

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JANET REEVES, MISS AMERICAN
TEENAGER

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 21, 1973

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, a young lady from Columbus, Ga., recently distinguished herself by winning the "Miss American Teenager" contest in New York City. Miss Janet Reeves is 16 years old and was selected from among 46 young American women to become the 14th holder of the title.

I am proud of Miss Reeves, as all Georgians are. She has brought a distinct honor to her State and the people thereof. Chosen to represent all American teenage girls, she embodies the traits and characteristics we revere so much as to call them ideals.

Miss Reeves' picture and name have appeared in newspapers and on television around the world. She is a fine representative and ambassador for all Americans of all ages, and I would like to publicly express the admiration of the Senate for this young lady's accomplishments.

I might add, Mr. President, that this is the second time in 4 years that a Georgian has been so honored, because in 1970 Miss Kimberley Graham of Morrow, Ga., won the title.

I ask unanimous consent that a news release announcing the selection be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

NEW YORK CITY.—Janet Reeves, 16, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Reeves, of 2352 Burton Street, Columbus, Georgia won the title of Miss American Teen-Ager today in the 14th annual Miss American Teen-Ager Pageant here in New York City. She topped a field of 45 other teenage beauties between the ages of 13 and 17 from all parts of the nation, to win the coveted title of Miss American Teen-Ager and more than \$20,000 in prizes including a 1974 Dodge Challenger.

She is 5'7½" tall, weighs 115 pounds and has brown hair and blue eyes. She is in the 12th grade of the Hardaway High School. Her greatest ambition in life is to become a pediatrician, wife and mother. She is in Who's Who of American High School Students and is on the honor roll.

She has been active in R.O.T.C., choral and the sponsor club. Her hobbies include sewing, piano, horseback riding. She plays the piano in church, models and babysits.

She describes her state as "hospitable, growing and historic." Our country as "majestic, generous, and hopeful," and herself as "capable, feminine, and honest."

Her first runner-up was Katherine Kassing, 17, of McLean, Virginia. Her second runner-up was Lucy Demkiw, 17, of Brooklyn, New York. Her third runner-up was Sherri Moore, 17, of Fullerton, California. Her fourth runner-up, Kim Wagner, 15, of Overland Park, Kansas.

The winner of the Miss Congeniality Teen-Ager award, voted by the contestants themselves for one of their sister contestants was

Susan James, age 16, of 3588 South Hillcrest Drive, Denver, Colorado, Miss Colorado Teen-Ager. She is 5'4" and weighs 110 pounds, has red hair, green eyes and is a junior at Thomas Jefferson High School in Denver.

MORE ABOUT URANIUM
ENRICHMENT

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, this is a followup on previous material I have inserted recently in this record regarding the future structure of the uranium enrichment industry which must be created in order to supply rapidly growing demands for nuclear fuel for power reactors. I have suggested a Government corporation be used as a transition device from the present Government form of the industry in the United States to competitive private industry. The corporation would also insure that there is a timely supply of nuclear fuels and that the United States will compete effectively for foreign business and thereby earn foreign exchange.

In this context, the following extract from my recent letter to the President's budget director on an element of my plan for the Government corporation is self-explanatory.

The letter follows:

URANIUM ENRICHMENT

DEAR ROY: A criticism has been voiced against my specific plan for utilization of the United States Enrichment Corporation to expedite the transition from government to private industry. The allegation is that it would block such a transition because the government corporation will be offering contracts to all comers, thus competing with private industry which needs the contracts in order to arrange financing to build enrichment plants.

This allegation is erroneous.

USEC will be offering contracts, but it will not be competing, because all contracts which it writes with utilities for enrichment services that exceed USEC's then-committed enriching capacity will be subject to call by any United States private enriching company.

This is how it will work:

The law setting up USEC will require (1) the assignment of such contracts in the order last received when demanded by the private corporations; (2) the law will provide that the utility consent in advance to the assignment of its contract with USEC to private enrichment corporations so long as price and terms contemplated by these corporations are reasonable; and, (3) reasonableness will be assured this way: corporations will specify their pricing formulas and other terms and conditions in their applications for permits to build enrichment plants; the licensing authority, which will be the new Nuclear Energy Commission, will determine reasonableness as a condition of issuing any permit.

By the foregoing, or any suitable variation thereof, utilities will be assured nuclear fuel under reasonable terms and price.

Private corporations desiring to enter the enrichment business will be assured in advance that their new plant will commence operating at 100% capacity, so long as there are contracts to assign.

The national interest in balance of payments will be served by having a United States unity in existence which is continually offering contracts and discouraging foreign competitors.

I wish to emphasize that my statement on the nature and role of USEC is conceptual and for the purpose of having some structure to start improving and perfecting. I welcome suggestions. We are writing the future and have complete flexibility to do what is reasonable.

So, where there are any hitches found by your advisors please have them call me and talk it over. We should avoid losing this opportunity to do something right and on time because someone jumps to wrong conclusions . . .

WHAT THE PENSION BILL MEANS

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 21, 1973

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, since 1966 I have been advocating pension reform legislation.

Now that the Senate has passed a bill and sent it to the House of Representatives, some confusion exists as to what the Senate-passed pension reform bill would actually do for workers.

On September 20, the Washington Star carried a brief, understandable summary of the major provisions of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHAT IT MEANS

Here is what the Senate pension bill could mean to you:

If your company has no pension plan, (and half the workers in the country are not covered), you can set up your own retirement system with tax-free deductions of 15 percent of your salary up to \$1,500 a year.

If your company does have a pension plan, the bill provides that effective Jan. 1, 1976 you must be included in it once you've worked a year and reached the age of 30.

For the purpose of determining your vested rights in a company pension program, you must be given credit for up to five years of work before age 30. After any 5 years of work, the vesting is 25 percent. It goes up five percent a year for five years and then 10 percent a year for 5 years, reaching 100 percent at the end of 15 years of employment.

Thus, if you quit after 15 years, you can claim 100 percent of the pension you are then entitled to, but not until you reach retirement age.

(A year of service is defined as any year in which the employee has worked more than five months and at least 70 hours a month.)

If your company folds or, for some other reason, the pension plan is wiped out (19,000 persons lost their pensions last year this way), the bill provides an insurance system

funded by a tax on employers of \$1 for each employee in the pension plan for three years.

Once vested in one pension plan, you retain that claim even if you shift to another job and a new pension system. Employers will have to report your vested pension status to the Internal Revenue Service which in turn must pass this information on when you retire and apply for Social Security.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I believe it is also important to note that a worker currently covered by a pension plan who has no vested rights would get credit, if the bill becomes law, for years worked prior to the effective date of such a new law. In other words, the vesting provisions of the bill, to some extent, would be retroactive.

THE TAX BALLOONS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join others in this House in taking a shot at the trial balloons for a tax increase now being raised diligently by the Nixon administration and the Federal Reserve Board. Under no circumstances will I vote for the imposition of new tax burdens on the American people.

I say this despite the economic expertise of Federal Reserve Board Chairman, Arthur M. Burns, who holds a tax hike would "siphon off" what he sees as "excess" purchasing power, and the musings the other day of Presidential Counselor Melvin R. Laird that a 10-percent refundable tax surcharge might help lessen inflationary pressures.

Call it what you will, a tax hike would still be a tax hike and thus a cruel blow to Americans who, no matter what is said about excess buying power, still are struggling, in the vast majority, to make their financial ends meet. Prices have them in a bind. How, then, can we, their elected representatives, in justice worsen their problem by belting them with a higher tax bill?

The weapon against inflation is not to be found in the taxing power but in the congressional ax which needs to be swung, and swung vigorously, at excess governmental spending. As long as we here spend more than the people can afford, then we shall have continuing Federal deficits, a wobbly dollar, and higher and higher prices. These results cannot be avoided.

We have been too prone over the years to accept the notion that a mighty government, by delving more and more into the personal financial affairs of the citizen, can make both the citizen and the economy as a whole behave as the theorists wish. All this is fallacy. No economy can be made sound, or its currency stable, or its prices equitable unless the basic economic laws are kept firmly in mind and fully observed. The most fundamental of these laws is that spending must not exceed income for too long a time, or governmental income get too

far beyond the public's true ability to supply it.

No one in Washington is unaware of the vast opportunities which exist to curb the Federal spending spree. Billions of dollars still are being scattered with reckless abandon in dubious aid programs all over the globe—at enormous cost to our people. Thousands of young Americans, who should be home and helping to fuel our economy in constructive work, remain in standby military idleness in prospering countries in Western Europe and the Far East. Why are they not returned and this great expense ended? Scores of domestic programs are filled with waste and duplication of efforts and, in many cases, have no logical reason for existing at all. And yet, the trial balloons are going up for a tax increase. How senseless.

No matter what Chairman Burns may say, there is no excess purchasing power in this country—true purchasing power. Our economy is rocking along on credit and has been for years. More than 60 percent of our cars are bought on the installment plan. Virtually every home is so purchased. Our stores have turned into interest-collection centers, as dependent on this kind of income as on their sales markups. Credit cards have replaced real money at gas stations, motels, and restaurants. If we Americans suddenly were forced onto a cash basis, Chairman Burns would see how little substance supports his claim of excess purchasing power.

It needs to be repeated time and again that high taxes—taxes which already are at staggering heights in this country—are the major cause of high prices and inflation. They constitute a big part of every price ticket. They are a major item of the cost of producing and marketing every product. They bite deeply into the earnings of most workers and the profit figures of all businesses. They support the multiplicity of useless and nonproductive governmental endeavors which, by being nonproductive, serve as a heavy drag on the economy. And now the trial balloons are up for more. Let us shoot them down quickly and as quickly get about the real anti-inflation tasks—those of bringing governmental costs back into line.

AIRPORT FOR 2001

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I was invited to attend the dedication ceremonies of the new Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport. I regret that I will be unable to be at the function. Time magazine's September 24, 1973 issue describes the new airport and I recommend the article to Members of Congress and the public.

It seems that this is one time when citizens of this country have adequately planned a major project that meets tomorrow's needs as well as present ones.

The article follows:

AIRPORT FOR 2001

When Fort Worth decided in 1927 that it needed a commercial airport, the town fathers choked back civic rivalry with nearby Dallas long enough to propose a joint effort. Dallas huffily declined, buying the Army's Love Field instead. But in the mid-'60s, the cities overcame their animosity and agreed to build the world's largest airport, 17 miles from each downtown area. Local boosters are spending over half a million dollars to inaugurate the Dallas/Fort Worth airport, climaxing this week with a four-day Texas bash of balls, banquets and barbecues. Among the scheduled guests are President Nixon, officials from 48 countries, and a British-French Concorde SST.

DFW, as the airport is called, will be completed in three stages: the first ending Oct. 28 of this year, the second in 1985 and the third in 2001. Larger than Manhattan Island, the prairie complex was designed to meet virtually every known airport problem. Its spacious runway system, planned to be tripled in capacity, will easily handle peak loads well into the 21st century.

Airport planning, under the engineering firm of Tippetts-Abbett-McCarthy-Stratton (TAMS), was so far ahead of its time that many features resulted in an updating of FAA regulations. New patterns of lighting for both centers and edges of runways, as well as brighter, low-glare runway signs for pilots, will now become mandatory. TAMS also persuaded the FAA that conventional twelve-inch runways were not thick enough. DFW uses 17 inches of concrete, enough to receive million-pound aircraft (a fully loaded, stretched 747 weighs 880,000 lbs.). Furthermore, the runways are designed for thickening to 24 inches to accommodate heavier aircraft now on the drawing boards—and possibly even rocket-powered airliners of the future.

Reaching passenger gates should be easy via a ten-lane, 55-m.p.h. spinal highway between the two rows of superterminals (the four now operating will become 13 by 2001). DFW Executive Director Thomas Sullivan, who oversaw the building of La Guardia, Newark and J.F.K. airports, chose a simple semicircular terminal design that allows passengers to drive directly to one of 66 gates, which are all within 120 ft. of the airplanes. Older terminal designs, which often park airplanes at the ends of long "fingers," may entail hikes of as much as a quarter-mile from counter to plane.

AIRTRANS

To move people round the airport there is Airtrans, a 13-mile system of automatic electric-powered tracked vehicles that ride on a cushion of air. The system can carry 9,000 passengers, 6,000 pieces of baggage and 70,000 lbs. of mail every hour. Even though transit passengers may have to cover more than three miles from one plane to another, they can reach any point in the airport in about ten minutes.

The airport manager's biggest environmental headache, noise pollution, is reduced by the very size of the place. Beyond each end of the runways extends a 4½-mile buffer zone, without any buildings, followed by another mile where private housing is banned.

The worst problem seems to be getting here in the first place. The Dallas and Fort Worth city councils, claiming a monopoly on ground transportation to the airport, are being sued by Continental Bus Systems Inc., which wants a piece of the action. While the matter remains snagged in the courts, the only way to go is by that old environmental nemesis, the automobile. Even that will not be easy, because traffic jams seem certain to develop on behind-schedule highway approaches.

Texans don't seem to mind, however. Residents are convinced that DFW will transform the area into the economic anchor of Middle America. They shrug off charges that extra acreage was bought so they could call their airport the world's biggest and ignore the fact that Montreal is building a bigger one. Theirs is the biggest now. Says former Dallas Mayor Erik Jonsson, who helped bring the two cities together in the first place: "A wholly different world will be opening to us."

CHILEAN REVOLUTION RECEIVES VARIED REACTION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Chile has now experienced a revolution.

The unusual aspect of the Chilean revolution has been the reaction from those quarters which have been so active and vocal in encouraging revolutions around the world. Those who espouse revolutionary movements have been utterly aghast. Apparently, revolutions are only intended to be used against non-Communist followers. The dissatisfaction with the revolution in Chile seems to be that the right side won.

The junta explain their action as one of self-defense and national sovereignty. They make the case that President Allende, assisted by domestic and international Communist elements armed with weapons from the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, was prepared to overthrow the existing government and establish a Marxist dictatorship. The junta, however, out-revolutioned the revolutionaries.

Subsequent events, including Castro's convulsions, would seem to bear out the suggestion that there was more in Santiago than has reached the outside world.

Brezhnev, the mouthpiece of the Communist Party, Soviet Union, has taken the defeat exceptionally hard, and abandoning the détente party line, has blamed the Communist's poor timing on the United States. Brezhnev's indisputable argument that despite United States-Chile disagreements, the United States continued to train Chilean officers, is creditable. Especially since the U.S. military continues to train and exchange top level military information with the Soviet military and officers from Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and I guess any other Communist country in the world that wants to study how the United States can lose wars with the best trained soldiers and the most sophisticated weaponry available. If Brezhnev is right and the United States continues to train Soviet soldiers, there may still be a chance for the Russian people and their enslaved minorities to yet escape the bondage of communism.

But, the most astounding reaction to the Chilean liberation has been the silence and pussyfooting by the leadership of the United States. Certainly every thinking American who understands the criminal conspiracy known as communism should be thankful and proud that

the Chilean people themselves overthrew a corrupt system which is alien and foreign to the American hemisphere. The Chilean incident should remind all rulers in high places that the people can only be pushed so far.

I salute the freedom-seeking Chilean people and their leaders in these hours of great trial and torment as they strive desperately to maintain their government and system to that of a constitutional republic.

I ask that related newspaper clippings follow.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 20, 1973]

CHILE JUNTA CITES "CORRUPTION"

SANTIAGO, CHILE, Sept. 19.—The new Chilean military government alleged today that the administration of former President Salvador Allende "sacked and robbed" the country during its three years in office.

The junta also renewed warnings that anyone caught resisting would be executed.

Air Force Gen. Gustavo Leigh, a member of the four-man junta, said, "We should say, with all frankness, any man who shoots against our forces, dies; any man who shoots against innocents, dies. And we will not rest until we clean these traitors from our country be they foreigners or Chileans."

Adm. Jose T. Merino, another junta member, promised at a news conference that the new government would issue a white paper which "will tell the most incredible things."

"Chile is broken and destroyed and not because it has not been producing," he said. "It is economically destroyed because what it produced was sacked and robbed by thieves. This immorality, this corruption has no measure."

Allende killed himself rather than "confront the courts and the justice of Chileans," Merino claimed.

Merino said he could not give out details of the corruption until the white paper was released but gave an example of "a former high official in Valparaiso in whose home we found \$145,000 in bills, ready to be taken abroad, without caring that the people who had elected him were dying of hunger."

The junta admiral said, "Abroad there is being mounted a campaign to affirm that what we have done is criminal. What is really criminal is that military men, policemen and some sailors were assassinated by foreign guerrillas and snipers, the majority of whom as we have proven are Argentines, Uruguayans or Cubans."

The military authorities announced the arrest over the past 24 hours of 53 persons, including three foreigners, for violations of arms laws. They were sent to the national sports stadium in Santiago, where most of the capital's 4,400 detainees were being held at the disposition of military courts, operating as in time of war. Nearly 1,000 are being held elsewhere.

Around the country, authorities said there was virtual calm. In the far north in Iquique, two persons were reported arrested when they tried to attack a police station.

During the curfew, military patrols have been moving from house to house in search of arms caches and Allende supporters.

The junta also authorized the daily *La Prensa*, organ of the Christian Democratic Party, which led the opposition during Allende's presidency, to resume publication. The junta said the state-owned daily *La Nacion* will also reappear shortly under the editorship of the chairman of the journalists association, Carlos Sepulveda. The daily will be called in future *La Patria* (The Fatherland), the junta said.

Chile's borders remained sealed although the junta allowed a charter flight from Buenos Aires to bring in 91 foreign newsmen, the first to enter since the coup. The junta

said the nation's borders and airports would start being opened this week, "after we solve certain administrative problems."

Patricio Aylwin, president of the Christian Democratic Party, said the ousted president was plotting to stage a fake uprising which he would have crushed with his armed supporters.

"The best proof is the enormous amounts of arms that the illegal Marxist militia had," Aylwin said. "They formed a true, parallel army, with fire power equivalent to 12 regular regiments and the active presence of more than 12,000 foreign extremists."

Army patrols digging through the burned out presidential palace and the bombed presidential residence uncovered hundreds of weapons shipped in clandestinely from the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, according to the junta. They included antitank launchers and rockets, light machine guns, automatic rifles, pistols and grenades.

Also found in the presidential palace, the junta alleged, were plans to assassinate the armed forces chiefs, opposition political leaders and journalists.

[From The Washington Post, Sept. 20, 1973]

BREZHNEV TAKES HARD STAND ON CRITICS

(By Robert G. Kaiser)

Moscow, Sept. 19.—Leonid Brezhnev, the leader of the Soviet Communist Party, gave a sternly worded speech on foreign affairs in Sofia today, indirectly but clearly responding to recent Western criticism of the Soviet Union.

Abandoning the optimistic tone of his recent public statements, Brezhnev said, "Ill-conceived propaganda campaigns . . . aimed at sowing mistrust in the policy of the U.S.S.R." were actually meant to hinder détente.

Those who suggest pressuring the Communist countries "for some concessions" in current East-West talks are pursuing a "naïve . . . unseemly . . . mercantile approach to the question," Brezhnev said.

If there is to be a "new system of international relations," Brezhnev said, it must be based on "the principles of sovereignty and noninterference in internal affairs."

In these and other passages Brezhnev appeared to be reacting to foreign criticism of Soviet domestic policy, particularly the treatment of intellectual dissidents.

Other sections of the Soviet leader's speech could be interpreted as attempts to persuade his colleagues in Moscow of his own unswerving dedication to a "Socialist policy" which will not compromise on basic ideological issues with the capitalist powers.

In an ambiguous sentence perhaps intended for both Western statesmen and some of his own colleagues in the Kremlin, Brezhnev noted that the building of a new world order "requires an absolutely different approach, different methods and perhaps a different psychology than those that existed previously."

This sentence followed one of several warnings that treaties and agreements already negotiated must be "unswervingly implemented." This seemed to be a reference to West Germany, which has recently taken a harder line on its interpretations of the four-power Berlin agreement and several aspects of Chancellor Willy Brandt's East European policy.

Brezhnev also bitterly attacked "the bloody crimes committed by Chilean reactionaries" in the recent coup, and said former President Salvador Allende, "one of the most noble figures in contemporary political life," had "died the death of a hero."

Perpetrators of the coup, "aided and abetted by imperialist forces abroad," had adopted policies "of violence, military dictatorship and terror," Brezhnev said. Allende's government was trying to transform Chilean

society with the support of "the overwhelming majority of the nation," Brezhnev said.

[A Soviet newspaper today suggested Pentagon involvement in the coup in Chile, UPI reported from Moscow. Literary Gazette, the Writers Union weekly, said "despite the worsening of the relationship between the U.S. and Chile, despite the economic aggression against Chile by U.S. monopolies, there was only one definite field of relations which continued flourishing. The United States continued to train Chilean officers."]

The principal topic of the speech—delivered in Sofia at a ceremony where Brezhnev was officially installed as a "hero of the Peoples' Republic of Bulgaria"—was East-West relations, particularly in Europe.

Discussing the resumption this week of the European security conference in Geneva, Brezhnev said some in the West wanted to exploit the Communist countries' interests in a new all-European security treaty "to pressure them and bargain for some concessions."

It was this which Brezhnev termed an unseemly, mercantile approach to the question. Security was desired by all, he said, and should be achieved through "joint, multilateral efforts," not as the result of diplomatic haggling.

He suggested that the issues of freer cultural exchange and "humanitarian problems"—the issues which most interest the West at this second round of the security conference—were less important than an agreement on mutual security—the issue which most interests the Soviets.

"We always remember, and we believe others should remember this too, that broad and fruitful development of economic relations and the effective solution of humanitarian problems are possible only if the threat of war is removed," Brezhnev said.

THE SCOUTS PROVIDE A RECYCLING LESSON

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the Boy Scouts, as we know, gather at regular times in what they call "Jamborees" for the purpose of fellowship and instruction in matters having to do with the future good of the Nation.

One such convocation—a "National Jamboree"—was held this past summer in western Pennsylvania, at Moraine State Park within striking distance of the city of Pittsburgh. The boys, I am certain, had a good time. And I am sure they learned a lot.

But my point in this is that the Scouts, in their Jamboree, provided a very important lesson to all of us in a country that is being increasingly strewn with discarded beverage cans and decorated with those tough little rings which are yanked free from the can tops in the opening process.

The Scouts at Moraine Park gulped down 200,000 cans of soft drinks. But, as good Scouts, they were careful about the used containers. They stacked them up and had them hauled to a scrap firm at New Castle, Pa. There the cans were compressed into 65 solid 2-foot square bales.

I quote from an Associated Press report:

The bales then were taken to U.S. Steel Corp.'s Edgar Thompson Works in nearby Braddock where they were transformed into steel. A U.S. Steel spokesman said the steel was being rolled into new steel sheets to be sent to manufacturers of new beverage cans, automobiles and appliances.

Surely, this Scout-type cleanup points the way for the rest of us and, perhaps, in time to a situation in this country when needed recycling programs and handy facilities for carrying them out can correct the growing litter problem, at the same time, provide our plants with needed material for the making of new products.

We seriously need scrap metal. In fact, scrap has become a matter of concern in international trade as well as in operation of our own steel industry. It is a scarce commodity and yet there are uncountable tons of it in empty and rusting cans scattered as eyesores in highway ditches and most everywhere we look nowadays.

There were 44,000 boys at the Moraine Park Jamboree. The soft drink consumption of 200,000 cans meant that, on the average, each Scout managed to down the contents of 4.5 such containers, which is not bad for such an event. But in doing so, the boys, according to the AP, provided industry with nearly 9 tons of reclaimed steel, the total weight as announced by the United States Steel spokesman, thus showing in dramatic fashion what recycling can be made to accomplish when it is planned and diligently carried out. We can thank the Scouts for the demonstration.

A CONVERSATION WITH RUAIRI O. BRADAIGH

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1973

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak once again of my concern for the Irish people's struggle for self-determination and a United Ireland.

I have previously stated my belief that a reasonable and just solution to the tragic situation in Ireland should include: First, withdrawal of all British troops from the streets of Northern Ireland; second, a declaration of intent from the British Government to withdraw all military personnel from Northern Ireland and allow the people of Northern Ireland to determine their own affairs; and third, a British grant of amnesty to all political prisoners.

I am distressed to learn that one of the first proponents of such a plan for peace in Ireland, Ruairi O. Bradaigh, president of Sinn Fein, has recently received undeservedly critical reports in the American press. Misunderstandings concerning Mr. Bradaigh's character and intentions can only hurt the efforts of those who wish to bring peace to Northern Ireland.

Recently, an acquaintance of mine, Mr. Fred Burns O'Brien, had the privilege of engaging in an in-depth discussion with Mr. Bradaigh. I would like to

share with my colleagues and the American people, Mr. O'Brien's account of that meeting in hopes that it might dispel some of the misunderstandings that surround Mr. Bradaigh:

RUAIRI O. BRADAIGH: MAN OF PEACE

(By Fred Burns O'Brien)

It was my privilege recently to have an in-depth discussion with Mr. Ruairi O. Bradaigh, President of Sinn Fein, concerning the events of present times in Ireland, and especially the unfavorable press reports his Party receives in British, Irish and American media. With tranquil eloquence, Mr. O. Bradaigh explained that there is a massive attempt to discredit his political opinions by the respective governments, to portray only British solutions for the ills of the North of Ireland. The American public is all too familiar with violent war after ten years of holocaust in Vietnam, hence, any form of violence of a similar nature is conveniently ignored for fear of rejuvenating a conscience that wishes to remain dormant. The British play on this present American revulsion and distort their own violent activity in such a manner as to transmit the guilt and responsibility for the Irish War to Irish Freedom-Fighters rather than placing the proper blame upon themselves whose very presence is the Irish Troubles.

It was with this emblazoned on my subconscious that I confronted President O. Bradaigh and pressed him for his views on the violence recurring daily in the North. He did not make a sweeping statement, that those he would support are not guilty of violence, such as the British attempt to do in their press offerings. Britain makes statements of utter denial for any responsibility for violence which is not realistic and to be believed by a naive individual or a complete fool. Mr. O. Bradaigh stated that the IRA has been involved regrettably in the violence of war, but their valid position is the pursuit of national self-determination of the Irish people, while the duty of the British soldier is to prevent such a course of action and maintain British domination in the North of Ireland.

It was apparent from his manner and his dire concern for his people, that violence and death was not a task to be taken lightly; he deplored it inclusive of killing British soldiers. His sincerity was evident to me by his emphasis on a political solution for the North that offers concrete guarantee to all sides with institutionalized guarantees. He espoused his Party's plan of regional government because he wants to curtail the war and bring a lasting peace so that new generations, as yet unborn, would not be the recipients of recurring violence. In support of Mr. O. Bradaigh's desire for peace is the further fact that no other faction or governmental group has put forth any lasting solution to the crisis. The present British plan can only have a short-range success if any, and the Dublin Government remains passive as it has done for fifty-three years. Only Sinn Fein has expounded a viable peace plan to terminate forever, "the troubles," and to restructure a new Ireland for all Irish citizens to live in under equitable and equal status.

The important factor Mr. O. Bradaigh rendered is that the Republican Movement is not just a military effort with aimless abandon, but rather, it is a military effort to rid Ireland of the intruder, offering a concrete plan for a government to relieve the present foreign regime from its imposed governance. Reporters pressured him continually on the violence and its corollary sensationalism and Mr. O. Bradaigh explained his attitudes on the aspects of the defense of his people then returned to a discussion of his plan for peace. He established that if Stormont, Leinster House, Westminster or a "recognized" political party placed a plan such as he proposed for a lasting peace before the public, it would

be acclaimed as magnetic and an obvious road out of the political morass. Because it was initiated by Sinn Fein, it is rejected without consideration. This ignorant unqualified rejection prolongs the war, not IRA policies.

Ruairi O. Bradaigh was in the States not to discuss the pros and cons of war, instead he was here to draw attention to the aspects of peace insured by the plan he espoused. To date, it is the only plan and it considers the political and social feelings of all diverse opinions, and in allowance for diversity it seeks to construct an all Ireland conscience of conciliation. This writer is quite familiar with the theory of regional government and it must be said it is the only system that at present might work.

Sinn Fein President Ruairi O. Bradaigh is a politician that is quite cognizant of the complex inner workings of government. He is a man dedicated to the unity of his country and he is a man who seeks peace with justice. Because of the insistence of imposing a British solution on Ireland, Britain prolongs the war and deters the peace that Mr. O. Bradaigh would tender the Irish people under his plan. He is a man on a mission of peace not the promulgation of war. Liken to all other peoples who seek their own self-destiny the Irish fight solely for their country and their freedom, which upon attainment will terminate the violence.

It is the imposed authority of the foreign power that will not let Ireland be a whole nation, thereby perpetuating violence, which must be rid or destroyed. Ruairi O. Bradaigh is the personification of the dedicated Irish patriot through eight-hundred years of struggle has sought simply to be his own master. Like all the men and women who passed before in pursuit of the dream of freedom, he is our national conscience and it is an immense burden that he cannot and should not bear alone. He needs the encouragement of us all, if we are to be called Irish.

CDU/CSU PARLIAMENTARY PARTY

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday, the West German Supreme Court decision on the basic treaty between East and West Germany is of such great significance, that it should be examined more closely by the U.S. Congress and State Department. Accordingly, I am including additional statements on the interpretation of the treaty:

CDU/CSU PARLIAMENTARY PARTY

(In the Saturday edition of the "Westfälische Nachrichten," Münster, the Chairman of the CDU/CSU Parliamentary Working Group on Foreign Affairs, Dr. Werner Marx, published the following comment on the verdict of the Federal Constitutional Court on the Basic Treaty.)

Since all parties have welcomed the verdict of the Federal Constitutional Court in Karlsruhe on the basic treaty, some argue that now a period of cooperation between executive and opposition in the field of "Deutschlandpolitik" might begin. However, one needs to take a closer look at the tenor of the approval in order to assess chances for future agreement by the various parties. For the CDU/CSU party where everybody knew that the court in Karlsruhe would not impede the Federal Government by rejecting the treaty, the reasons for the verdict are of very special importance.

The court bases its reasons for declaring the treaty constitutional on fundamental views and principles of the basic law which an important section of the Government and its parliamentary majority had almost lost sight of. Future actions by the Government will now be restricted by clear limitations. It is obligated to maintain the claim for reunification laid down in the basic law within and without. It may not fool around with legal titles. It may not treat the border between both parts of Germany as a normal state border, but as a border of state law, and it may not reduce the nation to a nation joined together by language and culture. In those instances where incompatible elements had been eagerly melted into strange hermaphroditisms, clarity has now been restituted.

The verdict of Karlsruhe helps to strengthen the position of the law in relationship to power—in accordance with often stated expectations of the CDU/CSU. It sets a liberal interpretation of the treaty which is rooted in the constitution off against some cynical arguments of the Government. The Chancellor's remark that he is not speaking about reunification any more, or the trivial statement that world history is no district court, or Bahr's cynical remark that a demand for elimination of the shooting order must be considered an improper demand, that and a hundred other statements which came ever closer to the interpretation by the other side, have ceased to be possible since the verdict. And the gentlemen Honecker and Winzer in East Berlin will no longer be able to expect understanding or even agreement from anyone in the Federal Republic for their communist interpretation which is totally oriented towards demarcation and unilateral advantage, because that would be in contrast with the constitution.

Hence: Only on the premise that the Federal Government and also those forces within the SPD which are moving in direction of a popular front at a steadily increasing pace, abide by the verdict of the Federal Constitutional Court in interpreting and applying the basic treaty, and provided that they cease to treat that organ with disrespect as they repeatedly did in connection with this proceeding, only on that basis can there be any talk of cooperation in the area of "Deutschlandpolitik". The opposition which qualifies the basic treaty as a poor negotiation policy and which refused to give its consent to it, can now go along with the treaty, because its interpretation binds it unequivocally to the constitution thus preventing further free-wheeling experiments.

The joint resolution of Parliament of May 1972 on the treaties with Moscow and Warsaw is a further important means of interpretation for the entire policy on treaties with the East. The Federal Government is obligated to adopt its political activities to these documents. The seriousness of its desire for political cooperation will have to be measured by its actions.

MANDATORY OIL ALLOCATION PROGRAM NEEDED

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1973

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the immediate implementation of a mandatory oil allocation program. Some weeks ago I wrote to the administration urging that Governor Love put into force a mandatory allocation program which would insure an ade-

quate supply of oil for New England and our independent oil dealers.

His inaction, in the face of the coming crisis, makes me wonder if Governor Love and his staff have the qualifications to adequately safeguard the energy needs of the Nation.

My initial inquiry into this matter makes me feel that the President has placed well meaning but inexperienced men in charge of this most important vital sector of our economy.

Governor Love has had little experience in dealing with the oil industry. His right-hand man Charles Di Bonna has had experience but only as a purchasing agent for the Navy—his dealings with the oil industry have not given him an appreciation of the problems of marketing, distribution, and competition in the private sector. The man who apparently will design the allocation program is Mr. Charles Cullen. Mr. Cullen was a public relations man for the 1968 Nixon campaign—my investigation does not reveal any experience dealing with energy problems.

These are the men to whom Mr. Nixon has entrusted the problem of allocating the energy supply of the Nation. They are all well-meaning men. But they are out of their fields and appear to be "yes men" for the President and his big oil supporters.

All of the economists and independent analysts who I have talked to indicate that they feel that these men do not have the level of expertise necessary to draft a mandatory allocation program. The proposed program which was tendered by these men for comment several weeks ago was an economist's nightmare. It showed naivety and incompetence in suggesting allocations to some classes of users while completely ignoring other classes—a plan which could result in the farmer and the homeowner getting all of the petroleum that they need but which would close factories and force the country into a depression.

That is, some of the economists I talked to said the program was naive. The others suggested that the program looked as if it had been developed by or for the major oil companies. The feeling being that the public could not possibly support such a ridiculous plan—thus the independents could be driven out of business.

The philosophy of the majors in regards to any allocation program has been repeatedly expressed. Most recently a member of my staff attended the hearings regarding a mandatory propane allocation program. Gulf Oil was there. Gulf's representative pleaded for the Government to allow the major oil companies to continue their voluntary program.

Let us examine the results of this "voluntary program" thus far:

This summer under a "voluntary allocation program" many independent gasoline dealers throughout the Nation were forced out of business.

A recent survey of 30 oil companies serving the east coast revealed that there was "no critical shortage among companies which produce home heating oil; only among the independent operators

who distribute most of it." The survey showed that enough heating oil is now on hand or available to meet demands along the east coast—an area which consumes 65 percent of the heating oil in the country—if mandatory allocations are set into action.

Furthermore, the survey showed that the major oil companies have 14 percent more heating oil in their storage tanks than last year while independent companies have half of last year's supply.

So it appears that the "voluntary allocations system" is not helping anyone—except the major oil companies. Yet this is the program which has been repeatedly supported by the President and Governor Love.

My respect for the President and his administration's knowledge and abilities in the field of petroleum was further weakened last week when I read "Petty's Oil Letter" in the Oil Daily of September 12:

We wish that President Nixon and John Love, his top energy adviser would get their facts straight when they brief the press on important Presidential energy announcements.

It is unusual for Nixon not to be pluperfect about the fact of any situation when he holds a press conference—but energy and the energy "crisis" are either beyond his present comprehension, or his interest.

The article goes on to explain how the President in his September 8 briefing after a Cabinet meeting on energy, made statements concerning the U.S. ability to become energy self-sufficient and his warning to the Arab nations that the United States could become "self-sufficient" for its energy needs and deprive them of their billions of dollars in oil revenues—the implication being that the Arabs should take a more reasonable approach in their dealing with U.S. oil companies or risk losing their business.

Governor Love was asked what time frame he was considering in looking toward a "self-sufficient" energy status for the United States. The Governor replied that he could not forecast with certainty, but that he was thinking in terms of a "3- to 5-year timespan."

The article then dismisses both the President's warnings and Love's estimates as pure rhetoric. That is to say, that it would be impossible for the United States to become energy self-sufficient within the next 20 years.

Thus we have the major source of oil news running a column seriously questioning both the President and Governor Love's knowledge about the energy gap.

Because of this apparent incompetency and insensitivity on the part of the administration. And because of the alliances which have been formed between the President and "Big Oil," I urge the House of Representatives to mandate an oil allocation program immediately which will insure a minimum supply of oil to independent oil refiners and distributors equal to the supplies which they received last year, and no less than the same percentage of this year's total oil production and distribution that they received of last year's supplies.

Such a program would be a temporary measure. The Congress should take it

upon itself to begin an intensive study of the oil industry and its distribution patterns as well as the effects of recent oil pronouncements by foreign countries on projected U.S. supplies so that we will be in a favorable position to rewrite the mandatory allocation program next year.

FIGHT FOR JUSTICE IN NORTHERN IRELAND—II

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I had inserted into the RECORD the first section of a brief filed by Luis Kutner, an American attorney to the European Commission on Human Rights, on behalf of the persecuted minorities in Northern Ireland.

Luis Kutner has been called the "Da Vinci" of the legal profession because of his interests and achievements in many varied aspects of the practice of law. Perhaps his greatest contribution to the law profession has been his establishment of the world renown, "Poor Man's Justice" program. This revolutionary program has as its sole purpose the aiding of indigent persons who have been wrongfully and illegally convicted and incarcerated. This program has resulted in the freedom of over 1,000 persons.

I insert in the RECORD, the second part of the brief as filed by Luis Kutner.

The brief follows:

BRIEF BY LUIS KUTNER—VII

Counsel for Applicants reminds the Commission that not one of the Applicants interned or released was ever charged with a criminal offense, nor were they given a fair and impartial trial, nor given the right to defend themselves. At no time were they given free legal assistance, notwithstanding that Article 6(3) (c) of the Convention would guarantee that, had the Applicants been so charged, "everyone charged with a criminal offense has the right to defend himself in person or through legal assistance of his own choosing, or if he has not sufficient means to pay for legal assistance, to be given it free when the interests of justice so require."

Referring to the Commission ruling that Applications cannot be proceeded with as one collective Application, counsel for Applicants takes exception in that each Application charges the Respondent Governments for committing delicts against the person of each Applicant. Since the principle of collective responsibility is one of the most characteristic elements of legal technique prevailing in general international law it follows that individuals may act collectively. States and individuals have interchangeably been held to be subjects of international law, the juristic status of the person is the personification of a legal order regulating the mutual behavior of individual human beings. For the protection of individuals, sanctions are imposed upon any State in case of contrary behavior.

Law, by its very nature, is the regulation of mutual relations between human beings; all legal relations are relations among individual human beings existing under the personification of a State. The right of any State is to be concerned in terms of its obligations and responsibilities to the rights

of all individual human beings and the most fundamental of all being the human right of individual freedom.

The Commission has an obligation to supersede its procedural convenience and to position itself in the global history of the human rights of man. Human Rights are the indicia of a civilized State participating as a unit in the world's political processes. Functioning world communities can only live in a world of minimum public order. Violence to the individual, be it organized or sporadic, becomes unthinkable and intolerable. There is no condonation for the option of the public policies of a State that acts by committing crimes against humanity and crimes against the equivalent conscience of mankind.

The parochial interests of a State must give away to the universal concern for the aggregate entrenchment of the security of human rights. It would seem that the Commission can and should take judicial notice of the numerous reports and commissions of inquiry on the record of army and police brutality from August 9, 1971 to the current date. The Commission's attention is directed to the following reports:

"Crisis in Northern Ireland." The representations of the National Council for Civil Liberties to H.M. Government, December 1971.

"Violence and Civil Disturbances in Northern Ireland in 1969." Report of Tribunal of Inquiry. Government of Northern Ireland. Vols. 1 and 2, Cmd. 566, April 1972.

"Report of the Tribunal Appointed to Inquire into the Events of Sunday, 30th January 1972, Which Led To Loss of Life in Connection With the Procession in Londonderry on That Day" by The Rt. Hon. Lord Widgery, O.B.E., T. D., H. L. 101, H. C. 220, 18th April 1972.

"Liberty Under Law Anarchy Totalitarianism"—This is the Choice. American Bar Association, 1970.

"Disturbances in Northern Ireland." Report of the Commission appointed by the Governor of Northern Ireland, September 1969. Cmd. 532.

"British Army and Special Branch RUC Brutalities," December 1971–February 1972. Compiled by Father Denis Faul, Dungannon, and Father Raymond Murray, Armagh.

"Commentary upon the White Paper" (Command Paper 558) entitled 'A Record of Constructive Change' published by the Government of Northern Ireland on 20 August, 1971 Irish News Limited.

"Northern Ireland the Plain Truth." (Second Edition) issued by The Campaign for Social Justice in Northern Ireland, Castlefields, Dungannon, 1969 and 1972.

"Northern Ireland—The Mailed Fist." A record of Army & Police Brutality from Aug. 9–Nov. 9, 1971. Issued by The Campaign for Social Justice in Northern Ireland in association with The Association for Legal Justice, December 1971.

"Law" (?) and Orders. The Story of the Belfast 'Curfew' 3–5 July 1970. Central Citizens' Defense Committee 1970.

"Review Body on Local Government in Northern Ireland 1970." Report. Chairman: Patrick A. MacCrory, Esq. June 1970 Government of Northern Ireland.

"Discrimination"—Pride for Prejudice. The Northern Ireland Society of Labor Lawyers, 1969.

VIII

In its ruling (point 5) the Commission suggests that a Repeal and amelioration of the Special Powers Act and its regulation has been made as of April 1973; when the opposite happens to be reported. An August 8, 1973 report from United Press International, Belfast, Northern Ireland, states:

"Tough new laws to combat terrorism in Northern Ireland came into force today.

Authorities are now empowered to conduct trials with no jury, limit bail, detain persons for as long as four hours on suspicion only,

searches without warrants, and file charges against persons who refuse to answer police questions.

The laws also assume a defendant is guilty until proven innocent.

The Chief British official in the province, William Whitelaw, said the laws showed the government's determination to "remove the cancer of violence and lawlessness which is the enemy of true freedom and democracy."

But the Northern Irish Civil Rights Association called the laws "the most oppressive legislation outside the Communist bloc . . ."

The dilemma of the Commission can be expressed in a question. If a nation will not arm its people against itself, can we put a sword—or at least a shield—in the arms of the victims. The resulting answer can only be "No"—but the question put like that is too uncompromising. In the first place, most nations pretend, in principle, to arm the people against abuse of authority, however far the practice may be removed from precept. In the second place, the will to protect individual a sizable number of nations might not be human rights is not so universally feeble that found to make a contracting State keep on the road to international vision.

IX

The European Commission of Human Rights is the first court of its kind in history. However, a right that has not been made into realistic law cannot be said to exist. What the Commission should now be doing is to cut through the labyrinth of procedural obfuscation and help the victims, the voiceless and the hopeless, to draw strength from the knowledge that there is a legal forum that will prevent a nation from trampling on the rights of its citizens.

The difficulty of international protection of Human Rights is that the laws that protect or the laws regulating the relations of the individual and his own government are in conflict. The confrontation is not nation and nation, but man—the "poor forked creature" of Shakespeare's lines—and the mighty appointees of the modern state. Hence the objective has to be domestic laws which conform to international standards.

The Commission's findings should be based on substantive human rights issues. In other words, the fundamental freedoms in Articles 1-14 must not be limited in their application by the procedural articles of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission. Such new protocol would constitute a major step in bringing about a major change in the present international rule of law. The liberality of the Commission in the *Nielsen vs. Denmark* (2 Yearbook Human Rights 412, 1960) and the *Iverson Application* (3 International Legal Materials 417, 1964) can be precedent persuasive.

X

Counsel will now address himself to the barren policy of the European Commission of Human Rights and its departure from the positions spelled out by the Convention.

The legitimacy of the Applicants' cases is countered by the resolute determination of the European Commission to illegitimize the allegations of Respondents' deprivations and violations of specific Articles of the Convention. The disinherited and disenchanted Applicants strike a note of incomprehension at the symbolic manipulation by the Commission to impose a cruel and ubiquitous factor in judicial politics which invests authority with the power to erode the vaunted "human rights" of the Convention.

The tragic attitude and shocking apathy of the European Commission demonstrates its unresponsiveness to facts alleged and facts which must be judicially noticed. It would appear that the European Commission is asserting an operative ideological justification to promote its system of power,—in the di-

vine rancor of Kings, the mandate of heaven the sanctity of its judicial priests, or the superiority of its administrative lords.

Applicants deluded by the promise of the Statute of the Council of Europe, seriously challenge the functional validity of the Commission and of the European Court of Human Rights.

The chaotic situation in Northern Ireland, the medieval garbage and torture conditions in the detention centers of which Applicants complain, suggest abundant propitious crises facts which the European Commission can resolve by its self-proclaimed reformist and corrective informal and formal innovations.

The world may properly frown at the obstructionist institutional channels interposed by the European Commission to make the Applications ineffective. The alleged acute grievances are more than just expressions of frustration over social, economic, political and totalitarian judicial conditions. The micro thrust of the Applicants' allegations is a profile of the macro shadow of the oppression, repression, torture and arbitrary jailing of the masses. It is a coherent cry of their sense of desperation and grim determination to end the injustice, the humiliation, the oppressive rule in Northern Ireland that seems almost entirely concentrated on Irish Catholics.

By its obvious catastrophic attitude and procrastination, the European Commission has temporized over technicalities while the death toll in Northern Ireland has risen from 210, when the Applications were filed, to 850, and the toll of injured and maimed approximate 12,000. And the Civil War continues and the death and maimed toll rises each day.

A judicial forum unwilling to fulfill its Convention aspirations begins to lose its legitimacy. When it condones governmental coercion as a primary instrument of ruling, it aids and abets the instruments of the oppressive government in obtaining obedience to surface efficacy and cohesion. The European Commission might reassess its parochial interests of the ruling regime in Northern Ireland and detect the perceptible gap between those in authority and the expectations of the "collective" Applicants who are in the forefront of the crusade for freedom and decency and dignity in Northern Ireland.

The European Commission, by its inaction, bolsters the negative weapons of the Respondents since they produce no desired results such as quenching the flame of the revolutionary human rights movement in Northern Ireland. The indiscriminate imprisonment lack the broad support of the civilized world. They are compelling but most self-deserving.

The European Commission enforces the punitive militarism of the Respondents. All the reports of brutality, systematic torture, imprisonments and murders cited herein are not exercises in semantic hoax rhetoric.

Judicial asphyxiation by the Respondents and the European Commission and the European Court of Human Rights is guaranteed to expand the conflict in Northern Ireland.

Counsel for Applicants welcomes the pervasive and pragmatic insinuation that the European Commission will take the incentive and make direct contact with each Applicant. This is precisely what has been the goal of counsel since the nightmare night of August 9, 1971 when the lynching blitzkrieg of the Respondents was launched. This is the first sign of a needed moral and judicial regeneration of the European Commission. The hard core militancy and terrorism may at long last be exposed. It is hoped that this last ascerbic missile of the European Commission to counsel constitutes a preview of things to come.

An alert international public opinion is awaiting the judicial awakening of the European Commission to bring pressure to bear

on Respondents to abolish its Nazi patterned Special Powers Act of 1922 and to abandon its Nazi terror and bullyboy tactics against Applicants and all of Northern Ireland.

XI

The Commission is invited to consider the pending and about to be adopted United Nations standard minimal rules for the treatment of prisoners. It is the consensus of the United Nations that a Convention be adopted by the member states outlawing torture, inhuman or degrading treatment of persons imprisoned or interned for constitutional crimes under international law and to render compulsory, under international law, at the very least, the observances of the consensus of United Nations to eliminate torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

The Statutes of the Council of Europe anticipated the United Nations adoption of its moral code and has the advantage of being the beacon light that inspired the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights of 1966, which provides that no one shall be subjected to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and that all persons deprived of their liberty shall be treated with respect for the inherent dignity of the human person.

The Commission is further invited to consider the prohibition against torture and inhuman treatment contained in Regional Conventions on Human Rights and the numerous exhortations made by non-governmental organizations, churches and religious bodies, the international public opinion for the elimination of violations of Human Rights and for the application and implementation of existing rules of international law.

Applicants further wish to recall to the Commission that:

- (a) That the Universal Declaration of Human Rights affirms that no one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment;
- (b) That the Genocide Convention of 1948 confirms that the causing of serious bodily harm to the members of a group with intent to destroy it in whole or in part is a crime under international law;
- (c) That the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination guarantees, without distinction, the right to security of person and protection by the State against violence or bodily harm whether by Government officials or by any individual group or institution;
- (d) That in the absence of specific provisions relating to the treatment of persons imprisoned or detained, such persons remain under the protection of governance of the principles of the law of nations as derived for the usages established among civilized nations, from the laws of humanity and from the dictates of the public conscience.

The Commission is also requested to remind itself that the Human Rights articles of its Convention have firm roots in the soil of the laws of humanity among civilized nations and as formalized in the Haig Convention of 1899 and 1907, the Geneva Protocol of 1925 as defined by Resolution 2603 (XXIV) the General Assembly, and the Geneva Convention of 1949. It is of some credit to the European Convention that it inspired Resolution 23 of the United Nations International Conference of Human Rights held at Teheran, condemning any erosion of Human Rights that engenders brutality, physical and psychological torture or inhuman treatment of prisoners. Further, the signatories to the Statute of the Council of Europe are obliged to respect Article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: "No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment."

INTERNATIONAL GAMES WITH
AMERICAN MONEY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, now that the prime interest rate has soared to 10 percent, with no assurance that it will not go even higher, American bankers and businessmen should start asking why and where is the credit going.

On September 7 the Federal Reserve banking system reported intervention in foreign exchange markets at a cost of \$273 million. It is unknown where the Federal Reserve is authorized to manipulate U.S. dollars abroad.

On September 14, 10 American banks headed by the Bank of America announced an agreement to finance \$180 million in equipment and material to be used in building a fertilizer complex in the Soviet Union. The U.S. Export-Import Bank had already agreed in principle to extend an equal amount in credits to the Soviet Government as part of an \$8 billion, 20-year fertilizer deal.

On September 17 the World Bank, through the International Development Association—IDA—under the leadership of Robert McNamara of Edsel fame, announced an increase in U.S. participation to help "the poorest among countries and people of the world" from \$960 million to \$1.5 billion.

Yet while all of these financial shenanigans continue to constitute a stumbling block to the American people, the IMF announces its historic meeting at Nairobi, Kenya to solve the world's financial problems at the expense of the U.S. taxpayers. I include related newsclippings:

[From the Washington Star-News, Sept. 7, 1973]

INTERVENTION BY FED TOTALED \$273 MILLION
(By Philip Greer)

NEW YORK, Sept. 6.—U.S. intervention in foreign exchange markets at the height of the speculative onslaught on the dollar during July amounted to \$273 million, the Federal Reserve System reported today.

Intervention is a price-propping operation, by which the U.S. sells other currencies and buys back surplus dollars. In this case, the U.S. sold \$220 million in German Deutschmarks, \$47 million in French francs, and \$6 million in Belgian francs.

The total appears larger than most market observers had estimated at the time, but the Fed credited its actions with helping to stem the decline of the dollar, which reached its low point in July.

The intervention in the markets confirmed by Fed chairman Arthur F. Burns on July 18, but recognized by market traders earlier than that, was accomplished through the Fed's "swap" arrangements for trading currencies with other countries. As a result, U.S. drawings from the swap network rose to \$1.828 billion at the end of July.

The swap network is a system of short-term, reciprocal credit lines between the Federal Reserve, the central banks of 14 other countries and the Bank for International Settlements. Its purpose is to moderate excessive short-term swings in foreign exchange markets.

The report on U.S. intervention in the markets was contained in a quarterly analysis

by the Federal Reserve Bank in New York, which conducts foreign exchange operations on behalf of the system. In previous reports, which were issued semi-annually, borrowings under the swap network were stated up to date. Under an agreement with the Treasury and the House subcommittee on international finance, they are now reported quarterly, but cover only a period ending 30 days before the report is issued.

Although the swap network has been in operation for a number of years, the July period was the first when the U.S. itself intervened more than briefly in the markets as a matter of policy. Charles A. Coombs, senior vice president of the New York bank who is in charge of the foreign exchange operations, said the Fed has intervened in the past under special conditions—such as the assassination of President Kennedy in 1963. Normally, he said, central banks of other nations moved into the market and the Fed absorbed surpluses from those banks.

Commenting on the change in Fed policy, Coombs said, "The dollar seems undervalued and if there's pressures on it, I think it's a good idea to resist it."

In July, chairman Burns and Treasury Secretary George P. Shultz said the U.S. would intervene in exchange markets "at whatever times and in whatever amounts are appropriate for maintaining orderly market conditions."

As a result of the heavy selling of dollars in July Coombs noted that some banks refused to quote exchange rates at all. "Exchange trading was grinding to a standstill," he said.

Since the intervention, the dollar has recovered a large part of its losses, Coombs said, "and I think there's a distinct improvement in the tone of the market."

Coombs said the Fed's effort to stem the dollar sales was closely coordinated with the West German Bundesbank, which bought \$300 million to help stabilize the markets.

[From the Washington Star-News,
Sept. 7, 1973]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEVELOPMENT BANK
LEGISLATION RESUBMITTED

The Nixon administration yesterday resubmitted to Congress proposed legislation to establish a District of Columbia Development Bank. A similar bill, offered in the previous session of Congress, was not enacted. Although hearings have been held on the idea, Capitol Hill staff members said they do not expect quick action because of the press of other business.

The legislation would set up a bank to purchase and sell debt obligations or equity instruments, and guarantee any debt obligations issued to finance projects here. American Security & Trust Co. chairman Joseph W. Barr first proposed the development bank several years ago and President Nixon has endorsed the idea in the last two State of the Union messages.

Treasury Secretary George P. Shultz yesterday supported the legislation as providing assistance to development projects in D.C. that have difficulty obtaining necessary financing from traditional business and government sources.

The bank would be authorized to provide technical assistance and training for projects, and could issue up to \$10 million of obligations to the Treasury.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 14, 1973]
U.S. BANK FINANCING IS SET FOR SOVIET
FERTILIZER PROJECT

LONDON.—A syndicate of 10 American banks, headed by the Bank of America, has agreed to finance \$180 million in loans for American-made equipment and materials to be used in building a fertilizer complex in the Soviet Union, a Bank of America spokesman announced yesterday.

In May, the U.S. Export-Import Bank agreed in principle to extend an equal amount in credits to the Soviet government, as part of an \$8 billion, 20-year fertilizer deal between the Soviet Union and Occidental Petroleum Corp.

Meanwhile, in Moscow, Tass reported that the Soviet Union would build a new deep-water port on the Black Sea to enable it to fulfill its chemical-products contracts with Occidental. The new port is to be situated at Grigorevsky, 40 miles northeast of Odessa, Tass said.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 17, 1973]

IDA LOANS TO "THE POOREST" INCREASE

(By Hobart Rowen)

The World Bank's "soft loan" affiliate, the International Development Association (IDA), sharply boosted its lending in fiscal 1973, with increasing concentration of the aid "on the poorest among countries and peoples."

According to the annual report of the World Bank Group—the bank itself, IDA, and the International Finance Corp., which finances private projects—total development assistance came to \$3.555 billion in the year.

This record fulfilled a goal announced in 1968 by Bank President Robert S. McNamara, that the group should provide twice as much development assistance in 1969-73 as it had in the prior 5 years.

In releasing the report, prior to the annual meeting of the bank and the IMF next week in Nairobi, Kenya, bank officials stressed their conviction that they are achieving success for another basic McNamara goal: spreading the benefits of development more widely.

"Development is about people, especially about poor people," said one bank official. "We have done a lot to spread development downward . . . There's more to it than just getting more GNP per head."

For example, a review of IDA's lending policies showed that 7 per cent of IDA resources had been directed to the poorest countries (those with a per capita GNP of \$12 or less).

Even in mixed economies, as in Brazil, the emphasis is now on directing assistance to the least affluent sectors.

One consequence of this policy is that the volume of agriculture loans, for the first time in the history of the bank and IDA, exceeded that of any other category. At \$938 million, it was twice as much as in fiscal 1972, and 35 per cent higher than lending for transportation, which formerly had the top spot.

Economic growth among the developing countries was put at an "impressive" 6 per cent in calendar 1972. But because population growth exceeded a hoped-for ceiling of 2.5 per cent, the per capita GNP grew by only 1 per cent.

But these aggregate figures incorporate wide differences. The growth rate per capita of the least developed 25 countries fell to zero from 0.4 per cent the year before. By contrast, the rate was 4.5 per cent per capita among petroleum-exporting countries, and 5.5 per cent among those able to export manufactured goods.

Among other highlights of the bank group report:

The largest single source of funds to support a near-record \$1.723 billion in borrowings was Japan, which supplied 35 per cent. Germany was next with 22 per cent.

The bank doesn't foresee any change in the interest rate it charges—7.25 per cent—inasmuch as the average cost of its money is only 4.5 per cent. Treasurer E. H. Rotberg said: "At this point, 7.25 per cent looks good. But we'll have to see how much the next \$3 or \$4 billion costs us."

Total capital flows, public and private, to developing countries increased in 1972—but the funds disbursed actually represented a smaller percentage of the donors' GNP. As re-

ported by the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD, total flows were \$18.43 billion, compared with \$17.21 billion in 1971. As a percentage of GNP, that was a drop from 0.78 to 0.73.

On the matter of the next replenishment of IDA funds (which will come up in Nairobi next week), the new U.S. executive director for the bank, Charles O. Sethness, said that the United States supports a proposal to increase the replenishment from \$96 million to \$1.5 billion a year, but with the U.S. participation at one third rather than 4 per cent.

[From the Washington Post, July 30, 1973]

COMMITTEE OF 20 MEETS ON MONETARY REFORM

(By Hobart Rowen)

The finance ministers of the Free World, organized as the Committee of 20 of the International Monetary Fund, begin a two-day session here this morning, an important preliminary to the IMF Annual Meeting in Nairobi in September.

Monetary reform, with the hope of reaching an outline of an agreement at the Nairobi session, is the task of the C-20.

Officials have made it clear that this ministerial session (the third since the C-20 was created at the last annual IMF meeting) is a "working"—rather than a decision-making—affair. Thus, there will be no communiqué at the end.

Nevertheless, it could be a highly significant session in which the political leaders of the several countries will see whether divergent viewpoints are susceptible to a real compromise.

The main issues still to be decided are how to achieve a better working of the balance of payments adjustment process; the convertibility of the dollar; the role of gold in a reformed system; and the precise functions of the IMF itself.

Technical work has been done by the C-20 deputies, chaired by Jeremy Morse, formerly an executive director of the Bank of England. Earlier this month, Morse told reporters that the deputies had carried their study about as far as possible, putting it up to the ministers for decision.

Another ministerial session is scheduled for Nairobi, immediately prior to the IMF meeting. It is possible, also, that the deputies will be asked to meet in Paris in early September.

Officials privately express a degree of cautious optimism, despite the lack of specific agreements so far. "The nature of a process," says one aide, "is that there is never much to announce until the whole thing falls into place."

However, the very brightest scenario contemplates only an outline of an agreement at Nairobi, with work to perfect a new monetary system lasting for at least a year beyond that.

The complexity of the problem is illustrated by the intense debate on what international pressures may be necessary to "discipline" a nation's balance of payments.

Much of the discussion in both the ministerial and deputies groups has revolved about an American proposal to use the level of monetary reserves as the chief "objective indicator" for forcing changes in exchange rates. The Europeans agree that some pressures may have to be applied, but shy away from the use of a single, specific test.

Treasury Undersecretary Paul A. Volcker who, along with Treasury Secretary George Shultz and Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur F. Burns, leads the American delegation, put it this way recently:

"In concept, we all want a better process of balance of payments adjustment. But in practice, that dull and abstract phrase, 'bal-

ance of payments adjustment,' translates into difficult economic judgments and sensitive political issues for any government. Who is to decide what action will be taken, when, and by which country? . . .

"We must settle the appropriate scope for national discretion, the role of the IMF and the extent to which 'objective indicators' can be usefully employed. In all these areas, a full consensus has not yet been reached."

Alli Wardhana, minister of finance for Indonesia, is chairman of the C-20. In addition to the ministers, representatives of the European Economic Community, the Bank for International Settlements, the GATT, UNCTAD, the World Bank, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development will attend the two-day meeting.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 16, 1973]

U.S. MONETARY REFORM PROPOSALS

A Department of the Treasury statement released on Aug. 27 outlined U.S. views on 14 separate monetary reform problems:

System of Adjustment—Equitable and effective incentives and disciplines for balance-of-payments adjustments by both surplus and deficit countries. Stable but adjustable par values supported by convertibility.

Adjustment Policies—Maximum discretion for national authorities to choose from a range of international acceptable measures—domestic policies, trade liberalization, capital liberalization, increased aid or exchange rate changes.

Role of Consultations—Improved and strengthened consultative procedures in the IMF, even though consultations alone cannot provide the needed certainty in adjustment arrangements, which are difficult decisions often postponed.

Exchange Rate Regime—Strictures against competitive undervaluation must play an important role. Stable but adjustable par values as the "center of gravity" of the new system. Wider margins of exchange rate fluctuation.

Convertibility Arrangements—Each country maintaining a par value or central rate would stand ready to convert foreign official balances of its currency into primary reserves (or the currency of the country requesting conversion).

Special Drawing Rights (SDRs)—Central role of SDRs as "numeraire" (or unit of account) and as main reserve asset. Dependence on gold and currencies should diminish.

Currencies—Option of holding currencies can provide elasticity for the system, which should be flexible to accommodate short-term and possibly reversible capital flows without unwarranted adjustments or restrictive measures.

Gold—Historic decline in gold's role should continue, although it cannot be demonetized overnight. Provide for continuing but declining role for gold.

Intervention Arrangements—Major countries should adopt exchange market intervention system similar to EEC's "multicurrency intervention." Countries would be responsible for intervention in all participating currencies.

Consolidation and Funding—Past accruals of currency balances secondary to satisfactory adjustment system.

SDR-Aid Link—Proposals to link SDRs to development aid to other countries are risky and impractical. Link might weaken confidence in SDRs' main function without providing significantly more resources to developing countries.

Stake in Reform—Developing countries have strong interest in overall reform, and stand to gain much from prosperous and expanding world economy.

Monetary-Trade Relations—Monetary reform is vital part of total reform of interna-

tional economic affairs, encompassing trade and investment opportunities. Monetary questions cannot be separated from other issues, rules and practices.

Structure of IMF—Senior and politically responsible people from various countries should meet periodically in a revamped executive board, a new executive committee, or a continuation of the Committee of 20.—Congressional Quarterly

[From the Washington Post, September 1973]

MR. NIXON, THE "FED" AND HIGH INTEREST RATES

(By Hobart Rowen)

Sitting in the White House East Room for President Nixon's press conference last Wednesday, one thing became perfectly clear: the administration has no new ideas for controlling inflation.

Sidestepping any blame for himself, the President took a dig at his economic advisers for the disastrous price spiral of 1973.

"I'm afraid I can't be any more perceptive than my economic advisers have been and their guesses with regard to, as you know, the numbers insofar as inflation have been, have not been very good."

He then tossed the advisers a crumb of comfort by saying he didn't blame them because of "factors . . . (they) did not foresee."

Mr. Nixon's advisers have been wrong on more than guessing the rate of inflation. At almost every turn, from the original "game plan" of 1969 which produced inflation and recession at the same time, to the ill-fated junking of Phase II of wage-price controls on Jan. 11, Mr. Nixon and his experts have botched the job of managing the economy.

This isn't to say that there were no problems beyond their control, notably a worldwide boom that contributed to rising prices here.

But lots of our present economic headaches could have been avoided or mitigated. There were plenty of warnings, for example, that the Agriculture Department was following a policy of scarcity all during 1972, when food demand was booming. But the department had a monolithic concentration on boosting farm income rather than the national food supply.

And consistently, Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur Burns—whose name the President invoked twice at the Wednesday press conference—begged for a stronger tax policy that would ease the inflation-fighting burden imposed on monetary policy. Had that advice been heeded, interest rates wouldn't be so high today.

For all of the policy mistakes, only two notes of grace can be recalled. First, Treasury Secretary George P. Shultz has admitted that Phase III was a disaster, and Burns concedes that the Fed should have exerted greater monetary restraint last year.

Government expenditures should also have been reigned in last year. A golden opportunity to trim back military spending coincident with the winding down of war in Vietnam was missed.

But now the monkey is on the back of Mr. Burns and his six fellow governors. Almost the entire fight against inflation depends on a high interest rate policy—and the Fed is the first to admit that there are serious limits to what should be expected from monetary measures. The Fed can establish a goal—and have no assurance that it can reach it. Moreover, it is uncertain what effect a given policy, even if achieved, will have on prices.

Former Fed Governor Sherman Maisel points out in a soon-to-be published book, "Managing the Dollar," that the present Fed points out in a soon-to-be published book, who can pay the price must at some point price others out of the market.

Burns himself, in testimony Aug. 3 before the Joint Economic Committee, said that interest rates "could go so high that we would be laying the foundation for the breakdown of our economic and social order."

He cited, in that connection, the fact that the 180-day interest rate in Chile was 90 per cent, because the inflation rate had hit 200 per cent.

"If I accomplish nothing else this morning," Burns told that hearing, "I want to emphasize the simple truth that inflation and high interest rates go together, and that both the one and the other pose perils for economic and social stability in our country."

But in the month since then, interest rates have forged relentlessly upward. We may not yet be suffering from a Banana Republic style of inflation, but for the first time in recent history, interest rates, like other elements of price inflation, are being measured in double numbers—11 per cent or so for bank loans to small business, 10 or 11 per cent in the "overnight" rate at which banks borrow from each other—and 10 per cent is widely predicted for the banks' prime lending rate, the price of money to the best and biggest customers.

When asked Wednesday whether "the tax structure should be altered in any way to help strengthen the economy," Mr. Nixon responded:

"... a number of my advisers, including, incidentally, Arthur Burns, have strongly recommended that the answer to this whole problem of inflation is the tax structure, you know. That there's this gimmick and that one. And by saying gimmick, I don't mean anything disrespectful to Arthur Burns, because he's very important to us at this moment... But there isn't a chance that a responsible tax bill would be passed by this Congress in time to deal with that problem."

That may be a correct political judgment. But if proposing higher taxes of some sort is the right policy, the President shouldn't shrink from it. Just his willingness to develop a more even-handed economic program might have a beneficial effect.

Right now, the burden of monetary restraint is very uneven. Housing gets clobbered. Smaller businessmen get hit hard when borrowing money. Local communities find it tough or impossible to get the money they need for community projects.

To those affected by high interest rates, it is little comfort to hear that with 6 per cent inflation, a 10 per cent interest rate works out to a "real" money cost of only 4 per cent.

That may be significant to the big businessman, to whom interest rates are but another operational cost, with the government picking up as much as 50 per cent of it on his tax return, anyway.

But to the homeowner or small borrower, a high interest rate is just another inflated price, along with the rest of them, which reduces the amount of money in his pocket. If it goes on long enough, a recession is a certainty—but it won't necessarily cure inflation.

ESPERANTO

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I spoke before this body on the

occasion of the birthday of Dr. Lazarus Zamenhof, the creator of the international language known as Esperanto.

Although Dr. Zamenhof is not alive today, the spirit of Esperanto lives on, taking on additional relevance as each new sign of international peace emerges.

At this point in the RECORD I insert an article written by Dr. Mario Pei, a noted professor of linguistics at Columbia University, who gives further justification of the need for Esperanto in our time:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 2, 1973]

WHY COLLEGE LANGUAGE COURSES GO BEGGING

(By Mario Pei)

Two worries beset the world of higher education. The major, overall one has to do with shrinking college enrollments. The other concerns one area of higher studies, and may reflect a change in our national and international outlook.

The drop in foreign language enrollments outstrips that in other fields.

Does this indicate a resurgence of isolationism after decades of growing internationalism? If so, it concerns far more than higher education and college administrations and faculties. It may go hand in hand with congressional tendencies to restrict foreign aid, military spending, U.S. participation in world affairs.

Increased study of foreign languages had been widely touted as highly necessary in a world that we dominated. True, everybody was supposed to be learning English. But the appearance of the first Russian Sputnik in space gave notice to Americans that other countries, speaking other languages, could achieve technological miracles, and would have to be reckoned with. Foreign language enrollments took a big jump at that time, and the expansion in foreign language studies continued until quite recently. There were about 1 million college students taking foreign language courses in 1970, as against less than half that number in 1950.

Now there has been a sudden reversal. Colleges that had required high school foreign languages for admission, and had language requirements in their own curriculum, began to decide that it was no longer necessary to impose the study of languages on all their students. This sort of thing had been a growing practice in the high schools, only 25% of which make the study of a foreign language a must.

But a college education is something higher; it is supposed to broaden your outlook beyond the national horizons. The trend is distressing, not only from the point of view of the college language teachers, who find a shrinking market for their skills, but for the philosophy of higher education as well. It may even be ominous for the nation, as one of the symptoms of withdrawal from our position of leadership in world affairs.

In extenuation of what goes on, it is argued that as higher education reaches out to more and more people it is unreasonable to expect the less endowed among them to go in for subjects they may have little occasion to use in later life, and which they are basically unequipped to handle.

Same argument, of course, could be advanced against mathematics, history and the sciences, which are also required. Is all we should expect of higher education merely training in citizenship, skill in driving a car, speaking, reading and writing barely acceptable English, ability to get along with all sorts of people, a manual skill? These are everyday activities, of course. But many peo-

ple acquire them without spending four expensive years in college.

It is also argued that removal of the requirement leads to smaller classes and more efficient instruction imparted to fewer but better motivated students. But it also leads to the abolition of classes, and the dropping of languages that do not achieve sufficient registration in a given college.

In these days of expanded international travel and trade relations, the languages should be able to stand on their own feet. Required or not, they should be able to generate enough interest among college students to ensure their survival, even their expansion.

The trouble is that far too many college teachers have refused to modify their approach in the matter of motivating their students and gaining their enthusiastic cooperation instead of the ho-hum attitude that seems to say: "Well, I have to take two years of some language or other in order to get my degree. I have to go through it somehow. Which is the easiest of these languages, the one in which I'll have to do the least amount of work to get a passing grade?"

It isn't that the language teachers are not masters of their respective subjects. If anything, the change would have to be that they dominate their field too completely. They assume that everyone is as interested in it as they are. Too many of them, in order to qualify for their posts, have had to specialize in a narrow area of the language they are going to teach and especially in its literature.

They carry their predominantly literary interests into the classroom and expect to ram them down the throats of their students, who may be interested in the language in an altogether different way, if at all. The student may want to learn to speak the language so he can use it when he travels as a tourist or a business representative, or to read it for scientific, commercial, or diplomatic purposes. What he gets instead is insistence that he learn about literary currents and authors who do not interest him, and whose language is often anything but contemporary.

It used to be the boast of Harvard in the 19th century that students of Italian spent the first year acquiring the grammar and some vocabulary, then in their second year went on to read Dante in the original and discuss his philosophy. Some of that attitude still remains. There is nothing wrong with it if the student wants it—but how many students want it?

Several remedies have been suggested by language teachers. Most contemplate a reduction but not the complete abolition of the language requirement—rather the substitution of a one-semester or one-year requirement for the present two or three years. But the courses suggested are calculated to arouse in the students the interest and desire to go on with foreign languages, even if not compelled to do so.

The first of these suggestions involves an introductory required course dealing with the world's main languages in their geographical, population, political and economic aspects (how many people speak each language, where they are located, what their actual and potential status is, to what extent we do or expect to do business with them). This would place foreign languages squarely within the range of relevancy from the standpoint of the individual and his career plans. At the end of the course, the student would have a clearer idea about which language, if any, he wants to pursue.

Suggestion No. 2 is that the entering freshmen be given a required course in a constructed language like Esperanto, which is far easier than any national tongue by reason of a grammatical structure that can be learned in a couple of hours, ease of

spelling and pronunciation, and an international vocabulary. This would familiarize the student with the idea of another language besides his own while minimizing the initial difficulties. Then he could pass on to one of the national languages. He would also gain the bonus of acquiring an international language that is widespread and already has millions of users all over the globe.

A third suggestion is that the student be required to pick a foreign language and be given an initial course dealing not with the language itself, save incidentally, but with its speakers, culture and the country or countries where it is used. If he likes what he gets and wants more, he can then go on to the regular language course.

A fourth suggestion deals with all the foreign languages in the second year of their study. Remove all literary reading material, with which the second language year is now topheavy, and concentrate on current newspapers and magazines, which reflect the present-day language and carry items relevant to what goes on today.

These reforms in the presentation of foreign languages, individually or in combination, might go toward sugaring the pill of the language requirement, making the study of foreign languages both more palatable and more meaningful.

This still leaves in abeyance the question of whether the drop in language study is one of the facets of a new, growing isolationism on the part of all Americans, who may be fed up with the principle that they are responsible for the peace and prosperity of the entire world, and with the lack of cooperation of other nations that also have a stake in those matters. If this is so, time will tell.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHIEF OF POLICE, JERRY V. WILSON, ENDORSES LOCAL CONTROL OF POLICE

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1973

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the endorsement of local control of law enforcement by Chief of Police, Jerry V. Wilson. The chief's statement, which is printed on page 52 of House Report 93-482 accompanying H.R. 9682, the District of Columbia self-government bill, states in part:

Personally, I feel that apprehension over local control of police power in the District is misplaced. My own sense of this community is the overwhelming majority are responsible citizens who want effective law enforcement just as much as residents do in any other city. If the City of Washington is to be treated substantially as a local community, albeit, a special one, rather than a Federal enclave, then there is no reason to deprive local citizens of control over that fundamental local service, the police force.

I fully support the suggestion of Chief Wilson that the bill include:

Some option . . . of authorizing the President to determine when special events and emergencies require temporary Federal assumption of control over the police or the deployment of Federal forces.

This is a constructive amendment which I will offer to the bill during the debate October 9 and 10. It will reinforce our intention to provide protection of the Federal interest through action by the President.

The committee report also includes strong endorsements of H.R. 9682 by Mayor Walter E. Washington and City Council Chairman John A. Nevius.

Mayor Washington states on page 51:

I strongly urge the passage by the House of Representatives of H.R. 9682, as a direct, practical and equitable way to provide District residents that basic privilege of all American citizens, the power of electing the officials of their local government.

Chairman Nevius states on page 52:

The Council has vigorously supported the adoption of legislation which would provide to the District residents the basic privilege shared by other American citizens, that is the power to elect the officials of their local government and to participate in a positive manner in the affairs of their local government.

Mr. Speaker, these experienced municipal officials have been of great help to the House Committee on the District of Columbia during our months and months of hearings and markup sessions. H.R. 9682 represents the careful product of a great deal of work on the part of the committee. I trust that the House will find favor with the bill when it comes to the floor in 2 weeks.

SENATE—Saturday, September 22, 1973

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O most holy, wise, and powerful Preserver and Governor of all Thy creatures and all their actions, keep us, we beseech Thee, in health of body and soundness of mind, in purity of heart and cheerfulness of spirit, at peace with Thee and in charity with our colleagues; and further all our undertakings with Thy blessing. In our labor strengthen us; in our pleasure purify us; in our difficulties direct us; in our perils defend us; in our trouble comfort us; and supply all our needs according to the riches of Thy grace.

Through Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., September 22, 1973.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Ala-

bama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 21, 1973, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MRS. LUCY LOCKE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 379, S. 1848.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows: S. 1848, for the relief of Mrs. Lucy Locke.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was

considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Lucy Locke shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of November 6, 1958, and to have complied with the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of such Act. In this case the petition for naturalization may be filed with any court having naturalization jurisdiction.

THE COUP IN CHILE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post, under the Washington Merry-Go-Round, there is a commentary by Jack Anderson and Les Whitten entitled "No Direct U.S. Role Seen in Chile Coup."

I ask unanimous consent to have this commentary printed in the RECORD.

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

NO DIRECT U.S. ROLE SEEN IN CHILE COUP
(By Jack Anderson and Les Whitten)

We have been deluged with inquiries from all over the world about possible U.S. involvement in the overthrow of President Salvador Allende in Chile. Because we exposed the ITT-CIA plot to block Allende from assuming power in 1970, newspapers in many countries have asked us whether the CIA was also behind the military coup which left Allende dead in the presidential palace last week.