system will be the sole official measuring system of this country. The key bill introduced by Congressman Teague also calls for a changeover through a national plan but sets as a goal to make the metric system only as predominant as possible in the ten-year time span. The Teague bill resembles the legislation considered by the Senate Commerce Committee.

Neither bill would outlaw use of the customary standards and measurements with which Americans are familiar. Both bills call for a voluntary changeover, so do most of the other nine bills introduced.

The metric system of measurement, officially known as *Système International d'Unités* and commonly abbreviated SI, has six base measurement units: the unit of length is the meter; the unit of mass is the kilogram; the unit of time is the second; the unit of electrical current is the ampere; the unit of temperature is the kelvin; and the unit of luminous intensity is the candela, or candle. All other units of measurement, such as speed and volume, are defined in terms of the six base units. This measurement system had its beginnings in France,

where it was conceived in 1670 by an abbé, Gabriel Mouton.

France, however, did not adopt the system until the French Revolution period of the 1790s. During the following century, about 80 percent of the countries of the world adopted the metric system, leaving the United States and the British Commonwealth countries the primary holdouts. That situation has changed radically in the past few years, particularly with Great Britain's decision to adopt SI in 1965. Today all of the major countries of the world except the United States have officially adopted SI or are in the process of conversion to it. As the international community moves toward this common language of standards and measurements, the United States remains the only English-speaking nation not officially committed to a given system of measurement.

There is little question that adoption of the metric system would enhance our position in world trade markets. The export of measurement-sensitive products is often dependent on domestic supplies of parts and tools in countries to which goods are being exported. With Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and a number of other formerly English-measurement countries now committed to the metric system, closer trading ties can reasonably be expected to develop between those countries and industrialized nations presently using SI. A result of the realignment is already observable in Britain's recent entry into the European Economic Community.

During the 1962-1969 period, the U.S. share of free-world trade decreased 10.4 percent, even though the absolute volume increased. Of the top six major free-world trading nations, only the four using the metric system for the entire period increased their world market shares, with the United States and Britain experiencing declines.

Texas manufacturers perform operations in about 98 percent of all manufacturing Standard Industrial Classifications. Texas produced about 5 percent of all U.S. manufactured exports in 1969, a decline from 5.4 percent in 1960. Still the state ranks seventh in export of manufactured goods, and Texas obviously has a stake in any policy formulation that might alter the position of the United States in the world market. The metrication issue and the decisions made during the next few months could be critical.

Texas, with its deep-water seaports, large air terminals, and international border, is in a prime position to take advantage of the overseas market for American-made goods. Even by providing embarkation facilities for the shipment of goods manufactured in inland states, Texas benefits, and any increase in that commerce enhances state revenues.

Aside from improvement of the U.S. role in international trade, numerous other reasons exist for switching to SI. Since metric units are related by submultiples of ten, problems of designation and calculation will be simplified. For example, addition of a series of fractions of inches and conversion of the sum to feet require considerable arithmetic calculation, but the corresponding operation with metric units requires only addition of decimal units and conversion of the sum to the needed measurement by moving the decimal point (such as cents to dollars: 25 cents = .25 dollars).

The simpler terminology and greater flexibility of the metric system make it easier to learn and to use. In fact, much of the time spent on fractions in elementary school could be used in teaching other subjects. Engineering and scientific calculations based on units of ten are faster, simpler, and less expensive to the employer. Basic product research in this country is usually performed by use of metric units, which are customarily converted to English units during product design processes. The switch to SI will elim-

inate the need for inefficiencies involved in conversion of one measuring system to another as a matter of routine operation.

From the point of view of the consumer metrication has several advantages. Prices of items sold by volume, weight, or count are easier to compare if the monetary and measurement systems both have the same decimal unit base. Further, after SI has become accepted throughout American business and government institutions, savings resulting from increased efficiencies should pass on to the consumer-taxpayer.

An established trend toward conversion to metric measurements has been apparent in the United States for some years. Notable conversions have occurred in activities and disciplines that are more or less self-contained. The pharmaceutical industry has discarded its traditional drams, grains, and minims in favor of milligrams, grams, and milliliters. Camera equipment is designed with metric dimensions for compatibility with metric-sized film. Mathematics and science education are largely taught in the metric system in the United States, often to very young children. Manufacturers of anti-friction bearings of all types have largely changed to metric designs. Automobile mechanics have added metric tools to their toolboxes as the number of cars having metric-dimensioned parts has risen to 20 percent of those on U.S. highways. In fact, some foreign-made parts of metric design are presently being installed in American cars, and General Motors has recently announced plans for a metric changeover. Other items that often appear in metric sizes are snow skis, swimming pools, typewriters, and motorcycles.

The increasing usage of SI in U.S. business and industry, the adoption of the metric system in all other major trading nations, and the interest taken by Congress in the past few months indicate that metrication in America is a movement with much momentum. This impression is true, but the movement faces resistance from many quarters. Fully 58 percent of the American public has only the vaguest notion of what the metric system entails. Further, a surprising number of people contend that any metric conversion in the United States would primarily benefit those enterprises dealing in foreign trade, all at the expense and inconvenience of the American consumer-taxpayer. They often hold that businesses wanting to trade with foreign countries should switch to SI and leave the rest of the country alone. But a policy of isolationism is not feasible, for the United States is inextricably involved in international commerce and politics. Although only a small percentage of our GNP is shipped in world commerce, that percentage is a large portion of total world commerce. Countries historically using the metric system have made heavy inroads on the American share of free-world trade.

Numerous problems can be expected along with the changeover to SI in this country, but none of them are insurmountable. SI will be phased in over a ten-year period and the initial changes will be "soft," language-only changes.

The general public is reluctant to accept widespread change over a short period of time. Many are reluctant to study a new system that might take time or effort to learn, cost money, or change familiar habits and lifestyles. The 58 percent of the population knowing little or nothing about the metric system is the group most reluctant to change. An intensive government-sponsored education program will be necessary to overcome some of this resistance. On the positive side, many secondary-level students have grown accustomed to the idea of national conversion to SI, a probability suggested to them by science teachers for several decades.

#### ESTIMATED COSTS OF METRICATION TO TEXAS INDUSTRIES

Industry	SIC groups	Estimated conversion cost (millions)
Agriculture/forestry/fisheries...	0100-0900	\$7
Mining.....	1000-1400	14
Construction.....	1500-1700	7
Ordinance (included with SIC 3500).....	1900	
"Soft" manufacture.....	2000-3200	101
Primary metals.....	3300	20
Fabricated metal products.....	3400	79
Machinery (except electrical), ordinance.....	3500, 1900	70
Electrical machinery.....	3600	17
Transportation equipment.....	3700	47
Instruments.....	3800	14
Miscellaneous manufacturing.....	3900	2
Transportation.....	4000-4700	5
Communication.....	4800	2
Utilities.....	4900	6
Wholesale trade.....	5000-5200	30
Retail trade.....	5300-5900	22
Finance/insurance/real estate.....	6000-6700	1
Services.....	7000-8100, 8900	5
Total cost to Texas industry.....		449

Note: The table shows absolute amounts and does not relate metrication costs to volume of sales or value added.

Another stumbling block to conversion is the potential initial cost to industry and business. Manufacturing businesses will experience costs for tooling and metering changes as well as for employee training programs. In more measurement-sensitive areas, particularly in businesses operating under Standard Industrial Classifications 1900 and 3300-3800 (see table accompanying this article), changes will be more costly, particularly in the fastener and nonelectric-machinery industries. Costs to nonmanufacturing industries will be largely for training employees and for educating customers and clients. Wholesale and retail trade businesses expect significant costs, probably for time spent explaining to and placating customers, dual dimensioning in catalogs, drops in sales because of customer resistance to change or lack of customer knowledge, and customer resentment of a new and unfamiliar measurement system apparently being imposed by the business selling the goods.

Some fear exists that repair and maintenance of long-life structures and equipment will become prohibitively expensive, if not impossible, within a short time after the changeover. Replacement parts and modernized components compatible with ships, buildings, and similar products built to English measurements and standards may become scarce soon after conversion. Most products falling into this category, however, are custom-built, one-of-a-kind structures, and improvements and modifications are also custom fitted. In most cases, the basic framework of such structures need not be altered as a direct consequence of the new measurement system; modification would be necessary only at points of modification attachment—changes that would quite likely need to be made even if the system of measurement were a constant.

Many business organizations will incur costs as a result of retraining needs and initial inefficiencies resulting from lack of familiarity with SI. Inefficiencies will be particularly noticeable during the changeover period in cases where a mechanic's intuitive feel for a tool size or an engineer's conception of design sizes are important. Functioning of such intuitive processes will be hampered until the worker or designer gains experience with the new system.

This kind of problem is a primary concern of many unions, which claim that older workers may "lose experience" when their familiar worker-too-material relationships are replaced by relationships more easily learned by younger workers. Another union demand is that costs to individual workers for tool



replacements of measurement-system sensitive tools should be borne by someone other than the individual worker.

Many small businesses do not have technical, financial, or managerial resources sufficient to plan their own metric changeover. Further, the small businessman is less likely to be in a position to decide when to go metric; large companies tend to set the pace. Small operators are often dependent on the ready availability of standard parts and supplies.

In many business and institutional operations, inventories of parts and materials will be duplicated, depending on the mix of metric-nonmetric products being produced or serviced. Many manufacturers customarily maintaining large inventories and users of long-life machinery and goods should expect costs in this area. The Department of Defense expects a significant expenditure for double-inventory provisions.

Most accepted engineering standards will require reevaluation, in some cases entailing only conversion of units between systems, but in others involving hardware changes. Screw-thread standardization will be a large part of such a program, but this problem has been under study for some time. The fifty-nine thread sizes in customary usage probably will be replaced with a standard set of twenty-five sizes. Similar industry standardizations have taken place in the past; bricks and light bulbs are examples.

Some observers fear that the expanded cooperation between companies within the same industry as a result of the metrication effort could run afoul of the antitrust laws. It has been suggested that such cooperation, if certain conditions are met, should be immune from antitrust action.

During the metric changeover, some operations may hold invisible hazards, particularly when rapid decision making involving measurement calculations is necessary. If a machine operator habitually thinks in terms of English units, he would quite likely translate metric instructions into his familiar measurement language before acting. The delays involved in translation could be critical in some cases. For example, an aircraft pilot used to thinking in terms of feet of altitude might have to translate meters to feet when analyzing instructions from air traffic controlling agencies.

These problems have been outlined not as argument against implementation of the metric system in the United States, but as a suggestion of possible problems the businessman-industrialist might encounter when the changeover is being implemented. The benefits of metrication—and its by-products—are expected to far outweigh the costs. For example, many long-needed standardizations and updatings of materials, processes, customs, and other inbreedings of the American industrial mechanism can be accomplished at virtually no cost if that cost is allocated to the metric changeover. Most of these outdated but institutionalized tools of American business and industry could not be eliminated economically if approached singly, but would be updated easily in a wholesale housecleaning.

If the foreign experience is a reliable indicator, metrication in America will be far less traumatic than many predict. British workers have derived a number of English/

metric relationships that allow the worker to maintain some of the "feel" he had under the English system. For example, 30 centimeters is only slightly shorter than the foot, so construction workers habitually thinking in terms of feet can visualize lengths in terms of multiples of 30 centimeters. Other innovative relationships have been used as devices to help soften the impact of metrication abroad. There is no reason that American workers cannot use similar analogies to simplify the transition to the metric system in this country.

Estimation of the advantage of metrication in dollar amounts is difficult, largely because many of the benefits are intangible and are not quantifiable. Measurement of the costs of metrication is also difficult, but many businesses in the United States have experience of partial or complete changeovers. On the basis of that experience, estimates by company and governmental officials not having metric experience, and "educated guesses," the *U.S. Metric Study* made rough estimates of the industrial costs of conversion to SI. Factors derived by the study were applied to Texas industry figures, and this process yielded estimates of costs of metrication to Texas industry (see accompanying table). Manufacturing industries, wholesale and retail trade, and mining are expected to incur greater costs than other categories of industry in Texas.

The loss of export trade experienced by Texas primary metals and machinery industries solely as a result of the presently used measurement system is estimated at over \$15 million per year at the present rate. The entire cost of metrication to Texas industry could be covered in less than thirty years by the savings in those two industries alone. Further, metrication will give Texas industry as a whole vast opportunities in foreign trade. The disadvantage in foreign trade will increase in the future unless this country adopts the metric system, particularly since many of our primary trading partners are forming trade alliances with other metric countries.

Many Texans are interested in potential costs in other areas, such as costs to the consumer, to education, and to federal government agencies. The ten-year costs to Texas consumers as a direct result of metrication are expected to be about \$14 million. A breakdown of the major items is shown in an accompanying table. Education costs are expected to be negligible if the program is extended over the ten-year time span. Most educational materials are replaced one or more times within ten years, and replacements can be updated with metric-language material without additional costs. Teacher education, not a great problem, can be handled in normally scheduled workshop and in-service training sessions for public school teachers.

#### Summary of Cost Estimates to the Texas Consumer

[Dollars in millions]	
Self-education .....	\$1.8
Cooking equipment .....	5.1
Sewing equipment .....	1.7
Home shop equipment .....	5.0
Total .....	13.6

The Texas portion of costs expected to be incurred by civilian agencies of the federal government amounts to approximately \$2.30 per person, or \$26 million. This cost is the present value, discounted at 4 percent, of costs expected over the ten-year period. This figure should be thought of as an upper limit. The present value of the portion of the Department of Defense estimate allocated to Texas is \$690 million. This estimate is no doubt high, but it is difficult to adjust the figure downward with any intuitive or numerical justification.

The costs of metrication along with the expected benefits are depicted in an accompanying diagram showing the cumulative costs over the ten-year implementation period and the benefits over the following several decades. The solid line depicts the cost-time relationship that is expected with a nationally coordinated plant. The dashed line shows the relationship expected if no program is instituted and a *laissez faire* approach to metrication is taken.

There exists little doubt that the nation will adopt the metric system of measurement. It is highly probable that legislation will be forthcoming from the 93rd Congress, and that legislation is expected to propose a ten-year coordinated transition program. The new system will feel a number of dampers, but none of the problems appears insurmountable. The businessman should not allow himself to be caught unaware by implementation; a certain amount of preparedness and forethought as well as timely introduction of the system into his own operations should smooth the transition.

#### ON FINANCES

#### HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, a note of levity is always pleasant in these days of care and concern. Mrs. Charles Ernest Winters of Bethesda, a friend of long standing, furnished such a note by sending me copies of some of her "terse-verse." I thoroughly enjoyed them—and think all of our Members will also:

#### ON FINANCES

I  
It's time to admit  
That curing social ills  
Is simply no substitute  
For paying our bills.

II  
I don't know whether to laugh or cry  
Our dilemma is so nearly comical.  
For we're now in the spot  
Where we really cannot  
Afford to be more economical.

III  
Prosperity's great  
I've always adored it.  
But as of right now  
I just can't afford it.