

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PRESERVING THE SPIRIT OF A
NATION

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, many of our traditions change or become outmoded, but there is one that I hope will never become passé. That is the singing of the national anthem at sports events. This is the only time many Americans are reminded about the greatness of our Nation and it would be a national shame to cast this great tradition aside.

One of my constituents, Prof. Gilbert Lycan of Stetson University in DeLand, Fla., recently expressed his views on this matter in a letter to the DeLand Sun News editor. His letter reads as follows:

[From the DeLand (Fla.) Sun News, Jan. 29, 1973]

NATIONAL ANTHEM SEEN AS HONORED
TRADITION

EDITOR, Sun News: I heard on television recently that there is a movement afoot to stop the singing of "The Star Spangled Banner" at the beginning of athletic events. I, for one, would deeply regret the ending of this honored tradition.

Visualize the scene at an important football game. There are some 40 strong, robust men on each side—physically the nation's finest—who are about to take to the field for a fierce battle with each other. The stadium may have from 40,000 to 60,000 partisan fans who will soon be cheering and yelling for one team or the other. Literally millions of Americans are looking on by television, and they too are imbued with the spirit of combat, eager to see one team vanquish the other. But then, just before the struggle begins, there is a pause for the national anthem—reminding every player and every spectator that there is something, still, that should bind us all together—that in our love and admiration for our great country we all stand as one. Isn't this well worth preserving?

People who survive a great common danger, such as the battle of Gettysburg or the sinking of the Titanic, frequently form an organization and hold annual meetings for the rest of their lives. Is it not even more fitting and proper for all the citizens of the United States to memorialize the periods of dramatic dangers through which our people have passed? We should all seek to share with Francis Scott Key those hours of anxiety when he, from time to time, saw in the cannons' flash the American flag still flying over Old Fort McHenry. Our hearts should thrill with his when, at the dawn of the new day, he saw the flag still flying. It did not mean merely that Baltimore had been saved from the grasp of the invader; the whole nation had survived an hour of great peril, and all Americans of our generation are the richer for it.

The national anthem should remind us not only of that hard-won victory of 1814 but of all the hazards through which our country has passed, and it should bring to every American breast a surge of appreciation for the thousands of men who have offered their lives to preserve for us the blessings we now enjoy. I want to see the flag; I want to hear the anthem; I want to recall.

Our nation is so large, and our people are diverted by so many conflicting interests and emotions that it is difficult, at best, for us to maintain a national will and purpose, without which no nation can survive. Symbols of common interest are necessary for holding a people together. Many things are needed for establishing meaningful bonds of national unity—one of which I am firmly convinced, is that moment of suspense, when we look upon our flag and hear the challenging words and the stirring tune of our national anthem, as the nation pauses.

GILBERT L. LYCAN,
Professor of History.

Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with Dr. Lycan and I believe the vast majority of Americans agree also. We must forever keep that one moment of harmony and closeness when we all recognize the greatness of this country.

THE HONORABLE GORDON
BROWNING

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the Seventh Congressional District of Tennessee we are fortunate to have living in our midst the distinguished elder statesman of our State, the Honorable Gordon Browning, a former Member of this body and twice Governor of Tennessee.

I have had the pleasure of knowing Governor Browning for many years and was honored to serve in his cabinet for a period of 4 years. He is the only living former Governor of Tennessee, and I can say truthfully that I have never known a greater American.

Recently, the Carroll County Historical Society honored the Governor by opening a special room at the Carroll County Memorial Library in McKenzie to house his papers. On Friday, February 23, 1973, the Dresden, Tenn., Enterprise ran a feature story on the occasion, and I include this story at this point in the RECORD:

FORMER GOV. GORDON BROWNING HONORED

Gordon Browning, the only living former Governor of Tennessee, sits at his desk in the library of his home near Huntingdon and discusses his early childhood, military days and his life in the Governor's mansion.

He was born November 22, 1889, on a farm in the Atwood District to James H. Browning and Melissa Brooks Browning, the youngest of 4 children. His father was a farmer and served at one time as a Justice of Peace. His first school days were spent at House's School and Trezevant School. The family then moved to Gibson where he attended Milan High School. After high school graduation he entered Valparaiso University in Indiana. After receiving his degree from Valparaiso University he returned home to teach school in Gibson. He taught school for 2 years then entered Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tennessee to study law. Receiving his law degree and being admitted to the bar, he returned to Huntingdon to practice law in the office of George T. McCall March 15, 1915.

When World War I broke out Mr. Browning was one of the first to volunteer. He served in the states earning the rank of Captain and later in Europe where he was decorated for gallantry and earned the distinction of being an able leader.

Mr. Browning returned to Huntingdon after the war was over and married Miss Ida Leach. He resumed his law practice in the office of George McCall. During this time he served 1 year as Deputy Clerk and Master of Chancery Court.

The peaceful existence of a small town lawyer did not appeal to Gordon Browning very long. In 1920 he ran an unsuccessful campaign for Congress. In 1922 he ran again for Congress and this time won by a landslide. Mr. Browning states that the McKenzie Banner was the first newspaper to endorse him with a double page ad. Mr. D. A. Burkhalter was editor at this time. He and Mrs. Browning moved to Washington where they spent the next 12 years while he served in Congress.

In 1934 Browning made an unsuccessful race for the United States Senate.

In 1936 he ran for Governor and won by a landslide. His first term as Governor has been described as one of the most active first terms of any Governor in the History of the State of Tennessee.

When Browning took office the State had a 143 million dollar debt and no particular way of paying it. During his term in office these debts were funded and provisions made for paying them off, saving the taxpayers several thousands of dollars.

In 1938 he was defeated for re-election.

Back home in Huntingdon he was elected Chancellor of the eighth Chancery Division without opposition. He served in this capacity for 7 years.

When World War II broke out, Browning went to the Adjutant General's office and asked how he could get a commission. He was told if he would accept the rank he held when discharged at the end of World War I he would be accepted. Once again he put on his uniform and entered the Military Government Division, becoming a Military Governor in Europe.

Captain Browning was promoted to Lt. Colonel and was decorated by five Governments.

In 1949 Browning waged another campaign for the Governor of Tennessee. He was elected, coming through with one of the largest majority votes ever given a candidate. Once again Mr. and Mrs. Browning moved to the Governor's Mansion, staying there until 1953.

During the 4 years he was Governor, the State Library, Archives, The Cordell Hull Building, The House Office Building, a new School for the Blind and a school for the Deaf were constructed. Several thousand miles of roads were improved and a Conservation program introduced.

At the age of 84, Mr. Browning is still very active. He is a member of the First Methodist Church, serving as a board member, American Legion Member, VFW Member, and a Mason. Mr. Browning also owned and operated a farm until he sold it recently. He travels several hundred miles each year speaking at various gatherings and working in politics, with the aide of Jerry Kemp, Tennessee State Trooper, furnished the former Governor by the State of Tennessee.

The Brownings live in a beautiful red brick house near the Huntingdon Church of Christ. They had their home designed and built by Hart, Freeland and Roberts in 1953. The house has 3 bedrooms, dining room, library, den, kitchen and 2 baths. The rooms

are all paneled with wood from Tennessee Trees.

Carroll County Historical Society recently honored Gordon Browning by opening a special room in his honor. The room is located in McKenzie upstairs in the Memorial Library. The room will be called the "Gordon Browning Room" and will serve the entire County. Personal papers, political papers, photographs, desk, military items, books with the Governor's name in gold lettering on them and many more items will be on display in this room. A large picture donated to the society will hang on one of the walls. Carroll County recently donated \$1500 to help preserve these valuable items.

According to Mrs. Julian Devault, Society President, the room will open early in the spring if funds are available. Anyone having items they would like to donate to the Society please bring them to the library.

Tennessee and Carroll County is indeed fortunate to have a man like Gordon Browning living in our area. A man who has served 3 terms as governor, 7 years as Chancellor and as Congressman from our County. What greater service can one offer than service to his fellowman?

NEWSCASTERS AND A FREE PRESS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, this month marked the passing of David Lawrence, founder of U.S. News & World Report, noted editor and columnist. As a New York Times tribute noted:

Readers of every viewpoint found that though they might disagree with him, they could always respect him for his intellectual seriousness, lucid prose, vigorous advocacy and total honesty.

It is fitting that in one of the last editorials written before his death, Mr. Lawrence addressed himself to the assaults by the administration upon newscasters and the free press. This assault has included threats to use antitrust laws against television networks and to use the licensing power of the Government to enforce "fairness." Newsmen have come under fire as they attempt to protect the confidentiality of information sources.

This attack has seriously threatened the independence of the free and vigorous press necessary to a democracy. Mr. Lawrence's editorial posed the essential question when it asked: "Should governmental authority be exerted to judge the subject matter of radio and television programs, or should this be left to the people?" The answer must be that such responsibility rests with the people.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD the editorial written by David Lawrence which appeared in U.S. News & World Report on February 19, 1973. The article reads as follows:

ONLY THE PEOPLE CAN REGULATE BROADCASTING

(By David Lawrence)

Five weeks ago on this page an editorial was reprinted from a January 1935 issue predicting some of the constitutional questions that would arise if the Government attempted to regulate the nature of either radio or television programs.

The Federal Communications Commission has had the power for more than 38 years to allocate licenses to broadcasting stations on the basis of "public interest, convenience and necessity." The need for this developed because the channels or frequencies are limited in number and a governmental agency had to be given authority to determine which applicants should be granted the three-year privilege of operation.

Broadcasters are required to apply a "fairness doctrine" under which opportunities must be given to present all sides of public questions. Similarly, candidates for office are supposed to get "equal time" during political campaigns in order to respond to attacks or to present their own views.

But now the controversy has expanded with protests against "bias" in broadcasting.

The Government through its spokesmen says plainly it doesn't want to impose any rules that would be regarded as censoring the content of programs. Its responsibility exists, however, with respect to judgments that must be made when licenses are up for renewal.

Clay T. Whitehead, Director of the White House Office of Telecommunications Policy, whose interview appears in this issue, recognizes the difficult problem which confronts the Government. For the mere fact that licenses may be renewed or revoked has produced the impression that a form of regulation is involved.

On one noteworthy occasion, President Nixon made a nationwide television address and immediately afterwards commentators on a network vehemently took issue with what Mr. Nixon had said. Many persons were amazed that, before the people in the audience throughout the country had time to discuss or even think about the President's speech, they were instantly confronted by the critics.

This created a lot of unfavorable reaction among listeners. In a talk a few days later Vice President Agnew spoke about the unfairness of the broadcasters. His comments got widespread support but were promptly construed by opponents as meaning that the Government was threatening to censor television.

If people are unhappy with how a radio or television licensee is serving them, Mr. Whitehead says, the Government "has to listen to them and determine whether or not they have a case." How, he asks, is a station going to be evaluated "except through a look at what it programs"?

Broadcasting is a medium analogous to the press. What would people say if the Government declared that second-class postal rates would not be given to newspapers and magazines which do not satisfy the Administration's concept of "fairness"? Should governmental authority be exerted to judge the subject matter of radio and television programs, or should this be left to the people?

If the power to license is interpreted to mean the power to regulate content, then the First Amendment to the Constitution is being ignored.

Mr. Whitehead stresses the importance of self-regulation and indicates clearly his belief that what goes on the air should be left to the stations. But in the long run the decision as to whether a license is being improperly or properly used remains with the Government.

Is there an alternative method? Newspapers are subject to criticism from time to time, and readers express their dissent. Over the years the mail from readers has always been given serious consideration by the management of the publications. An unpopular newspaper runs a risk of losing its subscribers and advertisers. Broadcasting stations might be in the same position if surveys were made of the kind of programs that are regarded unfavorably by the communities they serve.

The frequency or channel which a radio

or television station is authorized to use is essential to its business. Commercial advertising is sold in order to meet the expenses of operation. But, as is not the case with newspapers, broadcasters must obtain from the Government a license to publish.

It is the fact that the licenses are issued by the Government which has caused the discussion about censorship and improper influence by officials who criticize some of the things said on television.

Mr. Whitehead is right when he says that the stations should control or regulate their own programs. If the public realizes that the responsibility is on the shoulders of the broadcasters themselves and not on the Government, there might be a different situation and a reduction of the criticisms of stations or networks as being one-sided or unfair.

THE AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY AND THE 1970 CLEAN AIR AMENDMENTS

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to insert in the RECORD the address by Lee A. Iacocca, president of the Ford Motor Co., to the New York Chamber of Commerce on February 15, 1973, regarding the automotive industry and the 1970 Clean Air Amendments. The address follows:

ADDRESS BY LEE A. IACOCCA

It's good to be in New York with you today, and especially to meet with you members of the New York Chamber of Commerce in this Great Hall.

You know, I've been reading about the plans, or lack of them, for our country's 200th anniversary in 1976. Most of them seem to suggest that 1776 was the beginning of about everything that's stamped "made in U.S.A." But you celebrated your 200th anniversary eight years ago! I'm delighted to know that not only did your organization precede the Union by eight years, but it was a group of businessmen who did it!

There are many subjects I could talk about today.

Monday, for example, our company announced the highest earnings in our 70-year history. That's a pretty good subject from my point of view.

I could talk about this year's economic prospects for the auto industry—which are great, by the way.

And we could discuss gas rationing, or the energy crisis, or devaluation, any one of which is of more than passing interest to all of us.

But I've chosen a subject—in the short run probably not as interesting as any of these—but in the long run, a subject that's vital to you, to me, to the jobs of millions of Americans, and to the economic well-being of the nation.

The subject is automobiles and clean air. So what's new? Simply this. We could be just around the corner from a complete shutdown of the U.S. auto industry, and all that that implies.

It's not a fight over whether we should have clean air. That's been settled—and our air is getting cleaner every day, as far as automobiles are concerned.

So what's the issue? Simply this. Baked into law is a requirement that by 1975—or 1976 at the latest—we reduce the three pollutants that come out of auto exhaust pipes—hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, and oxides of nitrogen—by 90 per cent from the levels of 1970 and 1971. We've already spent millions

of dollars and we can come pretty close, but no cigar. We can't meet the precise requirements of the law. And that's the hang-up.

Let me make one point clear at the very outset. I'm talking about the Clean Air Amendment sponsored by Senator Edmund Muskie, and adopted by Congress in 1970. Early in the 60's, Senator Muskie was one of the first to identify the threat to our national environment posed by airborne pollution and he led the successful effort to pass the Clean Air Act of 1965. He was even more effective in his leadership of the effort to pass the Amendments of 1970. The vote was 73 to 0 in the Senate. In the House, it was 374 to 1. I personally think that Senator Muskie has done a courageous and important job on behalf of our environment.

Actually, the automobile industry has been cleaning up and reducing engine and exhaust pollutants since the early 1960's. For example, Ford's 1973 models have hydrocarbon levels that are 85 per cent less than those produced by cars without emission controls a decade ago. At the same time, Ford has reduced oxides of nitrogen by 48 per cent from last year's level and carbon monoxide by 69 per cent from levels given off by uncontrolled vehicles.

These gains are impressive, but they don't get us to the levels of control that the Amendments now specify for 1975 and 1976. Our industry has been backed to the cliff edge of desperation, and time is running out.

As far as Ford is concerned, the problem is simply this: As of today, February 15, 1973, we know of no practical way to meet the 1975 emission standards for our products in time to produce 1975 models. As far as the even-tougher 1976 requirements are concerned, nothing seems to describe our situation as well as that clincher Sam Goldwyn is supposed to have remarked: "In two words: IM . . . POSSIBLE!"

Well, why the dramatics, you ask? 1975 is almost two years away. A lot can happen between now and then. And you're right. The only catch is, in our business, it's already 1975! We are less than 17 months from "Job One" of our 1975 models, and only three months from the start of the test program we have to complete to make that first 1975 vehicle legal.

Last April we asked the EPA to suspend the 1975 standards for one year as authorized in the law. We were turned down. But, as you may have noticed, just this last weekend a ruling by the U.S. Court of Appeals gave us a new lease on life. It ordered the Environmental Protection Agency to take another look at the one-year suspension request.

No question about it, for us this was a landmark decision, even though it was more a reprieve than a pardon. In fact, even if the rehearing results in a one year postponement we still won't be out of the woods—because the basic problem remains. And that problem is the inflexibility of both the standards and the timetable for meeting them that's built into the law. Mr. Ruckelshaus, the Act's Administrator, has little enough latitude for 1975 but he has even less beyond 1976.

And so here we are—with a ray of hope for an adjustment in 1975 standards but with a continuing prospect that expensive and virtually experimental expedients will be required in 1976 if not on 1975 models.

A key factor in our ability—or inability—to meet the standards established in the time allowed is a thing we call "lead time." This is the time required to complete our new model designs, provide our suppliers with specifications and schedules and fill our production pipe lines. The fact of the matter is, we were well into plans for our 1975 models when the Clean Air Amendments of 1970 were adopted.

By last April we just couldn't wait any longer. We had to "freeze" our 1975 vehicle designs. So we took a deep corporate breath, counted to 10 and then went ahead

with what is now officially known within the company as "Ford's High Risk 1975 Emission Lead Time Plan." At present, we believe our one best hope of approximating the 1975 standards is to use catalytic converters as part of our emission control systems. Not only the Government but, based on their public statements, every other American manufacturer now appears to agree on this approach.

In an effort to settle on the best parts and systems, Ford engineers and research people have been subjecting a wide variety of the latest catalytic systems to emission level and durability testing at Dearborn and Riverside, Calif. Recently we finished running 24 test cars equipped with a variety of catalytic systems over the 50,000 mile "benchmark" distance required by the '75 standards. They all failed based on the rigid EPA rules for certification testing. One vehicle at Riverside did complete 50,000 miles with emission levels below those now set for '75. But even that tiny triumph was cancelled out by the 23 vehicles that did not meet the standard. Furthermore, we find that we have had to reject more than 50 per cent of our catalysts for defects either as they arrive or after they have gone only a very few miles on our test vehicles.

These results shouldn't come as a shocker to anybody. Last year a report of the National Academy of Science said flatly: "The technology necessary to meet the requirements of the Clean Air Amendments for 1975-model-year light-duty vehicles is not available at this time." And, only last week, the U.S. Appeals Court noted that it now has "grave doubts as to whether technology is available to meet the 1975 statutory standards."

Despite the claims and counter-claims that pop up in the news from time to time, the simple fact is that nobody we've heard of yet in this highly-competitive one-upmanship auto world has managed to produce that breakthrough device that could consistently achieve the '75 standards on a variety of production vehicles of different size, weight and power. Mind you, I'm not talking about a single prototype under laboratory conditions, but a cross section of road vehicles going the 50,000 miles required by the law.

As for the 1976 standards on nitrogen oxides—no way. We and others have developed a few vehicles and power plants—either highly experimental or much smaller than the standard U.S. vehicle size—that have met the standards one way or another for brief periods, but the goal isn't even really in sight.

But there is another thing to keep in mind. Our inability to meet completely the arbitrary standards within the arbitrary time frame set by Congress is, fortunately, not even a small threat to the health and welfare of any of us. A lot of new information and data have become available since 1970 concerning atmospheric pollution. These new facts not only clarify the relationship between pollution and health, but also bring into question the feasibility and good sense of what certainly has been a headlong, cost-be-damned approach to the problem. In short, they suggest that we may be out of our minds if we don't re-examine the criteria established by the 1970 Clean Air Amendments.

Several study groups including the Federal Office of Science and Technology have identified the essentially regional nature of air pollution in the United States. According to the OST study about 30 per cent of the country's vehicles are registered in areas, representing about 25 states, which have no ambient air quality problems from auto emissions. Think about that a minute. That means that in a 10-million-car year, 3,000,000 buyers will pay up to \$500 to buy and operate equipment which provides them with no

direct benefits. That adds up to one and a half billion dollars—which, in these days of belt- and budget-tightening could certainly go for something better.

The same study suggests that it may be an exercise in futility to insist that 1976 models in the New York metropolitan area meet the same standards for oxides of nitrogen as '76 models in the Los Angeles region. Simply because of the dominance of power plants and space-heating units already emitting nitrogen oxides in the New York metropolitan area, the study concludes that there would be no significant difference in air quality here even if new cars and trucks were allowed to emit three times the legal limit of oxides of nitrogen specified for 1976.

The law ignores these variations in the nature and seriousness of the problem, and provides only a set of rigid, across-the-board standards for emission levels. In these circumstances—and this is what I want to emphasize to you today—we believe there should be a serious concern that the measures required to comply may cost far more than their incremental benefits can possibly justify.

Just what does an all-out effort involve? First it involves people. Right now at Ford, we have some 4,200 people working exclusively and full-time on the problem of finding ways to meet emission requirements. And a lot of those people have made a career of it.

Next it takes money—lots of it. By next month Ford Motor Company's financial commitments and contingent obligations just for meeting the '75 standards will reach almost \$100 million. By the end of this year, they will amount to almost \$300 million. In all, we've earmarked up to \$400 million just for this attempt to develop acceptable emission controls for our 1975 models.

In effect, we are betting \$400 million that somehow we will be able to meet the '75 standards. Frankly, it's a lousy bet—especially when you remember that none of our 24 test vehicles at Riverside passed the salvia test. On top of that, our second durability fleet is failing catalysts at an unacceptable rate. Obviously, we are involved in a lot more than a day at the races. We can't sit out this race and wait for one with better odds. We either put up our money on every race or leave the tract. The reason for hanging in there, of course, is that the stakes are the jobs and incomes of hundreds of thousands of our employees and those of our suppliers and dealers right along with the dividends of our stockholders. And perhaps most important, the stakes include billions of dollars of our customers' money that is represented by the cost of complex and unproven emission control equipment.

And if our entries don't pass the emission control test—we go out of business.

Now I've been told by knowledgeable people that such an eventuality won't actually be allowed to happen—that is, in fact, we can't meet the standards, some adjustments will have to be made.

At Ford, we've practically "broken our pick" in an all-out effort to meet 1975 standards. In addition to our expenditure on research and development, we've committed for millions of dollars worth of parts, equipment and even precious metals needed in the catalytic converters. But it seems more than likely that a last-minute retreat to levels that everybody in the industry can meet may make competitive losers out of the technological winners. The Appeals Court recognized this situation when it said, "This case is haunted by the irony that what seems to be Ford's technological lead may operate to its grievous detriment." Usually, the Court observed, high achievement carries with it rewards for those who do the most and the best. Yet, in the case of emission control development among manufacturers, it might have just the opposite effect.

So much for the big picture. What does all this mean to you as an individual customer? First, it means a bigger price tag on your new car—about \$300 bigger for the 1975 emission control systems including catalytic converters. Moreover, whether the catalytic approach or the present system of emission controls is retained, we believe the customer will have to pay an additional \$125 to \$175 for increased maintenance and loss of fuel economy over 50,000 miles. It is also possible that owners of catalyst-equipped vehicles may find themselves facing substantial costs for replacing catalysts during the lifetime of their vehicles.

And so, as we are fond of saying these days, there is no such thing as a free lunch and that goes for clean air in spades. But in my book this only adds to the obligation of both the government and our industry to make absolutely sure we get the most for every dollar we spend on emission controls. And with action now, there is a way to save our customers a lot of money and yet continue our progress toward cleaner air. Here is where that Ford proposal I mentioned earlier comes in.

We at Ford believe we can save you, our customers, at least \$100 to \$125 per vehicle and still improve air quality—if we don't have to put catalytic converters on your 1975 model cars. This comes out to something like a billion dollars a year.

We believe we can reduce hydrocarbon emissions 43 per cent from 1974 levels, cut carbon monoxide by 29 per cent and still continue to meet the present federal requirement of a 48 per cent reduction from 1970 levels in oxides of nitrogen—all without using catalysts. Not only would such levels represent an average one-third improvement in hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide reductions over the previous 1974-model year, but they would also represent a reduction from pre-control models of 92 per cent for hydrocarbons, 78 per cent for carbon monoxide and 48 per cent for nitrogen oxides.

In other words, we don't have to abandon our progress toward cleaner air just because we need to adjust our timetable.

For all these reasons, we want Congress, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the public to consider and act upon a plan which we believe serves the best interests of all of us. We believe this proposal offers the nation a rational, orderly, temperate and effective program for improving air quality in all of the 50 states without unacceptable penalties to our national economy, our personal mobility, our industrial vitality or our government's credibility.

Because it appears highly unlikely that any manufacturer will be able to meet 1975 standards for a representative line of vehicles, Ford proposes that the 1975 Federal requirements be suspended for a year—as permitted by the present law—and that interim standards higher than those now required be set out at levels that can be met by vehicles without catalysts. As I suggested earlier, such interim standards could reduce by a third the mean levels of hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide from the 1974 standards and thus continue in a substantial way our progress toward cleaner air. Based on public documents, all American manufacturers could meet these interim standards.

Second, because California, and specifically, the Los Angeles area, have the nation's most difficult smog problem, we are proposing special interim standards for California that would be far more stringent than those proposed for the other states. This would permit a state-wide test and demonstration of the use of catalytic technology.

Third, we propose that the Clean Air Act be amended to permit extension of these interim standards until 1977 to permit thor-

ough testing of the catalytic converter system in California over a two-year period.

This plan would have several important advantages. First, it would give California the benefit of the most advanced smog-control technology. Second, it would take advantage of the substantial and essential enforcement and inspection systems already in place in California. Third, we can do a better job initially by keeping the job smaller.

By setting aside at least two successive years for manufacturing and field experience with catalytic converters, the industry would gain a valuable basis for comparison of gains, losses and trends between the first and second year's experience with the system's. With the opportunity to develop and refine catalytic systems on two million California cars in 1975 and 1976, we believe we could reduce their cost by 10 to 15 per cent and substantially improve their reliability and maintenance costs before being required to install them on 100 per cent of our production.

Our interim proposal for California is similar in some respects to what is called "the two-car strategy." Under this proposal high-control, sophisticated systems would be required in 26 of the nation's air quality regions, with non-catalytic equipment for the rest of the nation.

In fact, it seems to us that some kind of "split level" or even a "local option" approach could make a lot of sense. While an Angeleno with smog-caused tears running down his cheeks might figure that even \$500 a car isn't too much to get some relief, the citizens of an Idaho community, for example, may figure that as little as \$100 a car for emission control is too much—especially when they may need the money to do something about the air pollution from stationary sources.

There are some complicated problems associated with such an approach, of course. But it's a serious matter, too, when we require the auto owner on the shores of Lake Superior to pick up the same emission control tab as the guy who drives in New York.

Maybe we should work toward a system that would permit people to opt for "clean," "cleaner" or "cleanest" emission control systems as regional air circumstances require.

Fourth, Ford Motor Company also proposes that the new Congressional Office of Technology Assessment begin an early review to determine the ultimate levels of control that will be required for each of the three automotive pollutants. Essentially, we'd like to have this authoritative body report to the nation whether this multi-billion-dollar trip will really be necessary in terms of air quality needs, technological feasibility and cost-effectiveness.

If catalytic systems prove successful in their two-year use test throughout California and if it is found in the public interest to do so on the basis of the Congressional study, we would propose to extend the use of catalytic systems nationwide on 1977 models.

The Ford proposals I have outlined today suggest a coordinated and we think realistic program to improve our national environment. If all our environmental goals are not achieved as quickly as some would like, these proposals may have the at-least-equal advantage of some permanence, measurable cost-benefits and the prospect of not being leap-frogged and made obsolete tomorrow by an unforeseen technological breakthrough.

Improving our environment is not a religious crusade but a human challenge on how to use available scientific knowledge at acceptable cost in dealing with the undesirable side effects of our improved standard of life in America.

In the nearly two centuries of our nation's independent history, the diverse interests represented within the United States have grown and flourished only by reacting to ra-

tional pressures for compromise, often less than seemed vital to some, but often more than seemed necessary to others. What has emerged has certainly not been utopia, but instead what is probably "the best of all possible worlds" under the circumstances.

Today appropriately happens to be the birthday of Galileo, the great Italian astronomer who was also "the father of the experimental method." Galileo's wisdom seems particularly relevant to us today in light of the problem I have identified in this talk. More than four centuries ago, he said: "It is always wise to examine the unalterable power of facts before invoking supreme authority."

We have more facts today than we have ever had before. And if we use them with intelligence and forethought they can point the way to a better life for all of us.

MENTAL HEALTH TRAINING

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget request for fiscal year 1974 would sharply reduce or eliminate Federal assistance for programs preparing qualified mental health personnel. One of the many groups that will be seriously affected is nursing.

In the United States today nearly half of all hospitalized patients have a mental or emotional illness. In addition, an increasing number are receiving therapy at community mental health centers. Nurses with special training in mental health are essential in all these services as well as in prevention and aftercare programs. Largely as a result of manpower training programs authorized by the National Mental Health Act, the Nation's supply of psychiatric nurses has increased 400 percent since 1950. However, today the demand is so great that 25 percent of budgeted positions are unfilled. That shortage can only increase if Government support is withdrawn.

As present there are 195 graduate and undergraduate schools of nursing in 45 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico receiving NIMH funds to improve training programs and increase the numbers of psychiatric nurses. Currently NIMH provides stipends or traineeships for 1,346 students in mental health nursing. One positive effect of the current program has been an increase in the number of qualified psychiatric nursing facility, thus improving all nursing students skills in this important area. In some of the mental health nursing programs, many of the faculty positions are supported by those training grants.

If the President's 1974 budget recommendations are enacted the impact on mental health training will be disastrous: there will be no new funds; programs would have to close as present students complete their training. What is to happen to our people when they need care and there are no psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, or nurses to take care of them?

All 195 mental health nursing programs across the country will be affected.

All undergraduate schools of nursing will precipitously lose support thus losing faculty which has taken years to recruit. Approximately 40 graduate programs in mental health and psychiatric nursing will not be refunded as of July 1, conceivably causing the closing of many.

While much has been said by the administration about the absence of need to support health professionals' undergraduate education, in 17 States such as Arkansas and Oklahoma, there are no graduate programs in mental health nursing, thus all the leadership nurse manpower to direct patient care in mental institutions and clinics in those areas must be prepared by other States or rely on the undergraduate mental health nursing programs to at least give beginning understanding of the subject.

Mr. Speaker, the Government-funded psychiatric nurse training programs have been successful in improving quality of mental health instruction in schools of nursing and in greatly increasing the numbers of psychiatric nurses, but due to new demands for mental health manpower there are still, as I pointed out before, 25 percent unfilled positions in this field. The Congress has recognized the need to improve mental health services by enacting the Community Mental Health Centers Act and amendments. These centers and other mental health services must have an adequate supply of qualified personnel in order to carry out their mission. They would not have unless we see to it that there is adequate Federal support. I hope this body will face up to its responsibilities and exert some real pressure to redirect some of our national priorities.

GUN CONTROL

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following remarks were sent to me by a constituent, Dr. Alan J. Kringel, who has obviously done serious thinking about the complex problem of gun control. I found them perceptive, thoughtful and timely and thought my colleagues might also:

GUN CONTROL

President Nixon is a proponent of capital punishment, the cruelty and ineffectuality of which have been abundantly demonstrated; yet he has been opposed to effective Federal gun control legislation, which is one of our best hopes for lowering the rate of murders and other violent crimes in America.

In the past, Mr. Nixon has said that firearms control should be left up to the individual states. This is an absurd assertion: if a criminal lives in one of the few states, such as New York or Massachusetts, that have relatively strict gun licensing laws, he need only take a short trip to other states where he can buy all the guns he wants with no trouble at all.

Every year, over 20,000 Americans are killed by firearms—in suicides, homicides, and accidents. Almost two-thirds of the murders in the U.S. are committed with firearms. If this slaughter is soon to be reduced, the 93rd

Congress will need the courage to frustrate the National Rifle Association by enacting a Federal firearms control law that isn't as shot full of loopholes as the Gun Control Act of 1968.

This Federal law must ban the cut-rate, easily concealable, snub-nosed pistols and revolvers known as "Saturday night specials," which are probably used in at least half of all U.S. crimes involving guns. Prospective buyers and present owners of all categories of firearms and all ammunition must be licensed, after they have filled out application questionnaires and have been photographed and fingerprinted—to screen out those who have records of violent crimes, narcotic addicts, and others who are unfit to possess lethal weapons. These licenses, which will show the possessor's thumbprint and photograph, must be renewed periodically, as are drivers' licenses. Anyone buying a firearm or ammunition will have to personally present his license to the dealer. To combat the traffic in stolen and illicitly sold, traded, and borrowed weapons, the law must require that all firearms—rifles and shotguns, as well as pistols—be registered in the name of the person who has them in his possession. Anyone bearing or transporting firearms must always carry his firearms license and his firearms ownership registration card on his person.

To execute a gunman after a killing is a brutal and useless exercise; but to prevent him from ever getting a gun is something well worth doing!

MOORER ON DEFENSE ISSUES

HON. JOHN B. CONLAN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to help arrange a recent interview for Esther Clark, military editor of the Phoenix Gazette, with Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mrs. Clark, who has been writing military news for the Gazette for 24 years, was recipient in 1971 of the Marine Corps League's coveted Dickey Chappelle award. She has received many other military writing honors and was a war correspondent in Vietnam.

Her questions touched on some of the most important military issues of the day, and, as is the rule for Admiral Moorer, his answers were well thought out, direct, and to the point.

This interview is as succinct a digest of Admiral Moorer's views on the SALT agreement, U.S. military preparedness and discipline, and the military lessons of our Vietnam involvement that I have seen. I believe it will be of interest to everyone concerned about safeguarding America's strong national defense, and I would like to insert it into the RECORD at this point:

INTERVIEW OF ESTHER CLARK, MILITARY EDITOR OF THE PHOENIX GAZETTE, WITH ADM. THOMAS H. MOORER, CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF, AT THE PENTAGON, ON FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1973

CLARK. Admiral Moorer, how do you view the SALT Agreement? Would you agree that there is an inequity between what the United States is getting vis a vis the Soviet Union?

MOORER. I think you have to look at this way: In the first place, it's divided into

two parts. One is the treaty, which deals with the defensive systems—the anti-ballistic missile systems. This treaty, of course, is one that I would characterize as being a treaty of equivalence, in the sense that it provides for two sites, one of which can be where the national command authority is located. It provides for the same number of launchers and the same number of radars and the same size sites. In other words, it's the identical situation for both sides.

Now the other part is the offensive agreement—and I am differentiating between "treaty" and "agreement" because it's an interim agreement which extends for five years only. It deals with the offensive systems. Now the offensive systems are far more difficult to evaluate and to measure in quantitative terms, because in addition to the numbers one must look at such matters as geography and the number of warheads and the technological characteristics and things of that kind. Now it is true that the agreement permits the Soviets to have, for instance, 950 submarine missiles, whereas of this time we have 41.

CLARK. That's surely a disparity.

MOORER. It is a disparity, but again it comes back to this: The Soviets were moving forward with considerable momentum, building submarines, for instance, as well as land-based missiles, at a fast rate. And so this must be looked at in terms not so much of what it permits as what it prevents. The idea was to arrest this momentum.

Now the United States had no on-going programs which would provide increases in force-levels during this five-year period. In other words, no matter what action we would take, we would not have been in a position to increase our force-levels in that five-year period.

I think that it's important to inject at this point the fact that modern weapons systems require a tremendous length of time to develop. And the forces we have today are determined by decisions made eight or 10 years ago. The decisions we make today will determine the forces we have in 1980. And consequently, what we are really dealing with here is the future. So, as I testified before the Congress, I do not feel that the United States is in any position of inferiority today.

CLARK. You mean military strength.

MOORER. I'm talking about strategic forces. We're talking about the SALT Agreement. At the same time, I think it's very important that we move forward with the new programs—namely, the Trident submarine, the B-1 bomber, and other technological advances and improvements that we can put in all of the systems. And in this regard, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in taking a position on the interim agreement, I think you have to emphasize both words. First, its interim, and second, it's an agreement. And, of course, it hopefully provides the foundation for SALT II, which is going to commence very shortly. SALT I is simply the first small step, which will be picked up in SALT II, where we will make an effort further to refine and ultimately reach sufficient agreement that it would be suitable for a treaty in place of an interim agreement.

But again, we cannot stand still during this five-year period. That's the key point. And that's why it's so important that we move forward, because otherwise we will move backward into a position of obsolescence and finally inferiority, and I don't think the American people would accept that position.

Now when an agreement is reached, you always have this wave of euphoria, and some people take a deep breath and say, "Well now we'll have no more problems in the strategic area." Well this is simply not the case. Its going to take considerable and continuous effort on our part to ensure that we do not move into a position of inferiority. And I think that the United States and those involved in the negotiations will see to it

that the United States does not become inferior.

So I've given you a very long answer to a very short question. But your question doesn't adapt itself to a "yes" or "no" answer. Today, of course, the answer is no, we're not in a position of inferiority. In order to continue to say no in the future, it's necessary that we continue with these improvements. That's the point I'm trying to make.

CLARK. How about overall military strength, admiral? Is the United States on an equal footing now with the Soviet Union in overall military strength?

MOORE. Well again, when you look at it quantitatively the Soviets, of course, have always maintained a much larger standing army than we have. They have a larger source of manpower for the armed services, and they keep them in the armed services. It is true with respect to their air force that they have been continually developing new types of aircraft at a faster rate than we have. And so far as the navy is concerned, of course, they have moved forward with great vigor in building a modern submarine fleet, modern surface ships, and, of equal importance, which is sometimes overlooked, but of equal importance in terms of overall seapower, they have moved forward with considerable energy towards building up a very modern and large merchant marine.

CLARK. They are ahead of us in that area, wouldn't you say, sir? Most of our ships are, what, World War II vintage?

MOORE. A large number. If you look at just raw tonnage, you could make a case that we have casting around in the various rivers and so on more tons. But you've hit the nail on the head. In terms of a modern, viable merchant marine, they are moving out ahead of us and building at a far greater rate than we are. And so you have a situation where practically all of their ships are new—by new, I mean built within the past 10 years—whereas a very large number of our ships are old.

Now, of course, President Nixon has initiated a program which is aimed at correcting the maritime posture of the United States in terms of merchant shipping. And I think it is a vital national resource that needs major attention, because, after all, we are a maritime nation. We do import large quantities of fuel and other types of raw materials. And the United States has, with the exception perhaps of Russia, longer coast lines along both oceans, and we depend heavily upon the sea.

CLARK. Is it safe to assume that the United States still has control of the sea lanes?

MOORE. I think that the United States can control those sea lanes which involve an area of immediate interest. On the other hand, I don't think we can control the sea lanes worldwide, as we could at one time. And furthermore, the Soviets are continuing to build at such a rate that this challenge to U.S. control and use of the sea is expanding. It is true that they are building at a rate faster than we are, because today we do have fewer ships, fewer squadrons, fewer divisions than we've had prior to the beginning of the war in Vietnam, which really, calendar-wise, I guess you could say started about 1964.

CLARK. Speaking about the war, admiral, what would you say the main lessons are that the United States has learned and made profit by from having participated in this largely unpopular, undeclared war?

MOORE. The way that I answer that is as follows: I don't think in terms of military doctrine and principles of military operations that we've learned anything new. We've relearned what we already knew in the past: Namely, that a gradual application of force is not nearly as effective as a heavy application of force.

I think you've got to recognize the unique characteristics of this conflict. In the first place, the North Vietnamese have had a land

sanctuary. Not one hostile soldier set foot in North Vietnam. And this is certainly not a situation one normally finds in war. Secondly, on the other hand, the area of South Vietnam has never been subjected to heavy air attacks, or any air attacks. Then you had the situation where the area in Laos and Cambodia was used by the North Vietnamese for quite a while and to a large degree as sanctuaries where they could use them to accumulate supplies and to transport supplies and so on. And so that general situation, plus the nature of a war which involved conflict in the jungle, where it was difficult to identify friend from foe, where there were no battle lines as such, I think added to the uniqueness of this conflict.

But more importantly, the difficult part of it was created by the lack of public support, which was encouraged by the efforts on the part of many in this country to promote Hanoi propaganda and in effect deliberately to adopt a double-standard. Let me give you an example of what I'm talking about.

During the bombing that took place in December, you know that there was a great hue and cry about carpet-bombing and about killing civilians, and so on, whereas the facts were, by the North Vietnamese' own count, I think there were some 1,300 to 1,600 killed, which is actually very few. On that other hand, I didn't see any throwing up of hands in horror when the North Vietnamese invaded South Vietnam last March 30th, when they fired at refugees down the roads with airburst artillery, when they put 90,000 rounds in the little town of An Loc without any effort to discriminate between churches or orphanages or anything of that kind.

And so this attitude on the part of many in this country has made it very difficult for the decision-makers who have tried so hard to bring this thing to a close. And I can cite other examples.

You had a rather odd situation where U.S. citizens were actually visiting the capital of the enemy right during the time that the conflict was going on, and then reporting back in such a way as to totally discredit their own country. This was an amazing situation so far as I am concerned.

And so what all this boils down to, so far as lessons learned, is that in order to fight a war it's mandatory that we have public support. In order to have public support, the public must be involved. For instance, I feel very strongly that we should have called up the reserves at the outset, and that we should never have given college deferments—that was a mistake, because it tended to say that if you have enough money to go to college, you don't have to fight for your country. This, I think, accounts for some of the difficulties we've had in the colleges, because after all, when you have 500,000 men fighting 10,000 miles from home, I don't care what you want to call it—that's a war.

And so you've got to say at that point, "Now look, Mr. Public, these are not ordinary times. The country has got a problem. It can't be solved by some people in Washington or in the, quote, Pentagon, unquote. Everyone has got to get into the act." And that, I think—if you want to highlight a lesson that's learned as opposed to a principle of warfare—we've relearned the principles of warfare which we already knew. We certainly should have learned that public participation and public support are necessary in a large-scale conflict.

CLARK. You know, in 1964 Senator Goldwater had said, "We do not need to bomb Haiphong harbor. All we have to do is blockade it. All we have to do is breach the Red River dikes, and this will be over." Don't you think that everything he said has come to pass? At the time, he was called a warmonger. But don't you think that, had we listened, we perhaps could have saved 49,000 of our own lives, not to mention thousands and thousands of South Vietnamese? Do you con-

cur that perhaps the war might have been ended as long ago as 1964, when Senator Goldwater said that Russia would not take any counter-measures at that time, and that we could successfully have ended it right then and there?

MOORE. I think the political situation has changed to some degree since then. But you're getting back to the point I made a while ago. And I talked to Senator Goldwater about this many times, and he and I are in total agreement that once the battle is joined, then in order to terminate the conflict at the shortest possible time it is necessary to apply the maximum amount of power. And that's in effect what you're saying.

CLARK. Do you think that there is too much permissiveness in the Navy? There are critics who contend that the Navy is soft, that it's not the gung-ho operation it used to be. What is your opinion about the permissiveness? Is there any?

MOORE. I have a very strong opinion about permissiveness in a military organization, which I would describe this way: In the first place, those who wear the uniform of their country give up many freedoms in order that those who do not wear the uniform can have theirs. In other words, you can be told to pack up and leave and go anywhere, anytime. You can be told to be present at midnight tonight for a four-hour watch. No one gives you double overtime or anything of that kind. And what we have come to think of as creature comforts and freedoms in this country are not totally available to the man in uniform.

And this says, in effect, that a military organization is not a democracy and never will be. And consequently it must perform in such a way that the orders are carried out immediately and forthwith without question. And consequently permissiveness does not fit into this pattern.

CLARK. Well along that line, the Navy has had some problems with some of its young people. I suspect that you would call them racial problems, the blacks contending that they are equal with the whites and want equal rights. But at the same time, it would seem that they're not willing to abide by that concept themselves. They want something more than equal rights, it seems to me.

MOORE. Well first they had difficulty—I think you're referring to the two aircraft carriers, the Constellation and the Kittyhawk. Of course, I've been in the Navy quite a long time, and so far as I am concerned a man is judged on the basis of his ability to produce. It doesn't have anything to do with whether he's black, white, or green.

Now the Navy has a special problem in this regard. The Navy is a highly technical service. It's not a manpower service, per se. It's a technical service. And this was even recognized at the very beginning of our country, where the Constitution says it's the responsibility of the Congress to raise an army and maintain a navy. There are two very key points there. And even in those days of sail, they recognized that it takes a long time to build a ship and a long time to train a crew, so you have to maintain it if you're going to have it ready for use.

That being the case, you can see that in one sense a ship is nothing but a big steel box full of machines. And it's necessary to have the people capable of operating and maintaining these machines. And this means, then, that it is necessary to be selective about the quality or qualifications of the people who operate on the ship, because the failure of any one of these machines to operate could, in fact, jeopardize the ship. But I have never observed anything other than selection of personnel based on capability.

CLARK. Well, then, is this a tempest in a teapot? The Navy is squared away and there

will be no permissiveness? You are judged for what you produce?

MOORE. Exactly. I think that actions are being taken now, and, as you know, several thousands of the people who do not meet the qualifications are being separated from the Navy. I think, as they say in nautical terms, they're taking a round turn in this area.

Of course, I would interject at this point that I'm speaking from my position as simply an experienced naval officer, although I'm not directly involved in the discipline, promotion, and morale of any of the services in my present position. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, of course, are charged by law with strategic direction of the armed forces. And I find a big difference between my current assignment and the assignment of Chief of Naval Operations before Admiral Zumwalt relieved me.

And I don't like this particularly. In this assignment, I do not have the opportunity to deal directly with people and people problems, although, of course, I must continually consider them in the overall readiness posture of the military forces. And I'm very conscious of them. And I miss the fact that I don't have a chance to talk to the young people as often and mix with them and watch them and so on as one does when he's the chief of a service.

FOUNDRY INDUSTRY GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS CONFERENCE

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, last week the foundry industry held its second annual governmental affairs conference here in Washington to discuss problems peculiar to the industry and try to touch bases with Federal agencies which regulate the foundry industry.

Indiana had a large delegation at this conference, and the keynote conference address was given by a Hoosier foundryman, John E. McIntyre of South Bend.

I felt Mr. McIntyre's address synthesized well the problems industries like the foundry business face today and the many ways in which Federal Government policies affect such a business. I would like to share this material with my colleagues and ask permission to insert the body of the address into the RECORD.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY JOHN E. MCINTYRE

Honored guests from the Senate and the House of Representatives, fellow foundrymen; Welcome to the second annual Foundry Industry Washington Conference.

I sincerely appreciate the honor of being asked to be the keynote speaker at this breakfast meeting.

The attendance here this morning is an indication that foundrymen are increasingly aware of the importance of Washington activity as a matter of continuing concern. We are grateful to our friends from Capitol Hill for taking the time from their full schedule to be with us. We know you are busy men, so we shall not detain you very long.

A year ago it was desirable to acquaint you with a number of facts and statistics about the total foundry industry through speeches at the conference and personal visits in your offices. The Environmental Protection Agency had developed into a pretty active program, and the Occupational Safety and Health Agency was beginning to exercise some of its potent efforts.

Thirteen months of experience since January 1972 have been assimilated and now we can talk from a greater background of problems actually encountered. Also, during this interim period two areas of lesser concern a year ago have developed into prime problems today, and they need to take their rightful spots in discussions with our legislators and agency people at this conference.

INDUSTRY DATA

Because there are so many small foundries in the United States—out of some 4,500 units there are no giant companies engaged exclusively in the foundry business—so the size and importance of this industry is not too well known. According to government figures we rank sixth among major manufacturing industries in value added by manufacturing. The total value of the product produced by our industry is over eleven billion dollars. Furthermore, it is safe to say that the American economy simply could not function as it does today without castings. Almost every conceivable machine tool or piece of machinery or equipment used in manufacturing contains from one to many castings. The machines that built this building—the engine block in the car that delivered you here this morning—the stoves that cooked this breakfast—your refrigerators, heating plants, yard equipment—all contain castings of which you are seldom aware.

The largest segment of the total output of the foundry industry is gray iron castings, with other ferrous castings being made from steel, malleable iron and ductile iron. Non-ferrous castings—made of aluminum, brass, bronze and zinc—are important contributors to the same types of products in the American economy as ferrous castings are. We are a vital industry, both in peace and during national emergencies, although time does not permit elaborating on this point.

EPA

In past years many foundries had substantial amounts of particulate emissions entering the atmosphere, although our industry was judged to only create a very small percentage to air pollution nationally. At the time of this meeting a year ago a number of foundries using cupolas for melting iron were engaged in installation of emission control devices or were converting to the use of electric furnaces for melting purposes. The January issue of *FOUNDRY* magazine reports that in a recent survey 71% of the industry report they are in compliance with their area codes for air pollution control. This varies with the type of metal cast and sizes of foundries, but it still appears to show a special effort at compliance.

Unfortunately, there are cases where foundries have installed emission control systems under local, or state, codes which do not meet the federal code. Also, it was reported in May 1972 by the American Foundrymen's Society that six states had received 18-month extensions of the January 1972 deadline for filing plans to meet secondary EPA clean air standards. Thus there is confusion in the application of the law that creates confusion in the minds of operators and even may result in injustices.

Which type of cupola emission control equipment to install—or the decision to abandon cupolas and adopt electric melting processes—how to finance the extensive capital investment required—what the additional operating cost will be afterward—are questions that have been among the most difficult that foundry managers have ever had to answer. Some foundries have closed their doors rather than make the large financial investment required to install emission control devices that are completely non-productive plus the forever continuing expense of maintaining them.

It would be amusing if it weren't so deadly serious, that action taken by many foundries to control cupola emissions has created a new

problem of water pollution for them. A recent American Foundrymen's Society survey showed that 24% of the respondents had waste water treatment problems. Of those reporting such problems, 78% reported this was a result of the operation of dust collection equipment.

Out of the same group of respondents, 79% reported that they had a new solid waste disposal problem, especially in ferrous foundries, and, here again, is another area of operation that is affected by overlapping or conflicting regulations of various governmental units, local—state—or federal.

PHASE III

Coming next to the subject of wage and price controls under Phase III, I can only say that we, like most other businessmen, are still uncertain as to their exact meaning and impact on our industry, but we want to contribute our share to holding down inflation. Phase II had some inequities—and many more were beginning to surface. One of these has been documented. Each of the registrants has been given a write-up of the case. We hope Phase III will prevent similar situations from occurring.

Our industry is largely made up of small enterprises. We sell to the large corporations. Many of us have to negotiate labor contracts with the same international unions which negotiate with the large corporations. We are, in a sense, at the mercy of the wage settlements negotiated by these firms. There is a "wave" effect.

If these wage settlements are held within reasonable bounds, our settlements—and hence our costs and prices—reflect that condition.

If, however, the settlements go off into the wild blue yonder, we will have to pass along these cost increases to our customers. As a rule of thumb, about 50% of the foundry's cost is for wages. Being a high labor content industry, we naturally reflect wage increases to a higher degree than do other industries in which labor content plays a less important role in the cost of a product. This high labor factor is forcing foundries to become more capital intensive in their operations. This pressing demand for capital to improve productivity is occurring at a time when expenditures for EPA and OSHA are needed.

We do believe that one reason for the existence of controls today results from the fact that even the largest corporations cannot absorb the demands of the international unions. Our business system can function effectively only if there is an equitable balance of power. Our labor laws have tipped the balance.

A strike in past years had been looked upon as an economic test of strength. Management would weigh the losses accruing from a cessation of operations against the losses resulting from further concessions to the work force. Employees were called upon to balance the loss of pay during a strike against the potential gain that would result from prolonging the strike.

Today, the effect of a prolonged strike on a company can be disastrous. The effect on the average striker may be nominal.

Between strike funds, the opportunity to "moonlight" and government subsidies in the form of welfare assistance, Federal food stamps and, in some states, unemployment compensation, some workers have even received more take home pay when on strike than when working. This has resulted in an inability of some firms to resist excessive demands, or a lengthening duration of strikes against firms which have tried to resist. There is no longer any balance in the collective bargaining process.

In our industry the average duration of a strike was once two to three weeks. In the 1960's the average gradually moved up to five to six weeks. In 1970, 1971 and 1972, the average duration was seven to eight weeks.

1970 saw the greatest percentage of strikes in our industry since we began keeping records in 1953. 1972 gave us the lowest percentage of strikes in this period, but even during a period of relative industrial peace, the strikes averaged, as I have said, seven to eight weeks.

Welfare benefits, including Federal food stamps for strikers, have certainly aided these impasses to continue for an inordinate amount of time.

OTHER LEGISLATION

I suspect each person in this audience has slightly different ideas as to priorities on what kind of legislation should be enacted that will be most helpful to all citizens and business and industry. However, I think I am safe in saying that we are all deeply concerned over the size and growth in the national debt, and the steady rise in the percentage of the national income which goes for taxation. There can only be an end to this rise when we establish some sense of priority as to what we can afford and how it shall be financed. It seems fairly clear by now that we simply cannot buy our way out of all our social problems by spending more and more billions of dollars. With the enormous federal revenue available we recognize the temptation to think that another million here, or 500 million there, will not be the straw that breaks the camel's back. And yet in total we simply cannot continue to spend unlimited amounts for unlimited programs.

If serious consideration is to be given to the adoption of a value added tax, we hope to have an opportunity to present our views as to its impact on the foundry industry. We are a very large industry in terms of value added and would, therefore, be a source of considerable revenue. However, as I mentioned before, we are a labor intensive industry and provision must be made for us to pass along the amount of such a tax in the price of our products. If other industries which compete with ours have a lesser percentage of value added to their product, such legislation could place the foundry industry at a competitive disadvantage. Also, an undesirable side effect could be an increase in unemployment in other labor intensive industries which are adversely affected. I am not sure that this impact will be very different for our industry than for some others, but we recommend that careful attention will be given to the problems which can arise from the imposition of a value added tax.

We also recommend that federal tax laws will continue the investment tax credit as an incentive especially to smaller enterprises in making capital expenditures required to comply with EPA and OSHA regulations during the immediate future years. Tax credits that encourage capital investment are a positive force in maintaining a strong economy, and when they can assist the total environment program they stimulate social as well as economic benefits.

OSHA

We have lived with the developing application of the Occupational Safety and Health Act for almost two years now and wish to emphasize that we believe in the principles of this Act and will do our best to conform to its regulations pertinent to our operations as concerned citizens in our communities, states, and nation. Thus far a number of foundries have been visited by OSHA inspectors who have chiefly concentrated on safe working conditions and practices in our shops. We are proud that George C. Guenther, former Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor and OSHA's first administrator, wrote a letter, dated January 3, 1973, to one of our foundry trade associations, a portion of which I want to quote to you:

OXIX—393—Part 5

"Your industry is a shining example of voluntary compliance in action. Keep your program going and you will prove the Act to be a benefit not only to employees but to employers as well." (end of quote)

Mr. Guenther was referring to the efforts of the foundry industry Intersociety Safety and Health Committee in stimulating new or improved safety and health programs in the form of a comprehensive manual recently distributed to all foundries.

Last year in his keynote address to our first Governmental Affairs Conference, Burrell Jacobs of Grede Foundries, Inc., stated that "Many experts have estimated that, in the long run, the Occupational Safety and Health Law will be more costly to the foundry industry than air and water pollution controls." (end of quote) We ask our estimable Congressmen to help influence the various administrative agencies which promulgate regulations affecting safe working conditions to especially take into consideration their impact on small business units in areas of financial investment—additional record keeping—engineering time and alteration involved in carrying out their rules and regulations. Congress passes the laws and necessarily has to turn the administration over to various government bureaus and agencies. We hope that Congress will not lose sight of the fact that implementation may go far beyond the original intent of Congress in passing the law.

We understand that Congress will be holding more "oversight" hearings on OSHA regulations in the near future. We definitely favor such re-examination sessions.

The chief impact of OSHA on the foundry industry probably will fall on the control of noise generated in its manufacturing processes. Certain key operations have always been noisy and probably in excess of the permissible decibel maximum under OSHA standards. The correction of already existing equipment operating in foundries poses a long and arduous engineering effort and large capital investments to alter such equipment to be lower in sound created than the maximum noise standards. In addition, very little new equipment nor even the technology is available as yet to permit performance within specified noise limits.

The regulations provide that if workmen are exposed to excessive noise levels, they must be rotated after certain maximum time periods to perform other work of a more quiet nature. This sounds quite simple and beneficial, but the implementation of such a practice in most foundries poses many complex problems such as job skill differences in wage rates—unwillingness of employees to be shifted onto other work they may not like to perform—higher manufacturing costs from lost time, lost production and re-training created by shifting of workers from one job to another.

Foundries with a number of noise emission processes cannot possibly change them all at one time without closing down their operation for a number of months (which would be fatal), nor can they with any fiscal responsibility afford to pay the cost of such extensive corrections over a short period of time.

ENERGY SUPPLY

The foundry industry is concerned with rapidly approaching energy supply shortages. It is unusual to pick up a newspaper or magazine that does not make some mention of growing shortages in various types of domestic fuel supplies, and the resulting shutdowns and rationing. Some foundries have already faced reduced operations as a result of this situation.

Gentlemen these symptoms must be recognized as forerunners of a potential national crisis in the next few years unless our gov-

ernment takes swift counter measures to effectively solve it.

The December 25, 1972 issue of Business Conditions Weekly reports that—

"The United States energy problems lie primarily in the medium term future, through the mid-eighties, and we may be confronted with energy shortages of major proportions. From a long-term standpoint, our basic energy position is reasonably sound. "Assuming we continue our present course—with no major changes in government policies or economic conditions in the energy industries—our indigenous resources will not be developed and brought to market fast enough to meet our growing energy requirements—which will approximately double by 1985.

"We shall face at least four major problems: (1) a growing scarcity of natural gas, (2) dependency on distant foreign oil sources (predominantly Arab) for well over 50% of our crude oil requirements, (now at even higher prices because of the recent devaluation of the dollar), (3) necessity to expand output of nuclear power and coal, and (4) enormous capital inputs required to provide facilities for increased energy requirements."

We submit to everyone in this room—legislators—agency people—and foundrymen alike that our industry is critically dependent on electric power—coke and oil, and that we work together strenuously to help stimulate effective solutions.

EXPORT OF IRON AND STEEL SCRAP

According to the Bureau of Census, ferrous casting industry shipments have increased over 9% in the first eleven months of 1972 over the similar period of 1971, and some of our trade associations believe the increase is considerably higher. The foundry industry and the steel industry tend to move together in our economic cycle, both being affected by surges, or decreases, in the production of all types of machinery, equipment and structural material plus consumers hardgoods and the auto industry. Scrap is a vital raw material input in both the foundry and steel industries. As we enter 1973, both industries are running at still higher rates of production, and our demand for scrap will increase proportionately.

We are definitely concerned about the supply of scrap that will be available to us this year because:

1. World steel production is expected to advance 6½% over 1972.
2. U.S. foundries and steel mills are projected to need 12% more scrap tonnage than in 1972.
3. Projected U.S. exports of scrap in 1973 are up 60% over 1972.

Other nations, especially the Japanese, have made it clear that they will import larger quantities of steel scraps from the U.S. in 1973 since we are now the only major industrial nation permitting the export of this vital raw material.

Thus we are already in the same type of short scrap supply situation that created the chaotic condition of 1969-1970, which resulted in severe shortages of supply plus inflationary prices.

In a January 24th meeting with government officials at the U.S. Department of Commerce, representatives of the foundry and steel industries requested that it use existing authority to invoke licensing of scrap exports immediately and to restrict the total exportation of iron and steel scrap in 1973 to no more than 7 million tons. If no relief is offered by the Department, we will be back with you Congressmen for a grass roots campaign to solve this national problem.

CONCLUSION

Time is short, so I shall conclude by saying again that we appreciate your being with us and wish that we had time to discuss at more length the points we have tried to make.

Many of us will have an opportunity to visit with you on a more personal basis during the course of the next two days, and thereby we can explore some of these questions in greater depth.

We are first of all citizens—even before we are businessmen—and as such we recognize an obligation to work with you to the fullest extent toward making the American enterprise system as healthy and profitable as possible so that it may do its full share in nourishing our American way of life.

MARYVILLE COLLEGE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on September 5, 1872, the Female Academy of the Sacred Heart was founded in St. Louis with an enrollment of 80 boarding students and a free school for 70 underprivileged children. One hundred years later the academy has changed its name to Maryville College and has become a still growing institution of higher education with over 740 men and women enrolled in baccalaureate and associated degree programs in 33 fields of study.

Since its inception, the goal of Maryville College has been to educate its students as citizens, participating fully in the intellectual, cultural, professional, social, and moral life of the community. During the first century of Maryville's existence, many changes in the kinds of responsibility students were allowed or expected to assume have occurred.

Because of its early recognition and intensive study of the problems confronting higher education, Maryville is one of the few colleges in the Nation operating within a balanced budget, experiencing a rapid increase in enrollment and broadening programs offered to students, alumni, and the St. Louis community.

Since 1956, when medical technology was added to the list of majors, Maryville has followed a plan of offering pre-professional and professional education within the liberal arts context. By 1972, the bachelor of fine arts program, pre-legal, pre-dental, and premedical programs had become important to the focus of the curriculum. In 1972, 11 new carrier-oriented programs were added.

The ability to foresee needs in the community and among its students, whether they are intellectual, cultural, professional, social, or moral needs, will enable Maryville to continue as a truly outstanding institution of higher education in the St. Louis community in the future. I offer my congratulations to the President, Sister Harriet Switzer, and to the faculty and students of Maryville College on their centennial celebration and wish them every success in future endeavors.

TO UNDERSTAND AMERICA

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, for the second time in less than 2 weeks I have had a glimpse of the true greatness of this country and what it is which makes it so.

Watching our prisoners of war return to their homeland with only words of gratitude and praise for America in spite of years of cruel captivity, was the first.

Last week, the crew of the Apollo 17 honored the Third District of Tennessee with a visit during the annual Engineers Week program.

I was struck with the true humility of greatness. Captain Cernan, Captain Evans, and Dr. Schmitt were disarmingly unassuming despite their spectacular accomplishment. They expressed their love of country, faith in their Creator, and pride in being Americans in a way which captivated all who heard.

Although I have supported a reduction from the top funding of the space program I am convinced the benefits greatly outweigh the expenditures. Not the least of these is the lift to our spirit which comes from seeing the kind of men who have made it a success. The kind of men who have made our country great and will keep it great. Mr. Speaker, I insert the attached editorial from the Chattanooga News-Free Press, "To Understand America" in the RECORD at this point:

TO UNDERSTAND AMERICA

A lot of people, even Americans, don't really understand America. Some of the politicians seeking public favor proved that in recent elections.

There is a tendency sometimes to hear the dissidents, to view the demonstrators, to see the welfare rolls and think: "This must be America."

But it isn't. America, of course, is not monolithic. But the real nation is composed of millions who form a steady and firm body of people who trust in God, who love their country, who work for a living, who help other people, who are not examples of perfection or of unerring rightness, but are a stable body and rudder of a great nation.

To a surprising degree, the astronauts of Apollo 17, Gene Cernan, Ron Evans and Jack Schmitt, exemplified that sound "middle America" when they appeared in Chattanooga yesterday in an outstanding Engineers Week program.

Chattanoogaans were clearly impressed by them. But if the astronauts were at all impressed with themselves, they didn't show it. They were men who had been to the moon, but were quite down to earth.

They indicated their reverence for God with no self-consciousness. They did not pointedly "wave the flag," but in repeated references to their pride in being Americans and as Ron Evans said, seeing the flag and "United States of America" on the side of the space capsule after his walk halfway home from the moon, indicated their real and solid patriotism. Gene Cernan, like most other fathers, mentioned his nine-year-old little girl repeatedly, thinking about her and her future in our land more than about the tremendous thing he had done. And Jack Schmitt, the geologist, talked with humor

about rocks and recalled the great history of our people, of which he was reminded by Missionary Ridge and Lookout Mountain.

If they had made a great oration, if they had announced a scientific breakthrough, if they had displayed publicly the personal greatness that surely is a part of each of them, these astronauts could not have been more impressive than they were—displaying the qualities that make up the backbone of America.

Chattanoogaans were impressed with Gene Cernan, Ron Evans and Jack Schmitt for what they have done—and for what they are. Anyone wanting to know the secret of America's greatness may find a solid clue in them and in this. Many people do not understand America, but it is understandable if we view the qualities that really count and are abundantly present in so many Americans, whether great like these three men, or small like most of us.

FERTILIZER INDUSTRY HONORS TVA CHEMIST

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Travis P. Hignett, Director of the Division of Chemical Development at the Tennessee Valley Authority National Fertilizer Development Center, Muscle Shoals, Ala., has been honored as making the most outstanding contribution to the liquid fertilizer industry for the past year.

Mr. Hignett, who lives at 704 Wilson Dam Circle, Muscle Shoals, has been an outstanding employee of the TVA's chemical operation for more than 30 years. His work has resulted in numerous advances in the field of fertilizer technology and has been a significant factor in the production records which have been possible on American farms.

He was recently honored by the National Fertilizer Solutions Association, and an article about his considerable efforts was printed in the magazine of the association.

I include a copy of the article detailing Mr. Hignett's activities as a part of my remarks at this point:

[From the Fertilizer Solutions, Jan.-Feb. issue]

1972 HONORARY MEMBER AWARD PRESENTED TO TRAVIS HIGNETT

Travis P. Hignett, Director of the Division of Chemical Development at the Tennessee Valley Authority National Fertilizer Development Center, Muscle Shoals, Alabama, was named as the person who has made the most outstanding contribution to the liquid fertilizer industry for 1972. Hignett was presented the Honorary Member Award, sponsored by The National Fertilizer Solutions Association.

The award was presented by John E. Fletcher, sales manager, plan foods, U.S. Borax & Chemical Corporation of New York City, at the annual banquet held in conjunction with the 18th Annual NFSA Convention and Chemical/Equipment Exhibition at the Indiana Exposition Center at Indianapolis. Fletcher was the chairman of the 1972 Honorary Member Award Committee of the NFSA.

The annual award is given to a person usually associated with an agricultural college, government agency or private enterprise which is not eligible for membership in the NFSA. To qualify, the candidate must have made contributions to both state and national associations, to state and national industry and to the liquid fertilizer industry as a whole.

Travis P. Hignett is a native of Iowa, where he still owns a farm, and holds a degree in chemistry from Drake University. He joined the Tennessee Valley Authority in 1938 after working with USDA's Fixed Nitrogen Laboratory and a consulting research firm.

Although schooled as a chemist, his bent and enthusiasm for solving engineering problems helped meet the immediate needs of TVA in its early days. This led to a career as a chemical engineer. From a night shift supervisor in a pilot plant, Hignett advanced to research project leader and in 1947 to chief of the Development Branch. This organization was concerned with bridging the gap between laboratory research and commercial application of new know-how.

In 1962, Hignett was named director of the Division of Chemical Development at the TVA National Fertilizer Development Center. In this role, he is responsible for guiding the work of more than 200 research chemists, engineers and others working to develop new fertilizer products and processes. One of his major challenges is to maintain a balance between projects of immediate usefulness and long-range research.

Hignett's work has embraced a wide range of projects. Many have been concerned with developing improved fluid fertilizer technology. He gave leadership to just about all of the developmental work in the 1950's that led to superphosphoric acid, polyphosphates and suspensions. This work has, of course, tremendously influenced the growth of the fluids industry. He also has been a leader in developing granulation technology.

He has been granted several patents pertaining to fertilizer developments.

Hignett has published extensively. Several of his recent papers have outlined in considerable detail the evolution of technology in fluids and other areas. He also has done major summaries of factors affecting trends in both technology and marketing.

His writings have been presented to most major U.S. organizations concerned with fertilizer technology. He also has addressed several international meetings. Among these are The Fertilizer Society of London (Francis New Memorial Lecture, 1969), International Superphosphate and Compound Manufacturers' Association, and UNIDO's International Fertilizer Symposium.

Hignett is a member of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers, the American Chemical Society, The Fertilizer Society of London, and a director of the Fertilizer Industry Round Table.

Hignett will retire from TVA on June 30, 1973.

IS AN ARMY CAREER STILL WORTHWHILE?

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor has written a clear, concise, and very thoughtful article in the February issue of Army magazine on the continued worth of a career in the Armed Forces for young men in our society. I think it is important reading for all Members of

Congress who are being questioned on this subject at this very time by young men in their districts. I urge all Members of the House to read this article. I am sure we will find ourselves using it on many occasions to advise our constituents.

The article follows:

IS AN ARMY CAREER STILL WORTHWHILE?

(By Gen. Maxwell Taylor)

While reluctant to draw general conclusions from a few cases, I must confess to having detected of late unmistakable indications among some of my young Army friends of lowered morale and sometimes of a disturbing (for me) questioning of the value of a military career. The prime cause, although not the only one, appears to be the popular disesteem into which the armed forces have fallen and the anti-military bias which permeates a large segment of the public. To members of the armed forces, and particularly of the Army, there seems to be an organized campaign of defamation of the military and of the men who wear the uniform. Such treatment is hard to bear for dedicated soldiers proud of their profession who have returned from the dirtiest, most unpleasant and least glorious war in our history, never defeated by the enemy but rarely applauded by the nation which sent them into that war. It is not surprising that a few are wondering whether a military career is still worthwhile.

I would be inclined to view this attitude as a mood which would pass quickly had it resulted from the usual kind of anti-military feeling which in the past has often followed our wars but has shortly disappeared. The war just over is always the most senseless and unjustified of history, to the citizens who have been required to participate in it, and the professional soldier who remains in uniform at war's end becomes the symbol of their recent unhappiness.

At the close of World War II, now often cited as a relatively popular war which enjoyed unified national support, I was not infrequently booed in public because I wore the uniform of the Army "brass" who for the moment it was fashionable to denounce. My contemporaries and I did not enjoy this kind of treatment any more than do today's veterans, but we accepted it with at least a modicum of philosophy in recognition of the fact that anyone who gives his life to the military service must expect some boos as well as plaudits, resigned to being a hero today and a bum tomorrow. Certainly lack of public gratitude never led many of us to reconsider our commitment to a lifetime military career. But the difference now is that the Vietnam veterans have never had their days as heroes. Few can remember a band playing when a Vietnam Johnny has come marching home.

There are other differences, too, in the current vendetta against the military, new factors which I do not believe have existed before. In addition to being the symbol of a particularly unpopular war, the Army is held responsible for drafting unwilling young men and forcing them to fight and sometimes die in an "immoral" war. It is held liable for most of the brutalities and cruelties of that war as it has been portrayed by press and television. The tragedy of My Lai is taken as irrefutable evidence of war criminality deserving the Nuremberg kind of justice meted out to Hitler's lieutenants. Few respected voices have been raised to defend the Army, although it is an institution which ultimately guarantees the preservation of our Constitution and the American system based upon it. If such slander goes unrefuted and leads good men to decide against the worth of an Army career it is national security which suffers the major loss.

Nevertheless, regardless of the justification

for resentment, I would urge my Army friends not to take too seriously the adversities of this bleak period. Like truth crushed to earth, the record of Army achievements in Vietnam will eventually rise and overcome the present animus and, while awaiting this change of public heart, we can do well to review that record to restore confidence in ourselves.

The Army has much to be proud of—let us never forget it. From the time they landed in Vietnam in 1965, Army units provided defense for many of the principal military bases of the country, and no such base was ever lost to the enemy. They contributed mobile strike forces which destroyed major enemy units wherever found and in the many combat actions which ensued never lost a battle. In conjunction with the South Vietnamese, American forces inflicted such losses on the enemy in the prolonged ground campaign that the Viet Cong are no longer a military threat and the North Vietnamese have lost their capability for sustained offensive action.

Army achievements have not been limited to combat. Its technical units are responsible for the construction of the vast logistical system—airfields, posts, highways and telecommunications—which has made possible the projection of American military power throughout this remote, underdeveloped country. As a result of its timely construction in phase with the arrival of American forces, those forces never lacked for the facilities, supplies and equipment needed to perform their tasks. When the war is over, much of the permanent construction, such as the great port at Cam Ranh, will be of inestimable value to the peacetime economy of Vietnam.

In the long run, the Army's most important contribution may have been in advising and training South Vietnamese forces. It has been a long and often discouraging task which involved training our allies to cope with conventional, guerrilla and terrorist warfare, training often conducted in insecure areas exposed to the bullets and bombs of the enemy. But the end product has been the success of Vietnamization and the replacement on the battlefield of American soldiers by South Vietnamese. The armed forces of South Vietnam, now numbering almost a million men, are henceforth a most significant political and military factor in the power balance of Indochina—a source of strength not only in the field but also at the negotiation table.

I mention these achievements not in a boastful spirit but to remind Army men inclined to despondency that they should be of good cheer; their record is a sound basis for pride in the past and confidence in the future. And let us not be timid in speaking up when our service is under attack. At this moment, we need the voices of our friends, particularly those out of uniform. As Edmund Burke said, "When bad men concert good men must associate." Now is a time for an association on the part of friends of the Army.

So much now for ruminations over the past. What are the prospects for the future? For an Army career to have continued importance, there must be a role of continued importance for the Army in national life. While that role may change in many ways in the coming decade, with the many threats to our national values which are to be anticipated, I have no doubt as to its enduring importance.

It has been apparent since World War II that the scope of national security is widening, that it has come to connote far more than the protection of the national values, interests and assets by the armed forces from foreign military threats. These values, as I shall refer to them, have increased in number and are scattered more widely about the world than in times past. They in-

clude intangibles such as principles, alliances, reputation, national unity and national morale. Some are institutional—our Constitution and the government, society and the economic system based upon it. Others are spiritual and intellectual—ideals, leadership, brain power, culture, science and technology. Still others are tangible and material—our wealth, investments, trade, currency and natural resources. All such valuables require protection wherever found; they are the proper objects of concern of an adequate national security.

Apart from the increase in their number, our valuables are exposed to threats in varied forms, many of which do not involve military means or methods. The threats include acts of war in their traditional forms, but also the tactics of cold and irregular war—propaganda, psychological, economic and guerrilla warfare, political subversion and terrorism. Also of late, we have become aware of the dangers arising from social and environmental factors such as excessive population growth, pollution and the despoiling of natural resources. In combination these nonmilitary forces and environmental factors constitute a potentially powerful reinforcement to the internal threat to the American system of which we have become aware in the course of the Vietnam war.

If this evaluation of the expanding scope of our security is reasonably accurate, it strongly suggests a widened role for the Army and the need for Army leaders of broad perspectives who can shape flexible, versatile forces with a ready adaptability to a spectrum of threats extending from nuclear war at one extreme to subversion and environmental plundering on the other. They must learn from the Vietnam conflict without falling into the mistake of preparing to repeat it. A review of its lessons will tax their ingenuity to separate wheat from chaff, abiding truth from transitory appearance. I hope that they will remember that we Americans are a volatile people and that many things which today we insist we will never do again, we will find ourselves repeating tomorrow. I often recall how quickly we put aside the slogan of 1953, "No more Koreas," to accept involvement in South Vietnam in 1954.

Without attempting to forecast the many problems the new Army leadership will confront, I would like to mention a few which seem to me the most pressing.

The first is obvious: the need to restore the pride and confidence of the Army in itself and, in so doing, to regain the national prestige which it has enjoyed in better days. While some of the wounds from which our service is suffering are the doing of others, we ourselves are responsible for not a few, and these should receive our first attention.

The first step would be to purge the Army ruthlessly of marginal people, to enforce a standard of excellence for officers, noncoms and soldiers regardless of the limitation on the final size that such a standard will impose. The major advantage of the all-volunteer Army, as I see it, is the opportunity to eliminate the malcontent and the substandard, and to replace them with people who are, or show promise of becoming, loyal soldiers capable of doing their part in carrying out the increasingly complex Army missions.

The payroll cost of a volunteer force will be so high that we will not be able to afford a large Army; either a shortage of dollars or of volunteers, or of both, will impose a reduction in size below the level which the importance of the Army mission would justify. But I, for one, would accept such a reduction without complaint, feeling like Gideon that a few reliable men are more likely to defeat the Midianites than a horde which included "the fearful and afraid."

There must be quality not only in Army personnel but also in their equipment and in the military environment in which they live

and work. With respect to their environment, I am thinking not primarily of the comforts of the barracks or the variety of stock in the post exchanges but in the quality of life to which a soldier is exposed and the standards by which he learns to live. Army life, in my view, should not be an extension of the civilian life which lies just over the fence of the military reservation, but something quite different which reflects the unique requirements of military life.

I am unalterably opposed to the concept that the Army is merely a segment of American society which wears a uniform but which otherwise should live as nearly as possible as civilians live. That standard is not good enough for the military profession which, like the church, the law and the medical profession, has a special commitment which requires special standards of behavior. Newton D. Baker, President Wilson's secretary of war, in defending the West Point honor system, eloquently expressed the need for military standards different from those accepted in civil life:

"Men may be inexact or even untruthful in ordinary matters and suffer as a consequence only the disesteem of their associates or even the inconveniences of unfavorable litigation. But the inexact or untruthful soldier trifles with the lives of his fellowmen and the honor of his government."

To accept the truth of Secretary Baker's view, one has only to reflect on what the conduct of one platoon leader at My Lai has done to the reputation of the Army and the honor of the United States.

If the Army insists that its men must live differently from their fellow citizens, it should be able to explain why these differences are necessary. A convincing reply must show that the difference is one arising from the special requirements of a profession which must be ever ready to use disciplined violence to oppose an armed enemy in response to the lawful order of the President. Any military habit or custom is defensible if it reinforces that purpose; it is indefensible if it works against it. The purpose is strengthened by those things which improve readiness and effectiveness in combat, create esprit de corps, induce confidence and respect for leaders and comrades, and imbue men with an appreciation of the importance of their mission. It is weakened by these things which undermine discipline and loyalty, alienate officers from their men, create internal cliques and cleavages, and destroy the public's confidence in their armed forces.

How does this philosophy provide guidance as to what traditional Army practice should be preserved and what is "Mickey Mouse" and should be discarded? How much spit and polish is too much?

I must say that I cannot get excited over such current issues as the length of a soldier's hair. The historical record as to the merits of the case affords little guidance. Samson's downfall resulted from lack of hair, Absalom's from too much. Civil War generals who look to us like hippies apparently won battles as readily as their closer-shaved successors of later wars. But I can defend a lot of spit and shine on the basis of the effect of the personal appearance of a soldier on the taxpayers who support our armed forces. No citizen can believe he is getting his money's worth of protection from a soldier whose slovenly appearance shows lack of respect for himself, for his unit and for his service. I agree with that judgment. If this is support for "Mickey Mouse," make the most of it!

Inevitably, the quality of the officer corps establishes the standards of the Army. I have an uneasy feeling that something is missing nowadays in officer-soldier relationships. One hears so much about difficulties of communications between commanders and their men that I must assume the difficulty is real. But one wonders whether there is any

barrier which cannot be overcome by the officer who is deeply and sincerely concerned about the welfare of his men. Such concern cannot be feigned; it must be the real thing.

Is it beside the mark to suggest that, in the present emphasis on advanced academic degrees for officers, there may be a loss of officer interest in such prosaic things as the fit of a soldier's shoes, the health of his family and his need to understand the why of the military orders he receives? I have always admired the code of the old-time cavalry officer which decreed that he must first look after his horse, then after his men, then after himself. I hope that some similar code will survive in this bright, new Army we are contemplating—something that recognizes that an officer's insignia of grade is not a badge of privilege but one of servitude to his men.

If to Army ears all this sounds like sermonizing on the obvious, I offer the excuse of an old officer who loves the Army and owes much to it. There is a permanent quality in the appeal of military life which I wish I could convey to a young generation of Army men who have not yet grown to sense it. At the same time, I would like to strengthen the dedication to Army life of the older men who, as a result of Vietnam, may have come to doubt their profession.

So many of the satisfactions of Army service are beyond the here and now of today's tribulations and disappointments. There is an enduring value in military life which has appealed to men of a special sort throughout the ages. Such men have found the pleasure of association with comrades of a common motivation and life style who seek their rewards not in money but in difficult tasks discharged among congenial spirits in an environment of danger. They have sensed the feeling of growth and expanding capacity which arises from the wide variety of their duties, opportunities and places of assignment. Many have borne the awful responsibility of commanding men in battle and have reaped the compensation of sharing in the camaraderie of arms which unites men of all ranks and backgrounds who have together endured hardships and dangers in a common cause.

These are but some of the lasting values of a soldier's life. Like the ruler, prophet, priest and judge, the soldier represents a primordial social function which must be performed by strong men if civilization is to survive. The function may change in mode but not in essence. To fulfill it will always require many of the best citizens of any nation.

ESTIMATES OF THE COST OF VESTING IN PENSION PLANS: AND COST TO WHOM?

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, for a little over a year now, the Pension Study Task Force of the General Subcommittee on Labor on which I serve has been conducting an extensive inquiry into the many issues related to private pension plans. Among our chief concerns are providing greater protection to participants in these plans and assessing the effects of legislation designed to require vesting, funding, and reinsurance.

As a part of this study, the task force staff at the direction of our subcommittee chairman commissioned Dr. Howard E. Winklevoss, assistant professor of

actuarial science and insurance at the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School to prepare an analysis of the cost of vesting. Dr. Winklevoss' analysis has now been released by the task force in a report entitled "Estimates of the Cost of Vesting in Pension Plans."

Also included in the reports is the letter of transmittal from the staff. Our colleagues, I am confident, will want to examine both the analysis and the staff letter which together illuminate two hazy areas in the highly complex subject of regulating private pension plans.

First, the report furnishes us with a more comprehensive picture than has ever been exposed regarding the estimated cost of adding vesting to private pension plans; and, second, the report appropriately raises the question: Cost to whom?

As with other familiar studies, Dr. Winklevoss' work gives us one measure of the estimated cost of vesting, that of the increased contribution that would be involved if a pension plan takes on any of three vesting standards; but Dr. Winklevoss now adds a new dimension.

Utilizing largely empirical data associated with six pension plans and a computer model he had employed and developed in earlier studies, Dr. Winklevoss was able to simulate the operation of these plans under varying assumptions over a period of 50 years. This simulation process, under which each of the six plan populations changed forms during the projection period, has the effect of extending the results of the research to a much larger number of plans than would have been the case if the six populations were not projected into the future. Thus, this study represents a quantum jump in quality over previous studies and cost analyses.

While there is a hazard in trying to summarize Dr. Winklevoss' detailed and highly technical analysis, there is a companion need to do so. Observing this caveat, we can say that he reached two major conclusions through his research.

For the plans analyzed and the plans thus simulated, he found that the cost of vesting as provided in various legislative proposals when expressed as an increase in contributions ranged from a low of 1 percent to a high of 35 percent. He suggests, however, that a more likely upper limit from the data analyzed would be 15 percent for the 10-year and graded 15-year vesting provisions and 25 percent for the rule of 50 vesting provision.

Dr. Winklevoss also concludes that a 10-year vesting provision is consistently a little more costly than the graded 15-year provision where the benefit is lower; and that the rule of 50 provision would cost about the same for many plans as either the 10- or the graded 15-year provision, but would be more expensive in plans with older average entry ages.

When interpreting these findings, we must bear in mind that the "cost of vesting" as used in Dr. Winklevoss' analysis is limited to the percentage increase in a plan's yearly contribution brought about by the adoption of a fully retroactive vesting provision where the only vesting provision has been for retirement at age

55 with 20 years' service and whether there is no disability benefit. If a plan has disability benefits, the costs would be significantly higher. Importantly also, the results of extending these findings to other plans will differ, depending upon the plan's funding status, average entry age, turnover rates after vesting, and benefit formula—features which vary considerably from plan to plan.

As to the "cost to whom?", neither this nor any other vesting cost analyses that have been done give us specific answers. They cannot because the judgment as to who shall bear the cost—or if the cost is shared, in what proportion—has not been made. The report, however, disperses some of the fog surrounding "cost to whom?" by suggesting probable answers.

These probabilities can best be understood by viewing a pension plan in its simplest form, that is, as an equation. Its two components—contributions and benefits—must be balanced. Expressed another way, the contributions and earnings of a plan must equal the cost of the benefits that are to be paid for the plan to be solvent. In order to devise a funding formula, projections of benefit costs must be made; and the timing and level of the contributions that will be needed to fund the estimated benefits must necessarily be based on assumptions. Obviously, then, the achievement of this balance is directly dependent upon the assumptions used.

If the estimates used are borne out by the turn of actual events or if they prove to be overly conservative, all should go well—the plan should meet its funding schedule. On the other hand, if actual events deviate to any extent from the assumptions, the funding schedule may prove to be inadequate.

As we have learned from the Winklevoss study, liberalized vesting properly fits into the equation as an addition to the benefit side. Logically, then, it demands an offset.

One way it can be absorbed so as to maintain the balance in the equation is to reduce the benefit or the rate of benefit improvements. The cost in this case would become the burden of the employee.

Another way would be to liberalize the assumptions used, which would have the effect of reducing the overall costs of the plan so as to adjust for the increased vesting cost. This method suggests the possibility that the funding schedule may prove to be inadequate.

Alternatively, the contribution level could be increased. If this course is taken in plans financed by employers, the result could translate into higher consumer prices.

No one can predict which of these avenues would be followed by plan sponsors faced with the requirement to improve the vesting benefit. A look at general practices, however, affords a clue.

First, to provide a hedge against the unexpected, actuaries tend to use conservative assumptions. Second, most pension plan sponsors apparently gear pension benefits to the amount they expect to be able to contribute to the plan. In these cases, the plan actuary starts with that amount. Then, using the popu-

lation characteristics of the plan together with various assumptions, the actuary computes the benefits the plan can expect to provide and the funding formula that will be necessary.

If these general patterns are as prevalent as they seem to be, we can anticipate that the cost adjustment will be made either in the assumptions or in benefits. Moreover, because the contribution level appears to be relatively inflexible in the majority of plans, we can more reasonably expect adjustments in benefits.

In any event, there is no doubt vesting entails a cost. These costs relate to some 30 million participants in a minimum of 139,000 employee benefit plans, and these plans come in numerous varieties of shape, size, benefits, and so on. Thus, there is similarly no doubt that the cost to whom as it applies to these many people and these many plans must be addressed as we contemplate establishing minimum vesting standards by law.

I commend the report to my colleagues.

THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO KNOW SHOULD EXTEND TO CFR

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, possibly because the opinionmakers own and control the Nation's right-to-know machinery, we from time to time hear about the invasions on the first amendment and the actions by Government to invade the so-called privacy or privilege of reporters and newsmen.

There has been litigation before the Supreme Court to extend the first amendment through the 14th amendment to state action and there have been bills introduced in Congress to grant news gatherers a guaranteed immunity from revealing their sources of information. Such action is said to be necessary so that the people may know the truth about what is going on in their Government without recrimination against the reporters.

Here in Congress, we have even been criticized because of closed committee hearings because, it is said, this denies the people the right to know what is going on during voting, arguments, and markup.

Unfortunately, the same champions and vehicles in defense of the first amendment freedom do not champion the second amendment freedom. In fact, the first amendment freedom advocates would use their freedom to deny the second amendment freedom and somehow overlook the intended thrust of the first amendment—which was not to protect distortion, overreaction, and impartiality according to the wishes of the owners, but rather the right belongs to the people themselves.

And many Americans may find it strange that with the right-to-know machinery constantly on the attack urging overthrow of our system of government

and our economic methods of doing business, they are strangely silent in any attacks or enlightenment to the public on the true imperialist establishment which is greatly responsible for the many woes in our country today. I refer to the Council on Foreign Relations, the CFR, which has been so sheltered and protected by the right-to-know people that the average American citizen has never even heard of it.

And so, I was greatly impressed last week to see that Life Lines, a patriotic voice of freedom and a newspaper headquartered at 4330 North Central Expressway, Dallas, Tex., used its first amendment freedom to raise the question as to why its fellow newsmen have never used their resources to let the people of our country know the identity of the power structure that has permeated every segment of our society and, for all practical purposes, is dictating the policies of our country. I share the concern of the author, Keith Kathan, as to why our syndicated newspapers are so eager to attack the Military Establishment, conservative organizations, religious groups, and even develop emotional hate images for some movements, but are always silent on telling the people about the Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the Life Lines article, as follows:

[From Life Lines, Feb. 14, 1973]

ON FREEDOM OF THE PRESS—FORM BUT NO SUBSTANCE

(By Keith Kathan)

After quite a hassle with reference books, figures and an informed intuition, I have come to the conclusion that the term Freedom of the Press is almost meaningless.

Freedom of the Press once meant the people's right to know what is going on, which meant the press, and later broadcasting, was supposed to tell them. The Press Freedom commandment is meaningless if the consuming public is not served with most of the facts on most of the important issues. When the public is fed a steady diet of half the story, then say hello to fascism or communism or whatever totalitarianism is coming into its own at the moment.

I think we have the form, or skeleton, of Press Freedom. Form but not substance. I wouldn't dare say that in a Press Club anywhere, because the press, like the wife, is usually the last to know. After two decades in this business I believe there is no substance more impenetrable than the head of a newsman whose profession is being questioned. But let us look at the facts of this profession of mine and ascertain why this is the winter of my professional discontent.

On an average day when the massive weekly newsmagazines are published, liberal dogma is disseminated to at least 60 million adults via TV, magazine and newspaper. Only vague guesses are possible as to the daily dissemination by nonliberal media because there are no conservative-oriented networks and precious few such dailies.

On a monthly basis, leftist periodicals reach at least 2.86 million Americans, while conservative periodicals reach a minimum of 1.47 million. The middle of the road dailies and periodicals contribute to the vacuous assertions of the leftist media because both fall the test of informing as to what is going on. More on that later.

A check through two source books (see footnote, column 1 inside) reveals that 26 major conservative and anti-Communist periodicals have a circulation of 1.47 million, compared to 2.86 million for leftist periodicals, a ratio of 1 to 2 (For what it is worth,

my calculator tape for all these figures is five feet long).

The leftist periodicals come in various shades and hefty amounts: Radical Left, 19; Marxist and Socialist Left, 29; Underground, 27; Anarchist, 3; Liberal, 30; Civil Liberties, 10 (a euphemism for Off-the-Precipice Leftist); Peace, 22; and Racial and Ethnic Pride, 11—the latter two groups which are admittedly militant Left. The circulation in the left spectrum of periodicals, 2.86 million, has been understated to err on the side of reality.

It would be unreasonable to leave out, as we shall see but already know, the leftist newspapers which parade under the purloined label of "moderate." They are directed by members of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) which runs the US government (a proven fact) with a socialist bias. These left-wing dailies and weekly magazines have a circulation of 10.19 million. They are *Newsweek*, *Time*, *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *Houston Post*, *Minneapolis Star* and *Des Moines Register* and *Tribune*. The *Los Angeles Times*, run by Franklin D. Murphy, has been added in, perhaps unfairly. Mr. Murphy was dropped from the CFR list two years back for reasons unknown to most; still, it is a known fact that any CFR member who wants to remain a member and is important enough can remain without recorded membership status. We frankly don't know where to put *US News & World Report*, it seems so fairer than *Time* and *Newsweek*, but why was editor David Lawrence a CFR member up to 1969? This brings up another consideration: we have been informed by those associated with the CFR that many of its members are very nice people, hardly conspiratorial types, that we are all wet, in fact consumed by paranoia and fear. Perhaps the CFR is somewhat like my Cub Scout Pack: some of the parents are in it to run it for the good of the Cubs; some are in because they were pressured; some are in it to sell the other parents real estate, and others, well, to be in the Pack is right and prestigious! Some drop out because of any one of a hundred reasons.

To summarize, the American people are not being told what is going on because we the people who would tell you are termed irresponsible by what must logically be assumed an overwhelming radical media force. Moderate communication is overkilled by a ratio somewhere between ten to twenty-to-one. I don't write this to make anyone feel good. I write it to tell you America's mind is being raped by Rasputin. Proof to come.

What are we getting with this overkill?

Deficit spending is enlightened economics. Amnesty for draftdodgers isn't radical and marijuana isn't harmless because bureaucrats and an expert on Guinean aborigines told us so. The UN is a humanitarian organization and we know so because corrupt Chiang Kai-shek was booted out. The Pentagon "sells" itself and isn't that an aberration of militarism? Cops kill minority group folk because there is something evil in the makeup of the cop mentality. Loyalty oaths are reprehensible exercises which disallow personal political situation ethics. Busing is good because it mixes, and the National Council of Churches is a religious organization. George Orwell poetically explained these Marxist assertions in *Animal Farm* when he made his sheep say: "Four legs good. Two legs bad."

So, on any given day according to an informed source in television broadcasting, 40 to 50 million people are reached by the network news shows and subjected to the nihilism of nattering nabob newsmen. He says the 40- to 50 million is "probably a low figure." Even more millions are subjected to the leftist doctrines in documentaries on Red China, Cuba, gun control and "right-wing extremists" etc.

This isn't Freedom of the Press, it is pure Pravdaism; the freedom of leftist totalitarianism to bomb us all back to the cave with

Communist caveman ideology that always results in across-the-board rationing, hunger, food riots and abolition of all the rights we once had and have less of every day.

Why do they do it? They want to run everything, your life and thoughts, because somehow if they do so this will be a "peaceful" One World Socialist Government. They believe socialism is the wave of the future. The why has also been proved.

The full story is pieced together in three books, *Fabian Freeway*, *The Naked Capitalist* and *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*. The CFR members who dominate the book publishing industry did not publish these books. One told Rose Martin who wanted him to publish *Fabian Freeway*: "So what's wrong with socialism?"

The story begins with the English dandies in the Fabian Society of London, and thickens with its ties to the Rhodes-Milner Secret Society. Back in the 1890s, the Fabians decided the world should become socialist. They formed groups, intellectualized themselves into a frenzy, sent socialists to America to lecture at Harvard, thus importing socialist ideology to the United States in the form of what was to become the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA)—which recruited Eleanor Roosevelt, Reinhold Niebuhr, Walter Reuther, Ramsey Clark, John Kenneth Galbraith and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., among many others. But Cronkite never tells his audience Schlesinger is a socialist when quoting him several times a year.

The Rhodes-Milner Secret Society had a vision of an English-speaking federation to rule all habitable portions of the world. People like Cecil Rhodes, Alfred Milner, Lord Rothschild and Arnold Toynbee would run things from the top. But matters went awry, or became less nobly directed or were sinister to begin with. Upon the dashed hopes of American entry into the League of Nations, and under the tutelage of Fabian Socialist and Texan, Col. E. M. House, the Council on Foreign Relations and its English counterpart, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, were formed in Paris by gentlemen's agreement. James Shotwell and Arnold Toynbee, both members of the Rhodes-Milner Secret Society, were there as most agreeable gentlemen. What was really being formed was a London-Wall Street-Paris power combine composed of socialists and moneybags. I suppose the intent was to gain absolute power, but whatever that intent, it has become a One World Socialist Government precept. Guess who were members of both the ADA and the CFR, to cite examples? Reinhold Niebuhr, of Union Theological Seminary, a not so angelic angel factory; Ramsey Clark and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. The latter two became attorney general and presidential advisor in the Johnson and Kennedy administrations.

Well, what hasn't the CFR news media reported? Wouldn't it be a colossal scoop to report that CFR members have been helping Russia since the CFR was born, that the Rhodes-Milner group did so probably before American conspirators even got Trotsky shipped off to Russia and German conspirators slipped Lenin to Russia in a sealed box car? Very scoopish, too, to reveal that the CFR has its members in every top spot in the U.S. government (list in *Life Lines* #65, 1972). Why didn't the CFR newsmen reveal that the U.N. Association is heavily interlocked with the CFR (list in *Life Lines* #20, 1972)?

Ah, the sense of achievement in revealing Henry Kissinger as a CFR member as was his President and as is the great grandson of Jacob Schiff who gave the Bolsheviks \$20 million for the Communist Revolution. To dig and to reveal that Leon Trotsky admitted in his autobiography, *My Life*, that he got revolutionary rubles from an English gent, who was a cinch to have been Milner himself who was in Russia at the time.

Curious about Trotsky getting money from

that English bloke while Lenin was getting some from Schiff. Max Warburg, a German banker, gave the revolution much cash, while brothers Paul and Felix were marrying into the American half of the London-Wall Street banking axis. Felix married Jake Schiff's daughter. The banking crowd was immeasurably strengthened when the Rockefeller Chase Bank was merged with the Warburg banking interests to become the Chase-Manhattan, to this day a peak of CFR power. Paul went on to engineer in secrecy the Federal Reserve System the darndest interest-bearing hoax ever perpetrated against the taxpayer.

And who once ran Radio Corp. of America (parent of NBC) but CFR member David Sarnoff, the son of a Russian radio man. Heading RCA now is Harvard-educated Robert W. Sarnoff, Vice-President of the Boy Scouts of America. He is not listed as a CFR member, but the faith has been kept and the torch carried. He married a Warburg in 1950.

Money, government and news. Quite a trio of vehicles to power. Meanwhile, we are being very nice again, to Russia. And CFR member, er Mogul, Nelson Rockefeller did lend CFR member Henry Kissinger to ex-CFR member Nixon to perform whatever good and valuable services might be rendered. You wonder. Will we really shell out our tax dollars to rebuild North Vietnam?

There is much to be told. But what we are told is aired or printed by the mass-circulation, mass-audience CFR publications and networks. Many CFR members are proud of their membership, so why don't the newsmen in the CFR publicly tell us who they are? (list, *Life Lines* No. 96, 1972).

On and on it goes. We bombed Russian trucks in Vietnam, yet our CFR businessmen are right now building the biggest truck factory in the world in Russia. Newsmen fairly love to sniff out incongruities like that one. Why hasn't the *Times* or *Cronkite* or *Chancellor*? We have traded with Russia since 1918, the result being one billion persons enslaved, and now watch the freighters filled with American wheat steam to Russia. All the old mistakes being repeated. The newsmen who don't tell these stories or point out the paradoxes aren't lousy newsmen. They're worse. They are kept.

There is much being said these days about Freedom of the Press, like the other day in Dallas when the national journalism fraternity, Sigma Delta Chi, came to Dallas. One speaker groaned about the threat to press freedom posed by reporters being "enjoined, subpoenaed, charged and jailed." The complaint is legitimate, but late.

The news media lost freedom when it transmitted character assassination of conservative journals, almost as though on cue from Walter Reuther and various Communist Party Congresses. Press freedom began to die when the media failed to investigate socialist capture of education and textbook publishing.

Anti-Communist journals saw it coming when Walter Reuther sent his 1961 "Memorandum" to Atty. Gen. Robert Kennedy demanding that anti-Communists be silenced.

Soon after, some congressmen made noises sounding like the memo. In 1962, IRS agents appeared in our offices followed by postal inspectors who pulled out Regulation ZOT-4 (q) and, presto, cut our circulation by 33%. Meanwhile CFR and ADA members formed the National Council for Civic Responsibility as a smear organization (Frank Altschul, CFR veep, and Harper & Row's Cass Canfield were two of many NCCR-CFR members).

The smear technique was supplemented by a Reuther group called Group Research, and the Institute for American Democracy. IAD members who played dual roles were members of the CFR. The vilification continued, as Billy James Hargis and Carl McIntyre soon found out. But conservatism wasn't the only sin: the courageous Gov-

ernment Exchange Weekly was struck by political and economic sabotage and forced out of business when it reported too much about a sex and spy scandal in Washington, D.C.

I hope newsmen who can do the job will fight back to restore press freedom to something more than a monopolist's idea that some journalists are more free than others. But I fear that those who are up to the task are ill equipped, for most of them never heard of the NCCR, the IAD or the CFR. I know some local newsmen who believe the ADA is a milk lobby and that ACLU is a defender of everyone's rights, not a socialist group which lent some of its members to IAD to smear nonliberal journals. Sadly, if ignorance weren't enough, there is the actual lie or something close to it: when the National Council of Churches convened in Dallas about the same time Sigma Delta Chi did, a *Dallas News* reporter referred to LeRoi Jones (a real live anticapitalist and black revolutionary) as a "black separatist." Fundamentalist preacher and conservative Carl McIntyre was tossed off with the label "fundamentalist right-wing extremist." Nobody is perfect, but the public deserves something better than liberal garbage.

Freedom of the Press was a noble reality until the press failed the test of competition, inquiry, and incredulity. It began to die when it refused to recognize the threat to its very existence posed by those who pretended to be allies, when it became hard-headed and listened only to the socialist poseurs. It failed to cover the greatest ongoing stories of the 20th Century, the slow poisoning of the Constitution, which commanded press freedom, and the torture-death of our Constitutional Republic.

IF I WERE PRESIDENT

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest people I have had the privilege of meeting during my 21 years as a Member of Congress is a former pastor of Saint Anthony's Catholic Church in Falls Church, Va., Rev. Richard P. Baird. I have always considered Father Baird a very close and dear friend and since he left Saint Anthony's, he has communicated with me from time to time from other sections of the country. I am always glad to hear from him and receive his counsel, advice, and suggestions. He is now at Saint Bartholomew Church in Hollywood, Fla.

In his recent communication, he has asked me to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by Jim Bishop, a reporter for the *Miami Herald*. While I do not concur with everything in the article, I do find it interesting and thought provoking and I am delighted to comply with Father Baird's request:

IF I WERE PRESIDENT

(By Jim Bishop)

If I were president, all usable, movable U.S. equipment in Vietnam would be shipped home. I would start a campaign to clean up America and would use all able-bodied unemployed and all healthy persons living on relief checks—no work, no pay. All persons running for public office would have to pass an intelligence test first.

If I were president I would chop oil-depreciation allowances to 10 per cent. Appoint 10 assistants to the president to be-

come watchdogs over all the federal agencies. Cancel the license of any hospital that refused to treat an emergency case.

I would keep small, slow private planes out of high-speed jet terminals. Because we are the most powerful nation in the world, I would consider it against American interests to sign treaties of alliance with anyone. Regard automobile traffic as interstate and ask Congress to pass a uniform traffic law applicable to all states, cities and towns.

I would have all congressmen, cabinet members, bureau and department heads, and the president of the United States give an annual account of all personal assets. Abolish the system of State Insurance Commissioners and forbid companies to lend money to land developers in cases where the insurance company demands a piece of the action.

I would impose stiff wage and price controls to keep the U.S. from pricing itself out of all markets. Remove the price-readjustment clause from all government contracts. Admit that we did not attain "peace with honor," but lost 45,997 of our youth and \$140 billion dollars in an Oriental sink.

I would order bar associations to be responsive to the public welfare by proper policing of courts and lawyers or submit to government control. Pass an act protecting the only Americans not safeguarded in health and welfare—infants from birth to age six.

I would stop exporting our food, if selling wheat to the Soviet Union at below cost causes the domestic price to rise. Hold a decisive federal probe of all food brokers—the middle men who rob the farmer and hold out for higher markups from food markets. Force Congress to reveal its own budget in detail—something it has never done. Pay policemen a proper wage so they will have no reason to take gifts from malefactors. Enact a law shoring up freedom of the press or be prepared to blow a kiss to Big Brother.

I would appoint a court of inquiry with powers to redress wrongs against the American Indians. Put the American president on television once a month for an informal report to the nation. Cancel liquor licenses in country clubs where certain ethnic groups are not welcome. Eliminate tax loopholes for millionaires who pay nothing. Wipe out the hypocritical 30 days of mourning on the death of an ex-president—cut it to one day of prayer, no holidays. Not spend one cent to rebuild North Vietnam.

I would learn to live with poverty and Communism, two conditions that will be part of our world for a long time. Parole felons guilty of nonviolent crimes for long periods. Pass out 20-year sentences, with no parole, to perpetrators of crimes of violence and drug pushers.

I would appoint an assistant secretary of state for trade as America's salesman to the world. Have both houses of Congress consider appointing committees of minority opposition as watchdogs on the administration. Request all members of the United Nations to sign an agreement, suggested by the Airline Pilots Association, to discontinue traffic into countries that give sanctuary to sky-jackers.

I would stop glorifying and bargaining with militant blacks who do not represent the 23 million law-abiding Negroes in this country. Extend to all law-enforcement agencies equal rights with the culprits they apprehend.

I would arrange a universal maritime sovereignty law under which all waters beyond 12 miles from shore are considered to be international. Stop sending money to foreign nations. Considering the range and power of nuclear missiles, I would take the United States out of NATO and bring the troops home. Reopen the Suez Canal with international rights. Continue membership in the United Nations, but not expect it to prevent war. Set up a science exchange pro-

gram so that research for the betterment of mankind is not duplicated in several countries at the same time.

I would adopt the slogan of all other enlightened nations—"Us first."

AIRCRAFT NOISE CONTROL

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, a greater and greater number of American citizens each year have become concerned with the issue of aircraft noise pollution. This problem naturally affects most directly those individuals who reside in the vicinity of large urban airports. My own home in the Bronx section of New York is subject to the constant din caused by planes departing from and arriving at New York's Kennedy and La Guardia Airports. The noise level becomes particularly intolerable at night.

I would like to submit into the RECORD the results of a worldwide survey of restrictions on nighttime operations at commercial airports. My colleagues will note that major metropolitan areas around the world are imposing partial or total curfews on nighttime air traffic

in an attempt to cut down on the problem of noise pollution. The obvious question is: Why has America lagged behind?

Following are the survey results and cover letter from the Town-Village Aircraft Safety and Noise Abatement Committee of Lawrence, N.Y.:

WORLDWIDE AIRPORT NIGHTTIME RESTRICTIONS

Recently we sent out questionnaires to 188 commercial airports in 85 countries. These forms were kept simple and to the point, asking only the following 6 questions:

1. Are there any restrictions of operations, either arrivals or departures, at your airport during the night hours?
2. If any restrictions exist please indicate specific restriction.
3. Are there any other restrictions such as on run-up or warm-up of engines at night?
4. If so, please specify.
5. What are the regular airport operation hours?
6. If other than 24 hours a day, please explain.

Of the 188 airports to which this form was addressed, 99 or 52.66% replied. This is considered an excellent return for any type of a mail survey and is a good indication of the interest in this subject. No forms were addressed to any U.S.A. airports.

There were six returns which stated the evening traffic was insufficient to create a problem. These were filed in the category of "no restrictions".

62.63% of the returns advised of some form of restriction enforced because of noise problems. 77.42% of the restrictions were on plane movements. These ranged all the

way from enforced arrivals or departures in a specific direction to a complete closing-up of the airport.

42.42% of the returns advised of restrictions on run-ups or warm-ups. However, if the logical step be taken of adding to this number the airports completely closed at night the number would be over the 50% mark. These restrictions were from run-ups in specified areas of airport with aircraft heading a particular direction, to warm-ups at only 25% power, for a specified short time, etc., and in almost every case only after receiving special permission. Quite a number of the airports require hoods or mufflers be used during run-ups.

Of those airports not enforcing nighttime restrictions, many advised their traffic volume and the location of the airport was such as to reduce the noise problem to a tolerable level to the public.

Although we did not send any questionnaire forms to the U.S.A. airports, for obvious reason, we did send them to Canadian airports. This was done particularly in view of the claim that scheduling of overseas flights would be impracticable. Toronto International Airport is closed to jet traffic from 2300 to 0700 and Montreal International Airport is closed to jet traffic from 2400 to 0700.

There is no question, after reading over the replies, as to jet aircraft noise being a considerable problem worldwide, particularly at night. It is encouraging to note that approximately half of all the foreign commercial airports are taking some form of action to bring about an abatement, particularly in the evening hours, of this jet aircraft noise pollution.

A WORLDWIDE SURVEY OF RESTRICTIONS ON NIGHTTIME OPERATIONS AT COMMERCIAL AIRPORTS

Airport	Restrictions or curfew on aircraft movements	Restrictions on engine run-ups or warmup	Airport	Restrictions or curfew on aircraft movements	Restrictions on engine run-ups or warmup
Jan Smuts Airport, Johannesburg, Republic of South Africa	×	×	Dusseldorf Airport, Dusseldorf, Germany	×	×
Princess Beatrix Airport, Aruba, N.A.	×	×	Hamburg Airport, Hamburg, Germany	×	×
Adelaide Airport, Adelaide, Australia	×	×	Munich Airport, Munich, Germany	×	×
Archerfield Aerodrome, Queensland, Australia	×	×	Nuremberg Airport, Nuremberg, Germany	×	×
Darwin Airport, Darwin, Australia	×	×	Stuttgart Airport, Stuttgart, Germany	×	×
Essendon Airport, North Essendon, Australia	×	×	Timehri International, Damerara, Guyana	×	×
Perth Airport, Perth, West Australia	×	×	Francois Duvalier Airport, Port au Prince, Haiti	×	×
Kingsford Smith Airport, Sydney, Australia	×	×	Sangster International, Montego Bay, Jamaica	×	×
Brussels Airport, Brussels, Belgium	×	×	Osaka International, Osaka, Japan	×	×
Rio De Janeiro/Galeao Airport, Brazil	×	×	Tokyo Airport, Tokyo, Japan	×	×
Sao Paulo Airport, Congonhas, Brazil	×	×	Nairobi Airport, Nairobi, Kenya	×	×
Montreal International, Dorval, Quebec	×	×	Kimpo International, Seoul, Korea	×	×
Toronto International, Toronto, Ontario	×	×	Schiphol Airport, Amsterdam, Netherlands	×	×
Winnipeg International, Winnipeg, Manitoba	×	×	Rotterdam Airport, Rotterdam, Netherlands	×	×
Hong Kong International, Kowloon, Hong Kong	×	×	Christchurch International, Christchurch, New Zealand	×	×
Eldorado Airport, Bogota, Colombia	×	×	Kristiansand Airport, Kjevik, Norway	×	×
Juan Santamaria International, San Jose, Costa Rica	×	×	Oslo Airport, Oslo, Norway	×	×
Copenhagen International, Kastrup, Denmark	×	×	Stavanger Airport, Sola, Norway	×	×
Ilopango International, Ilopango, El Salvador	×	×	Karachi Airport, Karachi, Pakistan	×	×
Birmingham Airport, Sheldon, Birmingham, England	×	×	Jorge Chaves Airport, Lima, Peru	×	×
Heathrow International, London, England	×	×	Lisbon Airport, Lisbon, Portugal	×	×
Luton Airport, Luton, England	×	×	Edinburgh Airport, Edinburgh, Scotland	×	×
Manchester Airport, Manchester, England	×	×	Prestwick Airport, Prestwick, Scotland	×	×
Haile Selassie International, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	×	×	Malmö-Bulltofta Airport, Malmö, Sweden	×	×
Helsinki International, Helsinki, Finland	×	×	Basle-Mulhouse Airport, Basle, Switzerland	×	×
Nice-Cote D'Azur Airport, Nice, France	×	×	Berne Airport, Berne, Switzerland	×	×
Orly Airport, Paris, France	×	×	Cointrin Airport, Geneva, Switzerland	×	×
Lebourget Airport, Paris, France	×	×	Zurich Airport, Zurich, Switzerland	×	×
Tempelhof Airport, Berlin, Germany	×	×	Bangkok Airport, Bangkok, Thailand	×	×
Koln-Bonn Airport, Bonn, Germany	×	×	Coolidge International, Coolidge, Antigua	×	×
Bremen Airport, Bremen, Germany	×	×	Seawell International, St. Michael, Barbados, West Indies	×	×

A NEW APPROACH TO AIRLINE HIJACKING

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, this country has wrestled with the problem of airline hijacking for a number of years now. It has proven difficult to find a way to stop hijacking and yet not infringe upon the freedom or safety of other passengers. Guards and searchers

have only been partially successful in that they discourage the lone criminal or lunatic. A fanatical and organized group, however, can still overpower the guards and be well received in various foreign countries.

It is obvious that the problem must be approached in new ways and it is for this reason that I have joined in the introduction of H.R. 1859, the Antihijacking Act of 1973.

This bill would authorize the President to halt air service by foreign or domestic airlines between the United States and any foreign nation which harbors

airplane terrorists. In addition, air service would also be suspended with foreign countries continuing to maintain air connections with nations protecting accused skyjackers.

H.R. 1859 would also make it illegal for an airplane to fly passengers unless all passengers and baggage boarding the plane have been inspected by a metal detection device capable of detecting all metals. This provision would complete the job of inspection already begun at all our air terminals.

Regular air service has bound the world together into a community of nations. Any nation, however, which aids and en-

courages air terrorists has forfeited its right to be a member of this world community. This bill would penalize these nations by cutting air commerce to those who would protect the international airline hijacker.

H.R. 1859 warrants the serious attention of my colleagues, and I urge that it be considered on its merits and enacted into law.

THE AMNESTY ISSUE

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, what of the tens of thousands of young Americans who, for one expressed reason or another, fled the country, or went into hiding within its precincts, to dodge what their Government determined to be their military duty during the Indochina war?

This question now has moved to the forefront of our great domestic social concerns in consequence of the peace agreement. And it requires a great deal of thought in Congress and soul-searching throughout the nation.

Should these young men be granted amnesty—that is, be invited home and pardoned and thus be allowed to regain the full privileges of the citizenship whose responsibilities were fulfilled so bravely by those who did serve in Vietnam? Already the erstwhile peace groups are making this demand on the premise that draft dodging was merely a moral response to what the dodgers considered an immoral war.

But motives aside, the Nation does for the first time in its history face the necessity of deciding whether its laws pertaining to a citizen's duties can be violated with impunity by large numbers on the basis of personal views. I fear for our future if we allow this rule to become established.

I am aware of the incidents in which amnesty was granted in the past, but most of these cases were in the early days of the Republic or in the aftermath of the Civil War—both times of widespread confusion over loyalty. Never before, however, has the Nation's call to military service been so grossly and arrogantly disregarded.

The draft dodgers must be dealt with and with fairness and the customary compassion of our society. My judgment would be that they be allowed to come home only on condition that they serve at minimal pay in jobs of national service. And their service must be for a prescribed period and their duties made tough enough that their restoration to citizenship will be merited beyond question.

Similar proposals have been made by others in Congress and I shall support any legislation offered along this line, although I do feel that the President constitutionally bears the authority to grant pardons and amnesties under the provision which states: "President . . . shall have Power to grant Reprieves and

Pardons for Offenses against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment." The President, I am certain, nevertheless would welcome expressions of congressional will in the present amnesty issue.

There is much to be done across America among the poor, in the inner cities, in cleaning up the forests and the countryside, in helping the aged—in countless other ways in which manpower is needed. The draft dodgers can be put to work to earn back their rights and also the respect of the vast majority of their countrymen.

THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, recently the members of the Lithuanian-American community marked the 55th anniversary of the establishment of independence in their homeland—an independence which has since been wrenched away from them by the imperialism of the Soviet Union.

The Lithuanian Americans of the Metropolitan Detroit area, at their recent commemoration of this important national holiday, adopted the following resolution which I would like to share with my colleagues:

RESOLUTION

We, the Lithuanians of Metropolitan Detroit, gathered on February 18, 1973, to commemorate the 55th anniversary since the restoration of Lithuania's independence.

Recalling that:

1. The sovereignty and independence of the Lithuanian state, restored by the act of the Lithuanian Council on February 16th, 1918, won and protected by the blood sacrifice of the Lithuanian people during 1918-1920, and recognized by the international community was destroyed by the Soviet Union in 1940 by military occupation and incorporation into the U.S.S.R.

2. The Lithuanian people continued the unequal struggle for freedom from 1944 to 1952, when large Soviet military and police forces finally managed to extinguish armed resistance.

3. The Soviet Russian occupying power has perpetuated acts of genocide in Lithuania, resulting in the deportation to Siberia and other remote areas, and in the physical extermination of about one million Lithuanians, which constitutes one-third of the nation.

4. The freedom fight of the Lithuanian nation has now acquired different forms, which have received worldwide attention. Among the recent outstanding acts of resistance are these:

(a) The defiant courtroom speech of the sailor Simas Kudirka, following his unsuccessful attempt to escape to the free world on November 23, 1970, and his condemnation in Vilnius, in May, 1971, to ten years of especially forced labor;

(b) The self-immolation of Romas Kalanta, a young student and worker, in a public park in Kaunas on May 14, 1972, of V. Stonys on May 18, 1972, and K. Andriuskevicius on June 4, 1972—actions designed to symbolize the Lithuanian people's protest against the occupying power, and their demand for freedom.

(c) The petition addressed at the juncture of 1971-1972 to the First Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, Leonid Brezhnev, and to the Secretary General of the United Nations, Kurt Waldheim, by 17,000 Lithuanian religious believers who risked their personal freedom in protesting against the denial of religious freedom in Soviet-occupied Lithuania.

We resolve:

1. To demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military forces and administrative apparatus from Lithuania and allow the Lithuanian people to govern themselves.

2. To request the President of the United States of America to instruct his delegation at the Conference on European Security and Cooperation in Helsinki that it demand the restoration of the sovereignty and of the independence of Lithuania.

3. To ask Senators and Congressman of the United States for their support of the above requests.

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE LAWRENCE J. HOGAN TO THE AMERICAN HUNGARIAN FEDERATION

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, on January 13 and 14, 1973 the American Hungarian Federation and other national and local American Hungarian organizations of the Greater Washington area held a 2-day program commemorating the 150th anniversary of the birth of the great Hungarian poet, Alexander Petöfi.

My distinguished colleague, the Honorable LAWRENCE J. HOGAN gave the opening address at the English-language program held at the auditorium of Trinity College. At this point I would like to insert into the RECORD a copy of Mr. HOGAN's remarks:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

Ladies and Gentlemen: American Hungarians as well as Hungarians in many parts of the world where they have a chance to express their opinion freely, designated the year of 1973 as "Petöfi Memorial Year." Representative organizations of Americans of Hungarian descent resolved to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the birth, on January 1, 1823, of Alexander Petöfi, their greatest lyric poet of the golden age of Hungarian literature in the 19th century. These celebrations turn the searchlight upon the deeds and ideas of a true man and true poet, a patriot of impeccable integrity and a shining star for centuries to come.

Petöfi came from humble beginnings. The son of a butcher and innkeeper who had married a peasant woman, he proved his talents in his early childhood, and deserved his father's trust who sent him to high school to further his education. While his family moved from one small town to the other in the area south of Budapest, the young boy excelled in his studies, began to write poetry, executed fine drawings and developed an almost insatiable hunger for knowledge. However, in a new school, he experienced a shock—caused by a teacher who attempted to turn him against his beloved Hungarian nation—left the school and volunteered for military service. Luckily, a good-natured army doctor took advantage of a lung condition and managed to get his release from further rigors of the Austrian

army drill, hardships that might have ended the life of the talented youth. Petőfi, a veteran of two years of army service at nineteen, followed the advice of his friends, left the theatrical group he had been associated with for a short time, and finished his high school studies. Then, being without any means, and since his father, too, was just going through a period of financial difficulties, the young man took to the road, went to Pozsony, the seat of the Hungarian Diet, and participated in the editing of the *Diet News* (Országgyűlési Tudósítások), an informational paper launched several years by Hungary's great political leader, Louis Kossuth.

By this time, albeit a very young man of 19 years, Petőfi's name was well known in Hungary's literary circles, for he had published a few poems in the leading literary journal, *Athenaeum*. His reputation brought him a few contracts for translation of some popular foreign novels, and he soon found himself established as assistant editor of one of Hungary's leading ladies' journals. Beginning with 1844 he started publishing his own works, and, by 1847, he found a publisher for the impressive volume of his *Collected Poems*, which became an instant success.

Times passed more rapidly now than ever before. Events in the multinational political arena of Europe changed the international as well as the domestic political climate of Hungary. Petőfi, just married, felt the tensions around himself, and these opened the bright windows of his great spirit to the new currents of intellectual and political thought. He published a flow of poetry, which reflected joy and grief, love and fury, displayed feelings of unprecedented depth and affirmed uncompromising standards on private and public issues. He even started to translate Shakespeare's works into Hungarian. His name began ringing from one end of his country to the other.

The year of 1848, when groups of educated youth belonging to the old European society began to sound demands for constitutional and democratic reforms. Petőfi threw himself headlong into the fast currents of Hungary's political life—resurrected by Count Stephen Széchenyi two decades earlier—and urged, in prose and poetry, the implementation of reforms as well as the recognition of Hungary's historical rights to national unity, liberty and equality. His *National Song*, which captured the souls and minds of the citizenry in Hungary's capital city on March 15, 1848, became the battle song of the subsequent war of independence which the Hungarians, under Kossuth's leadership, fought against the armies of the Emperors of Austria and Russia. Later, even up to the present time it became an annually featured presentation number in the programs of the March 15 celebrations held by Hungarians all over the world, including this country of ours. The *National Song* rekindled the flames of love for liberty and independence in the hearts of many audiences. This poem, with its call to the nation: "Magyars rise, your country calls you"—fulfills a mission toward each generation of Hungarians as it did in 1956, when, unable to carry on a shameful, undignified life under the Stalinist boots of Hungary's rulers, the students of Budapest marched to the statue of their great poet and chanted the refrain of his *National Song*:

By the God of every Magyar
Do we swear,
Do we swear the tyrant's handcuffs
Not to bear!

Considering his brief life span of twenty-six years (Petőfi died at Segesvár, Transylvania, from the pike of a Czarist cavalry man on July 31, 1849) his mastery of lyric and epic poetry, his understanding of political and social principles, his maturity and insight in all matters of human, national and

international relations, reveal the genius he has been recognized for ever since the first English translations began to appear in the press. We, of the Greater Washington area, should be proud of the fact that the first American translations of Petőfi's poems appeared in some of the Spring 1852 issues of *The National Era*, a Washington paper. The creator of these versions of the Petőfi poems, Grace Greenwood, was helped by the prose translations of Colonel László Berzenczey, formerly with Louis Kossuth's army, who followed his leader into the exile and accompanied him on his memorable journey to this country in 1851.

Petőfi's ideals and principles, as well as the refined qualities of his poems; many of which became folk songs, caused some of his foreign analysts to see in him some Hungarian Burns, Shelley, Wordsworth or Heine. But, being no imitator himself, he could not be fitted into any categories. The magic of this Hungarian genius inspired men to write lyrics unknown before the Hungarians themselves, and the way he portrayed the types of his nation, including the humblest among them, remains the best key to understanding nineteenth century Hungary.

The resolution by the American Hungarian Federation and other Hungarian organizations in this country and other parts of the world to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the birth of this great Hungarian poet was well advised. This afternoon's program marks the launching of the commemorative programs for the Petőfi Memorial Year; among the patrons appear twenty-two other members of the United States Congress who join me in our wish that Hungarians never leave the path of their great forebears, the grand generation of Kossuth and Petőfi!

FEMALE ACADEMY OF SACRED HEART

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on September 5, 1872, the Female Academy of the Sacred Heart was founded in St. Louis with an enrollment of 80 boarding students and a free school for 70 underprivileged children. One hundred years later the academy has changed its name to Maryville College and has become a still growing institution of higher education with over 740 men and women enrolled in baccalaureate and associate degree programs in 33 fields of study.

Since its inception, the goal of Maryville College has been to educate its students as citizens, participating fully in the intellectual, cultural, professional, social, and moral life of the community. During the first century of Maryville's existence, many changes in the kinds of responsibility students were allowed or expected to assume have occurred.

Because of its early recognition and intensive study of the problems confronting higher education, Maryville is one of the few colleges in the Nation operating within a balanced budget, experiencing a rapid increase in enrollment and broadening programs offered to students, alumni, and the St. Louis community.

Since 1956, when medical technology was added to the list of majors, Maryville has followed a plan of offering pre-professional and professional education within the liberal arts context. By 1972,

the bachelor of fine arts program, pre-legal, pre dental, and premedical programs had become important to the focus of the curriculum. In 1972, 11 new career-oriented programs were added.

The ability to foresee needs in the community and among its students, whether they are intellectual, cultural, professional, social, or moral needs, will enable Maryville to continue as a truly outstanding institution of higher education in the St. Louis community in the future. I offer my congratulations to the president, Sister Harriet Switzer, and to the faculty and students of Maryville College on their centennial celebration and wish them every success in future endeavors.

REVENUE SHARING: ANOTHER SUBSIDY FOR THE RICH?

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, with President Nixon's revenue sharing program now the primary source of Federal funds for our cities, it behooves us to find out just where that money is going and how it is being used in metropolitan centers across the Nation.

I now submit for your attention, and the attention of my colleagues, Joseph Kraft's column that appeared in the February 15 edition of the Washington Post entitled: "Who Shares in Revenue Sharing?"

Mr. Kraft's article, based on a survey conducted by the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, leads us to believe that revenue sharing funds are being used by local governments to provide middle class services and cover administrative spending, rather than to meet the compelling needs of underprivileged citizens.

Inner-city residents across the Nation no longer will accept the President's assurances about worthwhile programs and social services. When it comes to revenue sharing, they will not believe it will work for them until they see it work.

Before it is agreed to place the future of millions of disadvantaged Americans in the hands of Mr. Nixon and his revenue sharing schemes, we in Congress had better look very closely at the program and its implementation.

The article follows:

WHO SHARES IN REVENUE SHARING?

The chief source of federal dollars for the cities is now President Nixon's program for revenue sharing. But what do the cities do with the money they receive from Washington through that program?

Well, the best evidence shows that they don't spend it on services to the poor. On the contrary, the indications are that the money which the cities receive from revenue sharing is going for services and tax cuts favorable to middle income groups.

The best evidence is a survey made by the Senate subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations which is headed by the Maine Democrat, Edmund Muskie. The survey asked several hundred cities how they planned to use revenue sharing monies.

The findings of the survey are necessarily imperfect. Some major cities, including New York, did not reply at first. Others gave only skimpy details. Still others have not yet decided what they are going to do with revenue sharing funds.

Still the evidence in city after city is overwhelming. In all sections of the country, cities are using revenue sharing funds to ease tax burdens or improve such services as police and fire departments.

A good example is the city of Los Angeles. According to Mayor Sam Yorty, the city will receive \$35.4 million in revenue sharing funds this year as against \$21.8 million for model cities, which is the next largest grant.

The final disposition of the funds has not yet been made, but Mayor Yorty's recommendations are indicative. According to the latest available figures, The mayor wants \$14.9 million to be applied to the city's deficit so as to head off a tax increase. He wants \$10 million applied to a reserve fund to be used against any increase in property taxes. The rest of the money would go for building a technical center to service city automotive equipment; a new increase in the fund for paying workman's compensation; and for supplies and equipment for a couple of downtown parks.

Chicago is not all that different. In his reply to the Muskie questionnaire, Mayor Richard Daley wrote:

"The city received approximately 50 per cent of its 1972 entitlement in December . . . This \$31 million was used in the area of public safety. Specifically, personnel costs in the police, fire and health departments were charged directly to the trust fund established to account for this grant."

In the East, the cases of Providence and Boston are illustrative. The Providence reply to the Muskie questionnaire asserted that revenue sharing funds would go to public safety, environmental protection, public transportation, recreation, financial administration and capital expenditure, in that order. The Boston reply said revenue funds would be used "to hold the line on property taxes."

As a final example, there is New Orleans, where information on revenue spending plans comes from a recent speech by Mayor Moon Landrieu. Landrieu is one of the most progressive mayors in America, and he owes his election in large measure to black votes. Even so, he does not feel able to use revenue sharing funds for projects chiefly connected with helping poor blacks.

He has recommended that \$19 million of the \$330 million the city receives from revenue sharing this year go to capital improvements which will increase the city's tourist income. Among the improvements are downtown parks, a cultural center and a parking garage.

I have no quarrel with the use of funds by cities to lower taxes, improve police services and build parking garages, but I don't think we should kid ourselves about what is happening.

Revenue sharing, like so much else in President Nixon's program, is a good way to help those who are already not so badly off. It is no way to help the poor. If the idea is to help those most in need, then the federal government will have to earmark funds in a very specific way.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, as one of the cosponsors of ac-

celerated public works legislation in the past, it is my desire to bring to the attention of Congress the possible demise of the Economic Development Administration. And I would like to enlist support for this important program.

Legislation calling for a 1-year extension of the economic development program has been introduced with bipartisan support. This program has been effective in assisting economically distressed communities in our Nation and should be continued despite determination by the administration to phase out these programs as quickly as possible.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S BUDGET

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned over the devastating effect Mr. Nixon's austere budget will have on my district. Boston metropolitan area alone stands to lose an incredible \$82 million if President Nixon's proposed cutbacks in housing, education, community programs, and health centers are allowed to stand.

In an article which appeared in the Boston Globe, Tom Oliphant outlined most graphically the catastrophic impact the Nixon budget will have on the Boston area.

I wish to heartily commend Tom Oliphant and the Boston Globe for telling it like it is, that the present grave state of domestic affairs can be summed up in three words—President Nixon's budget.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert the article as it appeared in the Boston Globe:

[From the Boston Globe, Feb. 26, 1973]

THE PRESSURE IS BUILDING ON STATE AND
LOCAL TAXES

(By Thomas Oliphant)

WASHINGTON.—There is both good news and bad news coming out of Washington for taxpayers these days.

First, the good news, which is that President Nixon's much publicized promise to keep Federal income taxes from rising is going to be kept.

Now, the bad news:

Social Security taxes, which just rose sharply last month, state and local sales and property taxes, and probably state and local income levies as well, are about to come under more pressure than ever before.

The historical result whenever taxes come under pressure is that they are raised.

The reason for this grave state of domestic affairs can be summed up in three words—President Nixon's budget—or more specifically the one for the Federal fiscal year that begins July 1.

Here's what's in store for Boston, for example, the figures for which come courtesy of a very angry and worried Mayor Kevin H. White.

Last year, about \$200 million came into the city from Washington, some to the local treasury and some to other activities like Community Action and Model Cities. It helped pay for programs like Public Safety, Health, Job-Training, Education for the Disadvantaged and Public Employment.

Next year, Boston stands to lose half that money because of Mr. Nixon's actions. At the same time, the city will get about \$18 million

in general revenue-sharing payments from Washington, its share of the \$6 billion or so going to states and localities without Federal strings of any kind.

The net loss, in short, will be a whopping \$82 million, according to the mayor.

In terms of programs and jobs, here is White's more specific breakdown of the impact of the President's budget on some things now happening in Boston:

5000 new housing units for the poor and middle-income families will not be built because of the freeze in the Federal financing of new projects for 18 months. If they were built, they would provide work for 4600 construction tradesmen.

The local Model Cities effort, roughly \$15 million worth of annual activity, will get slashed in half before getting killed entirely the following year.

The Community Action operation, run all over the city of Action for Boston Community Development, will die as of July 1.

Some 800 city workers, hired from the ranks of the unemployed and Vietnam veterans with Federal funds under the Public Employment Program, will get fired in addition to the 1600 the mayor already has decided to fire because his budget was excruciatingly tight even before Mr. Nixon made public his own budget.

About 5,000 underprivileged Boston young people won't get jobs this summer under the Neighborhood Youth Corps Program, because there won't be a Neighborhood Youth Corps Program anymore.

Meanwhile, White estimates that next year Boston businesses and citizens will send \$2.2 billion in Federal taxes to Washington, up \$200 million from last year's take.

From numbers like these, White has come up with a phrase to describe Mr. Nixon's notions about the new federalism, revenue sharing and the like. He calls it "a shell game of enormous proportions."

As he put it in a guest column in the Harvard Crimson last week: "The shell game at the local level means that for every new dollar we receive in general revenue sharing, we will lose five dollars in traditional Federal funding. We will be forced to rob Peter to pay Paul and the hard arithmetic shows that we will end up starving both."

Perhaps you think White is an exaggerating crybaby. The same kinds of numbers from other cities and states make clear that he is not.

Consider this tidbit from Maine, which was collected by its senior senator, Edmund S. Muskie. It concerns simply the impact of the Administration's decision to suspend all commitments to fund new subsidized housing construction for a year and a half.

As a result, some \$100 million worth of housing won't be built in a state that has a "deficit" of standard units for the less well off of 650,000 units, and an unemployment rate nearly two percentage points above the national average.

In blocking all of this activity, the Federal government will save \$7 million in direct outlay. In addition, preliminary approval was just withdrawn by the Administration from 550 units in five Maine cities, which amounts to one-sixth the annual subsidized production of that state.

"The (18 months) moratorium effectively kills half the housing construction in Maine," said Muskie last week, and could put many small contractors out of business."

"In addition the housing moratorium has brutal personal consequences for families which had planned to build housing with government help, but who now might be forced to continue living in substandard housing and who might lose hard-earned dollars in planning and land."

As one of the few liberals in the Senate with a firm grasp of budgets and Federal-state relations, Muskie held hearings last week before his intergovernmental relations

subcommittee on the Nixon budget, with 12 big city mayors as his star witnesses.

The picture they painted was the same as White's.

In San Francisco, for example, a town of Boston's approximate size, Mayor Joseph Alioto summed up the impact this way. He said that social programs now getting \$88 million in Federal funds, whose needs next year because of inflation and normal growth in scope would be \$118 million, will in fact get \$40 million from the Nixon Administration.

Alioto adds that come July 1, the first of many unpleasant tasks for him will be to fire 2100 people.

In Detroit, meanwhile, Mayor Roman Gribbs has figured that the next fiscal year's Federal budget will leave his city \$155 million less money, and that he will have to fire 2500 workers hired under the Public Employment Program.

Gribbs had another significant point to make about revenue sharing. He said that the effect of last year's payment was merely to give him one year's grace, during which his own budget, normal growth and all, was balanced. Next year, even with the second year of revenue sharing, he said Detroit's budget will be about \$30 million in the red before a single new street light is installed or extra policemen hired or new garbage cans purchased.

On the revenue-sharing side of his equation, Gribbs threw up his hands. Property taxes are already absurd, he said, and the city is in addition imposing a utility users' levy plus a two percent income tax.

And then there's New York City, where the numbers are all huge. Mayor John Lindsay tossed out some of them last week. As a result of the Nixon budget, he said that 30,000 planned units of housing will not be built, the financing for 6000 more now under construction has been destroyed, Federal contributions to city water pollution control projects have dropped to 5% from 55% of the total cost, and 3300 previously unemployed beneficiaries of the Public Employment Program will lose their jobs.

One problem with the numbers used by the mayor is that they fail to take into account money cities will receive under what is called Special Revenue Sharing—the President's proposal to lump spending for specific programs in four areas (Job Training, Community Development, Law Enforcement and Education) into broad bloc grants which communities could spend any way they like within those four areas.

However, the fact remains that even here the amount the cities and states would receive under Special Revenue Sharing is less than the total now being spent on the individual programs it would replace.

It is also quite a bit less than the Administration itself proposed for Special Revenue Sharing one and two years ago.

Evidence on this point was supplied last week by Mayor Richard Hatcher of Gary, Ind. As things stand now, Hatcher said Gary's Federal assistance will drop next year from \$30 million to less than \$9.5 million, a decline of about 70%.

Should Special Revenue Sharing begin at some point in the next year or so, though, Federal aid to the city would only rise another \$3.5 million which still leaves Gary short by nearly 60% of the aid it is now receiving.

Arithmetic like this is prompting mayors to have second thoughts about their original, warm endorsement of Mr. Nixon's Special Revenue Sharing proposal. As Mayor Norman Mineta of San Jose, Calif., put it last week, if the net amount of Federal aid is to be slashed, he would prefer to fight the budget cuts rather than switch to a better aid system. In the end, he implied, money matters more than philosophy in the cities.

Next week, the country's governors will be here for their annual conference, and a group of them will follow their urban counterparts to Muskie's subcommittee to do some complaining of their own.

Thus, in the three short months since Revenue Sharing began, President Nixon was re-elected, and Special Revenue Sharing proposals were readied for resubmission, the politics of the new federalism has changed drastically.

Mr. Nixon is now not just fighting the majority of Congress, he is also fighting mayors and governors as well. In the process, his role has changed from being the George Washington of the New American Revolution to playing the part of King George III.

ENGINEERS WEEK

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last week, February 18 to 24, was designated as "Engineers Week" in the United States.

My friend and constituent, Mr. Richard L. Sobera, president of D.C. Chapter No. 1, National Association of Power Engineers, Inc., called my attention to the long and distinguished history of his organization.

As I believe both the preamble to the constitution for the NAPE and an account of its early accomplishments will be of interest to our colleagues, I insert both items at this point in the RECORD.

PREAMBLE

This Association shall not interfere in any way between its members and their employers, recognizing the identity of interests between employer and employee, and not countenancing any project or enterprise that will interfere with perfect harmony between them. Its meetings shall not be used for political or religious discussion. Preference shall be given at all times to education on engineering, in all of its various branches. Its members pledge themselves to the securing and enforcing of engineers' license laws in order to prevent the destruction of life and property in the generation and transmission of power, and for the conservation of the fuel resources of the Nation.

HISTORY OF NAPE

Local Associations of operating engineers had been started in several sections of the country and in 1879 a number of engineers met in Providence, R.I. to consider the formation of an association. On December 11, 1879, a number of engineers met in the engine room of the Providence County Court House where Henry D. Cozens was Chief Engineer. This was the beginning of the National Association of Stationary Engineers, which was changed in 1928 to the National Association of Power Engineers.

The main object of the new Association, according to its founders, was to improve the engineer morally and intellectually and make him more competent in the performance of his duties and protect the interests of competent engineers.

Recognizing the need for action on a larger scale, correspondence was started with groups of engineers in other parts of the country to join in organizing a National Association. This met with approval and a group met in Convention that was held in New York City on October 25, 1882.

This was the first National Convention. The men who organized the Association recognized the great responsibilities of the engineer, both to the employer and the public and adopted an objective, preamble and constitution. The first Mechanical Exposition in connection with the annual convention was held in Baltimore in 1884. At the next convention in St. Louis in 1885 a start was made in the securing of adequate license laws. In 1896 convention in Buffalo distinguished itself by deciding to sponsor an official publication to be called the National Engineer.

SHIP COMPENSATION BILL

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday MARGARET HECKLER, FLOYD HICKS, LLOYD MEEDS, JOE MOAKLEY, GERRY STUDDS, LIONEL VAN DEERLIN and I, joined with 12 new cosponsors to introduce legislation to provide immediate payments to fishermen whose gear or boats have been damaged by foreign vessels.

The certification and authorization of claims would be under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, and would be retroactive to January 1, 1971. Five million dollars is authorized for past and future claim reimbursement.

This bill is unique in that it will pay damage claims immediately out of general revenues, instead of requiring the claimant to await the U.S. Government's attempt to obtain compensation from foreign governments. This process of litigation is time consuming under the best of circumstances. When a ship from a country with whom we have no diplomatic relations is involved, it approaches the impossible. In the meantime, the fisherman is left without a means to earn his livelihood. This bill provides income to a fisherman while his boat is laid up for repairs and he is unable to fish. The fisherman does not have to go on welfare. He is protected while the Government processes his claim. He has income to live on until he can get back to work.

The American fishing industry has enough to worry about from foreign competition without the additional fear that they will be put out of business by a vessel not required to pay for the damage it inflicts.

For example, foreign fishing vessels have been able to occupy the same harvest areas off the American coast as our own fishermen. In the 5-year period between 1960 and 1965 the percentage of fish caught by New England fishermen off the Continental Shelf dropped from 93 percent to 35 percent.

Additionally, most foreign countries provide large subsidies to their fishing industries, allowing them to purchase advanced equipment that American fishermen cannot afford. With the uncertainty of the fishing harvest, loans from the private sector are, to a great extent, unavailable. Profits must be used for re-

pairs. A fisherman usually has only one major economic asset—his boat and gear. When that is heavily damaged or destroyed, he is out of luck.

The extent of this problem is not widely known. A Russian trawler some months ago destroyed the lobster traps of one of my constituents. In June 1972 another fisherman, Stephan Biondo, was rammed by an East German ship while fishing north of Gloucester, and his vessel was destroyed. He is still awaiting final determination of his case. Such risk is beyond that which other businesses must cope with. Neither of these men can, at this point, turn to the Government for assistance. They cannot get a loan guarantee, or income maintenance other than welfare while their claims are being settled. And some claims may never be settled. There is no help for these men.

The State Department informed me this past summer that during the previous 2 years their estimate of gear losses amounted to about \$150,000 to \$200,000. Vessel losses would not account for a great increase in this amount.

This legislation is a fair and equitable solution to the problems encountered by the American fishing industry. Its cost is small in relation to the crisis facing our fishing industry.

The American fisherman pursues his difficult occupation with independence, diligence, and dedication. He asks only for an even chance to compete against the fishing nations of the world, and security for his family. This bill will be a major step toward providing an even break for the fishermen and the important American fishing industry.

FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. E DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been brought to the sober realization that the Nation's fish and wildlife resources are not inexhaustible.

A few years ago Congress enacted the first legislation to provide protection for fish and wildlife determined to be threatened with extinction in the United States and abroad. This action came none too soon. Now it is apparent that a further step is needed.

We cannot afford to wait until we are face to face with the threat of extinction of species of fish and wildlife. A far sounder policy is to do what is necessary to keep the critical point of threatened extinction from being reached.

I have therefore introduced a bill to provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of species of fish and wildlife which are likely in the foreseeable future to become threatened with extinction.

To assure such protection, my bill would remove the current ceiling imposed by law on the acquisition of essential wildlife habitat. It would also

prohibit the unauthorized import or export, taking, possession, sale, delivery, and transport of species at present threatened with extinction. Importation would be permitted at other than designated ports of entry in the interest of the health or safety of fish and wildlife.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is a logical extension of the protective legislation enacted by Congress some 6 years ago. It simply calls for protection to begin as soon as an early warning signal of threatened extinction of a species is flashed. That is just common sense.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians throughout the world and others who defend the right of small nations to freedom and self-determination recently commemorated the 55th anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence.

It is fitting today, more than three decades after that independence was extinguished by the Soviet Union, that we both pay tribute to the Lithuanian devotion to freedom and reflect on the larger meaning of a valiant people's plight to our world today.

We are in the midst of a reappraisal of our role on the international scene, in the initial stage of an era of negotiation rather than confrontation in pursuit of lasting peace. Yet if mankind the world over is to know the benefits of peace, our goal must recognize the interest of captive nations, and our strategies the realities of their experience.

LITHUANIA: EARLY VICTIM OF THE NEW SOVIET IMPERIALISM

Lithuania, whose people defeated czarist Russian forces on February 16, 1918, fell to the new Soviet imperialism in 1940, along with the other Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia.

During the following three decades, this was followed by the takeover of other Eastern European states after World War II, the recurring crises in Berlin, the Soviet Union's adventure in Cuba, its role in Korea and later Vietnam, its crushing of freedom in Czechoslovakia, and elsewhere.

I recite these facts not as incitement of suspicion against the Soviet Union, but as a recognition of obstacles. Tactics, often confused with policy, may change with the weather.

But a nation's fundamental policies are glacially slow to change even in a world suddenly shrunk by the technology of destruction. Our own steadfastness in Vietnam, along with our commitment to liberty exhibited in two World Wars proves the same point.

DÉTENTE: LET US REMEMBER HISTORY'S LESSONS

Nor do I imply anything less than wholehearted support for President Nixon's emphasis on negotiation. On the

contrary, recognition of the seemingly irreconcilable objectives of the United States and the Soviet Union makes for greater appreciation of the degree of détente achieved to date, as well as the dangers remaining and support the President needs.

Talks are in various stages of exploration leading to full-scale negotiations of mutual and balanced reduction of NATO and Warsaw Pact forces, and political settlement of the problems of a divided Europe. In the latter area, the Soviet Union has been pushing for a Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, with the Soviet goal of ratifying the status quo and "liquidation of the remnants of World War II."

NATO objectives include fostering the freer movement of people, ideas, and information beyond the framework of traditional cultural exchange. But these are merely steps in the endless evolution of international relationships.

In these negotiations and other initiatives in the years ahead, the people of Lithuania and other nations whose takeover we have refused—to our credit—to recognize must not be forgotten in the bargaining between superpowers and their allies but made beneficiaries of the improvement of relations which is our common goal.

In our pursuit of expanding freedom, our Nation must also be mindful of the role our defense posture and the credibility of our commitments have played in preserving the world from global war for nearly three decades.

WASHINGTON STATE SENATE RESOLUTION

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Washington State Senate has enacted a resolution concerning the Nation's energy crisis and the need to provide a pipeline to the North Slope oilfields of Alaska. The resolution, as enacted February 21, 1973, follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION

Whereas, The nation faces a well-documented emergency in the provision of fuels to meet all energy needs; and

Whereas, Multi-millions of barrels of oil remain undeveloped in the North Slope fields in Alaska; and

Whereas, Development of these energy sources will reduce the dependence of the nation on oil supplies from other nations; and

Whereas, In times of national defense emergency, it will be absolutely vital to have such energy sources under control of the United States; and

Whereas, The Congress presently has before it policy questions regarding the implementation of the pipeline project proposed by Aleyeska, Inc., of Bellevue, Washington; and

Whereas, Every effort should be made to expedite the construction of the pipeline from the North Slope area, with strict ad-

herence to all ecological and environment laws and regulations;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, By the Senate of the State of Washington that the Congress immediately take such policy and legislative steps necessary that will provide for construction of the pipeline from the North Slope to tidewater in Alaska.

Be it further resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the U. S. House of Representatives and the members of the delegation to the Congress from the State of Washington.

TAXATION OF FOREIGN INCOME

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today, one of America's foremost economic experts delivered an exciting statement before the Ways and Means Committee on the issues of foreign investment, tax provisions relating to foreign investment and an economic appraisal of U.S. investment abroad.

Prof. Peggy B. Musgrave of Northeastern University declared that:

Capital export is not a substitute for commodity export and foreign production by U.S.-owned companies is not a substitute for U.S. production.

In her testimony, she inquired:

Why should the U.S. pursue a tax policy which will further reduce its competitive advantage by artificially encouraging the movement of U.S. capital and technology to our competitors among developed countries, thereby worsening the position of production originating in the U.S.

Following are some of the major portions of the statement submitted by Professor Musgrave:

STATEMENT BY PEGGY B. MUSGRAVE

I should like to submit a somewhat longer statement for inclusion in the Record and in the brief time available here limit myself to what I consider to be the most important aspects of the problem: (1) the magnitude of foreign investment, (2) a critique of two major tax provisions and (3) an economic appraisal of U.S. investment abroad. More detailed aspects such as the Western Hemisphere Trade Corporations, the Less Developed Country Corporations and investment in the U.S. Possessions are covered in the longer statement.

MAGNITUDE OF PROBLEM

The magnitudes of U.S. foreign investment are impressive. In recent years, direct foreign investment of U.S. corporations has averaged around \$8 billion a year (including re-invested earnings) which compares with approximately \$30 billion of net domestic corporate investment in the U.S. Direct investments abroad have a book value of nearly \$90 billion. Profits thereon are close to \$20 billion or some 20 percent of total profits of U.S. corporations. U.S. taxes paid on such foreign profits were only 5 percent or less than \$1 billion. The output produced by U.S. affiliates abroad is about \$200 billion with sales by manufacturing affiliates several times the level of U.S. manufactured exports. Ownership of foreign affiliates, finally, is concentrated heavily in a small number of large corporations, the degree of concentration being higher even for domestic production.

These figures make it evident that the role of U.S. investment abroad is a major concern for our tax and foreign economic policy.

ECONOMIC ROLE OF FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Repeal of deferral and full or partial substitution of the deduction for the credit approach would, of course, result in a lower level of U.S. foreign investment. It is necessary, therefore, to consider the role of such investment. In taking a very brief look at this complex problem, I shall distinguish between (1) balance of payments effects and (2) effects on the level of U.S. income and its distribution.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS EFFECTS

Foreign investment has balance of payments effects on both capital and trade account. With regard to capital account, the return flow of income from past investment has come to exceed the capital outflow. At the same time, such outflow has served to accentuate our balance-of-payments crises as they have developed in recent years.

Effects of foreign investment on the trade account are not easily assessed. It is by no means evident that capital export leads to commodity export. Indeed, production by U.S. affiliates abroad, particularly in manufacturing, may serve to displace U.S. exports and even domestic sales in the U.S. This displacement effect is the more likely since direct investment is distinguished by being U.S.-owned and controlled. It is favored with U.S. technology and the corporations which account for the bulk of manufacturing investment abroad are also major exporters. As noted before, sales of manufacturing subsidiaries abroad are now nearly three times the level of U.S. exports of manufactured products.

In all, the balance of payments effects of maintaining a share of foreign markets via production abroad are very different from doing so via domestic production and export. Thus, \$1 of exports produces a \$1 credit in the balance of payments, while \$1 of foreign sales by a U.S. producing subsidiary abroad yields only, say, 6 cents of foreign exchange. (Such is the case if we assume a 20 percent profit margin on sales, a 35 percent foreign profits tax, a 50 percent pay-out ratio and a 15 percent withholding tax on dividends.)

EFFECTS ON LEVEL AND DISTRIBUTION OF U.S. INCOME

To make the most favorable case for foreign investment, suppose that returns to U.S. capital abroad are indeed higher than they are in the U.S. Assuming the tax factor to be neutral, the U.S. investor will do better in investing abroad. But the U.S. as a whole may well lose. This, as I have noted before, is the case because some 40 percent of foreign earnings accrue to foreign treasuries rather than to the U.S. treasury where the revenue would have benefited other taxpayers (who would have paid less) or the consumer of public services. For the U.S. as a whole to strike even, foreign rates of return before tax (assuming a 40 percent foreign rate) must be 1.7 times U.S. returns.

Moreover, while the position of investors is improved, that of wage earners is worsened. Since there is less capital in the U.S., income originating here will be lower. Consequently, both labor and capital income originating in the U.S. will be reduced but labor will not benefit from increased returns abroad. Thus the share of labor income in total income (including returns on foreign investment) will be curtailed. In this sense, the cost of foreign investment is borne by U.S. labor, while foreign labor gets a bonus.

Indeed, this makes too favorable a case for foreign investment. To a considerable degree, direct foreign investment does not reflect generally higher profitability abroad but rather rigidities in the domestic industrial structure which leads U.S. corporations to expand production abroad rather than to

redirect domestic capital into other industries. Where this is the case, the gain to the U.S. is reduced further.

However, this may be, some observers hold that the U.S. really has no choice in the matter. They view future economic development as one in which our traditional comparative advantage in manufacturing will move to Europe with U.S. production shifting towards service industries. As part of this scenario, the U.S. is said to be moving into an era of continued import surplus which (hopefully) will come to be financed by massive return flows of earnings derived from an increased volume of foreign assets, to be built up by the current process of capital outflow. I doubt whether this script will materialize nor do I think it inevitable or desirable.

Capital export is not a substitute for commodity export and foreign production by U.S.-owned companies is not a substitute for U.S. production. Why should the U.S. pursue a tax policy which will further reduce its competitive advantage by artificially encouraging the movement of U.S. capital and technology to our competitors among developed countries, thereby worsening the position of production originating in the U.S. (as distinct from U.S.-owned foreign production) in world markets? Is it really desirable for the U.S. to rush into the role of 19th century Great Britain, considering the political and economic problems that emerged therefrom? Can the effects of such developments on the division of U.S. income between wages and profits be disregarded? Would it not be to our advantage instead to direct our efforts at improving productivity in the U.S. and raising the capital stock of developing countries? I believe that we do have some degrees of freedom in these matters and that policy choices can be made.

My lack of enthusiasm for stacking the tax cards in favor of foreign investment should not be taken to imply a lack of concern for foreign trade. While I have considerable sympathy with the Burke-Hartke Bill as it applies to foreign investment, I am opposed to its protectionist proposals with respect to U.S. trade, except as a bargaining device for liberalized trade policies abroad. Subsidized foreign investment combined with penalized commodity trade would indeed leave us with the worst of all solutions.

REFORM PROPOSALS

The preceding considerations lead me to the conclusion that deferral (including DISC) should be phased out and that the foreign tax credit should be modified so as to increase the tax on income derived from foreign investment. The latter might take the form of (a) substitution of deduction for crediting; (b) limitation of the credit to one-half the foreign tax; (c) limitation of the credit to one-half the U.S. tax and (d) retention of the present credit combined with application of a 10 to 15 percentage point surcharge on the U.S. corporate rate as it applies to foreign income. Illustrations included in my longer statement show that the deduction and one-half credit approaches would be similar in their effects. The surcharge (with retention of the credit) might also be set so as to result in the same general rate, but it would have the advantage of reducing inter-country differentials.

PRESIDENT PROPOSES NASA INCREASES

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, while people have thrilled to our accomplish-

ments in outer space, no one wishes to see space program increases paid for by cutting back vital health and education programs. But the President's budget proposes to do just this.

We have been told that important domestic programs are to be cut back, because there is no money. There is no money because of a \$600 million increase in certain NASA programs over their fiscal year 1972 level.

Manned space flight operations are to go up by almost \$100 million. Space Shuttle costs will rise almost \$400 million. And funds for lunar and planetary exploration will increase another \$100 million.

These programs represent a sadly misguided system of priorities which this Congress must change. Space programs are not more important than health programs. Funds for space exploration must not be increased while funds for education are decreased.

We must reject the President's space program increases until we have first alleviated the hardships of life on this planet.

EAGLE SCOUT

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, a young man in my congressional district in Wisconsin has recently achieved an outstanding and unique honor. Mr. Bill Koch, aged 12, has earned the rank of Eagle Scout. The area Boy Scout office is aware of only one other Scout ever achieving this honor at that early age.

The Janesville Gazette of February 14, 1973, published the following article about Bill. I am extremely pleased to call to the attention of the House this outstanding young man:

BOY IS EAGLE SCOUT AT 12

Bill Koch, who Tuesday night received scouting's highest award, is a hard-working Eagle. He earned it when only 12 years old and the registrar's office of Sinnissippi Council Boy Scouts recalls only one other scout who became an Eagle here at that early age.

The son of Mr. and Mrs. Tom Koch, 227 Mohawk Rd., was presented with the enviable award at the court of honor of Troop 415, St. Paul's Lutheran School, where he is an earned Eagle by exceptionally hard work, say, too, that he is an "above average" student and a member of the basketball and flag football teams at the school.

Earning the 21 merit badges required to become an Eagle is not the only scouting achievement for Bill. He also holds the Pro Deo et Patri award, the God and Country award, which requires 100 hours of church work. Bill accomplished this by ushering, yard work, helping persons unable to do for themselves, and a community project, his participation in the Springbrook cleanup. Another community betterment endeavor of the youth, who will be 13 on March 21, consisted of writing an article on drugs and their abuse and circulating copies in the area where he lives.

Bill is also an Ordeal member of the Order of the Arrow, scouting's honor camping fraternity, and the order's election committee.

Boys are not eligible for scouting until they have completed 5th grade. His scoutmaster during the period when he earned his merit badges was Melvin North. Bill's father has just taken over the job of scoutmaster of Troop 415.

OPPOSED TO REPARATION PAYMENTS TO NORTH VIETNAM

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, now that the war in Indochina appears to be coming to an end and our prisoners are returning home, there is rising public concern and debate over the issue of reconstruction aid to the North Vietnamese. Because of the growing importance of this issue and because of the heavy volume of mail I have received opposing any economic assistance to Hanoi, I rise today, after giving the issue serious examination, to publicly spell out my position.

Let me state at the outset that I am irrevocably opposed to any reparation payments to North Vietnam, or to American financing of the wholesale reconstruction of Hanoi's economy. Although I believe our involvement in Indochina has been a tragic mistake, we did not start this war. Furthermore, we did not invite Hanoi's expansion into the territories of all its Indochinese neighbors. Reparations or massive reconstructive assistance for North Vietnam would only reward Hanoi's expansionist tendencies. The United States must never reward such activity.

In order to provide all concerned with a stake in lasting peace in Vietnam, there may be an argument for legislation providing certain specific and carefully defined assistance, such as refugee aid, to both South Vietnam and North Vietnam. This, I believe, could be justifiable not just from a humanitarian standpoint, but as well as in our own national interest in order to preserve and foster peace in that troubled region. Minimal assistance to build a peace is consistent with President Nixon's efforts to establish a stable international order that will insure a generation of peace.

But there are several conditions which Congress must attach to any incentive program for a lasting peace, no matter how modest such efforts.

First, no U.S. aid should be considered until the North Vietnamese have returned safely all American prisoners of war, and until we are satisfied that we have been provided a complete accounting of all men missing in action.

Second, we would be well advised to proceed cautiously and slowly before embarking on any program regardless of scale, assuring ourselves completely that all hostilities have permanently ceased. Moreover, it must be made clear that any new outbreaks of fighting will result in the cutoff of all economic aid to all sides. To not impose such a condition is to encourage both North and South Vietnam to divert their own resources from internal reconstruction to the continuation of the war.

Third, I endorse President Nixon's call for a \$269 billion Federal expenditures ceiling for fiscal 1974. Therefore, if Congress decides to approve any administration proposal for Indochina reconstruction assistance, funds for such assistance must come out of the \$269 billion budget. To say that under no circumstances such assistance should be financed from increased taxes or increased public debt is to put the case too mildly. It is my firm conviction that since the destruction of Indochina resulted from war, any funds for a program of economic incentives to keep the peace are also part of the cost of the war. Money to finance such a program should come from our military budget, not from our crucial domestic programs. And let me make clear that the first big slices out of the fat of the military budget should go to our problems here at home, not overseas.

If the Congress does approve any peace incentive program, we must be sure safeguards are provided against the corrupt misuse of funds by either Vietnamese government. Further, I believe we should insist on tripartite participation by both the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China so that any aid is administered in a way which will vest the interest of all three major powers in preserving the fragile peace which now exists.

Only if these conditions are followed and met, Mr. Speaker, does Congress have any justification for diverting one penny more of our scarce tax-dollars away from areas of tremendous need here at home. In the absence of all these conditions, I shall strenuously oppose any reparations or economic aid to North Vietnam.

CITIZENS UNION BACKS REFORM OF NEW YORK STATE LAW

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, nothing serves to strengthen our political system like grassroots, citizen participation. Concerned citizens across the country are organizing so that they might have a more significant effect on those officials whom they have chosen to represent them. We would do well to listen to the opinions and ideas expressed by these citizens groups and organizations. The greater input that these groups have into our political process, the more responsive and viable will our Government become.

I submit for your attention and the attention of my colleagues a recent New York Times editorial entitled "Albany's 'Dirty Dozen'," which describes the attempt of the Citizens Union of New York City to have a positive impact upon the legislative process in New York State.

ALBANY'S "DIRTY DOZEN"

After sifting legislative records in Washington, an environmental protection group last year compiled a list of Congressmen who most often voted wrong from an environmental point of view. An even dozen representatives were selected as having the worst

records of all—the "Dirty Dozen." This is a term that the Citizens Union of New York City has now picked up and used in a slightly modified meaning. The good-government group points to an even dozen areas of public concern needing state legislative attention this year.

The Citizens Union favors the enactment of sweeping court reforms and an improved method for selecting judges, a "bill of rights for prisoners," a requirement that handguns, rifles and shotguns be registered and that all gun owners be licensed. Welfare, health care, housing, education and transportation are still other areas for positive action.

This list is good, its proposals generally sound; but other things must be added to it as priority issues. There is need for broad electoral reform, for permitting absentee balloting in primaries, for extending the hours of primary balloting, for reforming the city's Board of Elections, for making voter registration and the casting of ballots generally easier. Family planning services remain neglected; they merit expansion and extension.

Governor Rockefeller's proposed budget looms as a source of conflict. Is there a hidden surplus? If so, how much? If a great deal, what to do with it? The state made a commitment to localities to return 21 per cent of state income tax revenues and this is a commitment that ought to be kept. Available funds could also be applied to a state takeover of education and welfare costs that continue to burden localities.

A bill protecting New Yorkers against the steep rent increases that flow from vacancy decontrol merits enactment as does the State Senator John Marchi's excellent bill creating a South Richmond development corporation. To its credit the Legislature has already enacted no-fault automobile insurance, a consumer-protection measure. The momentum for reform ought not to be lost.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House participated in a special order conducted by our distinguished colleague, DAN FLOOD, to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day.

I was especially impressed by an editorial in the New World of February 16, 1973, which I insert into the RECORD at this point:

WORLD'S LITHUANIANS DON'T FORGET

On Feb. 16 Lithuanians throughout the world will commemorate the 722nd anniversary of the formation of the Kingdom of Lithuania in 1251, and the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania on Feb. 16, 1918.

Both the Kingdom and the Republic live in the hearts of Lithuanians, though the Soviet Union in 1940 forcibly occupied Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and annexed them. But Lithuanians throughout the world do not forget.

Periodically stories of persecution and suppression of human rights break through the Soviet curtain; we may be sure there are many such violations which do not become known publicly. An example of the protests are the petitions from Lithuanian Catholics, bearing 17,000 signatures, which were sent to United Nations Secretary General Kurt Waldheim last March. The petitions charged that the Soviet regime is systematically strangling religious life and the Church.

Recently a broadcast over Soviet Radio claimed that about 830 Catholic priests are active in pastoral work in Lithuania. This was a broadcast aimed at Canada, answering a question from a Canadian listener.

But, in another broadcast for "home consumption" only, members of the Communist Party were urged to "combat religion" in accord with the principles enunciated by Lenin. Therefore, this must be done, the broadcast added, because "a certain number of Soviet people are still under the influence of religion" and it is the Party's duty to combat religion and propagate atheism.

There is no indication that persecution of religion in Lithuania is abating; it is more likely to go the other way, unless the force of world opinion has an effect on the rulers of Russia.

ENVIRONMENTAL LAW COMPLIANCE

HON. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, since coming into the Congress in January, I, along with the other Members of this body, have been confronted with the question of whether to bow to the executive branch in its determined drive to dictate to the Congress which of our legally funded and functioning programs shall or shall not be administered in behalf of the citizens of these United States.

It is also an unproven proposition that it is "economical" in any sense to slash programs concerned with and dedicated to the preservation of our natural and human resources, the protection of our health and the preservation of our environment.

Even as I consider the fundamental questions involved here, it appears to me there may well be a possible violation of law in the termination of such programs as the rural environmental assistance program and the rural water and sewer grant program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act. There is no evidence at hand that the administration has in either case filed the environmental impact statement called for by law in any "major Federal actions significantly affecting the human environment"—ref., 42 U.S.C. Section 4332—National Environmental Policy Act.

We have talked in this Chamber, we have talked in our offices, we have talked in our States and in our districts about the severe effect of the executive actions on innumerable duly adopted and funded programs; perhaps here we now have a situation which takes us beyond the talking stage and into litigation.

Certainly the abolition of such programs as those indicated above constitutes a major Federal action significantly affecting the human environment. But in its undue haste to cancel, dismantle, and impound, the executive branch appears to have not only overstepped its proper reach of authority, but perhaps to have overstepped the specific law.

It is my intention to pursue this matter in every appropriate way, and if my research of the law confirms my present view, I shall initiate such litigation as

may appear warranted. I invite my colleagues to join with me.

MOUNTING PRICES AND A CRUMBLING ECONOMY

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, in our Nation, a suspicion circulates that becomes increasingly prevalent. It suggests that the economy which has been the backbone of the world since World War I is crumbling.

Supporting this suspicion are several factors:

The economy in question has devalued its currency twice in the last 14 months and another devaluation is anticipated by many experts; this economy has a huge balance of payments deficit; this economy's currency is no longer convertible to gold; the credit of this economy has been grossly overextended; inflation and unemployment are rampant; nearly \$500 billion worth of red ink soaks this economy's balance sheets, and more.

It is, of course, no secret that the economy of which I speak is our own. How accurate the prophets of doom are, I cannot say; however, it is frightening that there are so many such prophets, many of them very knowledgeable in matters of money.

Perhaps the factor supporting this doomsday argument that most frequently and harshly affects the average American is the spiralling food costs. Ascending at a dizzying rate, the prices are literally clobbering the average American. Housewives can no longer send their husbands or their children to the store with a check for the exact amount their order will cost; prices are changing too rapidly. Such changes would be tolerable if they were not always increases.

The administration attempts to comfort us by pointing out that prices in areas other than food are inflating at a much slower, more reasonable rate. It seems to overlook the fact that man's most basic need is food, and certainly agricultural products are every nation's most basic commodity. When food prices get out of control, other prices are never far behind. Post-World War I Germany is an extreme example of this. There, inflation became so severe that a loaf of bread cost over one billion marks.

Mr. Howard Kaye of Teaneck, N.J., has written an article for the Bergen Record offering a rationale for the inflationary spiral of food costs. Mr. Kaye, a partner in a chain of supermarkets as well as a former farmer and food retailer and wholesaler, knows his subject well. His article follows:

FOOD COSTS WILL GO ON RISING—BY PLAN (By Howard Kaye)

The American consumer is caught in a food-price squeeze. No matter what she has been told, the cost of food continues to rise.

No matter what seems to be happening in other phases of the economy, food prices continue to rise.

And, no matter what the American consumer will be told in the next several years, the cost of food will continue to rise.

The reasons:

1. World economic competition
2. Legislation
3. Repeal of the law of supply and demand.

The American consumer is caught in the middle of an economic struggle between the United States and the rest of the world.

American economic leadership and strength have been based on American ability to lead all other countries in the production of manufactured goods.

This is not the case anymore. Such nations as Japan and combinations of nations such as the Common Market have helped to force the United States into a new second-rate position in the overall production of manufactured goods.

Even those who are not steeped in the science of economics can identify the U.S. position in this struggle through the current instability of the dollar and the trade deficits of billions of dollars our country is encountering. The combination has led to the devaluation of our currency.

Instead of exporting manufactured goods all over the world, the United States has become, on balance, an importing nation.

This is the key to the rising cost of food.

The strategy of the American government in this struggle is to use farm goods (food) as a level to help the American producer compete in the world's markets.

The strategy of the people in government involves forcing domestic prices to rise as high as consumers will allow them to rise. Instead of developing a program calculated to regain leadership in the production of manufactured goods, this administration has decided to replace manufactured goods with farm goods (food, etc.), and will export farm goods no matter what the domestic consequence.

Most of the people know about the wheat sent to Russia. In addition, large amounts of other farm products are being shipped to countries all over the world, this past year to the tune of \$10 billion.

The American consumer will pay twice. First, food products will be priced higher and higher domestically because producers do not have to rely on domestic markets. Second, because the American government has paid farmers not to produce (subsidies) since 1933, we have developed a farm economy less than fully efficient. In order to move these farm products into foreign markets, the American government is willing to make up this inefficiency by paying the difference between the price charged by Americans and what the foreign country is willing to pay for the products.

This is what happened in the Russian wheat deal. The wheat was taken out of the domestic market, and this caused a 5-pound bag of flour to go from 53 cents before the deal to 70 cents now—and still climbing.

And this has caused bread prices to go up.

In addition, in order to make the American export price competitive with other wheat exporting countries the American government paid exporters 20 cents a bushel to export the wheat. The consumer paid twice; higher food prices, and taxes to pay for the subsidy.

In an extension of this policy, the government is arranging for additional acreage to be used to plant certain crops this year. By reducing the subsidy to farmers who received such money for not planting crops, the government is hoping to increase the total tonnage of certain farm products.

The American consumer is being told that this program of increased acreage will lead to increased supplies of food products which

will eventually lead to lower prices. It's not necessarily so.

The increase in production will find its way into the export strategy instead of local markets. The hope is that this increase of food exports will contribute to reducing American trade deficits, but if this increase in food production does not find its way into local markets it will have no effect on food prices.

In addition, the increased acreage will be devoted to such commodities as wheat and soybeans, not to the fruits and vegetables that relate so directly to the average consumer's food costs.

Meat prices will go even higher. Despite the high cost of meat we are exporting meat products and cattle every day as a part of our export strategy. The cost of animal feed, based on the export of farm products strategy, will stay high. The government's Phase 3 economic program has already permitted the cost of commercial fertilizer to go up and, it is expected, will soon allow increases in farm machinery, transportation, and other products and services necessary to get farm animals to market.

In President Nixon's Phase 1, controls were placed on practically every product produced in this country except raw agricultural products. The producers of farm goods were being encouraged to produce more by allowing them as much as the traffic would bear.

Phase 2 and Phase 3 have been no different. No additional farm goods have been produced, and the uncontrolled prices have steadily risen.

No more farm goods have been produced, but more and more have found their way into the export strategy, again causing prices to rise.

The Government is making it profitable to be in the agriculture business.

And who is in that business today?

The small farmer is disappearing; the family farmer is disappearing. The patterns of production and distribution of farm products have changed radically in the past 10 or 15 years.

Production of farm products has passed into the hands of giant agribusiness firms. These large business organizations will sell their products to the consumer who offers them the most return.

Unlike the small farmer of the past, the producer we are describing has many forms of consumer to select from: the American family, the foreign family, the food processor, etc.

The current big producer has new tools at his command that make it unnecessary to reduce prices in eras of great production: advertising, refrigeration technology, radiation, research, etc.

By encouraging the small farmer, whose only market is the local consumer, to go out of business, this administration is directly encouraging higher and higher food prices.

So far the Administration, through bills in Congress, has attempted to do away with agencies and procedures designed to keep the small farmer financially stable. And it has submitted a bill that redefines upward the farm products producers who are eligible for government loans and loan protection.

What is the food pricing solution?

Get to the root of the basic problem, and devise techniques to solve it. Don't make the people suffer by trying to solve one problem by creating another.

Help the segment of the economy that produces manufactured goods to produce in competition with the rest of the world. In the past, competition was the stimulus that made our economy produce better—and more—for less.

What's wrong with us now?

If we don't solve our basic economic problems we will become the second-rate nation we deserve to be.

And higher and higher costs of living will have their own consequences.

A STRATEGY FOR SCAPEGOAT-MAKING

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, something very dangerous is happening in the United States today. In fact, it is not too far afield from something that happened in Germany about 40 years ago. It has to do with a Government's providing the middle classes with a convenient scapegoat.

This idea was perfectly articulated on February 26, 1973, in the Washington Post. It appeared in Mr. William Raspberry's column, "A Strategy for Scapegoat-Making."

Mr. Raspberry's article is so cogent and so brilliant, that I present here without further ado:

A STRATEGY FOR SCAPEGOAT-MAKING

(By William Raspberry)

It's foolhardy, of course, to try to guess what's going on inside someone else's head, especially when that someone else is Richard Milhous Nixon.

But from here it appears that the President is trying to provide the financially strapped American middle class with a scapegoat. Things are bad and appear to be getting worse for the wage-earners who pay the country's bills, and there's just one way to keep them from blaming the Nixon administration for their plight: Give them someone else to blame. The President, it seems, is offering them the poor and the black as a focus for their frustration and wrath.

That such a tactic is at work, I repeat, is speculation, not accusation.

But if I were a President who wanted to try such a tactic, I know what I would do.

I would cut off, or reduce to the barest bones, any program designed to deliver money, goods or services to the poor. I would take care not to make it appear to be an attack on the poor, but rather a non-nonsense attempt at bringing the national budget into manageable size. I would declare the war on poverty too costly and to ineffective, and I would disband it. I would cut into school lunch and free milk programs, health care for the poor, welfare payments and even aid to ghetto schools.

If I were really smart, I'd throw in some clearly unpalatable cutback (reduction of disability payments to Vietnam veterans), perhaps just to show that I wasn't picking on poor folks, and then abandon the idea at the first public outcry.

And then I would make a speech, or several speeches, declaring that with my proposed cutbacks, we could have a balanced budget and a resurgent economy without inflicting any further taxes on the hard-working middle-class people who put me in office.

If I really got into the spirit of the thing, I might even add a sweetener or two for this very special group: some hopeful thing about tax reform, for instance, or perhaps tax credits for the money they pay for their children's nonpublic education: that sort of thing, all without increasing their tax burden, of course.

I would know that the thing wouldn't work. Some of the social welfare programs clearly are wasteful and inefficient; some are theoretically unsound. But to the extent that they provide jobs and health care and food for people whose lives depend on those things, they'd have to be replaced with something. And I would know that that something

would cost money and probably necessitate a tax increase.

But would I say so publicly? Not on your life. I would take advantage of the fact that pressure for relief to the poor would tend to fall most heavily on the Congress. And if the Congress caught enough flak, or had enough genuine compassion for the neediest of their constituents, they would have to legislate replacements for the programs I had cut. They might even find it necessary to override my veto a time or two.

And that would be fine by me. For by then it would be very clear to the "real Americans"—the non-poor—just whom they should blame for the inevitable tax increase.

Not me, of course: I would have tried. They'd have to blame the poor, especially the urban (read: black poor), without whose special programs there would have been enough money at the old tax rates.

They would say of me: At least he tried.

Whatever the bad effects of such an undertaking, it would at least serve to take the people's minds off inflation, devalued dollars and the all-around disastrous state of the American economy.

Not forever, of course, but maybe for four more years.

USMC SPELLS PRIDE AND ESPRIT DE CORPS

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest battles of World War II was the Battle of Iwo Jima. In addition to the battle's importance in the outcome of that war, the raising of the flag which inspired the Marine Corps War Memorial in Arlington, Va., has provided this Nation with one of its greatest symbols of bravery and sacrifice in behalf of this country.

February 17, 1973, commemorated both the golden anniversary of the Marine Corps League and the 28th anniversary of that battle. The Marine Corps League's national commandant, Gilbert E. Gray, spoke at the wreath-laying ceremony at the Marine Corps War Memorial, Arlington, Va. Not only do I feel great pride in Commandant Gray because he is a constituent from the 25th Congressional District of New York which I have the honor of representing, but I believe his remarks hold a timeless message for all of us.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include Commandant Gray's full remarks in the RECORD:

USMC SPELLS PRIDE AND ESPRIT DE CORPS

(By Commandant Gilbert E. Gray)

"To hold sacred the history and memory of the men who have given their lives to the Nation and to foster love for the principles which they have supported by blood and valor since the founding of the Republic."

These words of sacred trust are contained in the Congressional Charter of the Marine Corps League. They explain quite clearly the purpose and reasons for our very existence. They also explain why we are assembled here this afternoon at the Marine Corps War Memorial in Arlington, Virginia.

We meet today at an historical moment in our time, in this year of our Lord 1973, as we mark with pride the 50th Anniversary of the founding of the Marine Corps League, and in reverent remembrance of the 28th Anniversary of the Battle for Iwo Jima.

This memorial stands as a symbol of a grateful Nation's esteem for the honored dead of the United States Marine Corps. Although this statue depicts one of the most famous incidents of World War II, by men who wrote their own bold chapter in the history of our beloved Corps, the memorial is dedicated to all Marines who have given their lives in defense of freedom since 1775.

Iwo Jima and Mount Suribachi—a grinding 36 day offensive that turned the tide in the Pacific—an event that captured for all time the spirit of Marines in victory. A victory that came at a high price—the highest in Marine history—5931 killed and 17,272 wounded. Only 1083 of over 20,000 Japanese survived. But the living and dead of both sides shared a grudging bond: *uncommon valor*.

To speak in memory of our honored war dead is not easy. We can add very little in words to what they accomplished in deeds. All that we can ever hope to do is follow their example—to show the same selfless courage in peace that they did in war—to return to our homes with renewed dedication to God, Country, and Corps.

Within the past three weeks, we have witnessed important world-wide events perhaps of greater significance than most in our entire lifetimes: the signing of the Vietnam cease-fire agreement on January 27th; the last American to die in Vietnam, Colonel William B. Nolde, United States Army, from Powers, Michigan, killed in action just hours before the cease-fire took effect on January 27th, and buried here at Arlington in these hallowed grounds with full military honors; and lastly and most joyously, the release of our first returning prisoners-of-war beginning on Monday of this week.

President Nixon's announcement of a peace settlement in Vietnam answered the prayers of all Americans. His achievement in Vietnam, *peace with honor*, is another proud moment in American history. Despite What the Critics and Detractors Might Say. It is a proud achievement for free men all over the world.

Ending the war and winning the peace in Vietnam did not come overnight. But we can thank God that the President stood firm for a settlement which would last—one that will protect the right of small nations to determine their own futures. It is a peace that was not purchased at the price of defeat or surrender. It was a courageous foot-by-foot advance, similar to that attained at Iwo Jima.

At the base of this statue is a roll call of Marine Corps battles fought from the Revolutionary War to the Korean Conflict. It is up to each of us to insure that this great Memorial remains, *in the eyes of all Americans*, not only as a symbol of the perpetual spirit of Marines who fell at the Battle of Trenton, Belleau Wood, Iwo Jima, and at Inchon, but including those Marines who served and fell at Khe Sanh. The real heroes of this present era are all those brave young men who served in Southeast Asia, from each branch of the service. As members of an elite Corps, it is our legacy, and our sacred responsibility, to honor all who have worn the globe and anchor, whose motto is *Semper Fidelis*, whose mission is devotion to duty, and whose initials U.S.M.C. spell Pride and Esprit de Corps.

I was deeply touched by something I saw on the television screen last night, on the 11 p.m. news. I watched the return to this country of our longest held prisoner-of-war, Lieutenant Commander Elveret Alvarez, who had been held captive for 8½ years, since August 1964. Upon leaving the plane, he stepped to a microphone to say a few words. And who among us will ever forget what he said. "We have come home," he said. And after a brief pause, he added, "Mr. and Mrs. America, you did not forget us."

General Jannell, distinguished guests, fellow Marines, and ladies of our Marine Corps

League Auxiliary, by your very presence here today, you have proven that you have not forgotten those who have gone before us, and all of those who served their Nation under arms.

As we pause to place this wreath as a symbol of our remembrance and a grateful heart, let us ask our Heavenly Father's blessing upon all assembled here and for all of our fellow Marines who faithfully served our Country, and who sacrificed and bled that our people might have freedom and justice. We ask His help that future generations may come to know the way of peace, and that war and all its attendant evils will no longer demand the sacrifice of the flower of our youth.

A PLEA FOR A HUMAN EVALUATION OF ESEA—TITLE I

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I was very impressed by the following letter from Dr. Charles W. Craig, principal of the Carpenter Road Community School, Flint, Mich., and would like to share it with my colleagues and all those concerned with evaluating our educational goals and priorities:

Rumor has it that Title I funds may not receive congressional approval for the 1973-74 school year. The basis for much of the disenchantment with ESEA funded programs is that they have not in general demonstrated that additional funding will provide concomitant increases in school achievement.

Although those of us in education are naturally concerned with achievement, it is my considered judgment that increased achievement is the wrong premise on which to base such programs. Rather, they should be conceived, implemented, and evaluated on the basis of whether or not they alleviated some of the human needs and problems for the school and community populations for which they were designed to serve.

As a principal of a school which receives Title I assistance mainly in terms of increased staff personnel, i.e., two reading teachers, one math teacher, three teacher aides, and one school social worker, I can justifiably report to you that without their efforts, our school and community would approach a state of unmanageability as far as dealing with the problems of our students and parents is concerned.

These additional personnel and supplies are also needed to combat a sense of "defeatism" that is often found among staff members in inner city schools. Their presence offers hope of progress, not only to one another as colleagues, but to students and their parents as well.

The elements in any given social function, such as education, can be of either a negative or positive self-fulfilling prophecy. That is, if the participants see things as going from bad to worse, they tend to give up, and by so doing, insure the very outcome they were afraid would become a reality. On the other hand, if those same participants have the feeling that everyone is united in a common effort and that hope for a better tomorrow is a constant companion, the situation is likely to improve.

The social problems which concern all of us did not materialize in the short span of a few years and they are not likely to be remedied in a similar period of time. I cannot assure you that our students and parents will show marked improvement in the various aspects of their lives with the continued

support of programs such as Title I. However, without such program support, I can most assuredly promise you that our school and community environment will deteriorate from what it is today.

The decision rests with you and your colleagues.

Respectfully submitted,
Dr. CHARLES W. CRAIG,
Principal,
Carpenter Road Community School.

MR. WOLFF'S NEWSLETTER

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep my constituents informed of my work as their representative in the Congress, I send each family in my district a regular newsletter. At this point in the RECORD, I should like to insert the text of my first report of the 93d Congress:

WOLFF'S NEWSLETTER

DEAR FRIEND AND CONSTITUENT: At long last they are on their way home from the jungles and the prison camps—all having suffered yet untold hardships for as long as eight years. It is a time for Americans to rejoice and be thankful that these gallant men have been released and reunited with their families and loved ones. Our nation owes them the deepest debt of gratitude for enduring. They justly deserve our admiration.

However, a hard, cold fact of war and peace remains. There are several more millions of our American veterans who served in Indochina. More than 46,000 of them made the supreme sacrifice for their nation, and for them we can only weep and remember. But, for the hundreds of thousands of the others—those with lifelong neurological disabilities, mangled bodies and permanent wounds; those wracked by heroin addiction and those finding it difficult to attain employment and return to enriching and productive lives, we can and must do more.

American industry is rightly going all out for our returning POW's with offers of top management jobs, but for our other Vietnam veterans, particularly the untrained and the unskilled, the employment rate is almost double the current national average. For the drug afflicted, the "cure" consists of two weeks of detoxification before being thrust back into society. For the remainder, who do not use drugs, there is the stigma of suspected use barring them from employment opportunities.

Think for a moment, don't you know a Vietnam veteran in your community who is facing hard times as he strives to return to the mainstream of America?

As the downstate New York member of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs and its Subcommittees on Hospitals and Education and Training, I pledge my commitment to care for and open up our resources to all these veterans.

I am recommending that the Veterans Administration institute an emergency program of drug rehabilitation running the full gamut of social, vocational and psychological services to train and enable these veterans to secure specific employment in the areas of our most pressing needs—health care, housing, education, environmental control, highway and mass transit improvement, law enforcement and crime control. Veterans with professional, educational or specialized Armed Services training and expertise should be placed in positions equivalent to their

capabilities at the federal, state and local government level, as well as in the private sector. I further am recommending that our programs of care and assistance be upgraded on behalf of the Gold Star mothers, widows and children who, too, have sacrificed so much in this tragic war.

We must now make a realistic and pragmatic assessment of the total American sacrifice by our Armed Services personnel in Indochina. All Americans, I believe, will agree with me that we must honor and help, not only our brave POW's, but all our veterans who served their country by offering them every available opportunity to return to fulfilling lives.

Sincerely,

LESTER L. WOLFF,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS BEGINS SCRUTINY OF 1974 BUDGET PROPOSALS

Your Congress has been presented an Administration budget for 1974 that, for all intent and purpose, would drastically alter the nation's basic philosophy of government. In the coming months this record \$268.7 billion budget will be closely scrutinized as Congress examines the wisdom of its funding proposals and the Administration's determination to eliminate essential domestic programs.

There is no question that this nation is facing an economic crisis brought about by a variety of causes and that we must cut back on the present rate of government spending to curtail the rise in deficits, year after year. I have long advocated that this nation must limit its spending to match its revenues or face continuing erosion of the dollar and its borrowing power. My proposed legislation to this effect is pending before the Congress.

However, the budget cuts must be made in the areas of non-essential government spending, not in programs essential to the continuing well-being of American families. The cutting tool must be a scalpel, not a meat cleaver.

For example, why must this nation continue to pay billions in subsidies to farmers each year not to produce food when prices continue to soar and people go hungry in the world? Why must we continue to bail out defense contractors with enormous loans whenever they make a mistake? Why do we permit foreign nations, which owe us more than \$46 billion, the continuing privilege of not paying back their debts?

The Administration's 1974 budget is asking your Congress to reduce benefits under Medicare, rather than expand them to meet the increasing needs of the elderly and the disabled. It is asking us to revise downward the structure of federal aid-to-education, to slash the Hill-Burton program to construct new hospital facilities, to agree that EOC programs, namely day care, family services, community action and manpower training are outmoded. These proposals show a callous disregard for the people.

The Administration's budget totally ignores sorely needed tax reform measures and welfare reform aimed at caring for the indigent, the elderly, the dependent child, and those unable to work. It ignores emergency unemployment assistance, veterans' needs, urban renewal and housing improvements to upgrade and infuse new life into our cities. The budget neglects programs for which your Congress appropriated funds last year by sharply curtailing or eliminating funding for pure waters and environmental control, health care, model cities, neighborhood facilities and open space.

Your 93rd Congress is facing a crucial period when it must, and will, regain its Constitutional role to enact the nation's legislation, to appropriate backup funding and to levy fair and equal tax burdens. Today, more than ever before, we cannot turn our backs on the Executive Branch's grab for these powers. The at-home needs of America have

been shunted aside for far too long to pay the high cost of the Vietnam War.

We must start by re-examining spending priorities with a firm eye on meeting our domestic challenges yet reducing our budget deficits. I, for one, will energize my efforts behind those programs that are meaningful to the needs of this nation and my Congressional District. We can wait no longer to act on these needs—or, it may be too late.

DOMESTIC CHALLENGES PROMPT WOLFF ACTION

The following is a brief summary of Congressman Wolff's legislative actions during the first months of the new 93rd Congress. However, it does not purport to reflect all measures he is sponsoring or supporting.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Co-sponsor of legislation to stabilize meat prices and require that the President submit to Congress a plan for insuring adequate meat supplies at fair prices as a step towards offsetting rising costs of food.

Co-sponsor of comprehensive package legislation to require that durable products be adequately labelled as to durability and performance and to assure sound consumer policies through "truth in labelling."

Co-sponsor of omnibus fire legislation to mandate federal standards for use of inflammable materials such as toxic plastics and polyurethane foam in buildings and furniture by amending the Flammable Fabrics Act; to establish a National Fire Academy to provide comprehensive training for firefighters; and to provide financial aid to local fire departments for the purchase of advanced equipment and self-contained breathing apparatus.

HEALTH CARE

As original sponsor of Medicare, hospital insurance program for the elderly under Social Security, HR 2713 would extend provisions to include prescription drug coverage.

Introduced legislation to insure that there be no loss of benefits (i.e. veterans pensions, Medicaid) due to 20 percent Social Security increase and to insure that every beneficiary receives the full increase.

Co-sponsor to reintroduce Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend programs of rehabilitation services to the handicapped and to provide special services for the severely handicapped, including those with kidney disease. President vetoed similar bill last year.

CRIME CONTROL

Co-sponsor of legislation to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies on Juvenile Justice to provide education and training for persons working with juvenile delinquents and to organize a data collection center on treatment control of youthful offenders.

TRANSPORTATION

Co-sponsor of legislation to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide additional grant assistance to states. Bill would permit annual use of up to \$800 million from Highway Trust Fund for purchase or construction of mass transportation systems.

[From the Long Island Press, Feb. 19, 1973]

DRUG PROBLEM IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(By Jack Anderson)

A report now in preparation will charge that the United States isn't trying to cut off drug smuggling from Thailand, because Thai leaders are too deeply implicated and might retaliate by closing U.S. military bases.

The report will be submitted to the House Foreign Affairs Committee by Rep. Lester Wolff, D-N.Y., who has been investigating the drug problem in Southeast Asia.

He came back from an inspection tour last year to report that some top Thai officials were operating a fleet of trawlers, which was moving tons upon tons of opium to Hong Kong for shipment to American addicts.

He is now back from another tour of Southeast Asia, where he found the Thai smuggling operation relatively unchanged. The Thai opium, he will charge, is handled by dealers who are virtually immune from legal interference. They include some of the most powerful men in the country, whom the United States doesn't wish to offend.

He also has proof, he will say, that illegal drug labs are still operating in Thailand, despite State Department denials. His report will also be critical of the government's strategy of buying up opium crops. The practice does little to stop drug smuggling and is excessively expensive, he will charge.

The report will claim that most of the money allocated for the war on drugs has gone into cutting off the Turkish opium supply, with little left to fight smuggling in other areas. Meanwhile, the "Thai Connection" blossoms like a poppy in the sun.

Wolff will point out, for instance, that the United States spends millions to keep 45,000 military men in Thailand but can't scrape up enough money to keep more than 35 narcotics agents to protect the nation against Asian drug smugglers.

Finally, the report will recommend that American aid to Thailand be shut off unless the country cooperates in smashing the drug smugglers.

Congressman Wolff is the author of amendment to the 1972 Foreign Assistance Act to terminate aid to Thailand for failure to take action to halt narcotics traffic. Amendment was adopted by both House and Senate. However, entire Act did not receive Congressional approval; foreign aid programs are being funded under Continuing Resolution pending adoption of a 1973 Foreign Assistance Act.

PUBLIC WORKS—THE ARKANSAS RIVER SUCCESS STORY

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the role of public works in promoting sound, balanced national growth and in stimulating economic development in depressed areas of our country has all too often been misunderstood.

During a quarter of a century of service in the Congress, most of it as a member of the Committee on Public Works, I have taken part in the planning and direction of literally hundreds of such programs, ranging all the way from the dredging of waterways to the redevelopment of entire regions of the United States. I have seen these programs—often denounced by misinformed critics as a waste of the taxpayers' money—grow from small beginnings into monumental and lasting contributions to the well-being of our citizens, contributions that repaid their original cost many times over.

One such project, initiated by the Public Works Committee back in the 1950's, involved a 450-mile stretch of the Arkansas River from its junction with the Mississippi to Tulsa, Okla. Over a period of 15 years, and at a cost of \$1.3 billion, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers opened the Arkansas River to navigation and restored to life a vast area of mid-America that had been slowly sinking into economic ruin.

The success story of that one project—

and it is only one of many public works successes—is best told in the accompanying article that appeared in the February 27 issue of the Washington Post, written by Columnist Joseph Kraft, once a vigorous critic of the Arkansas River project:

A RIVER—AND A STATE—REVITALIZED

(By Joseph Kraft)

LITTLE ROCK, Ark.—Headlong growth, bringing pollution and congestion and a riot of other ills, is visibly destroying many parts of the country along the Atlantic and Pacific coastlines. But how can growth be arrested in a country where the national ethic is to give maximum scope to individual initiative?

The answer is that instead of trying to restrict growth, it makes better sense to disperse it to less advanced parts of the country. A good case in point is the tonic effect on the area around Little Rock of the Arkansas River project.

That project has made the river navigable for 450 miles from its juncture with the Mississippi to Tulsa, Okla. Dredging and construction of 18 dams and locks cost an estimated \$1.3 billion spread over 15 years beginning in 1957 with formal completion last year. During the 1960s the project became known as the "biggest pork barrel in history."

I remember flying over the project about 10 years ago with its most powerful sponsor, the late Sen. Robert Kerr of Oklahoma. The stream below us was a muddy trickle. Sen. Kerr stopped along the way to open (with a golden bulldozer) construction on various ports so obscure that I do not remember their names.

At the end of the day I asked an officer from the Army Corps of Engineers which was building the project whether it wasn't unduly expensive. "Hell," he said, "it would have been cheaper to pave the river."

But that judgment, which echoed my own sentiments, has been unsaid by the results. The river has been totally transformed.

The dams have stopped the silting, and with the sediment gone, the tiny organisms known as plankton have reappeared, reopening the river to the life-giving force of the sun. The river has become greenish-blue in color, instead of brown. Bass and other freshwater fish rare 10 years ago are now abundant. A fresh-water shrimp, unknown before, has turned up.

The cleaning up of the river and the lakes created back of the dams has made the area exceedingly attractive for recreational purposes. Arkansas has become a magnet for retirees from Illinois, Missouri and Kansas. Many companies which value recreation highly in their choice of sites are turning toward the state. The town of Russellville, 65 miles from Little Rock, is one good example.

The Firestone Company is putting in a plant. So is a food division of the conglomerate company, International Telephone and Telegraph. Middle South Utilities, the chief power company in the area, is investing an estimated \$300 million in new generating facilities.

Improved navigation facilities have quickened commerce throughout the area. Hundreds of thousands of tons of Arkansas rice and soy beans go down river and across the ocean to Europe and Japan every year.

Bauxite from the Caribbean feeds aluminum plants near Little Rock. Steel from Japan is building a new bridge across the river. Over the last weekend, two new foreign auto agencies, stocked with cars shipped direct to Little Rock by sea, opened their doors here.

The result of all this activity is a mild population boom. This state lost population throughout the 1930s, the 1940s and most of the 1950s. With the Arkansas River project, the adverse trend has been turned around. Population is now back where it was in 1940—at about 2 million—and steadily rising.

No one in this state doubts that the project

has paid off. "It has exceeded the highest hopes of all its sponsors by far," Dale Bumpers, the attractive and energetic young Democratic governor said the other day.

More important are the national implications of what has been done here. Ecologists and environmentalists cannot on their own check forever the pressure for more and more development along the coasts.

At best they can slow down the headlong growth. They can achieve full success only if the pressure for growth which comes from individuals and families and companies is channeled elsewhere, as it has been here in the Arkansas River Valley.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I share with all of the Members of the House a warm profile of the distinguished majority leader, Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL. The profile is taken from the March 1973 issue of "Bridge," a magazine for the Boston College community.

This article, entitled "A Political Architect Plans a Stronger House," expresses the admiration and gratitude of the more than 40,000 living alumni of Boston College, a university from which Congressman O'NEILL graduated in 1936.

This profile of Congressman O'NEILL was accompanied by an attractive picture of the majority leader with his charming wife, Mildred. Although it is not possible to reproduce here this lovely picture, the profile which follows does nonetheless present an interesting account of the remarkable career of this distinguished statesman:

A POLITICAL ARCHITECT PLANS A STRONGER HOUSE

(By Rich Morrison)

Thomas P. O'Neill doesn't forget old friends. The night of Congressman O'Neill's election as Majority Leader in the House of Representatives was party night in Washington. During a get-together at the International Club with family and friends, and the thoroughbred Bostonian (in typical fashion) broke out into rousing song with some of the old BC crowd. Above the melodic din, Tip's dulcet tones could be heard leading an impromptu chorus of *For Boston*, the traditional fight song of the Heights, written by T. J. Hurley in 1885. It was the Class of 1936 all over again.

One of BC's most illustrious alumni to date, sociable energy notwithstanding, Tip did not forge his political career by throwing parties. His commitment to the welfare of the people he represents goes back to his student days. O'Neill has not lost an election since 1936 when, as a Boston College senior, he lost a seat on the City Council by a mere 150 votes. His 36 year fling with politics has been on the upswing ever since, the most recent stopover being the majority leader's seat, left vacant after the tragic plane crash that killed Louisiana representative Hale Boggs last fall.

The burly Irishman is described by his son Michael as a "super-fan" of Boston College. His career reflects his BC education and the strict Irish Catholic upbringing in Cambridge, where his family settled after immigrating from County Cork. When the legislature allows him some free time (he spends about 12 days a month home), he is in

Cambridge, where he lives with his wife, Mildred. Of their five children, Rosemary, 29, works for the State Department in Washington, Susan, 26, is a teacher in Virginia, Tom 3rd, 27, was just elected to the Massachusetts legislature, Christopher, 23 is a recent BC graduate and Michael, 21, is presently a student at Boston College.

After engaging in a few novice espionage techniques in an attempt to learn the congressman's home phone number in Cambridge, one colleague suggested simply, "Why don't you try the phone book?" I did and discovered that O'Neill makes it easy for his constituents to keep in touch with him. bridge contacted O'Neill shortly after his recent election and asked him if he saw any difficulty setting priorities between his role as congressman and as majority leader. His quick reply was, "There's no question about it. My constituents come first. And I'm dedicated to serving them with all my ability. Of course, having the majority leader's post will help my district. As majority leader I'm responsible for scheduling legislation on the floor and I'm in constant contact with the speaker and the committee chairmen. When legislation that affects my district is before these committees I know I'll get expeditious service and I schedule our bills for the floor immediately."

Possessed of a quick wit and fierce loyalty, the 60 year old alumnus is concerned with the vital issues perhaps more than any majority leader in recent history. Commenting on the fiscal crisis of the nation's cities, O'Neill said, "I definitely believe that an institution of higher education should be able to render services in lieu of taxes. After all, a college is a community organization and has a responsibility to improve the community using its resources as best it can, whether this be in the form of taxes or educational programs, it is a contribution just the same. Boston College is a national leader in community involvement and I am proud to be a member of the Board of Trustees."

O'Neill was nicknamed "Tip" by his family, after an 1880's baseball player whose name was O'Neill and who had a famous proclivity for "tipping" foul balls. He's a product of the times, from a working-class background. Parochial schools are a tradition in his family and there was a time when the four oldest children shared the same bedroom.

A nine-term member of the House Rules Committee and co-chairman of the Democratic Congressional Committee, the Roosevelt New Dealer has been among the unofficial leadership of the House since 1952, when representative John F. Kennedy moved to the Senate. Accused by some of old-time politics, the candid O'Neill has taken very visible stands on controversial issues. His split with the late Lyndon Johnson over the Vietnam war, in 1967 was a difficult move for him, but one which he felt, in good conscience, had to be made.

The new majority is energetic and untiring. His roots in Boston are deep and he has never forgotten the people who elected him congressman. Both conservatives and liberals share the expectation that Tip O'Neill will provide the kind of "can-do-get done" leadership in his critical House job.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES OF THE NEW CONGRESS

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the 93d Congress will confront some of the most complex and controversial environmental

issues in its history. The issues this session will not be nearly as clear cut as those which have already been legislated, such as air and water pollution and the need to protect wildlife.

Perhaps the most serious and most complex environmental problem is the Nation's energy crisis, which during the last winter led to the closing of schools, factories, hospitals, and also to the rationing of fuel all across the Nation. Largely responsible for this energy shortage has been the astounding rise and demand which has far out-paced the Nation's ability to meet the demand.

Unfortunately, assuming that the demand cannot be lessened, any contemplated new source of energy to meet the demand poses already well recognized hazards to our environment. For example, the Nation may be forced to return to traditional, and highly polluting, forms of power production, such as coal burning, and the use of high sulfur oil. The expansion of our nuclear power resources is also a matter of concern, because of the risk of thermopollution. And even the need for new crude oil sources has led to controversy over the Alaskan pipeline, off-shore drilling, and the highly controversial issue of nuclear power plant siting.

There is an obvious need for a national energy policy that will strike a balance between our energy demands and our deep concern for the environment. I am a member of the new Energy Subcommittee of the Science and Astronautics Committee which has been formed to take an indepth look into our energy crisis, and to consider ways to deal with these pressing problems with minimum risk to the environment. Included will be a study of highly efficient but potentially dangerous nuclear fusion power, the feasibility of encouraging smaller and leaner automotive engines, the practicality of improving pollution control mechanisms so that lower grade coal and oil can be used in our Nation's power plants, and other alternatives. However, in the short run it is clear that we will have to increase refined and crude oil by substantially raising import quotas.

I recognize that this is just the beginning but it is evident that we cannot delay any longer.

LAND USE

A second major environmental issue will be land use. The fact is that our Nation has no organized, comprehensive land use policy designed to protect the environment. Land use policy has always been the prerogatives of the diverse State and localities who have power over planning and zoning in their jurisdiction. The balkanization of zoning jurisdictions has, unfortunately, led to a complete lack of regard for the basic relationships of land use, such as between densely populated and sparsely populated areas, between agricultural and industrial areas, and between new cities and the need for open space. Even more unfortunate is the fact that while the Federal Government owns 34 percent of all the land in the United States, Congress has never established an overall program for its use. Clearly, if the Congress is to encourage communities and States across the Nation to develop comprehensive planning and

zoning it must establish a comprehensive plan of its own.

Related to the question of land use is the extremely controversial legislation to prohibit, or at least strongly limit, strip mining throughout the Nation. The Congress in its debate over this issue must consider the preservation of millions of millions of acres of forest lands and other environmental resources, as well as the incalculable harm to the thousands of families who depend on mining for their livings. This is particularly true in West Virginia where poverty has long been the area's greatest problem.

TRANSPORTATION

We must find a way to rid ourselves of our reliance on automobiles which are the major cause for air pollution. In this regard I have introduced a bill to divert highway trust funds for the construction of bicycle paths and other facilities throughout our Nation's Federal highway system. It is my belief that if we can encourage the increased use of bicycles we will not only find our air cleaner, our cities less clogged with traffic, and fewer highway traffic fatalities but we will have happier and more healthy citizens.

OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

One of the great sources of water pollution in the country derives from farm runoff. Earlier in the 93d Congress, Congress passed the rural environmental action program, designed to stimulate the Nation's farmers to develop efficient means of reducing land run off, as well as other environment related projects.

Another issue Congress will consider will be the question of environmental class action, similar to the law now presently in effect in Michigan. Hearings on this legislation were held last year on both sides of Congress, and it is likely that further hearings will be scheduled soon.

Perhaps the greatest issue facing the Congress is the need to coordinate Federal efforts. On the Executive side, environmental programs are fragmented between a multitude of departments including Housing and Urban Development, Transportation, Agriculture, Interior, and the Environmental Protection Agency, as well as the Corps of Engineers in the Department of Defense.

In the Congress environmental legislation is considered in no less than six committees in the House and a similar number in the Senate. Obviously, this leads to mass confusion.

In order to help resolve the question of congressional jurisdiction, I have introduced legislation creating a Committee on the Environment which would have full control over environmental matters. To simplify administration, my first step would be to transfer the Corps of Engineers to the Environmental Protection Agency, to insure that the corps considers the environment first and not last when it initiates its many and varied public works projects. I believe that anyone who has been connected with the corps' proposal to construct a polluted dredge disposal site at Pointe Mouille in Monroe County would agree with me on this issue. Unfortunately, Pointe Mouille is but one of many examples of the corps' short-sightedness on questions of the environment.

PROGRESS

In many ways I agree with the President's recent assertion that we have made enormous progress in the field of environmental protection in the last few years. When I first came to Congress this issue was but a ripple on the surface and was greatly overshadowed by other areas which were then considered more pressing. It is clear that the environment has now assumed a top place in our Nation's priorities and that we will continue to press hard for improved environmental legislation. However, the job is bound to become increasingly difficult and the issues much more complex. Despite this complexity we must continue to maintain our interest in this most important field—the preservation of the earth on which we live.

SHIP COMMISSIONED IN HONOR OF KOREAN WAR HERO

HON. JOHN MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to make mention of an occasion which passed rather quickly but not insignificantly.

I am referring to the commissioning of a ship in honor of a Korean war hero named Jesse L. Brown.

Ensign Jesse L. Brown was born October 13, 1926 in Mattiesburg, Miss. He was educated in the public schools at Hattiesburg and Ohio State University. He enlisted in the Naval Reserves on July 8, 1946. In 1947 he accepted an appointment as a midshipman in the U.S. Navy. From here he went on to the Navy Pre-flight School in Ottumwa, Iowa, followed by flight training at Pensacola and Jacksonville, Fla.

In October of 1948, when he was designated a naval aviator and received his "Wings of Gold," he became the Navy's first black aviator.

Midshipman Brown joined Fighter Squadron 32 which first saw service with the carrier U.S.S. *Wright* but was later reassigned to aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Leyte*—then bound for Sasebo, Japan.

Ensign Brown's prowess as a fighter pilot was truly exemplary, resulting in his being named a section leader in addition to receiving the Air Medal for daring attacks against enemy lines of communication, transportation facilities, military installations and troop concentrations at Wonsun, Chonjin, Sonjin and Sinanju.

It was this type of dedication to service and country that cost Ensign Brown his life for he died on December 4, 1950, while giving close air support to marines fighting near the Chosin Reservoir. Undeterred by heavy antiaircraft fire, Ensign Brown repeatedly attacked hostile troops and continued aggressive strafing runs until his plane was struck by enemy fire and crashed.

Ensign Brown perished in the wreckage of his plane. He was posthumously awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for his exceptional courage.

On Saturday, February 17, 1973, the new destroyer escort, *Jesse L. Brown*, was commissioned at the Boston Naval Shipyard, Charlestown, Mass., in honor of this great American. I am particularly pleased and proud that Boston was able to share in this momentous occasion.

Taking part in the commissioning ceremonies was Mrs. Gilbert W. Thorne, widow of the late aviator, and her daughter, Mrs. Terrence Knight, Ensign Brown's only child. May God bless them both.

In closing, I am most proud to honor this true American who so unselfishly gave his life so that we who might live on can continue to pursue the ever-fleeting goal of peace for all men.

Because of men like Jesse L. Brown, I am confident that such a peace can and must be achieved.

AME BISHOPS MEET WITH CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, 1973, the Congressional Black Caucus met here in Washington, D.C., with 17 bishops of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. Also present were a large contingent of AME Church ministers from all over America. This was a historic meeting for it marked the first joint press conference to be held by the caucus and these men of the cloth. It was a dramatic occasion—one filled with the impact of the times.

Mr. Speaker, the African Methodist Episcopal Church was founded in 1816 and is the oldest institution owned by black people. Collectively these bishops represent over 2 million black people and others on four continents. Mr. Speaker, these men are leaders—they are a formidable force in America's black communities.

They came to Washington out of a sense of compassion for people. They were distressed by the recent actions of President Richard M. Nixon and they came to articulate their concerns about black and poor people all over America.

Mr. Speaker, after our press conference, these bishops had a lengthy meeting with the Congressional Black Caucus. Following this they met with you, Mr. Speaker, and with Mr. GERALD R. FORD, the distinguished minority leader of the House in order to register their concerns with both of you as leaders in the House.

Mr. Speaker, as members of the Congressional Black Caucus, we were proud to receive the support of these outstanding religious leaders. Black Americans hold their religious leaders in high esteem.

I would like to share with my colleagues the names of the bishops with whom the Congressional Black Caucus met on February 26. They are as follows: Bishop D. Ward Nichols, of Columbia, S.C.; Bishop W. R. Wilkes, of Nashville, Tenn.; Bishop H. T. Primm, of Denver,

Colo.; Bishop F. D. Jordan, of Hollywood, Calif.; Bishop E. L. Hickman, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Bishop G. W. Blakely, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Bishop H. J. Bryant, of Kansas City, Mo.; Bishop H. I. Branden, of Atlanta, Ga.; Bishop I. H. Bonner, of New Orleans, La.; Bishop H. N. Robinson, of Jacksonville, Fla.; Bishop H. W. Murph, of Washington, D.C.; Bishop J. H. Adams, of Waco, Tex.; Bishop R. A. Hildebrand, of Atlanta, Ga.; Bishop S. S. Morris, Jr., of Little Rock, Ark.; Bishop H. H. Brookins, of Los Angeles, Calif.; Bishop V. R. Anderson, of Birmingham, Ala.; and Bishop F. C. James, of Sumter, S.C.

The following is the text of the statement and the resolution which the bishops issued at our joint press conference:

STATEMENT

The Bishops of the African Methodist Episcopal Church have come to the Nation's Capital today to register our deep distress at the recent actions of President Richard M. Nixon as they affect Black people and poor people across this land. We are here to protest the obvious effect on the part of this administration to negate the social progress of the past decade and plunge us in the direction of a period of social retrogression and despair. We deplore this trend.

The African Methodist Episcopal Church, established since 1816, has from its inception stood squarely for *Black Liberation*, *Black Dignity*, and *Black Pride*. Our history is inextricably bound with the developmental progression of our people. Their fortunes have been our fortunes; their hopes, our hopes; their defeats, our defeats. From humble beginnings in Philadelphia to the present, we have grown to nineteen Bishops, over seven thousand Pastors, ministering to a constituency of approximately one million communicants. We have churches, schools, hospitals, and service institutions located in every sector of these United States, as well as Africa and the Isles of the Sea. All that we represent is bound in the upward mobility of the Black and poor whom, through these years, we have sought to serve. It would be a negation of our total heritage should we stand mute in the face of the cruel emasculation of these vitally necessary programs.

We decry these cuts on moral grounds. It is dehumanizing to take from the Americans those supportive programs in education, in housing, in community organization, in manager training, in child care, in economic development, which have formed a small basis of hope in a raging sea of despair. We owe more than this to the *Aged*, the *Blind*, the *Halt*, the spiritually deprived.

We call upon President Richard M. Nixon today to rescind these threats to the very vital lifetime of our communities and, in his own words, to "Bring us Together"—together in confidence, not in fear; together in fulfillment, not in despair; together in achieving the American dream, not in dismantling that dream. Do not permit the vaunted "War on Poverty" to become a horrible "War on the Poor."

We call upon our constituents and our fellow Americans of good will throughout the land to "Shun that which is evil and cleave to that which is good."

May the terror of the times serve as the agent of re-creation. May we be called away from our divisive ways and drawn into that "Beloved Community" which prospers though oppressed, and cleave ever to the belief that, that which is right will ultimately triumph.

We are here today because we care. We have come to call the conscience of the nation to the moment of judgment. We call the great leaders of our minority groups to assemble a leadership conference immediately to lay out a blueprint for action.

Further, we call upon the members of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in every village, town and hamlet in America to join with those forces who are mobilizing to fight these cuts with all vigor and to appeal to the highest and best in America.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, has used his official position to end or emasculate those programs, initiated over the past twelve years, which had as an over-all goal the elimination of poverty, and the root causes of poverty, in which approximately one in five Americans are caught,

Whereas, The programs, across the broad spectrum of our common life, in housing, in education, in nursing and day care services, in Economic Development, have given the dispossessed of our land a reason for hope, and an introduction to the ladder of upward mobility in the areas of social and economic growth,

Whereas, The sudden announcement of the impending close of these programs has produced consternation in the poor communities, and among people of good will in every walk of life,

And whereas, Many of these people are the very people who make up our constituency.

And whereas, This action by President Nixon represents a cruel and callous disregard for the "paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty", and an offense to the sensibilities of justice which lies at the heart of our Judeo-Christian faith,

Be it Resolved: That the Bishops' Council of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in session at Louisville, Kentucky, this 21st day of February, 1973, shall forthwith communicate to President Richard M. Nixon our displeasure over his recent acts which result in the dissolution of federally funded social programs which have in the past decade offered Black Citizens and other oppressed minorities the hope of sharing equally in the material abundance of this the most affluent nation in the world.

Be it Also Resolved: That in implementation of this Resolution the Council of Bishops shall immediately call upon the presiding Bishops of Episcopal Districts, Presiding Elders, Pastors, and Lay Members of the A.M.E. Church to mobilize all of the human and material resources at their command to the end that these may be applied in support of those organizations and agencies which are currently attempting to impress upon the President of U.S.A. the collective discontent of Black Citizens with all of those executive actions and policies on his part which are clearly inimical if not hostile to the social welfare of the poor and oppressed. Let the full influence of the A.M.E. Church be joined with that of other Black institutions and organizations in such a practical manner as to create a voice of discontent of such force that it will be heard in every hall of government, and reverberate throughout the world.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE LITHUANIAN DAY OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, during the month of February freedom-loving people throughout the world observed the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania as well as the 722d anniversary of the founding of the

Lithuanian State. I am pleased and honored to join with you, our colleagues here in the Congress and Americans of Lithuanian heritage throughout our Nation in commemorating these most historic and memorable events.

In their deep concern and continuing support of Lithuanians in the struggle to regain freedom and independence for the country of their origin, the Lithuanian American Community of the U.S.A., Inc., and the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey have been in the vanguard of Lithuanian-Americans in their relentless efforts to seek remedial action. I call your attention to the following resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey which succinctly outlines the views they have communicated to me proposing the sovereignty of the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia as an integral part of the agenda to be discussed at the forthcoming Conference on European Security and Cooperation:

RESOLUTION

We, Lithuanian-Americans of New Jersey, gathered in Newark on February 11, 1973, to commemorate the 55th anniversary since the restoration of Lithuania's independence,

Recall: That the sovereignty and independence of the Lithuanian State, which was restored by the act of the Lithuanian Council on February 16, 1918 and protected by the bloody sacrifice of the Lithuanian people, was recognized by the international community;

That in 1940 the Soviet Union occupied and incorporated Lithuania into the USSR in violation of international law;

That this occupation resulted in acts of genocide, deportation to Siberia, and extermination of about one million Lithuanians;

That these illegal acts still continue to this present day as witnessed by the following acts which received worldwide attention:

The defiant courtroom speech of the sailor Simas Kudirka, following his unsuccessful attempt to escape to the free world on November 23, 1970, and his condemnation in May, 1971 to ten years in forced labor prison;

The self-immolation of Romas Kalanta, a young student and worker, in May 1972, which symbolized the Lithuanian people's protest against the occupying power and their demand for freedom;

The petition of 17,000 Lithuanian religious believers in 1971-1972 to Leonid Brezhnev and Kurt Waldheim, protesting the denial of religious freedom in Soviet occupied Lithuania, under the risk of their personal freedom.

We resolve: To request the President of the United States of America to instruct his delegates at the Conference on European Security and Cooperation in Helsinki to demand the withdrawal of the Soviet Union from the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and permit these people to exercise their sovereign rights in their own lands;

To ask the Congress of the United States for their support of this request.

UNITED COMMITTEE OF LITHUANIAN-AMERICANS.

K. JANKUNAS, President.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with our fellow citizens of Lithuanian ancestry in this annual observance and renewed encouragement to the Lithuanians in the Soviet Union in our mutual concern for their national independence and individual well-being.

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I rise very briefly to welcome my distinguished colleague and friend DON RIEGLE to this side of the aisle.

I think I probably understand quite well the difficulty of the decision that DON had to make, and that I too made a year ago. I assure him, though, that the decision will be eminently worthwhile and a happy one.

DON RIEGLE's switch means much not just to me, but to our party. The Democratic Party welcomes today a man of distinction, of deep commitment and of ability, both in and out of Congress.

This is no everyday affair we are encountering today; let us salute the courage and conscience of DON RIEGLE and thank him for making our party yet a stronger institution.

To Meredith Riegle, also, Mary Louise and I extend a warm welcome.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues DON RIEGLE's statement announcing his decision to join the Democratic Party:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

All of us who take part in public life find that our ability to directly influence events is almost always limited by circumstances over which we have little control. The constant struggle to develop a significant degree of influence on events is really the central challenge of political figures in a self-government system.

In the political struggle of competing ideas and personalities, each participant must constantly cross-check himself to insure that his methods and efforts are both consistent with his conscience and as effective as possible in helping to solve the most urgent problems facing the American people.

It is in this context that I have just finished reviewing my own six year record of service in the U.S. Congress. I have evaluated my past experiences in an attempt to try to increase the meaning and effectiveness of my work in the future.

This appraisal has had many facets—but has time and again led back to the issue of the two party political structure in America—and the extent to which party affiliation is a major factor in influencing job performance.

Party affiliation is also a matter of conscience. These tests of effectiveness and conscience have convinced me that I should change my party affiliation from Republican to Democrat—and I am today announcing that decision.

This is an intensely personal decision that involves my deepest feelings and that necessarily affects many of the longest friendships and working relationships I have had in public life.

For many reasons it is painful to leave a party you have been part of for so many years. I am grateful to the Republican Party for the support it has given me over the years, and I wish the Party—and all its members—well in the months and years ahead.

I hope particularly to maintain my friendships—and the shared commitment to many non-partisan goals—with the active Republicans in Genesee County—with other con-

cerned Republicans across the state of Michigan—and many of my Congressional colleagues from Michigan and across the country—most particularly Jerry Ford and Pete McCloskey.

At the same time, it is with a sense of hope and enthusiasm that I look forward to joining those people who make up the great broad stream of the Democratic Party. While neither party is without its faults, the Democratic Party in recent years has shown a greater responsiveness to the needs of all the people. Time and again it has shown itself able and willing to tolerate dissent—to undertake reform—to pursue justice and equity—and to hammer out issues in open debate. It has been willing to listen to people and try to help. While honest mistakes have been made, they have been made in the course of a search for a better answer.

Of the two major parties, the Democratic Party today is much more the people's party—its essential instinct is to care and want to help. I believe I can be more effective in serving my people by working within the party that is leading the fight to help people.

I intend to work long and hard within the Democratic Party structure to contribute whatever positive ideas and effort I can—and I am looking forward to learning much from those party members who have labored long and effectively over the years. In building new friendships and working relationships, I hope to actively participate in the search for sound and just answers to our nation's problems.

My decision to leave the Republican Party is based on a number of factors which have accumulated over a period of time.

In times past, the Republican Party has known greatness; it has been a vital national forum where diverse views were openly expressed and policies hammered out in a spirit of goodwill and mutual respect. At those times, the voice of the American people was highly valued and listened to—policy was formulated from the people up, not from party bosses downward.

In recent years however, the national Party has steadily lost this character—increasingly its policies have been imposed from the top down, by a handful of people in the executive branch of government.

As the character of party policy formulation has changed, so has the test of party loyalty. Party loyalty is no longer measured by adherence to time-honored party traditions and principles; the new test of party loyalty is unswerving obedience to the current views of the incumbent administration; ultimately, the views of one man.

It is ironic and sad that a party that for so long championed individual freedom—separation of federal powers—limited and decentralized government—open debate and free competition—should now find itself having to abandon that heritage in favor of all powerful presidential paternalism. The Republican Party has been maneuvered into a straitjacket, where it has been forced to reject its heritage by declaring itself in favor of the most extreme exercise of unlimited executive control in our nation's history.

As party policy direction has become even more tightly controlled, dissenters within the Party have been purged, had their patriotism impugned, and have been subjected to other pressures to silence or discredit their views. While many Republicans of diverse philosophical viewpoints have privately viewed these developments with growing alarm, these misgivings have not developed into an effective counter-force.

While I have been concerned about the centralization of control within the national Party, I have also been deeply troubled by many of the tactics and policies carried out in the name of the Party.

I have not been able to accept or support certain of the policies that have been imposed upon the Party, including such areas

as: human rights, wasteful national spending priorities, hindrance of freedom of the press, excessive reliance on executive power, illegal and unconscionable campaign tactics and special interest government—among others.

I have tried, with others, to change the Party's positions in these areas, to promote reform and open the Party up to new people with diverse views. It is only after the repeated failures of these initiatives that I have concluded that the national Republican Party as presently structured and controlled cannot be significantly changed—at least for the foreseeable future.

A year and a half ago, I held out hope for a possible resurgence of moderate views and strength within the Republican Party. It was a small and guarded hope, but one that seemed worthy of pursuit and a major commitment of personal effort. As the months passed, that hope has been extinguished.

The openness and diversity that exists in the local Republican Party in Genesee County does not, unfortunately, exist in the present national Party structure. I believe the national Republican Party has tragically veered off course—largely abandoning the heritage of Lincoln, Teddy Roosevelt, and Eisenhower. Those who control the national Party have made it narrower, more rigid in its views—and less sensitive and relevant to the broad needs and concerns of the American people. And this has been reflected at the ballot box: in 1968 there were 31 Republican governors—today there are 19.

Working to restore the Republican Party to greatness is a worthy fight, and I deeply respect those Republicans who attempt it. Independent-minded Republicans of all viewpoints are essential to a vigorous two party system—and our country is strengthened by their dedication.

But there is an even greater crisis today, and that is the burning set of problems and issues facing America.

For me, and for most Americans, party issues are a distant second to conscience and country. In recent years, there has been a great loss of citizen faith in our self-government system—in politicians—and in our national parties. Government has largely lost touch with the most urgent and wrenching problems facing its people, and a vast number of our citizens have become cynical, apathetic and disgusted. They are wondering if they can believe anyone in politics anymore. Only 55% of the American electorate even bothered to vote in the 1972 Presidential election—a stark measure of the public's loss of faith in our political processes.

Things need to change—and change for the better. Either we regain citizen faith in the concept of self-government—or continue the slide toward inevitable one-man rule. We are dangerously far down that road now—and it is absolutely imperative that we reverse this trend by reinvigorating our political processes with integrity and meaning.

Here, in our own district, most of my constituents are working people. Most are independent minded—and they care less for partisanship than they do for some hard-nosed answers to the problems that are keeping them awake at night.

The average working person today desperately needs political leaders—and parties—dedicated to equal justice and opportunity—to more and better jobs—a safe and clean environment, a decent standard of living, good medical care people can afford, high quality education for our children and economic security in old age.

These are the goals I believe America can and must accomplish—not decades in the future—but now—for this generation of Americans. We have the resources and vision to do these things—but not unless we change our priorities and methods. It means we cannot passively accept a federal budget like

the one that has just come from the Nixon White House—a budget that cripples needed hospital construction—diverts the resources needed to save and rebuild our cities—and takes away medical benefits from our old people who are sick—in order to fatten the defense budget or reward campaign contributors and cronies with special tax loopholes, massive subsidies and other government give-aways.

We must do better. I believe the greatest threat to America is rooted in inequity and broken dreams—of people who have been left out or find themselves locked in place on a treadmill—and these people number in the tens of millions. Americans are patient and long suffering if their burdens are equal, if their sacrifices are for just causes, and they are dealt with openly and honestly. They can be pitted against each other—and thus immobilized and exploited—only for a limited time. Ultimately, truth will prevail, and when it does, those who have twisted public policy to their own selfish ends will feel the full wrath of public outrage.

The party affiliation issue, then, comes down to a basic question of where I can be most effective in serving my people.

I believe I can do substantially more to advance these goals if I work within the framework of the Democratic Party. Believing this, I would not be honest with myself nor would I be keeping faith with my constituents if I were to remain in the Republican Party where I am convinced my efforts on these issues would have very little effect.

I should further note that challenges to existing party policy greatly irritate those who now control national party direction. Their antagonism has been an unpleasant and unremitting fact of life that one can only learn to endure.

Here at home, some local Republicans have also felt very uncomfortable about my dissenting views. Others have felt these differences should not be discussed publicly—that I should resolve them within private party channels. I understand and respect these concerns and have been deeply troubled about the discomfort I have caused many of my Republican friends.

I have not welcomed the image of an antagonist within my party—I dislike constant conflict—and I do not enjoy the role of consistent opposition to policies within my own party. I have also seen that this opposition—however well motivated—is largely unwelcome and unwanted. It has become a growing source of pain to me—and to many Republicans.

I have had to ask myself whether my energies, beliefs and abilities can best be spent defending and fighting for an unpopular minority point of view within the Republican Party; or whether these same efforts can better serve people if I am working as part of a majority coalition within the Democratic Party which shares many of these same beliefs and goals. It seems to me far wiser and more productive to work within the party where my views are more often in agreement—where I can be affirmative—a protagonist.

In concluding, I should note that while political parties are essential to our nation, I have never taken positions—or voted on issues—on the basis of party label. I have always supported issues based on my evaluation of what was best for the people—regardless of party label—recognizing that all parties have some good ideas to contribute. While I am joining a party whose long historic record is more consistent with my beliefs—there will be times when I will find it necessary to dissent. I hope always to make that dissent reasonable and constructive. Ultimately, I must vote the way that best seems to meet the people's needs and squares with my own conscience.

To my constituents I would say that I am the same Don Riegle I have been in the past.

It has been a great honor and privilege to represent you for the past six years in Congress, and I will continue our policy of full-time service to all our people. I have always kept partisanship out of the conduct of my official duties; I will do the same in the future.

Finally, I hope that my constituents, my colleagues, and the members of both parties can accept this decision with good will and a spirit of mutual faith in the concept of representative self-government. Active competition between political parties and the clash of opposing viewpoints is the very keystone of our democracy—and I believe each of us must search for the truth in our own way—at the same time respecting those whose views are different than our own. For whatever issues may divide us as individuals—within parties or between parties—there are many, many more which bind us together as fellow Americans who cherish our liberty and our processes of self-government. While we may compete aggressively on given issues—our mutual participation in the political process is an act of national unity which keeps Democracy vigorous and alive.

MORE ON MEDICAID ABUSES IN NEW YORK

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the following is the fifth in an excellent series of articles from the New York Daily News describing very vividly the abuses of the medicaid system in New York. I recommend it to my colleague in Congress in the hope that Congress will soon commit itself to a comprehensive overhauling of this Nation's medical services:

[From the Daily News, Jan. 30, 1973]

HOW A PHYSICIAN CAN PRESCRIBE PURE DOLLARS

(By William Sherman)

The pharmacy in the Delancey Medical Building is only a counter in a second-floor hallway and behind that, a room with some shelves and a small working area for mixing prescriptions.

But last year, out of that small one-man operation at 80 Delancey St. came \$95,000 worth of medicaid billings. The business was generated from a large group of doctors, dentists, podiatrists, and other specialists who also rent space on that floor and cater almost exclusively to medicaid clients.

And that center, which features a color television and a hot coffee machine in the waiting room, will generate more than \$1 million in medicaid billings this year.

There are 1,957 pharmacies in New York City that bill medicaid for filling prescriptions. In 1971, they collectively received \$30,502,341.

Many of the pharmacies, Health Department records show, are located inside group medicaid centers similar to the Delancey Medical Building. They usually pay a flat monthly rent to the owner of the center or to the building landlord.

An examination of the records revealed that some of the pharmacies, in addition to giving short counts and overbilling on drugs dispensed, also have their clientele directed to them by center personnel in violation of "freedom of choice" regulations, which require that patients must be given the freedom to choose the drugstore where their prescriptions are filled.

"This is supposed to prevent collusion among pharmacies, doctors, and center owners, many of whom are businessmen who do not practice in any of the medical professions," said Stuart Laurence, an attorney for the Health Department.

The inquiry into pharmacy practices came as part of The News' continuing Medicaid Probe series, an in-depth investigation into abuses of the city's \$1.3 billion medical assistance program.

"Some of the doctors use preprinted prescriptions, handed out by pharmacies," said Laurence, "other prescriptions are filled in by pharmacists and doctors simply sign at the bottom."

One variation: Dr. Mortimer Greenberg, with offices at 724 Eighth Ave., Brooklyn, was seeing as many as 150 medicaid patients a day in addition to his 150 private patients, department records show. Nearly all his medicaid patients had their prescriptions filled at the Park Slope Pharmacy down the block at 803 Eighth Ave.

When he was called to the Health Department for an explanation, Greenberg said he had an intercom-telephone hookup with the drugstore. An investigation showed that the druggists, H. L. Yalan and his son, filled out the prescriptions and the patients simply walked down the block and picked up their drugs, never having touched the prescriptions. Greenberg stated that he visited the pharmacy at his leisure and then signed the medicaid invoices.

Greenberg, who said he saw some patients as often as 12 times a month, said he spent "about two minutes with each patient," and prescribes "mostly antibiotics, tranquilizers, and birth control pills."

"I'm sincerely doing the best I can," he said.

Greenberg is doing well, too. He has been paid \$200,000 in city medicaid funds over the last three years.

Another example: a News reporter posing as a welfare client with a medicaid card visited a group practice at 481 E. Tremont Ave., Bronx. He complained of a cold and was directed to Dr. Pierre Sajous, who wrote out a prescription after a three-minute consultation.

"Get this filled down the hall," he told the reporter.

"But I have a pharmacy on my block."

"This is the only pharmacy in the city where you can get this prescription filled," said Sajous.

"What's this prescription for?" the patient later asked center pharmacist Bernard Knippel.

"Penicillin," he replied.

Another variation: One of the largest medicaid pharmacy chains in Brooklyn owned by Arnold Schoenbrun. Last year his operation billed medicaid for more than \$100,000 according to the Health Department.

VITAMINS AND IRON

Last month department pharmacist Eli Gorelik noted that an inordinately large number of prescriptions for Theragran (a vitamin compound) together with iron substitutes were being filled at two of Schoenbrun's medicaid center pharmacies, 353 Empire Blvd. and 426 Lafayette Ave. That prescription is for anemia.

The prescriptions were traced to two doctors: Vincent Da Luca, who practices at 426 Lafayette Ave., and Soturo Tochimoto, the owner of the Crown Heights Medical center at 353 Empire Blvd.

Senior Health Department auditor Dr. Howard Katz found the patients had been given the prescriptions were not anemic, but rather were suffering from a range of other ailments, from vaginal infections to hypertension.

Dr. Da Luca was called down to the Health Department for a hearing and asked to ex-

plain those prescriptions. There were 14 of that type filled in one day last fall.

THE DOCTOR'S DIALOGUE

"Did you write the prescriptions?" asked Dr. Katz.

"No, they were already filled in," answered Da Luca.

"Who wrote them out?"

"Somebody else, they were just handed to me."

"Why did you sign them?"

"Well, they told me they had stocked Theragran and to write for it."

"Who filled in the diagnosis 'anemia' on the invoices? It's not in your handwriting."

"The pharmacist," Da Luca replied.

And then Da Luca volunteered: "I swear by my children I never got anything from the pharmacist. They just told me to sign the prescriptions." He was given a "warning" by the Department.

35 GRAND BILLED IN 6 MONTHS

One week later, Dr. Tochimoto was called down. An examination of department records shows that he was paid \$50,246 in medicaid funds in 1971, and has billed \$35,088 for the first six months of 1972.

He owns the Crown Heights Medical Center, a conglomerate of specialists including a podiatrist, a chiropractor, an optometrist and several doctors. He receives 30% of their billing in addition to his own practice. The pharmacy pays a flat monthly rate to the building's landlord.

Tochimoto also said he wrote for Theragran, department records show, because it was stocked by the pharmacist.

An earlier department survey of Schoenbrun's Empire Blvd. pharmacy showed that of 26 invoices submitted, there were four cases where patients were "shorted," receiving only one or two ounces of an ointment when four were prescribed.

AGREES TO RESTITUTION

During a hearing last June 14, Schoenbrun replied to the findings in the survey and said that either his employees "were too lazy" to fill the prescriptions properly, or perhaps pilfering was going on. On Aug. 17 he agreed to make an \$8,000 restitution to the city.

Eli Gorelik, the Health Department pharmacist, said that shorting and substitution is "one of the biggest abuses because patients don't pay the bills and usually can't read the prescriptions so they never know when they're being cheated."

Another pharmacy where the Health Department found irregularities was the Del Med, at 80 Delancey St. An investigation showed that prescriptions were brought to the pharmacy by attendants of the medical center.

A sample survey of 15 patients showed eight discrepancies including bills for twice the amount of the medicine actually dispensed.

The investigation also revealed that generic drugs were being substituted for brand name drugs and billed for under the more expensive brand names.

Kenneth Levy, the owner of the Del Med, replied to some of the charges. He said if the amount prescribed was not available a note was given to the patient with the amount of pills due. He added that many patients do not bother calling back for the remainder of the prescription.

EXPENSES LISTED

Levy pays \$13,200 rent a year for his space in the center. Chief Pharmacist William Savin said he is paid \$200 a week in salary.

Last week, Savin, who was working at the Del Med when the department's investigation was being conducted, told a news reporter, "I think pharmacists who cheat should be thrown in jail."

CONGRESS NEEDS VETO POWER ON VET AID CHANGES

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, key members of the American Legion from across the Nation are in town this week to discuss matters of mutual concern to their organization and to all veterans.

The national commander, Joe L. Matthews, made an excellent presentation Tuesday to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am a member. He touched on many subjects which will have the attention of our committee in the weeks and months ahead. In particular, he referred to the ill-advised budget decision of the administration to revise downward the pensions for disabled veterans.

Although the White House has directed the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to call back its recommendation, I agree wholeheartedly with Commander Matthews who told the committee:

We are not assured that this is the end of efforts to reduce budget outlays for service-connected compensation.

It is incredible to me that the administration would choose this time to propose a change in veterans' benefits, particularly those applying to men and women who suffered disabilities in the service of their country.

ILL-TIMED AND ILL-ADVISED

This revelation came even as the White House was completing negotiations for the end of the war in Vietnam and the return of the prisoners of war.

Certainly, every effort must be made by the Federal Government to cut the fat from the budget but if any area should be given extra consideration, it is the matter of reasonable consideration for our Nation's veterans.

Several years ago our committee initiated legislation which became law to bind in the benefits for disabled veterans who had been receiving such benefits for 20 years or more. Thus, the veterans of World War I, World War II, and many of those who served in Korea are protected by law.

The proposed realignment of disability ratings, therefore, would affect primarily the veterans of the prolonged war in Vietnam.

I have joined with the new chairman of our committee, the Honorable WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, and other Members in sponsoring legislation to retain for Congress control over the disability rating schedule.

CONGRESS MUST HAVE SAY

This legislation, on which hearings are expected to be held by our committee shortly, would require that any change or readjustment of the disability schedule by the Veterans' Administration must first be submitted to the Congress and may only become effective if neither House of Congress has adopted a resolution of disapproval within 90 days.

Commander Matthews also gave strong renewed support for legislation to change

the administration of national cemeteries. Such legislation, on which I was a cosponsor, was pocket vetoed by the President last year.

I expect our committee to reenact the national cemeteries bill early in this session and I hope that it will reach the White House at a time when the President will not have the opportunity to stuff it in his pocket and again deny to Congress the opportunity to vote on whether to override the veto.

I was pleased to have the opportunity to meet with a number of Legionnaires from my area including my own Commander Peter Drezak of Adam Plewacki Post 799, one of the largest Legion posts in the country.

Others from the Buffalo area were the Erie County Commander, Raymond P. Bojanowski; Eugene J. Kane, past vice commander; John Michaels, past 8th district commander; and Ted C. Smigiera, past commander of West Seneca Post.

COST OF LIVING COUNCIL—UN- ABASHED CALLOUSNESS AND IN- IMITABLE BLUNDERING

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, when I articulated my displeasure to the Members of the House last Thursday—February 22—about the incompetence of the Cost of Living Council, I fervently hoped that there would be no further reason to have to do so again.

I was wrong, Mr. Speaker, and for the third time wish to advise my colleagues to pay most careful attention to all matters pending before the Council relating to their individual constituencies.

The latest episode I am about to recount illustrates that the Council's failings are the rule rather than the exception. Union Local No. 178, of the United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, Dayton, Ohio, wrote a registered letter to the Pay Board 4 months ago, appealing a denial by the Internal Revenue Service of a wage and benefits package for union members at a new plant.

Mr. Robert C. Yates, the local president, in a letter to me, said:

To this day I have heard nothing from the Pay Board or any one.

Mr. Yates is understandably distraught. He believes, and properly so, that he is entitled to the courtesy of a reply to his appeal, even if it is a rejection.

The Cost of Living Council evidently could not care less. Its total lack of responsiveness in this matter, as in the previously cited cases of the Good Samaritan Hospital and the National Cash Register Co. in Dayton is incredible, Mr. Speaker. I cannot think of a single other Federal agency or operation that even begins to approach the Cost of Living Council's unabashed callousness. In my sad experience, its major claim to fame is its inimitable blundering. Were any

Member of Congress to conduct himself in such fashion, his career, justifiably would be short lived.

BENEFIT CUTS FOR VIETNAM VETERANS

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, despite statements by the White House to the contrary, the Washington Post on Sunday, February 25, 1973, reported that the administration has not abandoned its shocking and degrading plan to cut physical disability payments for Vietnam veterans, including amputees.

When news of this plan was first brought to the attention of Congress last week, many Members, including myself, were deeply shocked. According to Veterans Administrator Donald Johnson, his department, at the request of the Office of Management and Budget, was getting ready to save an estimated \$160 million a year by slashing payments to disabled veterans of the Vietnam war. Apparently, veterans of earlier wars were saved by a congressional mandate not to cut their benefits.

After a great deal of adverse reaction by many segments of our society, the administration announced that they were withdrawing the planned cuts. Now, it seems, the decision to give Vietnam veterans less for their suffering than veterans of World War II and Korea receive is still very much alive, and may yet be instituted.

In a recent interview with staff aids of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Mr. Johnson said that his agency is still studying ways to save money by lowering benefits for Vietnam veterans.

Although the department is being somewhat cagey in announcing exactly how they plan to save \$160 million starting with fiscal 1974, their admission that benefit payments for thousands of Vietnam wounded and crippled could still be cut by large amounts is sufficient grounds for concern. Apparently, I am not alone in my concern for our brave men and women who endured so much in Southeast Asia. According to the Post, Senator VANCE HARTKE, chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, and our esteemed colleague in the House, Representative BRYAN DORN, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee on this side of Congress, are both preparing to start hearings this week on legislation to block any lowering of disability benefits for Vietnam veterans.

I wholeheartedly support my colleagues for their efforts to put an immediate halt to the administration's plans in this matter. I realize that this administration wishes to cut down on needless Government spending. And few would argue that a well-reasoned and fair plan to keep spending down to a noninflationary level is needed. However, must our brave servicemen, who have just completed fighting the longest and most unpopu-

lar war in our Nation's history, bear the burden of balancing the Federal budget?

I, for one, believe that we can never fully repay a serviceman who has suffered a crippling wound while serving his country. Yet, these same men and women, who just last week were being lauded as America's finest, now find their Government ready to deny them the benefits they deserve.

The changes in the disability payment schedules which the Veterans' Administration has proposed would place a tremendous hardship on a handicapped veteran of Vietnam and his family. According to the information released by the VA, many veterans who have suffered amputations would be given a 50-percent reduction in payments. In addition, Vietnam veterans who previously could claim a 50-percent disability rate and were thus eligible for extra dependency allowances, would lose these benefits in many instances under the proposed new regulations.

The economic hardship imposed by the proposed new regulations on a 100-percent service-connected veteran would be considerably worse. Were he to lose his 100-percent rating, the veteran would also be denied a host of other privileges, including PX and commissary, special medical benefits, and a special education scholarship for his children.

Saving \$160 million is a laudable goal. But I trust that my fellow Members of Congress will act promptly to insure that this sum does not come from the pockets of Vietnam veterans who have already given so much to their America. Let us instead look elsewhere in the vast Federal budget to save this money.

ALEXANDER PETÖFI—POET OF HUNGARY

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, recently, the people of Hungary celebrated the 150th anniversary of Alexander Petöfi, the greatest Hungarian lyric poet. He was an indomitable freedom fighter as well as a great writer. His example has inspired Hungarian youth of all periods since his own youth. Evidence of this admiration is given in the fact that it was in paying homage to him by assembling before his statue in Budapest that the demonstration began which turned into the fight for freedom of the Hungarian people in 1956.

The article below is taken from the Companion of Hungarian Studies which was written by the literary historians and historians of Hungary before the Communist takeover. It describes the poet's work and life:

ALEXANDER PETÖFI

The brightest spirit and natural leader of this new youth was Alexander Petöfi (1823-1849). He was a poet who came from the depths, from the people and held Burns among his favorites. As a young man his lot had been tolerable, but later his par-

ents—his father was a butcher and innkeeper—lost all their money and he tasted all the afflictions of poverty. He became in fact a *declassé*, full of wounded pride and the bitterness of the oppressed. He was the first Hungarian poet to take his stand against the nobility and on the side of the peasants—and in this one sees something of the defiance of Coriolanus. It was, incidentally, Petöfi who translated *Coriolanus* into Hungarian. His avowed intention as a poet was to write for the people, in the language of the people, in the voice of the people, and through his poetry to raise the people to a higher level of culture. The tendency initiated by Petöfi, which became that of the classic figures of Hungarian literature, has thus received the adjective of "popular-national." But it is far removed from any conception of the "volksisch" category of writing; there is nothing antiurban in it, there is no inveighing against modern civilization such as one finds in so many present-day "popular" writers. Petöfi does not descend to the level of the people in order to sink himself in the mystic and uncertain depths of the soul of the people, but to raise the peasant to a more enlightened form of living.

Petöfi was a lyric poet by the grace of God; there were perpetual fluctuations in his mind, his feeling and mood changed with surprising rapidity and intensity, and found their expression with surprising facility. It is no mere coincidence that the clouds and the wind predominate in his imagery, for these natural phenomena express the perpetual changes that took place in his mind. He was an impressionist before they were impressionists, a great artist of barely perceptible atmospheric changes. He had abundant imagination, but utilized it only for lighter touches and decoration; his world was reality, the present, personal experience. His poetry is as autobiographical as that of Goethe, like the fragment of a general confession; he speaks of everything that happens to him with an openness and sincerity unique in the primness of the nineteenth century.

Petöfi was one of those poets, like Shelley and Whitman, whose lyric temperament inevitably makes them revolutionaries. He welcomed the revolution of 1848 as a long-awaited and natural fulfillment in his life. His highest ideal was the same as that which animated the best, the purest and the most heroic figures of his age, Freedom. For him, Freedom meant two things: the particular Hungarian Freedom, or rather independence, the independence of the nation against Austria and the House of Hapsburg. But, more than this, it meant to him the freedom of the people, the freedom of the world, the unconditional triumph of democracy. Among the poets of the nineteenth century there are very many for whom freedom is the highest inspiration, but we may perhaps say without national prejudice that there was none in whom the yearning for freedom was so absolute, who idealized it with such religious devotion as did Petöfi. Perhaps the great Polish writers, Mickiewicz and Slowacki, may be compared to him, but in their case the ideal of national independence is merged in a kind of mystical religious feeling, while in Petöfi it is a combative democracy.

When the War of Liberty broke out, Petöfi joined the ranks of the revolutionaries. He felt that his poetry demanded it of him, for one who had so stirred up the nation to the struggle could not remain behind. He took part in the triumphant campaign of the national army in Transylvania under the leadership of Bem, the emigrant Polish general. Later, still under Bem, he found himself face to face with the Russian army which the Hapsburgs had called into help them. The overwhelming odds crushed the Hungarian resistance, and Petöfi was last seen on the

field of Segesvar where, in all probability, he was cut down by the Cossacks and his body cast into a common grave.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, for 26 years, the youth of this Nation have had the opportunity to speak up for freedom by way of the Voice of Democracy scholarship program, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary.

Each fall, 10th, 11th and 12th grade students in our public, private and parochial schools are given the chance to make a personal evaluation of their responsibility in preserving our freedom heritage.

I am enormously pleased and proud to salute the Pennsylvania State winner this year, Miss Barbara Beckman, of 46 Cherry St., Greentree, which is in the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania that I represent.

Miss Beckman, a senior at Mount Alvernia High School, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel J. Beckman. She was one of nearly half a million young people from 7,000 secondary schools across the Nation who participated in this year's Voice of Democracy program by writing a 5-minute script on "My Responsibility to Freedom."

Freedom is a responsibility, not a license, and our youths' awareness of that basic fact has been borne out in the thousands of prepared texts submitted to state VFW judges for consideration.

Each State winner receives an all-expense-paid trip to visit their Nations' Capital and the chance to compete for five national scholarships worth over \$20,000.

This year's gathering of State winners will take place March 2 to 7, with the awards dinner the evening of March 6 at the Sheraton-Park Hotel. I would urge all my colleagues to meet and talk with these truly outstanding youths.

I would like to share with you the text of Miss Beckman's winning script:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Barbara Beckman)

Hello, my name is Alice the Aware American, and I have some important friends of mine that I would like for you to meet. They are: Mr. and Mrs. A, Mr. M, Mr. E, Miss R, Miss I, and Mrs. C.

Will you tell us a little about yourself Mr. A? "I am an 'American'. How did I come about? All Americans are in a sense immigrants. They, or their ancestors arrived in this country as new-comers. Men and women from every land came; came as immigrants, became Americans.

"Freedom and equality are the cornerstones upon which the 'American' nation is built. Earlier America was known as a melting pot, and the different peoples made up the stew that it held. Today, instead of the old idea of melting pot, we have an American orchestra of races, ethnic groups, and cultures.

"Each member of this orchestra has the same drummer to listen to, but plays the beat with a different instrument. As an 'Ameri-

can' I must fulfill my responsibilities to my country. Isn't this so, Mr. M?"

"Yes, every man by being free has a chance to fulfill his responsibilities. Doing my best in all parts of my day, whether it is taking part on a jury during a trial or using my ability to lead in a group for ecology. Being able to express what I feel, is a freedom that I hold very dear. And I have to admit, this is where encouragement comes along." Mr. E, can we have your views?

"Encouragement, I couldn't keep on without it! After falling down, getting up, and falling right back down again, I find myself able to say this. I've tried with my friends when we staged a campaign to help get our school financially out of the 'red', and failed. I've worked hard on the staff of a town official and have had the experience of seeing all that he stood for, and all that we worked for lose an election! But I've also been given the privilege to vote for the people who govern our country, and to me, my 'one' vote affects the voice of my government to the point where I receive encouragement." Interrupting Mr. E, I asked him: But where does responsibility enter into freedom? Miss R answered my question by saying this:

"Responsibility, the ability to respond. Isn't that being free? Don't we have the right to choose between Good or Bad? It's proven by the awareness of, and growth of generations past and present. Today, eighteen year olds have the ability to respond in the election of their government officials. And we have to make the best of our voice in the government by being 'individuals'." Miss I had this to say about being an individual:

"Stating the fact that you are an individual and being one is something different. Being an individual is trying not to let prejudice affect you. Sometimes it's like a hair across your cheek. You can't see it, but you keep brushing at it because the feel of it is irritating. Being an individual is keeping in your head news, views, and what you personally feel. An individual cares for himself and others. Oftentimes, the eyes are blind and one must see with the heart. Am I right?" And Mrs. C answered:

"Working for and with people is what it's all about. Taking time out for others, when time is such a precious and scarce commodity. To listen—and hear feelings. To see not with your eyes, but your heart." Being unsure of what I heard I finally asked them: But can one really be this? And they answered together:

"We are Americans. And we'll spell it out for you:

"A—It's for America and the different people that it is made up of.

"M—Men—free men.

"E—Encouraged and free young Americans.

"R—Responsibility—the ability that young and free Americans have to respond to freedom.

"I—The individual—all of us who let ourselves be free.

"C—Caring—enough to give.

"A—Actors on the American stage in a drama called, 'My Responsibility to Freedom'.

"N—It's never too late. For what? To show your ability to respond as an American!"

WELCOME HOME, COMMANDER
BELL

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, over the past 8 years, all of us have been touched by the hopes and hardships of the fam-

ilies of American POW's. And we have shared the courage they have shown through the years of waiting. Now, let us rejoice and share in the joy of the freedom of our husbands and sons and brothers.

Last weekend, Navy Comdr. James F. Bell quietly returned to his home in LaVale, Md.—a home he has not seen in 9 years. His impressions of that day and the reflections of his parents and neighbors have been published in a Cumberland Times feature story. I want to share it with you, so that you, too, may rejoice as I do in saying, "Welcome home, Commander Bell—America is indebted to your courage":

FIRST TIME IN 9 YEARS: COMMANDER BELL HOME OVER WEEKEND

Cmdr. James F. Bell, the Navy pilot held seven years, three months and 28 days in a North Vietnamese prison camp, quietly returned over the weekend to his home at 224 National Highway, LaVale, to a home he had not been in for nine years.

Accompanied by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. F. T. Bell, he arrived from Bethesda Naval Hospital at 10 p.m. Friday dressed in a conservative civilian suit.

His first liberty weekend was spent getting reacquainted with his home community, including even a visit to Safeway in the LaVale Plaza Shopping Center with his parents Saturday afternoon.

While there he walked through the store being recognized only by a few, including one employee who was a classmate of his at Allegany High School where he was graduated in 1948.

His weekend included a visit to his next-door neighbors, Mr. and Mrs. George W. Montgomery at 248 National Highway.

Mrs. Montgomery said today that Cmdr. Bell looked much younger than his 41 years and showed a "nice sense of humor."

She reported that he said it was "real great" to be home and was very happy at the chance to be there.

The conversation was about family matters and Cmdr. Bell questioned her children about Allegany High School and talked much about sports there.

When asked about his impressions on being back in the states after nine years, she said he laughed about the many long-haired males he had seen.

Mrs. Montgomery said Cmdr. Bell was driven to see the changes in the city, including Sacred Heart Hospital and Bishop Walsh High School and the many new homes and apartments in Haystack Mountain developments.

When he visited the Montgomeries he was wearing a V-neck sweater and corduroy slacks.

The Bells and their son returned to Bethesda Naval Hospital, leaving here about 2 p.m. yesterday. There he faces an operation on his left shoulder, injured when he ejected from his plane after it was hit.

Yesterday the LaVale Lions Club and the LaVale Civic Improvement Association, not knowing he was home, erected signs across Route 40 at both ends of LaVale that said "Welcome Home Cmdr. Jim Bell."

They were put in place by Kenneth May and Bruce Anderson of the Lions Club.

If he and his parents desire it, the community will have an open house in his honor at the LaVale Fire Hall, Paul Boch, chairman of the welcome home committee of the LaVale Volunteer Fire Department, said today.

The event would be a joint venture of all civic organizations in LaVale, Mr. Boch said, "But we don't want to do anything until Cmdr. Bell gives his approval."

ACTING FBI DIRECTOR L. PATRICK GRAY

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, effective law enforcement under the rule of law is essential to the survival of a free people. The late J. Edgar Hoover as Director of the FBI not only believed in effective law enforcement, but probably did more than any other American to make effective progressive law enforcement a living reality in the FBI and in local and State enforcement agencies throughout the country.

Like most Americans, I have watched the performance of Mr. Hoover's successor, L. Patrick Gray III, since he was selected by President Nixon on May 3, 1972. Frankly, I like what I have seen. Mr. Gray has demonstrated leadership ability based on ideals and principles that are vital to the everyday operations of the FBI. I am convinced the President has chosen the right man.

Recently, I saw a statement by Acting Director Gray which gives some insight on his strong feelings about positive leadership in law enforcement. His remarks appeared in the February 1973 issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. I include them in my remarks because they contain a timely message for all who are interested in the preservation of law and order in our country:

MESSAGE FROM THE ACTING DIRECTOR

Leaders of the law enforcement profession are well aware of the grave responsibilities entrusted to our profession.

To fulfill these responsibilities requires us to maintain a high standard of excellence in the performance of our duties. This is the standard that we in the law enforcement profession have set for ourselves. To do less is to fail to serve those who look to us for protection.

While we strive to maintain this high standard of excellence, law enforcement officers are called on much more often than the average citizen to make quick judgments, particularly in the fast-breaking situations which so often confront us as we carry out our duties. Like other human beings, we make mistakes, too.

There are many evils which can and do afflict our profession. None is worse than corruption. There can be no room for corruption in the ranks of the law enforcement profession. Corruption erodes the public trust and confidence which is the foundation of our profession. Without the support and cooperation of our fellow citizens whom we serve, our efforts to combat crime would be ineffectual.

The working environment of a law enforcement officer is filled with temptation. There will always be someone seeking to reward him handsomely to look the other way when the law is violated. Many criminals have no hesitancy about offering and delivering special favors to those who can assist them in their illegal endeavors. Others may, by virtue of their positions, attempt to intimidate the law enforcement officer into neglecting his duty to the law. The officer is subjected to these pressures because he stands as an otherwise insurmountable obstacle to the plans of those who would act outside the law.

Corruptive influences work steadily upon the law enforcement officer, and it is not surprising that some succumb to temptation.

It is indeed a credit to our profession that so few have been corrupted. However, we cannot afford to be complacent and relax our vigil against corruption. Its threat to the successful performance of our responsibilities is too great.

Well-meaning platitudes condemning isolated instances of corruption in law enforcement do little to correct the problem. What is needed is strong leadership to expose and take action against each case of corruption. We may never succeed in screening out at the preemployment stage those who may be susceptible to corrupting influences, but we must not allow them to infect others in the ranks of law enforcement.

To combat corruption, law enforcement personnel must clearly understand what is expected of them. Imaginative, firm, and energetic supervision is also needed. Responsible officials must provide the direction necessary to root corruption from the ranks of our profession. I am confident that corruption will not survive the challenge of positive leadership.

L. PATRICK GRAY, III,
Acting Director.

February 1, 1973.

OSHA AMENDMENTS SHOULD BE ENACTED

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, because they are much needed to correct a legal monstrosity, I am today reintroducing in the 93d Congress a series of amendments to the Occupational Safety and Health Act. In doing so, I would like to urge our Education and Labor Committee that must pass on such amendments not to ignore the need to realistically revise OSHA provisions before more businessmen and farmers are needlessly driven out of business and their workers forced out of jobs.

An article appearing in the Wall Street Journal on February 20 indicates that as OSHA is operating at present, the typical small businessman may have to comply with as many as 20,000 specific rules and regulations so vague they are nearly incomprehensible to the ordinary layman.

The real tragedy is that many of these technical requirements do not seem to contribute a dime's worth to protecting workers on their jobs even though the cost of compliance is enormous and is driving small enterprises into bankruptcy. A recent National Association of Manufacturers survey shows that small firms of one to 100 employees estimate it costs them \$33,000 each to comply with OSHA, and the NAM believes even that figure is unrealistically low.

I fully share the view of the National Small Business Association that this law as administered violates several precious constitutional rights. Its enforcement mechanism is penal in effect and omits such constitutional protections as trial by jury, proof beyond reasonable doubt and the right to confront witnesses.

We should not continue to countenance without challenge the questionable

operations of an administrative agency that can declare certain conduct to be criminal, that can conduct searches without search warrants, that can issue citations and self-executing penalties, and that can operate under the legal presumption that the accused is guilty until he proves himself innocent.

There is great need to clear up the fear and confusion that exists among small businessmen who live from day to day worrying that an OSHA inspector may come in their shop and order expensive changes on penalty of civil or criminal prosecution. We can best ease this concern by amending the law to exempt the applicability of the law more fair and realistic for larger companies.

The provisions of this bill would—
Exempt entirely from OSHA coverage both agricultural and nonagricultural employers of 25 or fewer workers;

Delay for 1 year the effectiveness of the act for employers of between 25 and 100 workers;

Provide technical help to firms with less than 100 employees to help them comply with the act;

Require the Secretary of Labor to distinguish between reasonable and unreasonable standards and to rescind those found unreasonable or with which it is impossible to comply;

Specify that no penalty may be exacted by the Secretary of Labor for noncompliance with national consensus standards unless an employer has been provided with a copy of the requirement and given 30 days in which to comply or request administrative review;

Provide compensation to any employer for costs incurred in complying with rulings not adopted pursuant to the Administrative Procedures Act;

Stipulate that failure to comply with rulings in which usual administrative procedures have not been followed may not be used against employers as evidence of neglect or wrongdoing;

Protect employers from the absolute liability provisions of the act in cases where employee carelessness is to blame;

Provide that no employer may be held accountable for fines or punishment if he can prove that implementation of questionable requirements would not have materially improved the health or safety of his employee;

Permit the Secretary of Labor to assist employers and employees with certain medical requirements of the act;

Provide the Secretary of Labor with greater flexibility to negotiate prompt compliance in lieu of the imposition of Federal penalties;

Permit the formation of employee safety committees so that workers themselves can help employers identify health or safety problems and assist in their solution; and

Require the publication by the Secretary of Labor of the estimated maximum and average cost of complying with each present or future rule as a means of determining whether compliance is possible.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the new budget calls for 80,000 inspections among the 5 million workplaces covered by OSHA during the fiscal year

1974 that starts July 1st. Unless Congress will agree to enact some reasonable, responsible modifications like those I have proposed, these inspections may well result in more small business bankruptcies and more lost jobs for workers. We should not permit this to happen.

In further illustration of the need to amend OSHA, I include for the RECORD at this point articles appearing in the Wall Street Journal on February 20 and January 30 of this year:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 20, 1973]
NEW JOB-SAFETY RULES PERPLEX THE OWNERS OF SMALL BUSINESSES; "NEEDLESS" COSTS CITED

(By Michael Jett)

Henry Weast of Dahinda, Ill., is quitting the heavy-excavation business. He says he can't afford it any more.

It isn't that the business wasn't profitable. It was a steady money maker, and in Mr. Weast's view, it might have continued that way for a long time. It might have, except for one thing—OSHA—more formally known as the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.

Among other things, that massive piece of safety regulation would have required him to spend \$150,000 to install safety devices on his equipment to protect operators in case the machinery toppled over. "It just looked like there would have been no end to spending money," says Mr. Weast. "If I had fixed up one thing, they would probably have found something else."

As a result, Mr. Weast and his two partners have already dismissed 20 employees and they are currently trying to sell their machinery. From now on, they plan to continue selling sand, gravel and other building materials, but that end of the business accounted for only about 20% of their total \$1.5 million volume last year.

COSTLY AND "FOOLISH"

The reaction of Mr. Weast and his partners to the stringent new regulations may have been drastic, but their quitting the excavation business illustrates one effect the law has had on countless thinly capitalized small businessmen across the country. In a variety of ways, small businessmen say, the OSHA regulations—covering safety matters ranging from hard hats and guard rails to exit signs and safety posters—are causing widespread confusion, anger and frustration.

At the core of their problem, they contend, is the fact that practically every regulation—and they brand many of them foolish—requires them to spend money on measures that don't contribute to either safety or efficiency. Moreover, they complain, many of the highly technical regulations are incomprehensible to the layman. And even if the rules can be understood, these people add, compliance is difficult. In fact, by some estimates, as many as 20,000 specific rules and regulations apply to any single work establishment.

Indeed, the sheer bulk of the regulations is intimidating, and countless businessmen say that after they have waded through them all, they're hopelessly confused. Marvin Krauss, a furniture shop owner in South Amana, Iowa, says: "There are about 300 pages with pretty small print in the construction standards, and it's pretty darned hard to pick out exactly what fits you sometimes. You almost have to have a lawyer to figure it out."

Such complaints are becoming routine for officials charged with overseeing and enforcing the act. An OSHA spokesman says, however, that "some over-reaction" is to be expected. "Most of the complaints from small business people arise not from actual inspections, but from the fear of what might happen should there be one," he says. Unless there has been an accident or a com-

plaint by an employee, the OSHA man says, smaller concerns are much less likely to be inspected than larger firms. He adds that if a small businessman finds himself in a financial pinch as a result of the regulations, he can always apply for a small business administration loan, as provided in the act.

Due in part to the confusion and lack of understanding of some of the overlapping rules, numerous small businessmen are reluctant to talk for attribution—they're worried about what might happen if an OSHA inspector should see their names and then decide to drop by. "I'd hate to meet Mr. OSHA tomorrow because of my discussion with you," says a Mid-west farm-equipment dealer who has spent nearly \$100,000 on new equipment and repairs to satisfy safety rules. "We'll only know if we can really comply after somebody tears us apart." Like many other businessmen, he replaced a number of round toilet seats with horseshoe-shaped ones before OSHA rescinded the toilet-seat rule.

"AN ASININE SITUATION"

According to Herbert Liebensohn, legislative vice president of the National Small Business Association, many of the fears expressed by small businessmen arise "because the Labor Department has done a very poor job of notifying people what to expect under the law." In fact, many businessmen say they still don't understand how the law is administered, and they worry they will have to answer to inspectors who know almost nothing about their particular type of business.

"OSHA worries the hell out of me," says Ralph Zuber, manager of a furniture store in Amana, Iowa. "I want to comply, but I've got to keep making a living. Did you know we've even got to paint the electrical outlets orange? Why, I don't know."

Adds James Curless, an International Harvester franchiser in Fairmount, Ind.: "It becomes an asinine situation. The dangerous facets of our business are virtually beyond anyone's control. One of our employees got hurt when he bumped the automatic transmission lever on a tractor and it rolled over his leg. No laws can cover anything like that."

What angers many small businessmen the most, however, is the cost of complying with the regulations. "I spent about \$250,000 for four new punch presses, to enclose a conveyor, some electrical work and other things," says the owner of a metal fabricating shop in the Southeast, "and I don't think it did any good for safety or production. The punch presses, costing \$15,000 to \$30,000 apiece, had to be replaced only because they were too noisy. Those machines had been declared literally unusable."

COST MAY BE HIGHER

A survey of its members by the National Association of Manufacturers shows small concerns of one to 100 employees estimate it will cost them about \$33,000 each to comply with the act. But that figure may not tell the whole story. Kenneth E. Schweiger, the association's director of employee relations, says the real cost to the small businessman is probably much higher. "He doesn't know what's expected of him," says Mr. Schweiger. "Smaller business has grossly understated estimates of the cost."

Further, once the money is spent, employers still can't be sure if they're in compliance. "I spent \$125,000 directly to meet the law," complains a Midwestern contractor. "And after I spent the money I was inspected three times and was fined every time for some minor violations. There's no way I can meet the letter of the law as it's written."

When it comes to spending the money, many small businessmen are faced with a dilemma—what to try to get done first and what to try to get by with. "There's no consistency from one plan to another," complains the owner of several small woodwork-

ing factories in the Midwest. "I've been fined at one plant for something that has been overlooked at another. One will come through with flying colors and another will be penalized."

Businessmen "don't know which way to jump," Mr. Curless, the Harvester dealer, says. "They try and do a little at a time and hope that when the inspectors come they won't be too severe. We asked our insurance man to come out and inspect us. He said the way interpretations of the rules change so often, he couldn't even give us a decent inspection."

"I'D PROBABLY GO HOME"

"We've got to write our own ticket," says Bruce Martin, assistant executive manager of the National Roofing Contractors Association. "You can't comply with all of it. What we did was take the construction regulations and got it boiled down to about six pages of the most important standards and told our guys to try to comply with these."

And some are going to try to get by without doing anything at all. "I'd just run myself nuts if I tried to comply," says an Illinois heating and air-conditioning contractor. "I've only got three employees, and in a small business everyone has to be a money maker and that (complying with regulations) would be a full-time job. If an inspector walks in here, I'd probably just hand him the keys and go home. It would be giving up a lot, but it's not worth the worry and frustration."

Whatever problems the act is causing businessmen around the country, there are still some who must be delighted with the law—the safety-equipment companies. "You take a good hard look," says Mr. Liebensohn of the National Small Business Association, "and the economic benefits will go to the insurance and safety-equipment companies."

"Many problems for the small businessmen," he adds, "came about, because of the sales techniques of companies selling products for OSHA regulations. They became frightened and started protesting."

"We have spawned new enterprises in a variety of ways," George C. Guenther, former assistant labor secretary, told a House subcommittee on small businesses last June. "We would hope most of them are wholesome, but certainly there may be those whose consultative services are at less than desirable levels."

Still others may find themselves beneficiaries of the law. Many employers are going to be spending a lot of money for lawyers if they want to appeal a fine they feel was undeserved. Small businessmen almost never have a lawyer on their staffs.

W. C. Williamson, co-owner of an Atlanta roofing company, was fined \$600 after an employee was killed when he fell through a hole in a one-story building the company was working on. Mr. Williamson says the man was shown the hole and told not to remove the cover unless there was a foreman present. Why he took the cover off and exactly how he fell through the hole aren't known, but Mr. Williamson thinks he did all he could to protect the man. "I'm going to spend about \$2,000 to fight a \$600 fine," he says, "but it's the principle of the thing. It would be the same thing if they fined me if he drove his car into a telephone pole on his way to the job."

"It's going to be a full-employment act for lawyers," says Lawrence Stessin, editor of a newsletter dealing with the OSHA regulations. It isn't going to hurt Mr. Stessin either. After sending out a sample issue last October, he was swamped with 30,000 subscriptions in one month. "We're just inundated" with requests for information and subscriptions, he says.

With all the confusion, some shady characters are bound to jump at the opportunity to take advantage of the situation. "The

three latest rackets," Mr. Stessin says, are men posing as OSHA inspectors who are actually industrial spies, potential burglars figuring out a plant's security or con men who talk the owner into offering him a bribe for not imposing heavy "fines."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 30, 1973]

COMPLEX ISSUES RAISED BY JOB SAFETY ACT—LIKE EARMUFF DISPUTE—FLOOD COMMISSION

(By James C. Hyatt)

WASHINGTON.—One squabble was over who's to blame if somebody won't wear his earmuffs. Another was over the thickness of a wire rope. A third dispute, still to be resolved, involves the lead content of air.

These are among the cases that have come before a relatively new federal "court"—the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission.

Congress made the commission the legal referee over federal job safety and health cases—the place where employers turn to contest Labor Department citations for unsafe working conditions. Since it began work in April 1971, the agency has received about 2,000 cases as a result of the 33,000 federal safety citations issued to date under the Occupational Safety and Health Act enacted in 1970.

The commission is only beginning to flex its legal muscles as unexplored safety-legal issues evolve. Some major questions to be resolved include the responsibility of contractors for the unsafe acts of subcontractors at a job-site, the adequacy of federal standards and even the constitutionality of the job safety act itself.

Indeed, as one employer recently discovered, even earmuffs raise significant points. The company, Pacific Food Products Co., a Seattle food canner, worked hard to get ready for the new federal law. On the advice of a visiting nurse, officials even ordered industrial-type earmuffs to protect the hearing of workers near noisy canning equipment.

THE EARMUFFS CASE

Thus the company was dismayed when the Labor Department later proposed a \$17 penalty and issued a citation after an inspector found workers weren't using the earmuffs. Believing the company had fulfilled its obligation, vice president John Katona contested the complaint before the commission.

Citations that are contested are referred to one of the commission's hearing officers. The employer, the Labor Department and employees involved may file legal motions and introduce evidence. The hearing officer then issues a written decision, which takes effect within 30 days unless one of the three commissioners decides to call for a full review.

In the earmuff case, the hearing officer concluded that merely providing the equipment wasn't sufficient. "To avoid violation," he said, "the equipment also must be 'used,' and the final responsibility to assure that use rests with" the employer. (As a result of this decision, "we're forcing our employees to wear the earmuffs," says Mr. Katona.)

Such rulings have an impact on many employers and workers, of course. Following the earmuff case, for instance, a commission hearing officer assessed a \$600 penalty against a construction concern even though the company insisted it couldn't possibly insure that all 1,000 or so workers on the job used earplugs to guard against excessive noise.

Even the Labor Department has taken its lumps before the commission. Early decisions found some Occupational Safety and Health Administration inspectors careless in gathering evidence and arbitrary in proposing citations. One inspector charged an Illinois company with failing to display an Occupational Safety and Health Administration poster. But the hearing officer said the agency had failed to provide the poster until the time the inspection was made. He ordered

the Labor Department to return a \$50 penalty it had collected. Another hearing officer chided the department for causing wasted time, expense and ill feeling in an argument over whether a certain wire rope was $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch thick or only $\frac{5}{8}$ -inch. The parties ought to be able to agree on such issues on the spot, he said.

WHAT'S A RECOGNIZED HAZARD?

Some tougher questions involve the agency's safety and health standards. This month, for instance, the panel dismissed a citation against Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co. involving an accident where a worker was electrocuted by a defective tool. The Labor Department asserted the company violated a standard making employers responsible for "the safe condition of tools and equipment used by employees," and a hearing officer upheld the finding. But the commission reversed his decision, noting that the tool's condition wasn't known at the time of the accident.

Perhaps the thorniest area involves the safety law's "general duty clause" requiring work places to be free from recognized hazards causing or likely to cause death or serious harm.

Defining "recognized hazard" is often a problem, and proper steps to abate such hazards can be controversial. In one pending case, the Labor Department has alleged that workers in an American Smelting & Refining Co. plant were exposed to lead in the air "significantly exceeding levels generally accepted to be safe working levels."

The company has asserted in part that it wasn't violating the law because despite the lead levels in the air it maintains a "preventive program" of inspections, physical examinations and reassignment of workers to other jobs when the lead content of their blood exceeds certain levels. But a hearing officer said the monitoring system "in effect uses the employees as a test device to determine hazardous conditions. This is precisely what the act is intended to prohibit." The commission is reviewing the case.

SOME CRITICISM

The commission has irked some unions by dismissing relatively minor monetary penalties. Abating hazards, the members decided, is far more important than assessing a few dollars in penalties, particularly when the cost of correcting the hazard can far exceed the penalty. (Most violations involve a maximum penalty of up to \$1,000; a willful violation carries a \$10,000 maximum penalty.)

In setting penalties, the commission considers the size of the employer, the seriousness of the violation, the good faith of the employer in correcting the hazard, and his history of previous violations. Recently the commission dismissed a \$165 penalty against a small Pennsylvania giftware manufacturer because of the company's poor financial condition.

Bert Cottine, a staff associate at the Health Research Group, which is an affiliate of public-interest advocate Ralph Nader's organization, worries that easing monetary penalties will lessen the law's impact. The commission's rulings, he says, "set the tone for how employers will in fact comply with the law whether or not they are investigated."

Workers have only limited access to the review commission. They may contest the length of time the Labor Department proposes to give an employer to correct a safety or health hazard. But few employee appeals have been filed. Mr. Cottine asserts the appeal machinery is forbidding, particularly for a worker without a union to assist him. He says the commission's authority should be broadened to let workers appeal when the Labor Department fails to issue a safety citation on a complaint filed by an employee.

Commission members express concern over their own delays in resolving some crucial legal questions. Of 162 hearing officers' deci-

sions currently under review, 27 are more than six months old; the oldest, more than a year. Often "we just can't get together," concedes Robert D. Moran, the chairman. We want to be damn sure we come out with the right decision."

TO ELIMINATE INDUSTRIAL HEALTH HAZARDS

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International has recently broken new ice in the area of health protection for the American worker. It has taken the lead in seeking enforcement of the Occupational Health and Safety Act of 1970 requiring companies to provide a joint labor-management committee to monitor industrial health standards.

The following is the union's summary of the regulations insisted on in its contracts. I believe the union should be commended for its firm action and commitment to protecting the health of industrial workers. The summary follows:

TO ELIMINATE INDUSTRIAL HEALTH HAZARDS
(Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers, International Union, A. F. Gropiron, President, Denver, Colo.)

FOREWORD

(Dr. Barry Commoner, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.)

Most Americans are aware that the country faces serious environmental problems; we know that the air, the water and the soil are polluted. Most of us are anxious to do what we can to save the environment from destruction.

A good way to begin is to find out where pollution comes from, because it is always easier to stop pollution at its source than to clean it up after it has spread into the environment. Tracked back to their origins, many pollutants turn out to be unwanted by products of industry: chemical fumes and dusts that escape into the air; wastes that are dumped into sewage systems or directly into rivers and lakes. Clearly, the best way to rid the air and the water of these pollutants is to see to it that they are not released from the factory in the first place.

This is what some of the new environmental legislation tries to do. But one of the most effective new laws, at least potentially, is not strictly-speaking "environmental." Rather it deals with working conditions: the Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA). Yet, this act, properly enforced, can go a long way toward reducing environmental pollution—because it requires that industrial plants maintain healthy and safe conditions for their workers. This means that plants must control the release of poisonous materials and so prevent them not only from contaminating the workplace, but also from polluting the environment outside the factory gates.

Unfortunately, just passing a law is not enough to carry out its aims. People have to cooperate. The Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers have set a good example. They have written into their new contracts with petroleum companies the requirement that key provisions of OSHA to monitor and improve the workplace environment be carried out by joint labor-management committees. By working for environmental quality in the workplace, and developing new ways to improve it, these joint committees will help to

control environmental pollution at its source. We will all benefit.

The union is engaged in a strike against the Shell Oil Company, because—unlike most other U.S. petroleum companies—that company has refused to agree to this contract provision. In insisting on the provision for labor-management action to improve industrial health and safety the union is serving the best interests, not only of the people who work in the factories, but of all of us who live in the environment.

FIRST: FACTS WILL BE FOUND

New contracts between Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Intl. Union and nearly all American oil companies provide innovative approaches to the elimination of the health damage being wrought by the modern industrial environment.

Directly, the new contracts establish joint labor-management procedures for promoting health and safety in the work place. Indirectly, benefits will accrue to the general public and especially to those people who live near oil and chemical plants. Not only will the new contracts bring about corrective measures whenever health hazards are found within the plants, but also information will be obtained which will accelerate medical research into many unproven or unknown health hazards of modern industrial communities.

Three features of the new agreements are:

1. Surveys of plants to determine if workers are exposed to substances or conditions hazardous to health will be made by independent industrial health consultants. (Section 2*.)

2. Physical examinations and medical tests will be provided to employees to the extent necessary in light of findings of the independent consultants. (Section 4.)

3. Annually the company will furnish to the union all available information on the morbidity and mortality experience of its employees. (Section 7.)

These measures dovetail: the workplace is surveyed for potential health hazards; the employees are medically examined not just in a general way but specifically to determine if they have been affected by any potentially unhealthy exposures; and employee sickness and health records are made available for evaluation in light of exposures found and for comparison with general morbidity and mortality statistics.

OLD METHODS ARE NOT ADEQUATE

These forthright measures to locate and to measure occupational health damages have not been made in the past.

Measurement of health hazards in an oil or chemical plant is not a simple matter. Many dangerous substances are invisible, odorless and tasteless. Many do not cause immediate symptoms. A sensible worker cannot protect himself by exercising reasonable care. Carbon monoxide, for example, is not detectable by the human senses, but it can seriously damage the brain without the victim feeling any immediate effects. Industrial health hazards are insidious.

Measurements of the industrial health environment can be made only with instruments operated by trained people. Findings often can be evaluated only by experts.

Measuring and monitoring of toxic fumes and other potential health hazards have been the sole prerogative of management in the past. Such measurements have been made with varying degrees of thoroughness and conscientiousness. Many have been intermittent and almost casual. Others no doubt have been quite scrupulous, but the information gained has been zealously guarded by management, not subject to verification by the union or by independent scrutiny. Workers and their union representatives have not had

* Text of the standard health and safety clause is provided beginning on Page 8 of this booklet.

access to findings and therefore have not been in position to present meaningful data to physicians and industrial hygienists.

Physical examinations of employees have been generally superficial and irregular. Medical tests usually have been provided only for workers known to be exposed to such well-known poisons as tetraethyl lead. Results of tests often have not been given to the individual affected and rarely have been reported to the union or to medical researchers.

Incidence of particular ailments has been the subject more of guesses and rumors than of factual evaluation. Workers often comment that "there seem to be" many respiratory ailments in their ranks, or "there seem to be" too many cancer deaths, but few facts have been available to prove or disprove these vague impressions.

As facts replace guesses, corrective measures will be taken to eliminate unhealthful conditions in the oil refineries, chemical plants and other facilities covered by the new contracts. Some plants undoubtedly will be proven cleaner and the employees healthier than was previously believed. Even in these cases, there will be a good health dividend because anxieties will be relieved.

PUBLIC BENEFITS WILL ACCRUE

Lives will be saved among the workers. The living will be granted healthier, fuller lives. Then, the benefits will spread beyond the workers and their families.

Previously unavailable data will be provided to medical science, permitting more definitive evaluations of the effects of modern industrial materials on health. Ultimately every practicing physician will be better equipped to diagnose the ailments of patients who have been exposed to industrial pollutants, whether they work in the plants or only live near them.

Even more rapidly, environmental improvements made inside the oil, chemical and related facilities will benefit the neighbors. These plants are not hermetically sealed; typically, only chain-link fences separate them from surrounding communities. Whenever toxic substances leak out inside the plants, they inevitably spread to surrounding neighborhoods. Whenever corrective measures are made to eliminate these exposures inside the industrial facilities, the total environment will be improved.

A BILL OF RIGHTS WITH ENFORCEMENT

The health and safety clauses give workers a new Occupational Health Bill of Rights, guaranteeing:

1. The right to know precisely what health hazards exist in the work place.
2. An opportunity to study the effects of the work environment on health.
3. The right to act to bring about elimination of health hazards.

Machinery for enforcing this Bill of Rights is provided in the new health and safety clause. Basic control is delegated to a joint labor-management health and safety committee in each plant. Many joint committees have existed in the past, but they usually have been only advisory in nature, empowered only to suggest improvements and seldom have been provided with sufficient information on which to base sound suggestions. Such advisory committees have accomplished some good in the relatively simple field of safety, they have been virtually useless in the field of occupational health.

The new joint committees are given access to information and they have enforcement powers. They will decide the scope of industrial health research surveys by the independent consultants. They will have access to research findings. They will review research reports and determine the means of implementing corrective measures. They will meet at least once a month. Written records of meetings will be kept by both union and management.

With equal representation from management and labor, and with both parties having full access to all pertinent information, moral suasion will weigh heavily toward enforcement. Underwriting the entire clause is a provision for submission of disputes to a neutral arbitrator.

IN THE SPIRIT OF THE LAW

The OCAW health and safety contract clauses with the oil industry are significant in that they establish a new pattern for joint labor-management supervision of health and safety conditions on the job, replacing unilateral control by management.

To medical science, the clauses present new research opportunities.

To environmentalists, they promise a step toward elimination of industrial pollution.

To all Americans, they present a voluntary move in the private sector to comply with the spirit of the law.

Public Law 91-596 enacted by Congress and signed by the President, commonly cited as the "Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970," begins with a Statement of Congressional Findings and Purpose: "... to assure so far as possible every working man and woman in the nation safe and healthful working conditions and to preserve our human resources."

This declaration is followed by 13 specific means of accomplishing the purpose. The very first of these reads:

(1) by encouraging employers and employees in their efforts to reduce the number of occupational safety and health hazards in their places of employment, and to stimulate employers and employees to institute new and to perfect existing programs for providing safe and healthful working conditions. (Emphasis added.)

The law empowers the Secretary of Labor to enforce health regulations and to levy fines, if appropriate, against violators.

But the first admonition of the law is that employers and employees act voluntarily. The oil companies—most of them—as employers, and the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Intl. Union, representing employees, have done so by the negotiation of meaningful health and safety clauses in their contracts.

PARTICIPATING COMPANIES

The list of companies involved in this progressive effort constitutes almost a roster of the oil industry's blue chip leaders, plus many smaller companies. Included are:

American (operating subsidiary of Standard Oil, Indiana).
Atlantic Richfield.
Gulf.
Texaco.
Mobil.
Union.
Citgo (Cities Service).
Exxon (Standard Oil, New Jersey).
Sohio (Standard Oil, Ohio).
Continental.
Phillips.
Ashland.
Marathon.
Husky.
Skelly.
And many others.
Shell? No—Chevron? No.

Two large companies have refused* to enter into such agreements and thereby have flaunted the spirit of the law. They are:

Shell Oil Co. (the United States subsidiary of a world combine owned by N. V. Koninklijke Nederlandsche Petroleum Maatschappij of The Netherlands and The "Shell" Transport and Trading Co. of Great Britain).
Standard Oil of California (also known as Chevron).

OCAW has struck Shell and has called for a consumer boycott of Shell gasoline and other products because of that company's adamant refusal to negotiate on the health

and safety issue and on matters relating to employee pensions. Measures will be taken against Chevron at an appropriate time. The union, having reached agreement with most oil companies on this matter of high principle will not accept inferior terms from other, competing companies.

FURTHER PLANS OF OCAW

OCAW will continue to ask the federal government for assistance, under terms of the Occupational Safety and Health Act, whenever it is necessary to do so. But the union hopes that this will rarely if ever be necessary in the plants of those companies which have agreed to joint labor-management health and safety programs.

The newly negotiated clauses present an opportunity and a challenge for management and labor to solve their own problems. President A. F. Grosprion has written a letter to the president of each company committed to these agreements stating his intentions to make every constructive effort to make health and safety clauses work.

Thus far, the new clause has been agreed to in about 300 contracts covering workers in oil refineries, petrochemical plants and some other oil facilities. It has not been included in contracts covering small groups of products terminal operations and delivery truck drivers who are not engaged in processing or blending of products.

As OCAW's contracts with various chemical companies and other employers are renegotiated, the union will insist that the health and safety clause be included.

This occupational health and safety program will be carried forward for the protection of the workers, to the benefit of the public, and in the spirit of the law.

OCAW/oil industry health and safety clause

Printed below is the standard health and safety clause as adopted verbatim in most new OCAW contracts with oil companies. Another version, adopted by one major company, is stated in somewhat different form but contains precisely the same terms. The number of committee members provided for in Section 1 was reduced in the case of a few very small plants and pipe line operations.

Article

1. There shall be established a joint Labor-Management Health and Safety Committee, consisting of equal Union and Company Representatives, and not less than two (2) nor more than four (4) each.

2. The Company will, from time to time, retain at its expense qualified independent industrial health consultants, mutually acceptable to the International Union President or his designee, and the Company, to undertake industrial health research surveys as decided upon by the Committee, to determine if any health hazards exist in the work place.

3. Such research surveys shall include such measurements of exposures in the work place, the results of which shall be submitted in writing to the Company, the International Union President, and the Joint Committee by the Research Consultant, and the results will also relate the findings to existing recognized standards.

4. The Company agrees to pay for appropriate physical examinations and medical tests at a frequency and extent necessary in light of findings set forth in the Industrial Consultant's reports as may be determined by the Joint Committee.

5. The Union agrees that each Research Report shall be treated as privileged and confidential and will be screened by the Company to prevent disclosure of proprietary information or any other disclosure not permitted by legal contractual obligations.

6. At a mutually established time, subsequent to the receipt of such reports, the Joint Committee will meet for the purpose of reviewing such reports and to determine whether corrective measures are necessary in light of the Industrial Consultant's findings,

*As of February 15, 1973.

and to determine the means of implementing such corrective measures.

7. Within sixty (60) days following the execution of this agreement and on each successive October 1 thereafter, the Company will furnish to the Union all available information on the morbidity and mortality experience of its employees.

8. The Joint Committee shall meet as often as necessary but not less than once each month at a regular scheduled time and place, for the purpose of jointly considering, inspecting, investigating and reviewing health and safety conditions and practices and investigating accidents, and for the purpose of effectively making constructive recommendations with respect thereto.

9. All matters considered and handled by the Committee shall be reduced to writing, and joint minutes of all meetings of the Committee shall be made and maintained, and copies thereof shall be furnished to the International Union President.

10. Time spent in committee meetings by Union representatives, including walkaround time during joint inspections and investigations shall be considered and compensated for as regularly assigned work.

11. In addition to the foregoing, Company intends to continue its existing Industrial Hygiene Program as administered by Company personnel.

12. Any dispute arising with respect to the interpretation or application of the provisions hereto shall be subject to the grievance and arbitration procedure set forth in the agreement.

A letter

From A. F. Groszpiorn, president, Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Intl. Union, to the president of each company agreeing to health and safety contract clauses, in which he sets forth union attitudes on the matter.

DEAR MR. —: In view of recent settlements made with oil companies on health and safety and top level pension review, I feel prompted to make certain observations regarding these subject matters.

I feel that this is particularly desirable because of various "fear" statements attributed to some oil company executives and managers.

As to the matter of the health and safety language, we wish to assure you and your company that our union intends to work with management in making the work place as healthy and safe as possible. In doing so, we seek to promote joint understanding and realistic solutions to health and safety problems. We do not seek confrontation nor do we seek to harass management. We propose to work together to accomplish this objective because we believe your company is also interested in the health and safety of employees.

Where we find cooperative management there should be less need for government intervention.

This position is consistent with many statements I have made and in accordance with the intent of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.

We do not seek to manage any part of your business. Results of negotiations merely give us a meaningful voice in matters which affect the health and safety of the people we represent and their work place.

We will select local union members to serve on joint committees as provided by contract, and we will monitor their meetings and the work place to determine what meaningful and corrective actions, if any, we feel are necessary. We will also review mortality statistics. Employment of independent consultants will depend on problems encountered in the work place and other findings which we feel justify such action. In other words, we will start from scratch and try to work together to avoid a build-up of problems.

The purpose of the top-level pension re-

view agreement is to establish a factual and creditable basis on which future negotiations can be held. Also, we hope that the review committee findings will place the respective parties in a better position to negotiate and avert crisis bargaining on pension matters in the future.

I hope that my remarks on bargaining settlements made with your company are received in the spirit intended.

I believe the various companies, including yours, are to be complimented for having agreed to these clauses. A few years from now we should all be able to look back on these developments with pride.

Sincerely,

A. F. GROSZPIORN,
President.

THE LYRICAL POETRY OF SÁNDOR PETŐFI

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, last month, American-Hungarians across the country celebrated the 150th anniversary of the birth of Sándor Petőfi, the great Hungarian poet of freedom and democracy. The Washington observance was held at Trinity College on January 13. I recommend to my colleague's attention the following speech on the lyrical poetry of Petőfi, delivered at this program by Rev. Joseph A. Batori:

THE LYRICAL POETRY OF SÁNDOR PETŐFI

(By Rev. Joseph A. Batori)

The lyrics of Petőfi prove the rule of all great lyrical poetry: they encompass three worlds. The poet's person, inner life, the concrete exterior scene in which he lives, and the realm of ideas, the spirit of the age are the elements blended in all lyrical poetry. But, although the blending of these three elements forms the unity of a lyric, one or the other will receive greater emphasis. No matter which poet we consider in the vast spectrum of the Hungarian lyric of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, these three factors strike us. Petőfi's great forerunner, Mihály Vörösmarty, as also his great follower, Endre Ady, wrote their poems under the impact of their inner world and the spirit of the age.

Thus, their poetry became the powerful expression of the age in which they wrote but, at the same time, was a telling demonstration of the individual humanity, sensitivity and receptivity to the external truths of the great poetic figures. The lyric of Vörösmarty is philosophical; the lyric of Petőfi presents everyday episodes often crystallized into an experience that is deeply moving through its artistic quality and presentation of universal human truth; in Ady, the emotional impact of the external world, seen through the prism of a possibly overly-sensitive soul, becomes a wondrous, lasting experience.

In what does Petőfi's originality lie? Precisely in what numerous insignificant critics of his day objected to: that he sings of the simplicity of his parents' home, of everyday cares, of his honest and exemplary life. They objected to his practice of using scenes of family life, of the life of the village and the puszta—seemingly insignificant events—and especially, that his poetry was always based on specific images imprinted on his memory.

But Petőfi's individuality, his varied images and metaphors, his love of humanity, his patriotism and love of his native country made these poems lyrics. And they

are personal lyrics, though his style must be called lyrical realism for he presents himself as he is, truthfully, with his strengths and weaknesses, ideals and hates. His art lies in his ability to transform through the magic of poetry, the harmony he creates between his personality and the realistic scenes of his environment.

Petőfi's entire life can be reconstructed from his poetry. We see him as a child, a student, wanderer, soldier, actor and lover. We see him later, a champion of the dominant ideas of the country, as he aligns his own life with the totality of Hungarian existence, proposes, suggests, judges, urges, creates new genres in poetry, writes prose, translates, criticizes, and conducts an extensive correspondence.

It is impossible not to like the personality that emerges from his lyrics, the reflection of a warm and loving person who firmly believes that God created man for happiness. Petőfi wrote, "Until a man has been happy he can not die." Who would not wax enthusiastic and be moved by Petőfi's nobility of soul when he cries to God in "Fate, Give me Space": "my every heartbeat is a prayer for the happiness of the world." The more hypocritical the world in which one lives, the more he is struck by Petőfi's sincerity and steadfastness: "If you are a man, be a man; make your ideals your faith; / Profess this, even though your life is the price. / Rather deny your life a hundred times than deny yourself; / Let life itself be lost, if only honor remains."

The poet lived and died accordingly, as we now know, and we see also that "Freedom and Love" was not merely a poetic motto for him, but his creed: "Love and Liberty—These I need; / For love I'd sacrifice my life, / but for Liberty I sacrifice my Love."

It is not accidental that Petőfi's translators, both the English and the Germans, saw this brief poem as the expression of his beliefs even before his death. And when he died exactly as he had foretold it and as he had wished it, he stood before the world as a poet who had knowingly followed his destiny.

Another characteristic of Petőfi's poetry is the dedication to the people. "The true poet," he wrote—and Petőfi strove to be a true poet—"is he who drops his heavenly manna on the lips of the folk." Every line he wrote, he wrote so all could understand it, so even the simplest person could identify himself with the poet's fate. Therefore he idealized the family as every man's mode of life and goal, and to this end presented not only his own life, but Hungarian domestic scenes in many of his poems. And when, after his marriage he could celebrate his own wife, his own child, his poetry soared.

But we find more than just the poetry of folk life and of the hearth, or his own personal reflections in Petőfi's lyrics. We see a rich and varied sensibility. He was not a good actor, but his instinct was right: he can assume roles masterfully in his poetry. Everyone is surprised when they learn from Petőfi's biographers that he could not tolerate wine, and never drank it since numerous drinking songs seem to attest the exact opposite. Likewise, his personality was not suited to the flirtatious interchanges of society, although his witty, jesting, occasionally sharp poems suggest something else.

A method of expression that he brought to near perfection is the genre picture. The minor episodes of Hungarian life of the mid-nineteenth century, and its human types, gained lasting representatives on an eternally human plane: the village women, the men, the provincial nobleman, the outlaw, the young lovers, smaller and larger children are all framed in one memorable picture, as for example, the evocation of the peasant room in "Winter Evenings."

Literary histories list in detail the themes of his poems, pointing out their rich variety.

But only seldom do they mention that this richness comes from his lyrical realism: the harmony and relationships of Petöfi's human and poetic personality created the poetry we know today as the characteristic Petöfi-lyric.

A prominent place among his works must be given to Petöfi's *Patriotic Lyrics*. Petöfi's insight into the Hungarian soul and the picture of Hungarians which emerges from his poetry, as well as the role he marked out for the nation, is unique and still valid. To fully understand this aspect of the poet we must know that Petöfi's family had been granted a patent of nobility by Leopold I in 1667, a full century and a half before his birth. Furthermore, Petöfi was aware of this when the Diet abolished quit-rents, and so in effect freed the peasantry, he criticized the earlier behavior of the nobles, but that day wrote in his diary, "I did not say this by way of reproach to the nobility to which I myself belong." Those who wish to transform Petöfi into a rootless individual do so because it seems to be perhaps more democratic or more romantic. But the facts prove otherwise. His youth was spent in a wholly Hungarian atmosphere. Where else could he have acquired the impressive and charming Hungarian idiom, that unsurpassedly melodic, rhythmic Hungarian language, if not in the domain of Hungarian speech, folk poetry and folk song?

This tremendous Hungarian-experience gained a newer, wider sphere when the poet moved to Budapest. Let us not forget that this is the Era of Reform; the Turkish wars had been forgotten, but the Hungarian soul, too, was almost extinguished under centuries of foreign rule. In a cultured baroque society the young man became acquainted with the great representatives of western literature, the genius of Shakespeare, the revolutionary histories of Lamartine, Michelet and Mignet. In the footsteps of István Széchenyi, Petöfi became a leader among the young intellectuals of the Pilvax Coffee House.

Thus, he affirms the duty of the poet to the liberation and leadership of the people in "The Poets of the XIXth Century" as early as January 1847. Petöfi had been born into a society in which the ideals of the Reform—"the happiness of the majority"—had become both a political and a human goal. Vörösmarty, free of any fear, aided and encouraged the younger poet, and he himself maintained that "a nation's fate appeals to" the poet, and "when we had rescued that from the depths and have raised it as high as possible through the pure gleams shed by ideological battles, then we can say as we meet our ancestors: 'Life, we are grateful for your blessings: this was worthwhile work, this was man's work.'" Naturally, Petöfi, the strongest representative of the younger poetic generation, is no longer content to prepare for "ideological battles," for compromises as the decades slip by; he wants comprehensive changes—reforms which indeed the nation was able to achieve through the first responsible ministry of 1848.

We should not be surprised that Petöfi's patriotic, or rather political poetry becomes ever more radical. The Reform-generation only wished for improvements and at first even the young generation of Petöfi only sought that long-overdue reforms be implemented within the old forms, in conjunction with Austria. After all, even beyond the borders, in Austria, too, a new generation was urging progress.

When, however, the poetic message was not enough, when the alarms sounded in the "National Ode" on March 15, 1848 were dismissed by the ruling forces of the imperial court, and when, within a few months, the court revoked the reforms that had been sanctioned by the king, the "Young Hun-

gary" of Petöfi learned the final lesson: progress and liberty can not be achieved in co-operation with Imperial Austria. Petöfi was a revolutionary from the beginning, yet it was only in the final months of the Hungarian mortal struggle, during the months of the war of independence, that he became, both as a poet and as a politician, uncompromising in demanding radical reforms.

The country, Hungary, was not yet ready for comprehensive changes. Thus Petöfi, who in March of 1848 was perhaps the most popular man in the country, had lost so much ground by June that he was defeated in his bid for a seat in Parliament. The poet of the people was denied by the people. In this bitter mood he wrote the political-philosophical poem, *The Apostle*: the tragedy of the political reformer who comes before his time. New, grand ideas emerge in it, for it contains Petöfi's poetical testament and the program and beliefs of March 1848. Later, when the poet saw that the imperial government continued the policy of "divide et impera" and incited the nationalities against the Hungarians, he wrote "Life or Death," the poem in which he demonstrated convincingly to the nation that it is impossible to turn back on freedom, to undo reforms; one must always go forward because not only the liberty of Hungarians is at stake, but the liberty of all oppressed peoples.

The rest is history. Under Lajos Kossuth a Hungarian army, the national guard, was created. Hungarian officers and soldiers in the Austrian army, as well as the masses of Hungarian citizens, joined this new unit in such forces that, augmented by the youth of other lands (Poles, Italians, Austrians), victory was well within its reach. Only with the intervention of the Russian tsar, according to the terms of the Holy Alliance, was the force defeated.

Then did Petöfi become the true tempest of the Revolution. He saw he must become a soldier, and at his own request he joined the army of Transylvania, serving as adjutant to the Polish Joseph Bem, first as a captain, later as a major. His poems immortalized Bem and inspired the Hungarian troops in the face of the overwhelming Russian army. It was here that death overtook him on July 31st, 1849 during the Battle of Segesvár; here that he was buried—as he himself had wished to be—unknown, in "a mass grave with those who died for thee, sacred Liberty."

Is it possible to compare Petöfi to any other poet? Hardly. Certainly not to any foreign poet, but not even to other Hungarian poets, for his poetry is a mirror of his life and his life was an individual, unique human life. Petöfi is a poet for all Hungarians. And, further, in Hungarian terms, Petöfi is the poet of youth, the symbol of the regenerating Hungarian nation. For the non-Hungarian who appreciated literature, however, he is the Hungarian poet. Some of his simplest poems have been translated into forty to fifty languages. If we recall that the poetic output of Petöfi, who died in his twenty-sixth year, is 850 poems, and that this is the product of five or six years, then we can see the power of his creative energy.

As the literary historian Frigyes Riedl (who published the first English history of Hungarian literature early in this century) remarked, if Shakespeare or János Arany had died at twenty-six, we would not even know they had lived. Petöfi's career was like a comet's: what he produced in his brief life is truly a marvel. If we should list the great men of Western literature chronologically, we must start with Homer; Dante, then Shakespeare and Goethe follow. After that, Petöfi must come. Yet, even if one would include two or three other names, Petöfi must be listed among the ten greatest poets.

AID FOR SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the question of providing aid to Southeast Asia, including North Vietnam, has been suggested and may come before this body for consideration and action.

We need to study this matter very carefully during deliberative stages in order for us to make a wise decision based on fact and not emotion. In this regard, two editorials have appeared in South Carolina newspapers recently which merit serious scrutiny.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two editorials be printed in the Extensions of Remarks. "U.S. Role in Southeast Asia," dated February 16, 1973, from the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C.; "Nixon's Post-War Plan Due Thoughtful Debate," dated February 23, 1973, from the State newspaper of Columbia, S.C.

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

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, February 16, 1973]

U.S. ROLE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The idea that the United States should give economic assistance to North Vietnam is repugnant to many Americans, and with considerable justification. Obviously the Communist regime of Hanoi cannot be considered friendly. To many Americans, Communist governments are entities to be defeated, not assisted in any way.

Therefore, the suggestion, first advanced by former President Johnson and now given a big push by announcement of a joint economic commission representing the United States and North Vietnam, creates considerable controversy. At this juncture there is little reason to doubt that Congress would refuse to appropriate a thin dime for North Vietnamese assistance, if the matter were put to a vote.

There also is controversy over whether the United States should give significant economic assistance in the future to South Vietnam. Indeed the larger question of foreign aid anywhere may come under close scrutiny and sharp debate. Americans have become disenchanted with the idea of overseas largesse, especially in view of the nation's domestic economic and social problems and unfavorable trade balances with the rest of the world.

But the issue is not that simple. It is not merely a case of pouring out American resources to help other peoples. The United States no longer is able to do that; in fact this country is becoming dependent upon resources no longer available here and must now rely upon other parts of the world for them.

That puts the matter of economic assistance to Vietnam and all other parts of the world in an entirely different perspective. It means that the United States now must assist developing nations to become stronger in order to remain economically strong itself. It means that this country must help develop markets elsewhere in order to have resources for its own use and outlets for its vast productive capability.

It means that the United States must re-examine and readjust relationships, economic and otherwise, with all regions of the world. We have to work for more favorable trade balances with the developed nations, such as Japan and the European Common Market. We need to expand trade with those Communist markets which can produce goods and services we need. Finally we must help develop the underdeveloped regions, including Southeast Asia, in order to further expand the potential for consuming the goods we can produce and to provide resources we now lack.

This is the real significance—indeed it is the reason for—major efforts to end the Cold War confrontation with the Communist world. Essentially we are moving from competition based largely upon military power to an economic struggle in which our survival depends upon how wisely we use our vast technological and economic power all over the world.

Without question a peaceful, productive Southeast Asia is an essential part of the larger picture. The region cannot be made productive without major rehabilitation. It cannot be made both stable and productive unless the whole region is rehabilitated. Obviously North Vietnam is an important part of that whole.

Therefore, it is necessary that the United States participate in the planning and implementation of a program to make Southeast Asia a productive, peaceful part of the world.

Certainly this country cannot be expected to carry the whole load. There must be assistance from other countries, such as Japan and the European nations. There must be participation by the Soviet Union and China.

The point is that the United States has a stake in the future of Southeast Asia, and must play its role in the rehabilitation of the region.

Refusal to participate in building a stable economy in Southeast Asia, including North Vietnam, would be the worst course of action this nation could take at this juncture.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Feb. 23, 1973]

NIXON'S POSTWAR PLAN DUE THOUGHTFUL DEBATE

Several years ago there was a joke going the rounds that if the North Vietnamese were really smart, they would capitulate so that the United States could move in with massive aid to rebuild the country.

The gag, springing out of this nation's role since World War II in bankrolling our former enemies, isn't so funny today. The likelihood of the United States' taking a lead role in reconstruction of Southeast Asia is already evident.

Only a week ago, a joint communique, issued in Hanoi and Washington after four days of talks between Dr. Henry A. Kissinger and the North Vietnamese government, announced the creation of a Joint Economic Commission.

"The two sides exchanged views on the manner in which the United States will contribute to healing the wounds of war and to post-war economic reconstruction in North Vietnam," the statement said.

Although the communique mentioned only American aid, our State Department said it envisioned the commission as a conduit for economic aid from the Soviet Union, China, Japan, and Western Europe.

An immediate response of resentment at the prospect of helping the enemy was predictable. The hostility to the idea will not go away any time soon. Voices being raised in protest in Congress surely reflect much sentiment back home.

We suggest, however, that it is time to keep

our voices lowered and approach the matter thoughtfully. The strategy evolved by Dr. Kissinger and President Nixon has brought us close to peace in Southeast Asia, and we believe that the Administration deserves a measure of confidence in its post-war strategy.

Hasty judgments and absolute positions often are based more on emotions than on sound reasons and facts. There will be ample time for debate since the Congress must appropriate any reconstruction funds. Mr. Nixon has already mentioned \$2.5 billion over a five year period.

Secretary of State William P. Rogers has called it "an investment in peace." As reported in *The New York Times*, the purpose is "to persuade Hanoi that there is more to gain by accepting American aid and building up its own economy than in maintaining a wartime mentality and spending its energy on outside wars."

Mr. Rogers summed up the Administration's present view with cautious optimism saying, "We will have to make it clear to Congress that this makes sense. We will have to consult with them and cooperate with them and try to involve their interest... We think that, as in the past, Congress, when it finally finds out all the facts and gives full consideration to the problems and the implications of failing to help, will react responsibly."

We return to an oft advanced thought, that the decision should lie in what we determine to be the best interest of the United States in the long run. All of the facts are not yet before us.

TIMBER REVENUE

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, half of the First Congressional District of Montana is Federal land, most of it under the administration of the U.S. Forest Service. We live in enclaves within these Federal lands. We do benefit from these lands in a number of ways but they do complicate our transportation, communications, education, and distribution problems, and they do not contribute to our tax base.

Mr. Speaker, chapter 2 of title 16 of the United States Code provides for a share of timber receipts from Federal lands for the counties in which the timber was cut. These moneys are earmarked for school and road purposes and are desperately needed by local governments. If this reimbursement were a reasonable share it would go far toward alleviating our property tax burden.

It is my firm conviction that the intent of the original act was to reimburse local government for loss of tax base by returning 25 percent of the gross value of timber harvested. This is not the way things have worked out. A recent sale on the Flathead National Forest involving timber worth \$1,694,749 as it came out of the mill netted the county \$1,509. If you wonder how such a travesty is perpetrated, take a look at a U.S. Forest Service "Appraisal Summary" form.

Over the years, there has evolved a set of calculations which in the hands of the Forest Service bookkeeping depart-

ment whittles the local share down to 25 percent of the net. On a marginal timber sale, this is a paltry amount.

While the county fares badly, the Forest Service makes out quite well. They pay for slash disposal, erosion control, reforestation site improvement and road construction from timber revenues before a cent filters back to the county. Road construction is the worst offender, "Specified roads" in particular. These are permanent forest roads, frequently multipurpose in use, expensive and certainly not a legitimate expense to be paid for from timber moneys.

These forests belong to all the people. So do the roads. Let us have hard money appropriations for these roads. They will benefit the public as a whole so the cost should be borne by all, not just the Montana timber purchaser. Not only will this change benefit the local communities but the Forest Service will benefit as well. An escape from their cost-benefit timber sale policy will result in a more stable financial base on which improved forest management can build.

Mr. Speaker, I request that the text of my bill be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The bill follows:

A bill to amend chapter 2 of title 16 of the United States Code (respecting national forests to provide a share of timber receipts to States for schools and roads

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 500 of title 16 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 500. Payment and evaluation of receipts to State for schools and roads

"Twenty-five per centum of the gross value of timber harvested during any fiscal year from each national forest shall be paid, at the end of such year, by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which such national forest is situated, to be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of the public schools and public roads of the county or counties in which such national forest is situated: *Provided*, That when any national forest is in more than one State or county the distributive share to each from the proceeds of such forest shall be proportional to its area therein. In sales of logs, ties, poles, posts, cordwood, pulpwood, and other forest products the amounts made available for school and roads by this section shall be based upon the product of the volume of the sale times the awarded rate.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF ALEXANDER PETÖFI, HUNGARIAN POET

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, Hungarian-Americans throughout this country are joining this year in honor of a great Hungarian, Alexander Petöfi.

This Hungarian poet and patriot was born 150 years ago. His works, and his memory are still an inspiration around the world.

As a poet, his works have been translated into many languages, and he has received critical acclaim throughout the world.

As a patriot, he fought for freedom for his native country, and died on the battlefield. Today, his statue in Budapest stands as a monument to freedom.

It has been a privilege for me to work with many Hungarian-Americans in connection with congressional passage of the Ethnic Heritage Studies Programs Act last year, which was introduced to help all Americans have a better understanding of the culture, and heritage, and national heroes of all the ethnic and minority groups that make up our country.

Alexander Petöfi was a great Hungarian, and it is a privilege for me to join in public recognition of his achievements on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

STEED GIVEN DISTINGUISHED SCOUT AWARD

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on February 25, 1973, my good friend and colleague TOM STEED was presented the Distinguished Eagle Scout Award by the Last Frontier Council of the Boy Scouts of America. This award, one of the highest in scouting, is given only to Eagle scouts who have served scouting and their communities for at least 25 years. TOM STEED has been helping boys learn about scouting for more than 50 years.

I first met TOM STEED while he was a scoutmaster of a troop in my hometown of McAlester, Okla. Since that time I have witnessed his unceasing dedication to scouting and its ideals. TOM STEED is himself an exemplary product of the scouting movement.

I am proud to include in the RECORD an article containing a transcript of the Distinguished Eagle Scout Award presentation to Mr. STEED which appeared in the February 25, 1973, issue of the Shawnee, Okla. News-Star.

STEED GIVEN DISTINGUISHED SCOUT AWARD (By Ross U. Porter)

Sixteen year old Tom Steed, son of a Seminole County, Oklahoma cotton farmer, applied for his first job at the nearby Ada Evening News in 1920. The owner, Marvin Brown, assigned him to the stereo department which handled the hot metal type used in printing the newspaper. It was a most unglamorous occupation, but it was a starting point.

A few months later when Tom expressed a desire to become a reporter, the publisher, knowing of his keen interest in Scouting, consented to allow him to write the Ada Boy Scout Column, as a side line, while also continuing his scouting experience.

The first requirement however, was that Steed must learn to use a typewriter expertly, by typing the entire front page of The Daily Oklahoman each day, for 30 days. Tom met this requirement with unusual speed and accuracy.

The manual training teacher at the Ada High School, Professor Bradshaw, had recently organized the first Boy Scout troop in Ada, and was its Scoutmaster. It became a champion troop as it won many awards and

prizes. Tom Steed's column inspired much local pride and interest from leading citizens who were stimulated by his objective reporting of the scouting events.

A distinguished Ada attorney, Orel Busby, who later served for many years until his retirement, as an outstanding member of the Oklahoma Supreme Court, decided to form the first Boy Scout Council for that area of Oklahoma. The National Council of the Boy Scouts of America granted the charter, and Steed reported the historic event with many pictures, cutlines and stories in big black-face type.

Tom Steed sensed, in two short years, he had arrived at a reporters desk with a journalistic future. The publisher too, agreed his stories were original, clever, and attracted considerable attention.

Meanwhile, Tom had determined that he wanted to become an Eagle Scout, its highest scouting award. However, he discovered the merit badge requiring one hike per week for 52 weeks, and the 50 mile bicycle merit badges, were the toughest. It was 15 miles from Ada to his home in Konawa. The roads were unpaved, crooked, dusty, muddy and sometimes "dark as pitch." Tom made that challenging round trip on two occasions and received his Eagle Award in Ada, in 1921, over 50 years ago.

Sometime later Steed was offered a reporters job on the McAlester News-Capitol in 1924, and promptly accepted. He also accepted the assignment as Scoutmaster of the Episcopal Church troop in that city, and described the troop as "17 of the finest boys I ever knew." The scouts obviously, reciprocated the accolade.

There too, for the first time he met Carl Albert, now Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives. The long friendship between these two men is now well known to Oklahomans and to all members of the U.S. Congress. Each has carved for himself an outstanding record of service to the United States of America, contributing to the history of the Republic, and to their beloved State of Oklahoma during the past quarter century.

After McAlester, Steed joined the Daily Oklahoman staff as a news reporter, then traveled to the Bartlesville newspaper briefly. He then returned to The Daily Oklahoman—Mr. E. K. Gaylord and "Skipper" Walter M. Harrison, as an oil reporter, covering the gigantic Seminole oil boom development, from a Shawnee vantage point.

In due time the Shawnee newspaper signed him as a reporter. Eventually, he became managing editor of The Shawnee News-Star, his last newspaper assignment. He resigned this position in 1942, to volunteer for service in the U.S. Army, following this he launched into a political career. The voters in his 4th District of Oklahoma last November, re-elected him to his 13th consecutive term, or 26 years, as their Congressman, by the largest majority in history.

To be eligible for this Distinguished Eagle Scout Award, the recipient must have served Scouting for at least 25 years. Tom Steed has the very rare record of having helped this great organization for 50 full years.

On behalf of the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America—and the Last Frontier Council of Oklahoma, it is truly a great privilege to bestow upon this outstanding American—Oklahoman—Scouter—the Distinguished Eagle Scout Award.

TOM STEED EARNED THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

As a member of the Boy Scouts of America more than twenty-five years ago, in February, 1921, and

Because as an Eagle Scout, he has continued to serve his God, Country and fellow man, following the principles of the Scout Oath and Law, and

Because he has achieved distinction through service to Scouting as Scoutmaster, and

Because he has given distinguished service

to his Nation and community as member of the U.S. House of Representatives since 1948, Chairman of the Treasury-Post Office-General Government Subcommittee on Appropriations, member of several other important House committees, author or co-author of legislation in the fields of education, conservation, the interstate highway program, agriculture, and public works; former newspaperman and automobile agency operator, member of the Oklahoma Hall of Fame and the Minute Man Hall of Fame of the National Reserve Officers Association; veteran of World War II service as a U.S. Army officer and in the Office of War Information; and recipient of honors from the American Veterinary Medicine Association and the General Services Administration;

Because of these and other achievements and the desire of the Boy Scouts of America, upon the nomination of his local council and the recommendation by a committee of Distinguished Eagle Scouts to the National Court of Honor, acting on behalf of the Executive Board of the Boy Scouts of America, the Honor and Rank of Distinguished Eagle Scout are awarded to and conferred upon him.

AN EDITORIAL ON LAWLESSNESS

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, each member of this distinguished body—regardless of political affiliation—is concerned about our ever-increasing crime rate. Earlier this week, authorities announced that 264 persons were murdered in the District of Columbia during 1972; during the same time, approximately 300 Americans were killed in battle in Vietnam.

In a recent editorial, Donald Wear, vice president and general manager of WAPI-TV and WAPI-Radio in Birmingham, discussed the lawlessness which is so prevalent in our country today.

Due to the timeliness of this editorial, I ask that it be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for my colleagues' study.

EDITORIAL

With increasing frequency, it seems, we must report to you the lawlessness in our land. There appears to be no real safety when rapes, shootings, assaults, thefts and other violent, criminal acts can and do happen to anyone—anywhere. What in heaven's name has happened to our national fibre? The common decency which characterized the growth of this country seems to have eroded or at least the ability of the majority of American citizens to control the circumstances of our living appears to have been weakened. Law enforcement agencies have an overpowering task in maintaining some equilibrium in our society. They face apathy and disrespect. Danger and disillusion—and it is up to each individual to provide the support so vital to them in protection of our own lives and property. And since everything is a two way street, there is an equivalent obligation on the part of these agencies to use good judgment in the exercise of authority. This mutual cooperation—by everyone—regardless of position in life—or where they live—or work—or play—is an absolute necessity if we are to begin rebuilding the kinds of values and attitudes which will repair our decline. We believe there is something each of us can do, and that is "say something to somebody about it!" The next time you see a judge—or a lawyer—or a legislator—or congressman—or senator—

or councilman—or neighbor—or friend—say something about it. As Abraham Lincoln once said "with public opinion nothing will fail—without it, nothing can succeed." So let us rise up to the defense of our national interests. In many stadiums you hear the ringing roar of thousands of voices imploring De-fense, De-fense, and it works—because good men are motivated by good causes and the support of the people. Abuses of the law and the common rights of all people have no place in this America—and it's up to you to say something to somebody.

THE ATLANTIC COUNCIL CALLS FOR INTERNATIONAL TRADE REFORM

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic Council in a recent statement on international trade policy, identifies the main problems—both domestic and foreign—impeding trade expansion, and suggests possible reforms.

The text of the statement follows:

STATEMENT ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE POLICY

The Committee believes that the Administration and the Congress must give urgent attention to stimulating an increase in international trade for the benefit of business, labor, agriculture and the consumer. Improvements in world economic mechanisms, both in the monetary and trading systems, are necessary to enable us to attain this objective. Monetary reforms are already under discussion. The time has come to get trade reform underway as well.

The first urgent need is for vigorous Administration leadership in seeking authority from the Congress broad enough and bold enough to convince our principal trading partners that the U.S. is determined to seek, and has the necessary authority to negotiate for, a thorough-going reform of the international trading system parallel with reform of the international monetary system.

The second need is for the Congress to grant the necessary authority to the Administration to negotiate such changes. Only a broad, bold and forward-looking approach can meet the present and future needs of the American economy for full employment of manpower and of the country's exceptional industrial, technological and agricultural resources.

There is also need for an international sense of urgency about the task of reform and for reaching a consensus at an early date, at least among the governments of the principal trading nations, on the general nature of the negotiations to be conducted.

The need for reform in the trade field is not dictated by economic considerations alone. There is serious danger that if conditions are not provided for continuing expansion of world trade for the benefit of nations generally, we may face trade conflicts and jeopardy to the progress being made in other areas. The Atlantic Council has been deeply concerned about the possible damage to Atlantic relations, and those with Japan, that can occur as a result of increasing economic tensions. A key factor in ensuring the future maintenance of peace will be the growth of the economic strength and the cohesion of the countries of Western Europe, North America and Japan.

The negotiations will have to break new ground internationally, both as to substance and procedure. New legislation should there-

fore be broad enough to enable the Executive to negotiate effectively regarding the full range of subjects in which U.S. trade interests are involved. It should set forth the policies and principles of American foreign policy respecting international trade, to provide guidelines to the Executive and to make our outlook clear to our trading partners. The legislation should provide the Executive with the authority to act when the objective can be readily defined. It should provide negotiating authority subject to Congressional review in other cases.

The policy objectives to be sought should include the progressive elimination of barriers to international trade and of policies and practices which distort trade channels. They should aim at the establishment of conditions which will permit fair trade on a non-discriminatory multilateral basis. The creation of such conditions is in the general interest. It is also in the U.S. interest and should be clearly enunciated anew by the Congress as American policy.

The United States needs fair access to foreign markets to sustain our industrial employment and agricultural production. We need fair rules on competition in the marketplace. We can obtain fair access to other markets only by granting fair access to our own. The American economy is strong. Assuming that we keep it strong through sound domestic policies, the United States can compete in a fair trade system for the markets it needs to pay for its requirements for goods and services from other countries, provided that the international monetary negotiations result in the creation of an efficient and equitable process by which adjustments can be made through flexibility in exchange rates and other complementary measures.

Within the framework of the policies laid down by the Congress, the Committee believes that new trade legislation should cover the following subjects:

TARIFFS

Specific advance authority should be delegated to the President to enter into multilateral agreements for the reciprocal elimination of tariffs among the industrialized countries on a most-favored-nation basis over a specified time period of perhaps ten years, in accordance with a plan for progressive annual reductions. The elimination of tariffs would be subject to suitable safeguards for labor and industry referred to below.

NONTARIFF BARRIERS

As tariff barriers have been progressively reduced and as the trading nations move toward greater economic interdependence, non-tariff barriers and their trade-distorting effects have become increasingly important. A new, vigorous attack on these barriers is needed.

The objective in dealing with non-tariff barriers would be, depending on their character, to reduce or eliminate them or to correct their trade-distorting effects and to get rid of discrimination.

Some non-tariff barriers bear exclusively on imports and may lend themselves to negotiations similar to those which have been used regarding tariffs. Other non-tariff barriers are enmeshed in domestic legislation and require different approaches. There is danger, for example, that industrial, health or safety regulations can inadvertently or deliberately create trade barriers. The domestic goals concerned should be sought by measures which, as far as possible, avoid hampering trade. Dealing with these problems will inevitably be a long-term continuing process.

This process may well include negotiating:

A. Principles of fair trade.

B. Codes of conduct for governments, with provisions for making them effective through penalties or compensatory benefits in case of violation.

C. Agreements against discrimination.

D. Liberalization and simplification of procedures and practices directly relating to international trade.

E. Harmonization of other policies, procedures and practices which substantially affect international trade.

Adequate international machinery will be needed for review of governmental action regarding these matters, for dealing with complaints of violation, and for continuing consultation and negotiation, a matter which is discussed further below.

The Congress should give the President adequate authority, and clear cut assurance of support in principle, for conducting such negotiations.

AGRICULTURE

There are unique aspects to the problems of agriculture and dealing with them is complicated by domestic legislation and political sensitivities in many countries. It is essential nevertheless that international trade in agriculture be dealt with as an integral part of the reform of world trade system proposed above, particularly as regards non-tariff barriers, which are of great significance in this area. The Kennedy Round of negotiations was able to accomplish very little in this area, which is of particular importance to the United States in view of the efficiency of our agriculture and its role in our export trade.

Agreements should be sought which would contribute to rationalization of world agriculture and result in a substantial expansion of agricultural trade. Since our own domestic legislation is involved, a clear expression of Congressional intent in this area would facilitate effective negotiations by the Executive.

Another Atlantic Council committee is preparing more specific proposals on the subject of international trade in agriculture.

ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

The Congress should review and liberalize the legislative provisions for adjustment assistance to labor and industry affected by changes in international trade patterns. There seems to be widespread agreement that present programs have not been effective. More attention and support should be given to job-retraining, with improved Federal and local cooperation.

Assistance should also be extended in appropriate cases to communities which are heavily dependent on affected industries.

SAFEGUARDS

In order to bring about the desired changes, it may be necessary to provide safeguards for reducing the impact of changes on a few industries which are highly sensitive to altered conditions, by affording temporary, transitional relief from an excessive volume of imports which results in market disruption. Such measures, whether taken by the United States or other countries, should however be strictly limited in time and be subject to international consultation and review.

TRADE WITH COUNTRIES WITH CENTRALLY PLANNED ECONOMIES

The provisions of existing law bearing on trade with the USSR, Mainland China and other countries with centrally planned economies should be reviewed to determine whether they are adequate to enable the Executive to deal effectively with the governments of those countries, both as regards exports and imports, in the interest of increasing our trade with them.

TRADE WITH DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

The provisions of existing law bearing on trade among the more industrially advanced countries is not likely to be swift enough to meet the urgent trade problems of the developing countries. Legislative provision should be made for U.S. implementation of internationally agreed arrangements, already implemented by Europe and Japan, for a sys-

tem of generalized tariff preferences for these countries under conditions which are fair as between the advanced countries.

INTERNATIONAL MACHINERY

One difficult problem which will have to be solved in the negotiations, but which it may not be possible to treat in the initial legislation, relates to the international machinery for dealing with trade questions. While the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) has performed an essential role, consideration needs to be given to the adequacy of its procedures and mandate, which go back to the early post-war period, and to providing for a closer and more effective relationship between GATT and the International Monetary Fund. Consideration will also need to be given to the development in a new era of economic cooperation of the role to be played by the OECD in coordinating the economic policies of its member countries.

REQUIRED LEGISLATION

Legislation dealing with these problems would fall into various categories. For example, provisions for adjustment assistance should become effective immediately upon enactment of the legislation. Beyond this, two types of authority will be necessary:

One, dealing with tariffs, including safeguards, and some non-tariff barriers, should constitute specific authority. The other, dealing with non-tariff barriers and agriculture, should be in the form of Congressional guidance. Results achieved in accordance with this guidance should be subject to Congressional review. In the interest of obtaining action, agreements concluded under this authority should be submitted to the Congress and take effect unless disapproved by the Congress within sixty days of the date of submission. Major progress may not be achieved in a single, one-time negotiation, but rather by a process of continuing negotiations and consultation over what may be a very long period of time.

The foregoing comments relate to the subject of trade legislation. Such legislation, however, will not be able to deal with the totality of the U.S. international trade problem. The competitive position of the American producer, at home and abroad, is affected by domestic policy and legislation in various fields. Most important, of course, are the government's general economic policies and particularly the measures taken to restrain inflation and promote economic growth through budget and fiscal policy. It is particularly important at this time to place those ceilings, both executive and legislative, on outlays and appropriations which will avoid the threat of renewed demand-pull inflation as we increasingly employ the unused resources of manpower and capacity now available in the economy.

Tax policies, anti-trust policies, energy policies and environmental policies provide examples of specific domestic measures which may have a significant effect on foreign trade. Domestic policies and legislation, and the regulations deriving from them, which have such an effect should be reviewed in the light of changing conditions in international trade. The Committee makes no *a priori* judgment regarding them. However, where they are found to require adaptation, the Committee suggests that the desirability of an international approach, of seeking international rules or harmonization through international agreement, should be kept constantly in mind.

In making its recommendations, the Committee calls attention to the large current and prospective deficit in the U.S. trade balance, which reached a total of more than six billion dollars in 1972. This deficit reflects changes which have taken place in the international economic situation and distortions and rigidities which have developed in the structure of international eco-

nomics relations, preventing effective adjustment to changing world economic circumstances.

The Committee has also given attention to the continuing unduly high level of unemployment. A primary interest of labor, and indeed of the whole American economy, is the safeguarding and creation of jobs and resultant purchasing power. With respect to international trade, the Committee firmly believes that the best means of increasing employment lies in increasing efficiency of American production and through expanding exports, i.e., in the reduction of foreign barriers to trade and the re-enforcement of the competitiveness of American industry. It also believes that efforts to protect jobs through restrictive trade controls would be self-defeating by weakening competitiveness and inviting reprisals against our export trade and would operate to reduce standards of living.

The Committee has only dealt in its recommendations with actions to be taken by government. These can at best create a favorable climate for action by individual enterprises. In the final analysis, provided that the climate is favorable, it is the response of management and labor to the challenges which our problems and opportunities present which will determine the success of the American effort.

In conclusion, the Committee wishes to stress three points:

1. Action is needed urgently.
2. Only a bold, forward-looking approach can meet the present and future needs of the American economy and of American foreign policy.
3. Trade legislation should be looked on and dealt with as an integral part of our over-all efforts to achieve a peaceful and increasingly prosperous world.

DEPUTY U.S. MARSHALS RECLASSIFICATION

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, during the closing days of the 92d Congress, the House agreed to legislation which would have reclassified a group of Federal employees, deputy U.S. marshals, who have been receiving less compensation for comparable work than any other group of law enforcement officers in our Government.

This bill was also overwhelmingly accepted by the Senate and sent to the President for action. Along with many other bills, the President pocket-vetoes it.

Today, along with many other Members, I am introducing substantially the same bill so that we may have an opportunity to enact this badly needed legislation.

As with all law enforcement personnel, the work of the deputy U.S. marshals has been broadening and increasing. Thus the classification problem is becoming more acute. Among other duties, the deputy U.S. marshals are charged with guarding Congressmen and other important political figures, witnesses testifying before congressional committees, heads of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and a variety of other vital duties.

These employees are called upon to carry out hazardous duties over extended periods of time and in many cases have been killed or injured in the line of duty.

This bill would adjust the classification of these employees upward so that an entering deputy U.S. marshal would be paid \$7,694 per year.

At the other end of the scale this bill provides that after years of service, a deputy U.S. marshal might achieve a top grade of GS-11.

Currently, nonsupervisory deputy U.S. marshals currently are classified from grades GS-4 through GS-9. My bill provides for a trainee entry level at GS-5 with other classifications at GS-7, 9, and 11.

I hope that the 93d Congress will act with the same wisdom with which the 92d Congress acted and pass this bill in timely fashion.

AFRICAN BLOC DOMINATION OF U.N.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, when I first began my efforts to inform our people of the threat posed by the U.N. against America I pointed out the tightening noose of international controls over the American people—international ideas, goals, and laws replacing American ideas and laws.

It now seems that I may of been in error when I called the control "international." The voting record of the United Nations General Assembly clearly indicates the voting power of the world debating body now is in control of one group—the African bloc composed of 41 African countries. And this group grows larger each year.

The awesome power of the Africans to dominate the U.N.—to ram through resolutions almost unopposed—further strengthens the fear many Americans have of growing encroachment on this country's sovereignty. Even the "internationalist one worlders" are now concerned about this growing regional control of world affairs.

Almost one-third of the voting power of the 132-member U.N. is now in the hands of the 41 African countries—which represent less than one-tenth of the world's population, and pay less than 1 percent of the U.N.'s financial obligations. The American taxpayers, incidentally, have paid from one-third to almost 40 percent of the entire cost of U.N. operations until the Congress this year reduced the U.N. contribution to 25 percent.

Africa, whose total population is about twice that of the United States, has 41 votes to our one—a voting advantage of approximately 20 to 1. It is incredible that this great Nation's taxpayers, carry the vast majority of the financial burden.

The power of the Organization of African Unity, the group that pulls the

strings of the African ambassadors, even extends to the 15-nation Security Council, where African resolutions are rubber stamped in wholesale lots. The big powers, like the United States, lean over backward to appease by avoiding vetoes. Member nations with larger populations, size, wealth, and military might are afraid to incur the wrath of these underdeveloped minority countries.

The strength of the Africans to bulldoze the rest of the world into submission was evidenced last year. Bloc voting by African extremists gutted an international move aimed at preventing terrorism. They stand united, but most often side with the Russians on critical issues.

The economic sanctions imposed on Rhodesia were the result of more string pulling by the Organization of African Unity. But this group only uses the U.N. as a tool when it suits its purposes. One of its primary aims is to keep strictly African problems out of the United Nations, favoring a domestic or regional handling. The Africans want to voice control over other areas of the world, but demand a "hands off policy" when questions of Africa arise.

Only three nations have a larger population than the United States, yet the United States has only one vote while Soviet Russia has three. They pay 16.1 percent, we pay 25 percent. In fact, over half of the voting countries in the U.N. do not have the total population of the United States. United Nations advocates who call for a one-man, one-vote principle to be applied to Southern Rhodesia, are silent with regard to the abuse of this same principle in the United Nations.

And the expulsion of Nationalist China, a charter member, should remind all that peace, justice, and world representation are not U.N. objectives.

AMTRAK: IS IT EITHER NO SERVICE OR POOR SERVICE?

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it is not too often that a person from Arkansas has a basis for complaint about the service they have received from the Amtrak system. The reason for this situation is not that they are completely satisfied with its operation—it is just that since we have no service at all in Arkansas, we seldom have an opportunity to pass judgment on the train.

However, I would like to share with you and my colleagues a suggestion I received from one of my constituents, Dr. Wayne Workman, who has had experience with the Amtrak reservation services:

FEBRUARY 19, 1973.

DIRECTOR OF AM-TRAC,
Department of Transportation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On the fifth of January I called the Am-Trac toll number and requested reservations for two people, round trip, from Oklahoma City to Los Angeles, California. I

asked that these tickets be mailed to us, and they be charged to my American Express Credit Card, they said that this could be done. On the seventh of January these reservations were confirmed, and the bedroom and the car numbers were given to me, however, on the fifteenth of January no information had been received from Am-Trac. Another telephone call reveals that we would have to pick these tickets up at the ticket agent in Oklahoma City, and there was much confusion. This required three telephone calls and approximately some twelve to eighteen hours to get all of this information straightened out. All of the people who handled and dealt with me were extremely nice and courteous and seemingly intelligent, and they seemed to want to be helpful.

My point is this, I think that if Am-Trac is ever going to be successful it should be computerized. If I had called and made reservations on an airline I would have known within minutes whether or not space was available and tickets would have been mailed out immediately. I have made many reservations and purchased tickets in this manner with three different airlines without any problems or complications at anytime. It is no wonder that the railroad systems are having problems, past and present, they are years behind. My suggestion is, pattern the Am-Trac operation after the airline systems, indeed the whole railroad system.

Sincerely,

W. W. WORKMAN, M.D.

ELWOOD S. MOFFETT

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Speaker, last week the labor movement in America lost a great leader. Elwood S. Moffett, the former president of District 50, Allied and Technical Workers, died of an apparent heart attack while en route to a labor conference in Bal Harbour, Fla. Mr. Moffett, who headed the district 50 labor union for 11 years, was a special assistant to the president of the Steelworkers Union at the time of his death.

Elwood Moffett was a unique individual. He was a man whose early life found him working in the anthracite coal mines in Pennsylvania. From this humble beginning he rose to be president of one of the truly great independent unions of our time. When district 50 merged with the Steelworkers Union last summer, they represented 180,000 members in the United States and Canada.

Despite this obvious organizational and leadership ability, I find myself remembering Elwood S. Moffett the man. I had been a Member of the U.S. Congress for less than 2 months when Mr. Moffett invited me to sit with him on the speaker's platform at district 50's international convention here in Washington. From that day forward I had the privilege of enjoying a friendship with him that I valued highly. His personal interest and compassion for everyone he represented was obvious to all who came in contact with him. He displayed a great and rare understanding for the problems of the employer as well as for the employee.

At the memorial services for Elwood Moffett the unofficial chaplain of district 50, the Reverend Monsignor William J. Snyder eulogized him as a true Christian whose church influenced and directed his activities. When Monsignor Snyder said:

His Palm Sunday was long, his Gethsemane was equally long, but his Calvary will be short.

All of those present knew exactly what he meant.

The memory of Elwood S. Moffett will live with me for many years. I trust that the labor movement and those who worked with him will continue to pursue the goals to which he devoted his life. Elwood Moffett never considered one's political affiliation as a requirement for cooperation. He treated everyone equally, whether a U.S. Congressman or the newest member of his union. The labor union has lost an outstanding leader, the country has lost a great American, and I have lost a good friend.

VA HOSPITAL AT TUSKEGEE, ALA., OBSERVES ITS 50TH YEAR OF SERVICE

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, during the recent congressional recess, I was privileged to participate in ceremonies at the Veterans' Administration hospital in Tuskegee, Ala., as that institution observed 50 years of service to our American servicemen.

The record of service, started on February 12, 1923, following an address by the then Vice President Calvin Coolidge has been commendable. It is a record of dedication by the men and women of the Tuskegee area—the employees and the volunteers.

The foundation laid by those who have already served at Tuskegee deserve the finest tribute which can be most suitably rendered by the desire to move forward and continue to build on the base they constructed through many difficulties. In many respects, the 50th anniversary of the VA hospital in Tuskegee stands as a virtual monument of the achievement of goals of patient care delivery which were undreamed of and considered impossible in 1923.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that each of my distinguished colleagues has heard of Tuskegee, Ala.; if they have not heard of the VA hospital there, they have heard of the famed Tuskegee Institute—the school of George Washington Carver and Booker T. Washington. Tuskegee Institute, in fact, donated 300 acres of land to the Federal Government for the construction of the VA hospital.

But it is the Veterans' Administration hospital in Tuskegee which we are honoring—its director, Lucien Green, its assistant hospital director Ralph M. McClanahan; and chief of staff Dr. Daniel J. Thompson.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the history of

the VA hospital as included in the commemorative program observing the 50th anniversary of this fine hospital:

**THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL
AT TUSKEGEE**

World War I ended with many problems involving war veterans; particularly those who were wounded and sick. To meet the needs of those men released from the Armed Services, the United States Veterans Bureau began rapidly building hospitals in various sections of the country to insure adequate medical care for all. The Treasury Department Hospitalization Committee, under Dr. William Charles White, Chairman, after careful investigation found that it was almost impossible for Negro soldiers to secure proper treatment in mixed hospitals for veterans in the South. Because of this discrimination against Negro veterans, President Warren G. Harding and the Veterans Bureau were faced with the problem brought into focus by Negro public opinion.

In 1921, the Veterans Bureau of the United States Government encountered problems trying to locate a hospital at some suitable point in the south for the treatment of Negro veterans. A solution to the situation was initiated by Government leaders, including President Harding, who contacted Tuskegee Institute concerning the possibility of erecting a Veterans Bureau Hospital for Negroes in the vicinity of Tuskegee. It was also proposed that such a hospital would serve as an employment training center for young Negro physicians. Tuskegee seemed the most desirable location since it was near the geographical center of Negro population of this Corps Area and because of its leadership in problems related to the social, economic and educational problems of the Negro. For this purpose, Tuskegee Institute donated 300 acres of land to the Government. Forty plus acres were purchased by the United States from a local citizen of Tuskegee and a small parcel of land for a road was donated by local citizens. Plans for construction proceeded and building began. The next problems faced were the types of patients to be treated and personnel to staff the hospital.

The hospital was designated for the treatment of the tubercular and the mentally ill veterans. This designation met with some opposition from the community but was soon overcome through disseminated scientific and educational information directed to the public. The problem of hospital personnel loomed larger and larger as construction neared completion. Through the cooperation of Government agencies and the local citizenry, the problems which seemed insurmountable were resolved but not without difficult and trying moments. Dr. Robert R. Moton, President of Tuskegee Institute, Dr. John A. Kenney, Director of John A. Andrew Hospital, Tuskegee Institute, Dr. M. O. Dumas of the National Medical Association, Washington, D.C., citizens of Tuskegee, and the Tuskegee Institute community worked unceasingly to bring about the successful operation of the hospital.

Construction of the 600-bed hospital with 27 permanent buildings was completed and dedicated on February 12, 1923. The dedication exercises were held in the Chapel of Tuskegee Institute with the Honorable Calvin Coolidge, Vice President of the United States, as the principal speaker.

In his address, Vice President Coolidge referred to the patriotism of Negro soldiers and the loyalty of Negro citizens and appealed earnestly to the various groups which compose our country to live together in peace and in the spirit of Abraham Lincoln. He said, "It is well for us, who must live together as Americans, whatever our race or creed may be, constantly to remember the words of Lincoln: 'We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies.' Those who stir up animosities, those who create any

kind of hatred and enmity are not ministering to the public welfare. We have come out of the war with a desire and a determination to live at peace with all the world. Out of a common suffering and a common sacrifice there came a new meaning to our common citizenship. Our greatest need is to live in harmony, in friendship, and in goodwill, not seeking an advantage over each other, but all trying to serve each other. In that spirit let us dedicate this hospital and dedicate ourselves to the service of our country. To do that wisely, patiently, tolerantly, is to show by the discharge of our duties our indisputable title to fellow citizenship with Abraham Lincoln." These words marked the beginning of an enormous structure that would serve veterans of all wars.

On June 15, 1923 the VA Hospital at Tuskegee admitted its first 250 patients. President Harding and W. W. Brandon, Governor of the State of Alabama, appointed Colonel Robert Stanley as the first manager and medical officer in charge of the newly dedicated hospital. Dr. Charles M. Griffith succeeded Colonel Stanley as manager on September 2, 1923 and served until 1924, when Dr. Joseph H. Ward was named to the post.

Approximately 116 acres of land were transformed into a farm and incorporated into the rehabilitation and treatment program. The freshly picked vegetables, hogs, slaughtered in the abattoir, and poultry were put to good use in the hospital kitchen. The hospital was continually involved in either a permanent or temporary expansion program of buildings and facilities for the housing and treatment of its patients. Quonset huts, surplus from the military service were added to augment the permanent brick structures. The huts were beneficial to the hospital and were utilized for a Canteen, bowling alley, therapy clinics, a portion of the general library, and storage space. The farm was eventually discontinued as a part of the therapeutic program and the quonset huts were given to the Alabama Agency for Surplus Property after permanent buildings were erected.

Through the 1930 decade, the hospital continued to grow. The bed capacity increased to approximately 1498 by 1940. As more buildings were being added to this vast complex, the United States was soon to be involved in its most gigantic global war for survival. Fortunately, the assignment of capable managers through these formative years up to and including World War II, insured that the Veterans Administration Hospital at Tuskegee would be prepared for an influx of disabled veterans.

Dr. Eugene H. Dibble succeeded Dr. Ward as hospital manager in 1936 and served until 1946. The bed capacity had now increased to 2227 by 1946 to meet the needs of the increased number of battle casualties returning from the war fronts.

Succeeding directors were: Dr. Touissant T. Tildon, 1946-1958; Dr. Prince P. Baker, 1958-1959; Dr. Howard W. Kenney, 1959-1962; Dr. Julian W. Giles, 1962-1969; and Dr. Robert S. Wilson, 1969-1972.

Each successive Hospital Director made significant contributions which made growth and change inevitable. Growth is evidenced by the increased bed capacity from 600 to 2307; expansion of treatment programs; the inauguration of Residency programs in Medicine, Surgery, Ophthalmology, Dentistry and Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation; expansion of the library programs; and the establishment of Research programs.

One other change in the transformation of the VA Hospital of yesteryear into that of today involves the racial integration of patients and staff. Though historically established and operated as a segregated institution, specifically for Black veterans, full integration has evolved without incident and the hospital now serves veterans without regard to race, creed or religion.

Affiliate trainee programs are conducted in Corrective Therapy, Recreation Therapy, X-Ray Technology, Dietetic Internship, Psychology, Social Work, Hospital Pharmacy, and Nursing. Also, the hospital is involved in the Area Health Education Center effort which has as its primary purpose the training of paramedical personnel in conjunction with educational institutions in this area.

Today, the hospital is fully accredited with modern facilities and equipment. There are specialized clinics, excellently equipped surgical units, including surgical intensive care unit, a medical intensive care unit, a well equipped clinical laboratory with auto-analyzer and coulter counter among some of the more advanced equipment, a blind rehabilitation clinic, a pulmonary function laboratory, and a nuclear medicine laboratory. A coronary care unit is now under construction.

In keeping with Veterans Administration's newer concepts and philosophies in the delivery of health care and for more effective administration and operation, VA Hospital Tuskegee's operating bed capacity has been decreased to 1106 hospital beds and a 120-bed Nursing Home Care Unit.

The Veterans Administration Hospital, Tuskegee, Alabama on its 50th Anniversary stands as a monument of sincerity of purpose and hard work climaxed the realization that all people can work together for the betterment of mankind. The hospital faces the future dedicated to superior medical care and treatment for veterans of all wars.

Mr. Lucien A. Green assumed directorship of the hospital on October 15, 1972. Under his leadership we are mindful of our future obligations. Many more changes, additions and refinement are contemplated to insure that veterans will continue to receive the best medical attention available.

OKLAHOMA POSTAL TRAINING OPERATIONS GRADUATES 25,000TH STUDENT

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the Oklahoma postal training operations facility, operating on the campus of the University of Oklahoma, at Norman, recently passed a significant milestone.

In slightly more than 3½ years of activity, it has graduated 25,000 students. OPTO trains technical manpower essential to maintaining the sophisticated equipment now being incorporated into handling the U.S. mail.

The article that follows appeared in the Oklahoma Journal, Oklahoma City, January 20, in observance of this milestone:

POSTAL GRAD IS 25,000TH

NORMAN.—Oklahoma Postal Training Operations (OPTO) graduated its 25,000th student Friday at the end of three years, six months and five days of continuous education on the University campus.

Russell L. Wall, 37-year-old Minneapolis, Minn., environmental control specialist, was computer-picked for the honor of being OPTO's milestone graduate.

Wall is a veteran of four years service with the United States Postal Service (USPS) which administers the training facility.

OPTO is housed in Couch Center South, in quarters leased from OU, and operates a training program for world-wide USPS employees.

The Norman Activity is charged with training technical manpower needed to maintain sophisticated equipment now being incorporated into fast and efficient movement of the U.S. mails.

OPTO Director John J. "Jack" Kenney, former Commanding General of the Fort Sill U.S. Army Artillery Center, said Friday "there is no room for 'shade-tree' mechanics in USPS maintenance crews."

The mail service is becoming increasingly mechanized, Kenny said, and if the equipment doesn't operate, the mail stops.

Just one of the hundreds of pieces of equipment used by the mail service is a machine called the "optical character reader," capable of processing 46,000 pieces of mail per hour.

Another is known as the "ZMT" or Zip Mail Translator, which scans through thousands of envelopes per hour and automatically routes the letters to their proper mailing channels.

Kenny said USPS annually disburses a \$250,000,000 payroll to 25,000 maintenance personnel for the upkeep of these sophisticated machines.

Since its inception in July, 1969, OPTO has developed and implemented approximately 40 different resident training programs covering the entire range of postal technical maintenance.

The training facility also has provided a number of followup "on-the-site" certification programs for graduates of its highly technical equipment courses.

Wall, the 25,000th graduate, is typical of other OPTO trainees in that he has previously attended two other maintenance training courses at the Norman facility.

Programs taught at Norman include automotive air-pollution control devices, tuneup and electrical systems; self-service postal units; general-purpose process control computer programming and maintenance; optical character readers and ZIP mail translator systems.

One of the center's own computers picked Wall as the milestone graduate. He was honored with presentation of a special engraved diploma, presented by Kenney at the Friday graduation ceremonies.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday, February 24, marked the occasion of the 55th anniversary of Estonia's independence. Forcefully incorporated into the Soviet Union in 1940, Estonians today are among those peoples who have been systematically denied their very basic human rights of self-determination and freedom of expression.

With their illegal occupation by the Soviet Union, came a concerted policy in the Baltic States of mass deportation of natives to Siberia and elsewhere in the Soviet Union, supplemented by colonization of these countries with persons of Russian stock. It is estimated that at the rates of immigration which have prevailed in the past, Estonians may be a minority in their own country by 1985. Soviet control of Estonia does not end there, however, as we find the Soviets pursuing an antireligious policy and one which is designed to suppress cultural and ethnic expression as well. The spirit

of the Estonian people has not been broken, however, and we salute their bravery and integrity.

The United States extended full recognition to Estonia in July 1922. We wish on this occasion to reaffirm our strong friendship and support for the people of Estonia in their aspiration for freedom.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S \$15 BILLION MISTAKE

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, this morning before the Ways and Means Committee, Under Secretary of the Treasury Paul Volcker pleaded the administration's case for a Federal Financing Bank.

The new bank was described as an efficiency measure to permit consolidation in the financing of government debt obligations—a financing process which is presently scattered throughout the bureaucracy. We were told that the new bank would actually save the taxpayers money—reducing the need for separate debt obligation divisions within Federal agencies and corporations which have been authorized by Congress to issue obligations guaranteed by the Federal Government. The following is a list of many agencies and corporations which would be served by the proposed bank.

Funds appropriated to the President:

International security assistance.....
International development assistance.....
Agriculture:
Rural Electrification Administration.....
Farmers Home Administration.....
Commodity Credit Corporation.....
Public Law 480 long-term export credits.....

Commerce:

Economic development loans.....
Maritime Administration.....
Financial and technical assistance.....

Health, Education, and Welfare:

Health programs.....
Education programs.....

Housing and Urban Development:

Low-rent public housing.....
Federal Housing Administration.....
Government National Mortgage Association.....

Community development loans.....
New communities fund.....
Other mortgage credit.....

Interior.....

Transportation.....

General Services Administration.....

Veterans' Administration:

Housing loans and guarantees.....

Insurance policy loans.....

District of Columbia.....

Emergency Loan Guarantee Board.....

Export-Import Bank.....

Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....

Small Business Administration:

Business and investment loans.....

Disaster loans.....

Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.....

Other agencies and programs.....

GNMA Tandem plan.....

GNMA mortgage back securities.....

Export-Import Bank.....

The Bank would sell its securities to the public on behalf of the Federal agencies and corporations served.

When the Federal Financing Bank Act legislation was submitted to the Ways and Means Committee, it was introduced in a form that did not disclose that it was providing \$15 billion in financing authority in addition to the billions of dollars of authority already held by various agencies and Federal corporations.

This was a \$15 billion mistake. It points up the grave danger of taking up administration recommendations at face value.

STEEL WORKERS OF INDIANA PROTEST

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, my office has been receiving great quantities of mail, not only from my district but throughout the State of Indiana, protesting the unreasonable and flagrant reductions in domestic programs which this Congress has passed during the last several sessions. I have received letters from my district from industry, labor, educational leaders, professional people, et cetera, voicing alarm concerning the turmoil which is bound to result in our urban and industrial area of the Calumet region of Indiana and over the Nation. Many civic organizations are protesting the confusion already existent among thousands of organizations and individuals as to the result of these abrupt reductions and curtailment of programs for the unemployed, the elderly, the sick, and the part-time employees, et cetera.

Mr. Jesse Arredondo, president, and Mr. Joe Sosa Alamillo, recording secretary, have forwarded to my office the following resolution which was unanimously adopted by the United Steelworkers of America, Local Union 1010, at their meeting on Thursday, February 15, 1973. I include this resolution with my remarks:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, This Country is long overdue in subsidizing Programs to help alleviate poverty in America.

Whereas, The Federally funded programs have helped to find jobs for the jobless, provided skills for the unskilled and decent housing for the ghetto, rat infested areas through urban renewal programs,

Whereas, Many of the programs affected will mean a complete halt in education, employment, and decent housing,

Whereas, President Nixon's cut-backs of these federally funded programs is showing an all out attack upon the poor people of this country and a blatant disregard for the welfare of its voting citizenry,

Whereas, 42% of Nixon's budget will come from individual income taxes, and while he is cutting back on the poor, his national defense budget has increased even though the Vietnam War has ended,

Therefore be it resolved: That this Local Union and our International Union begin at once to have our legislators fight against these irresponsible cutbacks.

Be it further resolved: That our local Union send letters to all of our Congressmen in Washington immediately to fight against Nixon's proposed cutbacks.

DR. E. GREGG ELCAN

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on January 10 the city of Bainbridge and the county of Decatur, located in the Second Congressional District of Georgia, which I represent, were saddened by the passing of an outstanding citizen. Dr. E. Gregg Elcan, an educator, a scholar, a Christian, and a gentleman, rests now in the Deep South Georgia soil he loved so well, to which place he came from his native Virginia.

Dr. Elcan left a lasting mark on the people of southwest Georgia, and the high esteem in which he was held was expressed best, perhaps, by my dear friend, the former Governor of Georgia, the Honorable Marvin Griffin, in a front-page column of the Bainbridge Post-Searchlight on January 18, 1973. I enclose the article for the benefit of this House:

MARVIN GRIFFIN

TWO GENERATIONS ARE IN HIS DEBT

This community was saddened late last Wednesday afternoon, January 10, when E. Gregg Elcan, 88, slipped quietly away to his reward after a short illness at Memorial Hospital.

To two generations of men and women in Bainbridge, and to a host of other friends, he was affectionately known as "Fess," which is a colloquial abbreviation for the academic title of "professor."

"Fess" Elcan was not a man of different attitudes, different philosophies of life, different moods or different courses of action. He had an intense love for his Creator, his family and his country. He had great integrity, honesty, love for his neighbor and a preponderance of courage.

He was a modest man, and while he rejoiced to see his friends receive the plaudits of the crowd, he cared very little for the ostentatious ovations which could have come his way.

"Fess" was an outstanding scholar and a Christian gentleman in every meaning of the attribute, and at least two generations of citizens of this city have enjoyed happier and fuller lives because of his tutelage, and his interest in them.

PEDAGOGUE, BUT NOT A PEDANT

"Fess" came to Bainbridge to take over the Bainbridge Schools in the fall of 1917, which was 55 years ago, and as Superintendent or Schoolmaster, he spent every minute of his active working years trying to provide better educational opportunities for the boys and girls of Bainbridge. After he retired in 1949 he spent many years traveling over the length and breadth of Georgia organizing, supervising and encouraging Beta Clubs.

He was a pedagogue, but he was not a pedant. There is a vast difference in the meaning of the two words. "Pedagogue" comes from the Greek "paidagogos" (paidos, a boy plus agogos, leading) He was a leader of boys and girls, but he was no "pedant" because a "pedant" is one who usually makes a display of learning.

This young man and his young wife came to Bainbridge at a time when his professional services were badly needed.

For some reason the Bainbridge school had been permitted to run down in both academic achievement and discipline. I know, because I was in the Fifth grade when he arrived to begin his tenure of service.

Children had been permitted to stroll into classes at all hours, but he stopped that

wasteful practice the first day. He had all classes line up outside the school building, and on the bell signal, they marched to their classrooms to the beat of a drum. I remember the drum because the Rev. Ralph McCaskill, Presbyterian minister emeritus, had the privilege of beating the drum to the envy of most aspiring drummer boys.

He abolished a nefarious custom called "melindy". Now, I don't know that I have even spelled the word correctly, but "melindy" was a traumatic experience.

The older boys would get to the school grounds several hours before school opened on the first day, and some of them even as early as daylight, and would wait for the beginners and new boys to arrive. The old boys would equip themselves with straps, belts or switches and would form a gantlet. Every new boy had to run this gantlet, and most times came through the files minus a sizeable segment of skin and hide. "Fess," bless his heart, abolished this inhuman practice.

He was a good disciplinarian, but he was fair. You got what he promised you, but he was as quick to reward as he was to punish.

Some of the big boys had intimidated a school man or two, but it did not take them long to realize that this soft-spoken but wiry athlete and scholar from Hampden Sydney could stand his hand.

This has to be the mark of a good and a great man because I have never run into one of "Fess's" old students who did not profess love and respect for him.

Mr. Elcan was a charter member of the present Lions Club, which was organized in 1936, and was the organization's first president. He was made a life member many years ago, and attended meetings when his health would permit.

The imprint of this fine man's deeds are indelibly fixed in the memories of his family, his Church, his friends his colleagues and in educational circles where scholars discourse.

At the time of his passing, the deceased was an Elder Emeritus of the First Presbyterian Church, which was his reward for his many active years as a member of the Session of this Church.

"Fess" was a devout and devoted member of his Church. He had abiding faith in his God, and he practiced what he believed.

As a boy I can remember the many times he conducted chapel services, and it seemed to me the 23rd Psalm was his favorite.

"The Lord was his shepherd, and he did not want."

"Surely goodness and mercy did follow him all the days of his life, and I am convinced he will dwell in the house of the Lord forever."

No present day high school students were even born when Mr. Elcan retired, but their fathers and grandfathers and mothers and grandmothers who attended the Bainbridge schools knew him and can tell the story of a man who devoted his entire adult life to building character, scholarship and citizenship in this community.

There comes a time for every man to be called to his reward, and this good man was no exception, but I am happy I knew him, and I am sad at his going. I shall miss him.

A MORE EQUITABLE RETIREMENT BILL**HON. JEROME R. WALDIE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, many Federal employees have in the past served in federally funded and supervised programs which have been actually administered by State and local authorities. Un-

der existing statute, these Federal employees are not able to credit the time they served in these federally funded programs toward the calculation of their Federal retirement annuity.

Therefore, I have introduced a bill which will permit certain Federal employees to buy into the civil service retirement system, based on employment in federally funded programs operated by State and local governments.

In order to be eligible under this act, an employee must have 5 years of Federal service in addition to service in a State or locally administered program, and the time of service in such a State or local program must not be creditable toward the purchase of an annuity under any other program.

Under this act, Federal employees would be permitted to buy into the Federal retirement system by either depositing to the credit of the civil service retirement and disability fund a lump sum equal to the amount that would have been deducted during the period in question—plus interest calculated at 3 percent annum; or by making the deposit in 12 equal monthly payments withheld from their annuity as it accrues, each payment comprising one-twelfth of the deposit and interest computed at the rate of 3 percent per annum.

Application for coverage under the provisions of this act must be made within 1 year of the enactment, or within 1 year of meeting the retirement age and years of service presently in the act.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this act would correct a serious inequity dealt many current Federal employees, and I, therefore, submit it for the careful consideration of the Members.

I include the full text of H.R. 4884 in the RECORD:

TO ENCOURAGE EARLIER RETIREMENT BY PERMITTING FEDERAL EMPLOYEES TO PURCHASE INTO THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM BENEFITS UNDUPLICATED IN ANY OTHER RETIREMENT SYSTEM BASED ON EMPLOYMENT IN FEDERAL PROGRAMS OPERATED BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS UNDER FEDERAL FUNDING AND SUPERVISION

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

That section 8332 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

(L) Subject to sections 8334(c) and 8339 (b) of this title, an employee or Member shall be allowed credit for any period of service performed by him (unless the employee or Member was certified as being eligible for relief) in the employment of a State, a political subdivision thereof, or an instrumentality of either, primarily in the carrying out of any program authorized by Act of Congress to be conducted in accordance with standards prescribed by Federal law and all or part of which is financed directly or indirectly by Federal funds if—

(1) the head of the Executive agency, or his designee, administering the program or assuming the function or program makes a certification to the Civil Service Commission, in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Commission, concerning the service under this subsection, or such service is otherwise established to the satisfaction of the Commission;

(2) the employee or Member has at least 5 years of allowable service, under this Act exclusive of service allowed under this subsection;

(3) any such period of service has not and will not be used in obtaining an annuity under any other retirement system, including Social Security; and

(4) the employee retires—at whichever is later—within one year of enactment of subsection (L), or within one year of reaching the age and years of service requirements set forth in section 8336, unless the employee dies or is otherwise separated from the service prior to meeting the provisions of this subsection (4); and

(5) the employee or Member shall have deposited with interest at 4 percent per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the credit of the civil service retirement and disability fund a sum equal to the aggregate of the amounts that would have been deducted from his basic salary, pay, or compensation during the period he had been subject to this Act, provided that in determining the amount of such deposit, the term "period of separation from the service" as used in section 8334(e) shall be construed to include a period of service credited under this subsection (L); and provided further that the employee or Member may either make the full deposit within 30 days from the approval of his application for retirement credit under this subsection (L), or make the deposit by twelve equal monthly payments withheld from his annuity as it accrues, each payment comprising one-twelfth of the deposit and interest computed at the rate of 3 percentum per annum. For purposes of this subsection, "State" means the several States and Puerto Rico.

Sec. 2. The annuity of any person who shall have performed service of the type described in subsection (L) of section 8332 of title 5 United States Code, as added by the first section of this Act, and who before the date of enactment of this Act shall have been retired on annuity under the provisions of subchapter III of chapter 83 of such title, or prior provision of law, shall, upon application filed by any such person within one year after the date of enactment of this Act and in accordance with the provisions of such subsection (L), be adjusted effective as of the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act, so that the amount of such annuity will be the same as if such subsection (L) had been

in effect at the time of such person's retirement.

Similarly, the annuity of a person qualifying under the deferred annuity provisions of section 8338 and performing service described in subsection (L), shall, upon application filed by such person within one year after qualifying under section 8338, be adjusted effective as of the first day of the month in which he qualifies for the annuity.

WALDEMAR WYDLER, A REMEMBRANCE

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, on February 15 my best friend died. He was my father and the finest man I ever knew.

Dad was a man who had a zest for life that burned from within, with an intensity that touched all who met him. He lived each day—each minute—with a joy for living that made you feel good just to be with him. He suffered many setbacks in his life, but they never dampened his optimism for the future nor his faith in God and in his fellowman. His energy was an inspiration to me, for he enjoyed the important things on God's earth—his family, his home, and his fellowman.

Dad was a man of deep love. He was a giver and always told me:

What you give comes back a thousand times.

This love made him like a rock, and to his children a port in the storm. He was no saint, but he had no meanness nor smallness in him. He was truly interested in other people and all liked him because they knew he cared about them. He was his brothers' keeper. His judg-

ment and advice was good and nearly always right. I shall miss him and I know many others will, too.

I can but thank God for making him my father and letting me know him for so long a time. In the last few years he was ill and during one of his attacks he felt he was near death. He described it by saying:

The candle almost went out.

Life is fragile—and through my father I have learned how precious, as well. The candle has now gone out—but its warmth will be with me all the days of my life.

Thanks, Dad.

CONGRESS LETS THE SUNSHINE IN

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as we hopefully settle the Vietnam conflict through secret agreement, secretly arrived at and perhaps containing secret commitments in an agreement not submitted to Congress for ratification, meanwhile, back on Capitol Hill, we open up the Congress, its committees, and the caucuses, so that at least in those matters, which the executive branch does not think too dangerous to talk about in public, we "let the sunshine in."

It may be well to reflect on the remarks of Mr. John T. Dunlop, former dean of faculty of arts and sciences, now Director of the Cost of Living Council, who remarked on January 29, 1973, before the Senate Banking Committee:

It is my experience—I do not know how it is in politics—that people do not always say what they mean when they're saying it in public.

SENATE—Friday, March 2, 1973

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m., and was called to order by Hon. WALTER D. HUDDLESTON, a Senator from the State of Kentucky.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1973.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. WALTER D. HUDDLESTON, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 1973, AT 11 A.M.

Thereupon (at 10:30 and 35 seconds a.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order of Thursday, March 1, 1973, until Tuesday, March 6, 1973, at 11 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MEETING THE DOLLAR CRISIS

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks we witnessed turmoil in the money markets and a second devaluation of the dollar in 14 months. This

turmoil will undoubtedly continue in the months ahead.

This second devaluation is being hailed as something good for our economy. In the long run the opposite will prove to be true since we are treating the symptoms rather than the causes of the weakness of the dollar.

One of the heavy burdens placed on the dollar is that it is still continued to be used as a reserve currency. We can not continue to be the bankers to the

world at the expense of curtailing our domestic needs. This will merely increase inflation both at home and abroad.

Also, nonconvertibility places another strain on the international monetary system. Unredeemable promises to pay are but unsubstantial ersatz. We must face the fact that there is no real money operating in the world today. All the real money is securely locked up in the vaults of central banks or in the safe depositories of dealers and private hoarders.

None of it is operative even between central banks except for small quantities and in exceptional circumstances. There is no means of final payment. Instead, vast quantities of acknowledgements of debts are floating around the world under the guise of money and nobody knows what they are going to be worth next week or next year. Nowhere are the issuers of these promises to pay prepared to honor their bonds in something that has real worth.

As one prominent economist has stated:

Our generation has experienced the ultimate in the operation of Gresham's law. All the good money has been driven out of circulation. The only means of payment in circulation, even among central banks, consists of unredeemed IOU's. Gresham's law evidently requires reformulation: "Bad debts will drive good debts out of circulation." The process is already in operation.

Recently, Dr. Nasrollah S. Fatemi, distinguished professor of international affairs at Fairleigh Dickinson University, wrote an article for the Jersey Journal calling attention to some of the reasons for our dollar crisis. Professor Fatemi by no means has exhausted the subject on this matter. Rather, he presents in a cogent and readable fashion many of the reasons which have led up to the dollar crisis and two devaluations.

The same day that Dr. Fatemi's appeared, one appeared in the Wall Street Journal concerning currency crises which can be easily triggered by multinational firms. It is interesting to note that a Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee has begun hearings on the role that multinationals play in the conduct of foreign policy, currency crises, loss of jobs, and other areas.

Lastly, I should like to call attention to a statement prepared for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress on September 13, 1972, by Dr. Daniel R. Fusfeld, professor of economics at the University of Michigan. His statement is even more significant now in light of recent events, and parallels many of the views of Professor Fatemi. Professor Fusfeld points out that fixed parities supported by foreign central banks enable part of the cost of U.S. expansionism and power to be shifted to foreigners through the financing of a U.S. payments deficit, but the wider the band of fluctuation, the less that can be shifted. With most countries allowing their currencies to float against the dollar, it is obvious that more burdens are being shifted to U.S. citizens.

In recent testimony before the Senate Banking Committee, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns stated that the latest devaluation will result in a 0.2 percent increase in the consumer price level, or \$1.5 billion in higher costs to consumers, and perhaps double that amount if the indirect effect of diminished competition from foreign goods were taken into account. Mr. Paul Volcker, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, stated before the same committee that the latest devaluation will require a supplemental appropriations request of \$2.23 billion to maintain the value of U.S. subscriptions to the IMF and other international finan-

cial institutions, and that the Nixon administration would not devalue the dollar again. I would suggest to my colleagues that with the type of international monetary system under which we are presently operating, the dollar is continuing to be devalued de facto.

Mr. Speaker, the excellent articles by Professor Fatemi, the Wall Street Journal, and Professor Fusfeld follow:

[From the Jersey Journal, Feb. 13, 1973]

MEETING THE DOLLAR CRISIS

(By Dr. Nasrollah S. Fatemi)

The dollar crisis has reached its peak in Europe. The weakness of the dollar helped the pound sterling to rise and, the West German Government recently had an emergency meeting and decide on several harsh measures to protect the country against the inflow of dollars.

These new events show that the dollar market and the international monetary system are in disarray, and soon we must resort to another devaluation.

The present very serious situation has been brought about because of the following reasons:

1. The government's balance of payments show that since 1958 the United States has spent \$65 billion on military expenditures, military, economic, and grant assistance to other countries.

2. As long as the private section of our balance of payments produced a surplus, the deficit was tolerable. The preliminary trade report for 1972 indicates a deficit of \$7 billion.

3. The United States' balance of payments deficit in services also is the highest in 12 years, a total of \$2.5 billion.

4. When we add to the above amounts the billions of dollars transferred from the United States by corporations, speculators, and tax evaders, the result will be \$80 billion in foreign banks.

The United States wants other nations to help her alleviate the deteriorating system of her balance of payments, but no nation is willing to give up her comforting position to accommodate bureaucrats in Washington.

The big problem is that the international money managers have lost confidence in the ability of Washington to cope with this situation. They observe that, while the country has the largest trade and balance of payments deficit, the administration asks \$4 billion for foreign aid; \$2.1 billion in military aid to Indochina; spends \$4 billion in other countries; and Spiro Agnew promises new aid to every dictator and crook in Asia.

To remedy the present serious financial malady, we have to take the following steps:

1. The dollars used for military expenditures in the future should be marked only for the purchase of American goods.

2. Foreign aid and all "the welfare programs supporting crooks and tyrants all over Asia" must be terminated. It will be a great service to this nation if President Nixon impounded all appropriations for military expenditures and foreign aid, and Congress ended the "give-away era."

3. The Federal Reserve System should aim at narrowing and restricting, for the time being, the outflow of funds from the United States.

4. For 20 years the gates of this country have been open to the products manufactured by cheap labor, while every other country has restrictions and high tariffs for American goods; resulting in a \$7 billion trade deficit. We must tell every nation that our trade will be based on reciprocal arrangements and no favors will be tolerated.

What we need in Washington today is a state of mind to realize it is not our aid to education, better housing, and training of the unskilled poor which is hurting the economy but the billions of foreign aid and mili-

tary expenditures which have brought this nation to the verge of financial bankruptcy.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 13, 1973]
CURRENCY CRISES CAN BE EASILY TRIGGERED BY MULTINATIONAL FIRMS, U.S. STUDY STATES

WASHINGTON.—Multinational corporations control such vast quantities of money that they can precipitate international monetary crises by moving only small portions of their funds from country to country, a government study concludes.

The big companies and banks can outgun even the world's central banks in international currency dealings, the massive study by the U.S. Tariff Commission contends. And though the study absolves most multinational concerns of "destructive, predatory motives," in their currency dealings, it says that much of the speculative money surge during currency crises, such as the current turmoil in exchange markets, stems from the multinationals.

THE "LION'S SHARE"

The 330-page study of the economic impact of multinational concerns on trade, investment and employment was made by the Tariff Commission at the request of the International Trade Subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee. It's certain to add fuel to the growing debate in Congress on the effects of the multinationals, which have been under attack by organized labor as "exporters" of U.S. jobs and technology.

The study estimates that some \$268 billion of short-term liquid assets were held at the end of 1971 by "private institutions on the international finance scene," and that the "lion's share" of this money was controlled by U.S.-based multinational companies and banks.

The \$268 billion, the study reports, "was more than twice the total of all international reserves held by all central banks and international monetary institutions in the world at the same date." It adds: "These are the reserves with which the central banks fight to defend their exchange rates. The resources of the private sector outclass them."

Due to the immensity of the multinationals' assets, "it is clear that only a small fraction . . . needs to move in order for a genuine crisis to develop," the Tariff Commission concludes. This money "can focus with telling effect on a crisis-prone situation—some weak currency which repels funds and some strong one which attracts them." That's what has happened in the past two weeks as speculators dumped dollars and bought German marks and Japanese yen in hopes of profiting on future changes in their exchange values.

Since only a "small proportion" of the multinationals' money is needed "to produce monetary explosions," the study says, "it appears appropriate to conclude that destructive, predatory motivations don't characterize the sophisticated international financial activities of most multinational corporations, even though much of the funds which flow internationally during the crisis doubtlessly is of multinational corporation origin."

TWO POSSIBILITIES

In assessing the aims of big companies in currency crises, the report offers two possible conclusions: either that the multinationals "react protectively" with moves to protect the value of their assets or, alternatively, that most multinationals "hardly react at all, while a small minority, capable of generating heavy, disruptive movements of funds, do so." The study said the latter group includes companies that may actually "speculate" in the sense of betting on exchange-rate changes in hopes of a swift profit.

The study found that U.S. concerns invest abroad primarily to reach new markets, rather than to find lower-cost production. The search for low-wage labor is a "second-

ary" consideration except in a relatively few industries, including consumer electronics, footwear, toys and apparel, it says.

The study doesn't resolve the question of whether multinationals have caused major job losses in the U.S., as American unions contend. It presents three alternative explanations—two of which will please unions and one which companies will like.

The commission estimates that the presence of American-owned plants abroad represents a net loss of 1.3 million jobs in America if it's assumed foreigners would otherwise import the plants' entire output from the U.S. If foreigners imported only half of such output, and produced the rest themselves, the job loss would be calculated at 400,000. A third set of quite different assumptions produces an estimate that the multinationals have produced a net gain of roughly 500,000 jobs in the U.S.

The study concludes that the multinational corporations "played no role" in the sharp deterioration of the U.S. balance-of-payments position during the late 1960s.

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

(By Daniel R. Fusch)

The American economy is the strongest in the world. It generates more than half of the world's savings, which makes the United States the source of the bulk of the world's investment funds and New York the world's financial center. U.S. overseas investments are by far the greatest in the world: our annual net income from that source is six times as great as that of the next ten largest foreign investing nations put together. We consume close to half the world's manufactures and over half of its production of durable goods, forming the greatest market in the world. Our advanced technology and huge manufacturing capacity mean that we are the world's largest supplier of durable goods. All of these elements combine to create in the dollar the most important key currency in the international economy, held by all important trading nations as the largest portion of their international monetary reserves.

Today, however, we find ourselves in serious trouble. The dollar is weak and weakening further. We have a huge balance of payments deficit. In the last few years our imports have exceeded our exports by many billions of dollars, reversing a relationship that had prevailed for over seventy years. How did we squander our strength? What is the source of our weakness? How could such an economic giant have been brought to its knees?

WORLD POWER AND THE U.S. PAYMENTS DEFICIT

The war in southeast Asia is widely recognized as the immediate cause of our current problems. It created the domestic inflation that wiped out the U.S. surplus of exports over imports. It also added substantially to overseas military spending, which further worsened our balance of payments difficulties.

The more fundamental cause, however, is that we pushed corporate foreign investment and military-related aid and spending abroad beyond the levels that our foreign earnings from exports and investments could support. We insisted on spending more for world power than we earned. The resulting payments deficit ran upwards from one to four billion dollars annually for a generation, and U.S. policy encouraged rather than discouraged those activities. For example, tax benefits and investment guarantees promoted corporate investment abroad. Foreign nations acquiesced, perhaps grudgingly, partly because of the importance of the dollar in international trade, partly because our favorable balance of trade made it possible to rescue the system if things got too bad, and partly for political and economic reasons of their own. But when domestic inflation, itself rooted in American militarism, changed

our balance of trade to a deficit position, the game was up and the crisis of 1971 was precipitated. Even without the events of 1971, however, foreign nations would have ultimately rebelled, partly because it was senseless for them to accumulate excessive and unwanted dollars, and partly because the international financial system was being used for American economic and political aggrandizement at their expense.

BRETTON WOODS AND THE IMPACT OF U.S. DEFICITS

The Bretton Woods agreements of 1945 required that central banks stabilize the value of their currencies within one percent of par. If the value of the dollar fell relative to the currency of another country, that nation's central bank had to buy dollars with its own currency. These purchases increased both the demand for dollars and the supply of the foreign currency, and were continued as long as necessary to bring the relative values of the two currencies back to within one percent of par value.

This method of sustaining fixed exchange rates had several effects:

1. The U.S. was able to maintain its payments deficits for an indefinite and unlimited length of time. The financing of the deficit was shifted to foreign central banks by the requirements of the system.

2. Because of the persistent U.S. payments deficit, foreign central banks gradually built up large holdings of U.S. dollars until they had far more than they needed or wanted. This was one price they had to pay to maintain the international payments system.

3. Inflation was fostered within the foreign country. Purchase of dollars by a foreign central bank has the same effect as any open market purchase. It increases the reserves of the banking system and encourages an expansion of the money supply. This inflationary effect could be countered by other fiscal and monetary policies, but they would have the effect of dampening domestic economic expansion while making funds for expansion available to Americans.

4. It promoted transfer of ownership of foreign-held real assets into the hands of Americans. Holders of dollars were able to exchange them for foreign currencies at a penalty of, at most, one percent. They were then able to buy foreign assets with those currencies. In this way the financing of the U.N. balance of payments deficit promoted the worldwide spread of U.S.-based international corporations. To the extent that some of those assets were used by the U.S. government for military expenditures, aid and offshore procurement, foreign central banks helped finance the maintenance of U.S. power and the Vietnam war. It is a well-recognized fact that an overvalued dollar enables American multinational firms to acquire assets throughout the world on favorable terms, and understates the real cost of U.S. military activities abroad. What is not usually recognized is that our balance of payments deficit brought actual transfer of assets from foreign to U.S. ownership, financed by the process of pegging currency values.

5. Finally—and this point is poorly understood in this country—these transactions helped create inflationary pressures within the United States. Americans obtained added purchasing power through creation of credit by foreign central banks. The resulting inflationary pressures cannot be held within national boundaries, but tend to spread everywhere in the world through international trade and investment. The effect on the U.S. was probably not large, but it helps to explain some of the persistent inflationary pressures that have affected the U.S. and the world in recent decades.

In this fashion the international financial system enabled the U.S., through its persistent payments deficit of upward of \$1 billion annually, to draw upon the assets and resources of other nations to maintain

U.S. military power and promote the expansion of U.S. corporations. Inflation was one of the costs. More important, however, the fundamental conflict of interest embodied in these relationships undermined both the political system of world order that developed after World War II and the expanding pattern of world trade.

An historical analogy is appropriate here. When ancient Athens formed the Delian League in the 5th century B.C. to present a united front against Persian aggression its allies entered enthusiastically. But when Athens began to use the league for its own selfish benefit, opposition and revolt quickly followed. Much the same thing has happened with the postwar international financial system and its use by America for her own purposes.

THE INEVITABLE BREAKDOWN

The breakdown of this system has to come, particularly when foreign nations began to realize, as they did during the 1960s, that they were gradually turning the world over to the American international corporation and the U.S. military. Once that realization came it was more and more difficult for the U.S. government to get foreign central banks to finance our deficit. The French, in particular, were recalcitrant. U.S. gold reserves had to be used instead, until by the late 1960s they were sufficient to cover only a few years' deficit. Then, when inflation destroyed the U.S. surplus of exports over imports and made it necessary to finance a deficit that might run as large as \$10-20 billion, foreign central banks were no longer willing to support the dollar and the devaluation of 1971 followed. The Smithsonian agreements of 1971 provide some breathing space and time to work out new arrangements. The few indications we have indicate that the chief objective of the U.S. negotiators is to reestablish a system that would permit U.S. corporate investment and military expenditures overseas to continue unhampered by financial constraints.

EFFORTS TO PATCH UP THE SYSTEM, 1967-71

The Smithsonian agreements of 1971 made only a small change in the international financial system. The most important change widened the band of permissible fluctuations around par value for any country's currency from one percent to 2½ percent. This wider band could increase the cost of foreign investment to U.S. corporations to a premium of 2½ percent instead of one percent. But international differences in rates of return of that magnitude are by no means extraordinary. This change will stop the financing of U.S. corporations abroad by foreign central banks, but will merely slow it down somewhat.

The system has also been modified in recent years by the introduction of Special Drawing Rights (SDRs) and by the use of currency "swaps" between central banks. The latter provides greater flexibility to the system, while the former enlarges the total of world monetary reserves. Both of these changes enable the U.S. to finance its continuing deficit for an even longer period of time. As a consequence, the process of shifting foreign assets into U.S. hands is continued, and the inflationary pressures set in motion by the U.S. payments deficit are extended.

FEDERAL RESERVE SUPPORT OF THE DOLLAR

More recently, the Federal Reserve system has begun to actively support the dollar on the basis of the new par value established by the Smithsonian devaluation. This action contributes to deflation and reduced purchasing power in the U.S.

The process works, in essence, in the following manner. The Fed sells foreign currencies in the New York money markets to drive down their prices relative to the dollar. It receives payment by check, in dollars, drawn on a U.S. bank. Clearing of the check

reduces the reserves of the U.S. banking system, just like any open market sale. The deflationary effects can be neutralized by countervailing open market purchases by the Fed, usually of Treasury bills, but this has an added effect of fostering lower interest rates. If open market purchases neutralize the deflationary effect on bank reserves of Federal Reserve support of the dollar, they create inflationary effects by promoting lower interest rates. It is extremely difficult to gauge these conflicting effects accurately and completely neutralize the effects of Federal Reserve support of the dollar.

But where does the Fed get foreign currencies to sell, when the U.S. has a persistent payments deficit? Initially, U.S. reserves at the International Monetary Fund can be tapped. Ultimately, however, the foreign currencies are obtained by purchase or swaps from foreign central banks. When that happens payment is made in dollars and command over U.S. resources passes to foreigners. Thus American assets are transferred into foreign hands, which has been the traditional way of settling a payments deficit.

The costs of Federal Reserve support of the dollar are borne by the average citizen, first through the destabilizing effects of monetary policy, and second by the real costs of financing a deficit by transfer of assets to foreigners.

SHIFTING THE FULL BURDEN TO THE U.S. CITIZEN

U.S. policy has moved strongly toward placing the burden of financing the U.S. payments deficit on the American citizen. We have been moving away from the older system in which foreign central banks financed our deficit, to the detriment of their citizens. Federal Reserve support of the dollar is a major step in that direction.

Insight into the future was provided by former Secretary of the Treasury John Connally shortly before the Smithsonian Agreement was reached. He proposed devaluation of the dollar to the extent needed to create a favorable U.S. balance of trade of \$13 billion dollars annually. He argued that this amount would provide adequate amounts of foreign currencies for both high levels of U.S. private investment abroad plus substantial offshore military procurement and aid, and still leave about \$2 billion for emergencies. The actual devaluation under the Smithsonian Agreement amounted to about half that, at most (at price levels then prevailing). But whether the Connally proposal made sense or not is less important than the strategy it indicated. What Connally was proposing, in essence, was that the present U.S. military position in the world continue unchanged and that U.S. based international corporations continue to expand abroad, but that the costs be shifted entirely to U.S. citizens.

For a \$13 billion U.S. balance of trade surplus is a \$13 billion tax on the American economy. It represents \$13 billion of goods and services that are produced here but consumed abroad. In real terms we would be \$13 billion poorer. Devaluation makes the American worker pay for U.S. military adventures abroad and for the overseas expansion of U.S. corporations. Of course, U.S. jobs would be generated at the expense of unemployment abroad, but that is true only in the short run. In the long run any nation can maintain full employment at home by the proper mix of fiscal and monetary policies, and need not rely on its balance of trade for that purpose.

The strategy implied by the Connally proposals is to establish the value of the dollar, and stabilize it within relatively narrow limits, at such a level that the trade surplus to be generated would be large enough to adequately finance U.S. power and economic expansion. It also implied self-restraint on the part of U.S. policymakers not to exceed the limit imposed by the trade surplus. And

there's the catch. For in the past American economic and military aggression has never been willing to accept that kind of economic limit. We were unwilling to stay within the limits imposed by our former balance of trade surplus. There is no reason to believe that we will be more self-disciplined in the future.

The problem arises because the benefits from American economic expansion and power accrue largely to a narrow group of corporate executives, families of great wealth, and military leaders, while the costs are borne by the average citizen in high taxes, rising prices, battlefield deaths and prisoners of war. The international financial system of the past even allows some of those costs to be shifted abroad. As long as a few with power reap the benefits while the many without power bear the costs, the self-restraint required for a workable international financial system will be swamped by the greed that ultimately brings down any favored elite. We have just witnessed the end of stage one, the growing reluctance of foreign nations to bear a part of the burden. We are about to enter stage two: a shifting of the full burden to the average American.

FIXED PARITIES AGAINST FLEXIBLE EXCHANGE RATES

The debate in the last few years over restructuring the world financial system has increasingly come to focus on the issue of whether fixed parities, such as those contained in the Bretton Woods and Smithsonian agreements, are more desirable than flexible exchange rates. Much of this debate ignores the realities stressed in this paper.

Fixed parities supported by foreign central banks enable part of the costs of U.S. expansionism and power to be shifted to foreigners through the financing of a U.S. payments deficit. The band of permissible fluctuations determines how much of the burden can be so shifted: the narrower the band, the more can be shifted; the wider the band, the less can be shifted. To the extent that the Federal Reserve System supports the dollar, the burden is borne within the U.S. It is not surprising to find the U.S. government supporting a new system of fixed parities.

Devaluation forces Americans to bear a larger share of the burden of U.S. expansionism. By increasing U.S. sales of goods and services abroad it makes more domestic resources available to promote U.S. interests abroad.

Flexible exchange rates place the full burden on U.S. workers and consumers. A persistent balance of payments deficit created by overseas investment and military spending would bring a continuing fall in the value of the dollar—in effect, persistent devaluation—to generate the exports necessary to finance the deficit. Indeed, in the absence of frictions there would be no deficit—only a continuing fall of the dollar. In this case, two effects are bound to be felt. First, foreign nations can be expected to retaliate with barriers to U.S. exports, starting a chain reaction that will diminish and hinder world trade. Second, the entire international financial system would be weakened by the deteriorating position of its most important key currency.

We are forced to the conclusion that no system of international financial institutions can long survive a continuing drive toward world power and economic dominance by the U.S. government and American corporations.

CONCLUSIONS

The sickness that afflicts the international monetary system is the same that afflicts the United States as a whole. As long as this country puts world power and economic dominance at the first priority in determining its policies there can be no stability in the world's financial institutions. The slogan of "maintaining the security of the

free world" has become a cloak for a 20th-century version of the Medici motto in 15th-century Florence: "Money to get power, power to protect the money." It is those policies that have destroyed the post-war international financial system and will continue to undermine any successor. U.S. policy must ultimately come to terms with that reality.

As the burdens of U.S. policy come ultimately to be borne domestically within the U.S.—through devaluations and Federal Reserve support of the dollar, and perhaps flexible exchange rates—the average American will come to realize that he is paying the costs while giant corporations and banks and the military-industrial complex gain the benefits. When that understanding comes the U.S. international financial position will truly become a domestic political issue. This will be the third stage in the resolution of the problem. Perhaps then we will be able to discuss solutions that provide real benefits to the average American rather than arrangements which make him pay for someone else's wealth and power.

THE 93D CONGRESS SCOUTING SURVEY

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have just finished gathering the data for the 93d Congress on Members' participation in Scouting. I have conducted this Scouting survey during the past four Congresses as a service to Scouting and others interested in the Scouting movement. The information gathered is found useful by speakers and writers, including many of my colleagues. I am therefore today placing the results in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with the accompanying news release, so the survey will be readily available for use:

WASHINGTON, D.C.—More than three-fifths of the Members of the 93rd Congress have participated in Scouting, either as members during their youth or as adult scouting volunteers, according to a biennial survey by Ohio Congressman Clarence J. Brown.

Brown, a former Eagle Scout who has surveyed the House of Representatives and the Senate for the Boy Scouts of America during each of the past four Congresses, said 321 of the Members of Congress had participated in scouting.

That number includes 40 Representatives and Senators who have come to Capitol Hill since the last survey made in 1971.

The number of Members who attained Scouting's highest rank of Eagle remained unchanged from the 92nd Congress. The net loss of one Eagle Scout Representative was offset by the gain of one Eagle Scout Senator, Brown explained.

Brown's own Scouting activities began as a member of Troop 5 in Washington, D.C., where he served as a Senior Patrol Leader and earned the rank of Eagle. He was also Assistant Scoutmaster of Troop 47 in his hometown of Blanchester, Ohio, a counselor at Camp Hugh Taylor Birch at Yellow Springs, Ohio, and has served as a member of the Tecumseh Council, BSA, in southeastern Ohio.

The results of the Scouting survey were placed in the Congressional Record by Brown to be available for use by other Members of the House and Senate, and turned over to the BSA national headquarters for distribution within the organization and to other

organizations and individuals active in the Scouting movement.

BREAKDOWN OF 93D CONG. SCOUTING SURVEY

	Represent- atives	Senators	Total
Scout (only).....	157	40	197
Scout and leader.....	75	13	88
Leader (only).....	30	6	36
Total.....	262	59	321

Note: Total who were leaders, 124; percentage of Members who were scouts, 60 percent.

EAGLE SCOUTS

Senators—Frank Moss, Utah (D), Richard Schweiker, Penn. (R), Lloyd Bentsen, Tex. (D), Hubert Humphrey, Minn. (D) and Sam Nunn, Ga. (D).

Representatives:

Bill Alexander, Ark. (D)
Burt Talcott, Calif. (R)
Victor Veysey, Calif. (R)
Charles Bennett, Fla. (D)
Roger Zion, Ind. (R)
John Culver, Iowa (D)
Keith J. Sebelius, Kans. (R)
Larry Winn, Jr., Kans. (R)
Gerald R. Ford, Mich. (R)
John A. Blatnik, Minn. (D)
Thad Cochran, Miss. (R)
John E. Hunt, N.J. (R)
Barber E. Conable, N.Y. (R)
Mark Andrews, N.D. (R)
Clarence J. Brown, Ohio (R)
J. William Stanton, Ohio (R)
Tom Steed, Okla. (D)
John R. Dellenback, Ore. (R)
Daniel J. Flood, Penn. (D)
Bill Archer, Tex. (R)
J. J. (Jake) Pickle, Tex. (D)
Henry S. Reuss, Wisc. (D)
M. Caldwell Butler, Va. (R)

SILVER BEAVER

Senator: Mark Hatfield, Ore. (R)

Representatives:

Del Clawson, Calif. (R)
Larry Winn, Jr., Kans. (R)
John McCollister, Neb. (R)
John N. Happy Camp, Okla. (R)
John Ware, Penn. (R)

SILVER ANTELOPE

Senator Mark Hatfield, Ore. (R) and Rep. John Ware, Penn. (R)

CUB SCOUT DEN MOTHER

Rep. Ella T. Grasso, Conn. (D)
Rep. Marjorie Holt, Md. (R)

RESULTS OF BOY SCOUT SURVEY: 93D CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, CONDUCTED BY CONGRESSMAN CLARENCE J. BROWN OF OHIO

Scout denoted by S; Leader or Adult Volunteer denoted by L; Scout and Leader denoted by S&L.

ALABAMA

Sen. John Sparkman (D) S&L
John Buchanan, Jr. (R) L
William Dickinson (R) S
Walter W. Flowers (D) S&L

ALASKA

Sen. Mike Gravel (D) S
Sen. Theodore F. Stevens (R) S&L

ARIZONA

Sen. Barry Goldwater (R) S
Sen. Paul Fannin (R) S
John J. Rhodes (R) S
Morris K. Udall (D) S&L

ARKANSAS

Bill Alexander (D) S
John Hammerschmidt (R) S
Wilbur Mills (D) S&L
Ray Thornton (D) S

CALIFORNIA

Sen. Alan Cranston (D) S
Sen. John Tunney (D) L

Alphonzo Bell (R) S
Del Clawson (R) S&L
James Corman (D) S
George Danielson (D) S
Ronald Dellums (D) S
Don Edwards (D) S
Barry Goldwater, Jr. (R) S
Richard Hanna (D) S&L
Craig Hosmer (R) S
Harold Johnson (D) L
Robert Leggett (D) S&L
John McFall (D) L
William Mailliard (R) S
Bob Mathias (R) S
Paul McCloskey (R) L
John E. Moss (D) S
Carlos Moorhead (R) L
Ed Reinecke (R) S&L
John Rousselot (R) S
Edward Roybal (D) S
Burt Talcott (R) S&L
Charles Teague (R) S
Lionel Van Deerlin (D) S
Victor Veysey (R) S&L
Jerome Waldie (D) S
Bob Wilson (R) S

COLORADO

Donald Brozman (R) S
Frank Evans (D) S&L
James Johnson (R) S
Patricia Schroeder (D) S

CONNECTICUT

Sen. Lowell Weicker (R) S
Sen. Abraham Ribicoff (D) S
William Cotto (D) S
Robert Gialmo (D) S
Stewart McKinney (R) S
Robert Steele (R) S

DELAWARE

Sen. Joseph Biden (D) S
Sen. William Roth, Jr. (R) L

FLORIDA

Sen. Edward Gurney (R) S
Sen. Lawton Chiles (D) S&L
L. A. Bafalls (R) S
Charles Bennett (D) S
J. Herbert Burke (R) S
Dante B. Fascell (D) S
Louis Frey (R) S
Don Fuqua (D) S&L
Sam Gibbons (D) S
Bill Gunter (D) S
James Haley (D) L
Paul Rogers (D) S
Claude Pepper (D) S&L
Robert Sikes (D) S
C. W. Young (R) S&L

GEORGIA

Sen. Sam Nunn (D) S
Benjamin Blackburn (R) S&L
Jack Brinkley (D) L
John Flynt, Jr. (D) S&L
Bo Ginn (D) S
Phil Landrum (D) S
Dawson Mathis (D) S&L
Robert Stephens, Jr. (D) S&L
W. S. (Bill) Stuckey (D) S&L

HAWAII

Sen. Hiram Fong (R) S&L
Spark Matsunaga (D) S

IDAHO

Sen. Frank Church (D) S
Sen. James McClure (R) S
Orval H. Hansen (R) S&L

ILLINOIS

Sen. Charles Percy (R) S&L
Frank Annunzio (D) L
Leslie Arends (R) S
Harold Collier (R) S
Philip Crane (R) S
Edward Derwinski (R) S
John Erlenborn (R) S
Robert McClory (D) S
Edward Madigan (R) S
Ralph Metcalfe (D) S
Morgan Murphy (D) S
Dan Rostenkowski (D) S&L
Sidney Yates (D) S
Samuel Young (R) S

INDIANA

John Brademas (D) S&L
William G. Bray (R) S
David Dennis (R) S
Lee Hamilton (D) S
Elwood Hillis (R) S
W. H. Hudnut (R) S
Roger Zion (R) S&L

IOWA

Sen. Dick Clark (D) L
Sen. Harold E. Hughes (D) S
John C. Culver (D) S
Wiley Mayne (R) S
Neal Smith (D) L

KANSAS

Sen. Bob Dole (R) S
Sen. James Pearson (R) S
Keith Sebelius (R) S
Garner Shriver (R) S&L
Joe Skubitz (R) L
Larry Winn, Jr. (R) S&L
William R. Roy (D) S

KENTUCKY

Sen. Marlow Cook (R) S
Sen. Walter Huddleston (D) S
John Breckinridge (D) S
William Natcher (D) S
Gene Snyder (R) S
Frank Stubblefield (D) S
John C. Watts (D) S

LOUISIANA

Otto E. Passman (D) S
David Treen (R) S
Joe D. Waggonner (D) S

MAINE

Sen. William Hathaway (D) S
Sen. Edmund Muskie (D) S
William Cohen (R) S
Peter Kyros (D) S

MARYLAND

Sen. Charles McC. Mathias (R) S
Sen. Glenn Beall (R) S
Goodloe Byron (D) S&L
Samuel Friedel (D) S
Lawrence Hogan (R) L
Marjorie Holt (R) S&L
Gilbert Gude (R) S&L
Clarence Long (D) S
Paul Sarbanes (D) S

MASSACHUSETTS

Sen. Edward Brooke (R) S
Paul Cronin (R) S
Michael Harrington (D) S
Thomas O'Neill, Jr. (D) L
John Moakley (I) S

MICHIGAN

Sen. Robert Griffin (R) S&L
William Broomfield (R) S&L
Garry Brown (R) S
Elford Cederberg (R) S
John H. Dingell (D) S&L
Gerald R. Ford (R) S
Edward Hutchinson (R) S
Lucien N. Nedzi (D) L
Philip Ruppe (R) S

MINNESOTA

Sen. Hubert Humphrey (D) S&L
Sen. Walter Mondale (D) S
Bob Bergland (D) S
John Blatnik (D) S
Donald Fraser (D) S
Bill Frenzel (R) S
Joseph Karth (D) S&L

MISSISSIPPI

David Bowen (D) S
Thad Cochran (R) S&L
G. V. Montgomery (D) S

MISSOURI

Bill Burlison (D) S&L
William Clay (D) S
William L. Hungate (D) S
William J. Randall (D) S

MONTANA

Sen. Lee Metcalf (D) S&L
Richard Shoup (R) S

NEBRASKA

Dave Martin (R) S&L
John McCollister (R) S&L

NEVADA

Sen. Howard Cannon (D) S

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Sen. Norris Cotton (R) S
Sen. Thomas McIntyre (D) L
Louis C. Wyman (R) S

NEW JERSEY

Sen. Clifford Case (R) S
Sen. Harrison Williams, Jr. (D) L
James J. Howard (D) S
John E. Hunt (R) S&L
Joseph Minish (D) S
Charles Sandman (R) S
William Widnall (R) S&L

NEW MEXICO

Manuel Lujan (R) S&L
Harold Runnels (D) S&L

NEW YORK

Herman Badillo (D) S
Hugh L. Carey (D) L
Barber Conable, Jr. (R) S&L
Thaddeus Dulski (D) S&L
Hamilton Fish (R) L
Benjamin Gilman (R) S
James Grover, Jr. (R) S
James F. Hastings (R) S
Frank Horton (R) S&L
Jack Kemp (R) S
Carleton King (R) L
Robert McEwen (R) S
Donald Mitchell (R) S
Otis Pike (D) S&L
Bertram Podell (D) S&L
Howard Robison (R) S&L
John Rooney (D) S
Henry Smith III (R) S&L
Samuel S. Stratton (D) S&L
John Wydler (R) S

NORTH CAROLINA

Sen. Jesse Helms (R) S
Ike Andrews (D) L
James Broyhill (R) S
L. H. Fountain (D) S
David Henderson (D) S
Walter Jones (D) S
James Martin (R) S
L. Richardson Preyer (D) S&L
Earl Ruth (R) S
Roy Taylor (D) S&L

NORTH DAKOTA

Mark Andrews (R) S

OHIO

Sen. William Saxbe (R) S
Sen. Robert Taft, Jr. (R) S&L
John Ashbrook (R) L
Clarence J. Brown (R) S&L
Samuel Devine (R) S
Tennyson Guyer (R) S&L
William Harsha (R) S
Wayne Hays (D) S&L
Delbert Latta (R) S
Clarence Miller (R) S
William Minshall (R) S
Charles Mosher (R) L
Walter Powell (R) S
J. William Stanton (R) S
Louis Stokes (D) S&L
Chalmers Wylie (R) S&L

OKLAHOMA

Sen. Dewey Bartlett (R) S
Carl Albert (D) S&L
John N. Happy Camp (R) S&L
John Jarman (D) L
James Jones (D) S
Tom Steed (D) S&L

OREGON

Sen. Mark Hatfield (R) S&L
Sen. Robert Packwood (R) S
John R. Dellenback (R) S
Al Ullman (D) L

PENNSYLVANIA

Sen. Richard Schweiker (R) S&L
Sen. Hugh Scott (R) S

Edward Beister (R) S
Frank Clark (D) S&L
Robert Corbett (R) S
R. Lawrence Coughlin (R) S
Joshua Ellberg (D) S&L
Daniel Flood (D) S
James Fulton (R) S
Albert Johnson (R) L
Joseph McDade (R) S
Thomas Morgan (D) S
Fred Rooney (D) S
John Saylor (R) S&L
Herman Schneebeli (R) S
E. G. Shuster, (R) S
John Ware (R) S&L
J. Irvin Whalley (R) S&L
L. G. Williams (R) S
Gus Yatron (D) S

RHODE ISLAND

Sen. Claiborne Pell (D) S
Robert Tiernan (D) S

SOUTH CAROLINA

Senator Ernest Hollings (D) S
Sen. Strom Thurmond (R) S&L
Mendel Davis (D) S
Floyd Spence (R) S&L

SOUTH DAKOTA

James Abdnor (R) S
Frank Denholm (D) S

TENNESSEE

Sen. William Brock III (R) S
Ray Blanton (D) S&L
John Duncan (R) S&L
Richard Fulton (D) S&L
Ed Jones (D) S
Dan Kuykendall (R) L

TEXAS

Sen. Lloyd Bentsen (D) S&L
Bill Archer (R) S
Omar Burleson (D) S
Bob Casey (D) S&L
James Collins (R) S
O. C. Fisher (D) L
Eligio de la Garza (D) S&L
Henry Gonzalez (D) S&L
Abraham Kazen, Jr. (D) S
Dale Milford (D) S
Wright Patman (D) L
J. J. Pickle (D) S
W. R. Poage (D) L
Robert Price (D) L
Ray Roberts (D) S&L
Olin Teague (D) S
Richard White (D) S&L
Charles Wilson (D) S
James Wright, Jr. (D) S&L

UTAH

Sen. Wallace Bennett (R) S
Sen. Frank Moss (D) S
K. Gunn McKay (D) S&L

VERMONT

Sen. Robert T. Stafford (R) S

VIRGINIA

Sen. William Scott (R) L
M. Caldwell Butler (R) S
W. C. Daniel (D) L
Thomas Downing (D) S&L
Stan Parris (R) S
J. Kenneth Robinson (R) S&L
David Satterfield III (D) S
William Wampler (R) S

WASHINGTON

Sen. Henry Jackson (D) S
Brock Adams (D) S
Thomas Foley (D) S
Lloyd Meeds (D) S&L

WEST VIRGINIA

Sen. Robert Byrd (D) S
Sen. Jennings Randolph (D) S
Ken Hechler (D) S
Robert Mollohan (D) S
John M. Slack, Jr. (D) S
Harley O. Staggers (D) L

WISCONSIN

Sen. William Proxmire (D) S
Glenn R. Davis (R) L

Robert W. Kastenmeier (D) S
Henry S. Reuss (D) S&L
William A. Steiger (R) S
Vernon W. Thomson (R) S

WYOMING

Sen. Gale W. McGee (D) S

SPARTANBURG COUNTY
FOUNDATION

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, Spartanburg, S.C., is fortunate to be the home of W. S. Montgomery, who 30 years ago founded the Spartanburg County Foundation. This foundation has made a career of anticipating and responding to the goals of the community, extending a generous hand to assist the schools, to promote medical care and the arts, and setting a progressive pace for the people of the county.

On this 30th anniversary of the foundation, I should like to add my "thank you" to Walter Montgomery and the many fine people who have contributed to the good works of the Spartanburg County Foundation and to include in the Record the following tribute by the Spartan Radiocasting Co.:

WSPA takes note of the 30th anniversary of the establishment of The Spartanburg County Foundation and W. S. Montgomery its founder. The good works of The Spartanburg County Foundation are almost too numerous to mention. Businesswise the purchase of Camp Croft at the end of World War II gave this community an Industrial Park almost before the word was known.

The Spartanburg County Foundation has given 102 scholarships from its funds and 250 scholarships from special funds. It gives annually a Bible to each graduating senior of each high school of the county and also makes a valedictory award for scholastic achievement to the top scholar in each high school.

It has given over a half million dollars to the colleges of this county and has given to the community the Little Theater, has supported the Arts Center, The Gallery, The Brevard Music Center, The Charles Lea Center, The Spartanburg Boys Home, Walnut Grove Plantation and many other good works almost too numerous to name.

In addition to its liberal support of the Spartanburg General Hospital the Foundation joined with others in giving Isolettes. At that time the Spartanburg County premature death rate was one of the highest in the nation.

Of all the good works of The Spartanburg County Foundation few could have had farther reaching effect than the Peabody Report on the Spartanburg County School System underwritten and paid for by the Foundation. That Report showed that there were more School Districts in Spartanburg County, South Carolina, than in the whole state of West Virginia. When its recommendations were implemented by proper legislation, the schools were consolidated into the present seven school districts.

To W. S. Montgomery and those leaders in this community who established The Spartanburg County Foundation, an organization always willing to survey the needs and strike a spark to implement the proper remedy . . . to all of you WSPA says thank you.

THE SUPREME COURT'S DECISION
ON ABORTION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, reaction to the recent Supreme Court decision on abortion has been mixed. It has also been sharp. On the one hand, the decision has been attacked as an unwarranted intrusion into legislative jurisdiction and as a condonation of murder. On the other, it has been hailed as a vital increment to human liberty.

I think it is important when feelings run high that we both respect and listen to the views of those with whom we disagree, no matter how strongly.

My colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) has included the full text of the majority and dissenting opinions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 26, 1973—pages 5428 and following. I join him in his plea that every American read the decision before making up his mind about it.

To indicate how evenly divided the country is on this issue, I am placing in the RECORD the results of two recent public opinion polls:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Jan. 31, 1973]

SEVENTY PERCENT FAVOR ABORTIONS IN SOME
CIRCUMSTANCES: MINNESOTA POLL

Seven in 10 Minnesotans said abortion should be permitted when a woman and her doctor feel it is in her best interest or when the child might be deformed.

Two in three said they are opposed to unrestricted abortion in the early months of pregnancy.

Men and women shared similar views on when abortion should be permitted. People under 30 years of age were more willing and Catholics were less willing to allow abortion than were Minnesotans in general.

These are the findings of a statewide public opinion survey by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota Poll. The poll was completed about a week before the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a Texas statute, much like Minnesota's. The court ruled that states cannot prohibit abortions during the first three months of pregnancy and advised that states cannot interfere with the judgment of the woman and her doctor about an abortion at that time.

The survey shows that Minnesotans were about evenly divided on whether the 1973 Minnesota Legislature should change the state's abortion law and that both sides were firm in their convictions.

Forty-nine percent said the law should be changed to make abortions easier to get. Sixty-five percent who held this view said they felt strongly that the law should be changed.

On the other hand, 48 percent said the law should not be changed and 79 percent of these people were strongly opposed to changing it.

Of those Minnesotans who strongly favored changing the law, 9 in 10 said abortion should be permitted when the child might be deformed or when the woman and her doctor thought it best, and 6 in 10 said any woman who wanted an abortion should be allowed to have one.

Virtually all who felt strongly that the law should not be changed said they were

opposed to unrestricted abortion. But 4 in 10 said abortion should be permitted when the child might be deformed or when the woman and her doctor decide it is in the woman's best interest.

The 600 men and women in the survey were asked if they agreed or disagreed with the following statements:

	[In percent]		
	Agree	Disagree	No opinion
Abortions should be permitted when there is evidence the child might be mentally or physically deformed.....	70	26	4
In early months of pregnancy, any woman who wants an abortion should be permitted to have one.....	33	63	3
Abortion should be permitted when a woman and her doctor decide it is in the woman's best interest.....	69	27	3

Interviewers then asked the following questions (replies already shown):

"Under present state law, abortions are permitted only if the woman's life is in danger. Do you think the 1973 Minnesota Legislature should or should not change the law? (If should or should not) Do you personally feel strongly about your position on the abortion issue or not?"

The results of the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota Poll are based on personal in-the-home interviews with 600 men and women 18 years of age or older. Respondents are selected by probability sampling procedures and interviewed by a staff of 110 trained interviewers. The Minnesota Poll was established in 1944 as a public service.

BUT HALF IN LATEST SURVEY EXPRESS OPPOSED:
COURT DECISION CAME AT TIME OF GROWING
PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR LEGALIZING ABORTION
(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J., January 27.—Although the U.S. Supreme Court last week ruled 7-2 that abortions are legal during the first three months of pregnancy, the public in a recent survey is found to be evenly divided on the issue, with 46 per cent in favor, 45 per cent opposed, and 9 per cent undecided.

However, support for legalizing abortion has grown since a November 1969 survey when the vote was 50 to 40 per cent against the right to terminate pregnancy during the first three months.

The change since 1969 has come about almost entirely among persons under 50 years old. Those over 50 remain steadfastly opposed.

Increased support since the earlier survey is also recorded among both Protestants and Catholics. Protestants are now divided on the issue, while a majority of Catholics remain opposed.

Persons with a college background are most likely to favor liberalizing abortion laws. In the latest survey they vote 2 to 1 in favor of making abortion legal for the first three months of pregnancy.

Here is the question asked in the latest survey, with a comparison of the latest results with those recorded in a survey taken three years earlier:

Would you favor or oppose a law which would permit a woman to go to a doctor to end pregnancy at any time during the first three months?

	[In percent]		
	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
Latest (December).....	46	45	9
November 1969.....	40	50	10

The following table shows the comparison by key groups between the latest survey and the one taken three years earlier. The percentages represent those in favor:

PERCENT IN FAVOR OF LAW PERMITTING ABORTION DURING
1ST 3 MONTHS

	Latest	1969	Point change
National.....	46	40	+5
College.....	63	58	+7
High school.....	44	37	+7
Grade school.....	30	31	-6
Under 30 years.....	55	46	+9
30 to 49 years.....	48	39	+9
50 and over.....	39	38	+1
Protestants.....	45	40	+5
Catholics.....	36	31	+5
Men.....	49	40	+9
Women.....	44	40	+4

The current survey is based on personal interviews with 1,504 adults, 18 and older, in more than 300 scientifically selected localities across the nation, interviewed during the period Dec. 8-11. The previous survey, in which the identical question on abortion was asked, was based on personal interviews with 1,511 adults, interviewed Nov. 14-17, 1969.

On Jan. 22, the Supreme Court overruled all state laws that prohibit or restrict a woman's right to obtain an abortion during her first three months of pregnancy. The vote was 7-2.

The majority ruling of the Court specified the following:

For the first three months of pregnancy the decision to have an abortion lies with the woman and her doctor, and the state's interest in her welfare is not "compelling" enough to warrant any interference.

For the next six months of pregnancy a state may "regulate the abortion procedure in ways that are reasonably related to maternal health," such as licensing and regulating the persons and facilities involved.

For the last 10 weeks of pregnancy, the period during which the fetus is judged to be capable of surviving if born, any state may prohibit abortions, if it wishes, except where it may be necessary to preserve the life or health of the mother.

The majority rejected the idea that a fetus becomes a "person" upon conception and is thus entitled to the due process and equal protection guarantees of the Constitution. This view was pressed by opponents of liberalized abortion, including the Roman Catholic Church.

Justice Harry A. Blackmun concluded for the majority that "the word 'person' as used in the 14th Amendment does not include the unborn," although states may acquire, "at some point in time" of pregnancy, an interest in the "potential human life" that the fetus represents, to permit regulation.

It is that interest, the Court said, that permits states to prohibit abortion during the last 10 weeks of pregnancy, after the fetus has developed the capacity to survive.

A WORD OF CAUTION ON THE
ELECTRONIC VOTING SYSTEM

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to caution my colleagues in the House about certain aspects of the electronic voting system.

On Tuesday, February 27, 1973, I inserted my voting card to vote in favor of H.R. 3577, the extension of the interest equalization tax, but failed to check the board to see if my vote had been recorded. At the conclusion of the voting, I learned that for some reason, my vote had not registered.

Later, I attempted to change my vote and have it recorded properly. I found that under the new system, such changes are not possible.

I bring this to the attention of all the Members of the House so that you may avoid similar situations.

NEDA

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the National Environmental Development Association has taken strong exception to the recommendations of the National Water Commission's intended report regarding a proposed water resource policy for our Nation. NEDA is a privately funded organization fostering conservation, development and use of America's resources to protect and enhance its environment. The news release on NEDA's comments on the proposed report and the detailed statement made before the National Water Commission are of sufficient importance that I submit them for printing in the RECORD:

NEWS RELEASE

WASHINGTON.—The National Water Commission's proposed report to the President and the Congress would be a serious and unnecessary blow to the future economic growth of this country, according to Thomas A. Young, president of the National Environmental Development Association. In a statement today, Young said:

"There is much that we agree with in the draft proposals, and we commend the Commission for its diligent study the past five years.

"But the overall thrust of the report is strictly no-growth. We must balance development and the use of America's resources to protect and enhance the environment. In essence, the intended report of the Commission advocates a virtual halt to all future development of our water resources. Our water resources are so basic that such a wild scheme would stunt the future economic growth of this country. And that is serious and unnecessary and sheer folly.

"We cannot agree to that, and we believe that the American people do not agree with it. Hopefully, the Commission will revise its position before sending the final draft to the President and to Congress."

Young submitted a statement of NEDA's position to the Water Commission for its consideration. Copies of the statement are available, but here are some of the highlights of NEDA's statement:

NEDA disagrees that multipurpose water impoundments will not be needed in the future. On the contrary, more will be needed to meet the soaring demand for outdoor recreation, pollution-free energy fossil fuel conservation, etc.

It also disagrees that the government charge a higher rate of interest, than the treasury pays now to borrow, for projects that it does undertake.

NEDA also takes sharp issue with these other recommendations that are being proposed by the National Water Commission in its review report:

That Congress provide no more funds for destructive flood protection unless the beneficiaries repay the full cost.

That the U.S. charge tolls on the country's inland waterways.

That the U.S. build or replace no more inland waterway projects not necessary for defense unless some non-federal entity repays the full cost plus interest.

That subsidies be ended for agricultural irrigation, upstream flood control, draining land for production, etc. Perhaps the Commission is unaware that American agriculture is the marvel of the world—that the world needs our excess capacity now, that President Nixon has embarked on a program to do just that. And that undoubtedly the world will need more of our farm production in the future. Also that farmers were the first "environmentalists."

For your information, NEDA is a privately-funded non-profit corporation fostering conservation, development and use of America's resources to protect and enhance its environment.

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION BEFORE THE NATIONAL WATER COMMISSION

Honorable Commissioners: The National Environmental Development Association appreciates the opportunity to comment on the National Water Commission's draft of its intended report to the President and Congress regarding a proposed water resource policy for the people of the United States.

The National Environmental Development Association (NEDA) is a non-political, non-profit, non-stock corporation comprised of labor, agricultural, industry and other private and public interest organizations and individuals, recently incorporated in the fall of 1972 with headquarters in Washington, D.C.

NEDA was established for the purpose of promoting the conservations, development and use of the resources of the United States in a manner that will enhance the quality of the human environment of its many millions of people, who aspire to work and to improve their welfare, and the welfare of their children and grandchildren, in the decades ahead.

NEDA endeavors to do this by encouraging public awareness, understanding, and informed input on those proposed public policies which may serve, or impair, the achievement of that desirable human goal.

Within this framework, we have assembled our thoughts on the extent to which the water resource policy here proposed by the commission may serve that goal, as this is the means by which all such proposals must be judged.

We do so respectfully, and with full deference to the commission's duty to report as to the way it believes the Congress of the United States must discharge its manifold, constitutional responsibilities for the public use of this Nation's waters.

In a draft of the size we deal with here—over four years of preparation, on a matter so primal, by staff not responsible for water resource matters, and extending well over one thousand, heavily footnoted pages—it is no surprise to find ourselves in strong agreement with some of the proposed commission recommendations, and in strong considered disagreement with many others. We emphasize our agreements first.

We agree with those extended explanations, that consume so very much of the report, that the country must support and fund more study and research, improved planning, and more research and development on all aspects and avenues of water resource conservation, development, and management.

And we especially agree with much of the analysis on water pollution, today the country's number one water problem. This problem was brought about by a socially elevating economic movement of which we today, our forefathers, and our children are all the beneficiaries. And our program to correct it now should proceed as a collaborative undertaking involving the American economy—not as an attack on it. (Our regret is that the commission did not convey its views on the matter in a section 3(b) interim report to the Congress a year ago, when it was seeking legislative guidance in this area.)

We agree that full implementation of existing water quality standards will result in higher prices and severe employment and other economic dislocations in certain areas; that discharge limitations should allow for the known assimilative capacity of receiving waters; that the economic, social, and related environmental costs of achieving improved water quality should be weighed in setting specific standards; and that their implementation should be undertaken with the prudence necessary to prevent those pollution control excesses that would create a greater human "environmental blight" than the problem to be corrected.

The report is equally forthright on the matter of generating plant heat dissipation. Even assuming "zero population growth", and its limited energy conservation potential, electric energy consumption will triple by 1990. As new generating units installed between now and year 2000 will have a thermal conversion efficiency not significantly greater than the present 40 percent, generating plant waste heat is an environmental reality. The report recognizes that dissipating this directly to water may be far less costly, in environmental as well as economic terms, than dissipating it to air by the various cooling pond and tower methods possible, depending on the degree of aquatic life affected. These are our views also, and we commend the commission conclusion and recommendation that: "Rigid environmental standards which largely denied the ability of water to assimilate waste heat, regardless of the environmental costs of once-through cooling (which in some areas could be quite minimal), would deny the opportunity to make a rational evaluation", and water pollution control law "should recognize the waste assimilative capacity of receiving waters as a valuable resource for dispersing waste heat."

The recommendation that recreation be elevated "to a high priority" in the use and construction of Federal multipurpose reservoir lakes is both needed and timely. For we know of no more responsive way of meeting the now nearly unmanageable need for additional public water based recreation, and relieving those already damaging over-use pressures on the environment of our existing beach and land recreation areas. We would complete the report's catalogue of "Federal and federally-assisted" reservoir lakes by the addition of those hundreds of hydroelectric reservoir lakes licensed by the Federal Power Commission—many of which far exceed in lake surface, beach and related land area and recreation facilities, and public recreation utilization those now tabulated in the report. Moreover, considering the increasing outdoor recreation contribution to be supplied by these existing and proposed multipurpose impoundments in the future (at no cost to government treasuries), we would direct a recommendation to that agency also, in the interest of expediting their licensing and relicensing of these developments for their demonstrably needed, public environmental benefits of outdoor recreation, pollution free energy, fossil fuel conservation, and alleviation of dollar drain.

The report rejects the argument that the discount or interest rate for the needed water

projects government undertakes which industry does not, should be the interest rate industry would charge if it did. The rejection is deserved—for the same reason that government's long term interest rate is not a fair measure for return on industry undertakings. Controversy on this issue is often admixed with the issues of whether a project is needed, whether industry can undertake it on the optimum scale, and whether it can at a cost that serves the project purpose, or purposes. To be sure industry can undertake many needed water resource developments, or certain purposes thereof, as well, and sometimes better than government. But such are separate controversies, the answers to which do not affect the fact that government's interest cost on long term water developments is government's cost of borrowing long term money.

In identifying our areas of major disagreement with the review draft we have tried to be brief as well as constructive.

Although the report acknowledges the increasingly adverse effects of excessive environmentalism, it proposes to solve this crisis with more of the proceduralism that is its cause. This problem—of making decisions on "conflicting values"—will be solved by making decisions.

The excesses of environmental proceduralism have already accumulated to unduly burdensome levels. In last year's Water Pollution Control Act, for example, Congress found it necessary to declare that: "It is national policy that to the maximum extent possible the procedures utilized for implementing this act shall encourage the drastic minimization of . . . interagency decision procedures". The excesses of "public participation" in agency processes have already escalated, former AEC Chairman Schlesinger recently pointed out, to where this now provides lawyers with "a lucrative substitute for ambulance chasing", and that "the techniques which were employed in the anti-Communist crusades" are now being employed in the name of the environment.

We approach this issue cognizant that the subject of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 is "the quality of the human environment" (emphasis added). The lack of needed project services and products has very adverse effects on the quality of the human environment—attested by destructive floods, crop losses, water shortages, long hot summer recreation crises, power shortages, lack of employment, and industrial curtailments. We need no new procedures for determining and disclosing those adverse effects.¹

Accordingly, in addition to identifying and disclosing an undertaking's negative effects, means of minimizing them, and its alternatives, the commission should urge that they also identify a project's positive human contributions—which agencies now do not do adequately. Then, with all effects clearly in mind, the project decision can be made intelligently and promptly. Such full disclosure will also help the public in general, rather than a select group serving its own purpose, to discern and determine their own "alternative futures". It also will fulfill the congressionally declared policy of the National Environmental Policy Act.²

We appreciate this full disclosure decisional remedy does not appeal to the secretaries of excessive environmentalism, but we have faced the fact—as we believe this com-

mission must—that the ends and objectives they have chosen for themselves are not adequate to America. They cannot sustain our economy, employ our millions, educate our children, provide for our aged, and finance the public improvements needed for the human environment in the decades ahead.

Finally on this subject, we particularly reject Commission encouragement of the notion that CEQ or EPA engage in "independent" environmental determinations on projects, authorized or unauthorized. They are ill-suited to do so by their institutional predispositions and particular lack of any project responsibility whatsoever. We oppose the idea that CEQ be left free to advise the President against a congressionally authorized project without also advising the Congress. Last, we would urge as a recommendation the Commission's observation that: "If Congress reassesses a project and determines that it should continue, perhaps in appropriating funds after considering the possible environmental impacts of the project, the decision is made by the same entity which authorized the project to proceed in their first instance."

Concerning municipal and industrial water supply, the draft states that: "some water shortages are now apparent and others are likely to develop in certain regions", recent surveys showed many people are drinking poor water, and that the reasons include lack of needed water supply projects and fundings. The report notes the United States has attempted in many ways to assist State and local governments meet their primary municipal, industrial and other water supply responsibilities. However, the draft adds, "the Nation" may not have "the willingness or, in some cases, the ability to erect the institutional arrangements needed" effectively to meet "the expected doubling of municipal, and the tripling of industrial, needs by the year 2020." Notwithstanding, the draft affirms "full agreement" with the proposition that: "The responsibility for water resources projects, of which public and industrial water supplies are a primary consideration, should rest with that echelon of Government or of private interests closest to the people benefited." We urge that the Commission conclusion be reoriented to reflect the realities Congress itself has recognized in numerous recent measures. For instance, in enacting the Northeast Water Supply Act of 1965 during the most recent disastrous Delaware River basin drought, Congress declared (Public Law 89-298): "That assuring adequate supplies of water for the great metropolitan centers of the United States has become a problem of such magnitude that the welfare and prosperity of this country require the Federal Government to assist in the solution of water supply problems." The Rural Development Act of 1972 makes the same point, Public Law 92-419.

The recommendation that Congress provide no funds for destructive flood protection unless the beneficiaries repay the full cost thereof, ignores the fact that beneficiaries reside beyond project States, ignores the social and economic benefits of such works to the Nation as a whole, and would effectively end continuance of a national program that has repaid itself many times over since its inception. During the period 1936-1969, for example, Corps of Engineers flood control projects costing \$5.4 billion prevented damages of \$18 billion, prevented flood deaths, sickness and suffering, and permitted productive taxpaying endeavor in many important parts of America. Last June Hurricane Agnes caused damages of \$3.5 billion, deaths to the number of 120, inordinate, still continuing human displacement and ruination, and an immediate Federal emergency expenditure exceeding \$300 million, with much more to follow, in the Northeast. Corps projects in operation there prevented additional damages of \$1.5 billion; others, regrettably unbuilt but authorized or recommended for the area (and clearly costing more than their

beneficiaries can pay), would have saved still more. As a compassionate Congress cannot ignore such adverse human environmental effects of this Nation's waters and waterways, we urge that the draft recommendation be modified to affirm our country's established policy: "That the Federal Government should improve or participate" in flood control undertakings "if the benefits to whomsoever they may accrue are in excess of the estimated costs, and if the lives and social security of the people are otherwise adversely affected." (33 U.S.C. 701a)

The inland waterway program provides a service of ramifying importance to industry, agriculture, foreign trade, and the price levels of consumer goods. Its necessary navigation structures serve the essence of the country's interstate commerce flow. They are built and maintained by the United States, for functionally, legally and economically they exceed the concern and capacity of a project locality. The draft recommends the United States not build or replace any such project not necessary for national defense unless some non-Federal entity repays its "entire construction cost, plus interest thereon". We oppose this, and the similarly objectionable proposal concerning user charges. These recommendations violate the elemental interests of interstate and foreign commerce, industry, agriculture, and consumers.

The draft notes the American people subsidize production of their food by three programs involving water: conserving and supplying it to irrigate land, protecting agricultural land against floods, draining low lying land valuable for agriculture. In these and other ways, we note (for the draft does not), the American people: feed themselves on the most wholesome food in the world; spend less of their disposable income for it than any other people; feed their poor and underprivileged; export vast quantities of it, helping balance payments; make emergency food grants to diverse, periodically famine-stricken people in other lands, helping foreign policy; protect an important part of our land against the environmental ravages of nature, preserving it as America the beautiful; and help maintain resourceful present and future generations of citizens across our continent, removed from the social congestion problems of megalopolis. Based on analyses prescinding these social and environmental benefits, and focused only on an isolated estimate of the cost of food and fiber production, the draft concludes and recommends: we have adequate agricultural productive capacity to year 2000, there is "no need in the next 30 years for federally subsidized (agricultural) water resource development," and the three programs have added to "excess productive capacity of agriculture".

We oppose this conclusion and recommendation for several reasons. It will result in a level of food prices to consumers greater what they now pay plus the portion of their taxes attributable to these programs. It makes no provision for replacing the associated social and environmental benefits or requirements they provide. And we disagree with the conclusion that we need no further programs to insure agricultural adequacy. To wit, world climatic conditions in 1972 and projected for 1973 indicate that, with few exceptions, there are no surpluses of agricultural commodities; due to extreme droughts in Russia and Mainland China, United States grain bins are practically empty; curtailed production of food in India will create an additional demand for food and feed grains; there is great demand for high protein meal, causing the highest prices in history; and the recent Flanigan report is that with free trade in agricultural commodities, export demand for grains, feeds, oilseeds, livestock and their products will increase from \$7.8 billion in 1971 to \$18.4 billion by 1980. We believe the draft recommendation should be altered to reflect the last recommendation of the U.S. national

¹ We do not discuss the subject of Federal power plant siting legislation, to be considered elsewhere.

² I.e.: "to foster and promote the general welfare, to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans." 42 U.S.C. 4331(a)

academy of science, committee on resources and man (1969): "That the efficiency and capacity of agricultural productivity, both in the United States and abroad be increased to the maximum levels possible. This is necessary not only to assure national food reserves, but also to help those countries in need."

Numerous other draft recommendations we oppose include the proposition that Federal construction grants for water pollution control facilities should be terminated by 1982, and that present programs of the Department of Agriculture for the control of rural soil erosion and run-off, which control the growing problem on non-point pollution and accelerated eutrophication of waters, should not be expanded or accelerated. The interests of brevity dictate we not discuss here these and other draft recommendations we deem equally contrary to the public interest.

We conclude with the hope the Commission will consider these latter matters we have mentioned, to the end of enabling the Congress to fulfill its manifold, constitutional responsibilities to insure the conservation, development, and use of this Nation's waters to serve its many public purposes in the decades ahead. For to quote the words of the conference report on the Act establishing the Commission: "If the Commission is to be successful in accomplishing its mission, its recommendations must be susceptible of fulfillment." (H. Rept. No. 90-1862)

We would add a final note. We have seen certain pamphlets and brochures urging unreserved support of the draft, on the grounds that, if implemented, its recommendations will prevent continuance of this country's efforts to conserve its water resources. We are satisfied this was not the intent of the Commission.

DEFENSE CONTRACTORS MAKE DONATIONS TO NAACP

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in the days of Al Capone the protection racket was recognized for just what it was—a black-mail shakedown to buy peace and keep out of trouble.

We now read where the Nation's largest shipbuilding concern in nearby Newport News, Va., has seen fit to buy peace from the NAACP through a \$2,500 corporate membership in that controversial "civil rights" association.

Since the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. operates under military funds for the construction of naval vessels, it should be interesting to see how they write off this \$2,500 "peace" donation; that is, as a protection fee, legal expenses, overhead, or as a contribution to the enemy to assure continued legal agitation, thus perpetuating the need for defense contractors.

One thing is certain. It is the American taxpayer who is footing the bill, and there will be little auditing of this influence peddling gift by defense contractors.

A related newsclipping is as follows: [From the Washington Post, Feb. 25, 1973]

DRY DOCK FIRM JOINS NAACP

NEWPORT NEWS, VA., February 24.—Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., not too long ago the object of pressure by the

federal government to improve its minority employment practices, recently joined the NAACP.

The \$2,500, five-year corporate membership, a spokesman said, "is indicative of the changing times. There is nothing in the NAACP's charter that we don't already stand for."

The yard's conglomerate parent, Tenneco, Inc., of Houston, Tex., is a member of the Houston chapter of the association.

ANOTHER SIDE OF THE STORY

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions we have seen projects which have been authorized by Congress and for which environmental impact statements have been prepared and filed challenged and halted under demands of further environmental study. Often the charges lodged against projects, regardless of merit, are accepted as fact by many people because no rebuttal is made by proponents of the projects and there are few, if any statements in the press to support them. This is due primarily because once a project is authorized the advocates tend to "disorganize" and the constructing agency does not feel that it has an advocacy role since the project decision to build or not to build rests with the Congress.

One such project in this situation is the Auburn Reservoir on which we have invested several millions of dollars to initiate design and construction of a multiple-purpose project now being built by the Bureau of Reclamation. The completion of this project would offer flood control, water resources, recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and the generation of a substantial quantity of hydroelectric energy. The benefit-cost ratio on this project is excellent and there are many environmental advantages connected with the completion of the project. Favorable environmental impacts of the project have not been discussed publicly until a short time ago when the Auburn Journal took a look at the situation and reported the comments of one outstanding conservationist, Mr. Frank Nissen, who does support the completion of the project.

Although the article is directed specifically at the Auburn project it is my feeling that the author, in fact, speaks for many projects in similar circumstances and therefore I would like to share with my colleagues the recent column published under the name of the Auburn Auricle.

The article follows:

ANOTHER SIDE OF THE STORY

The attempts by environmentalist groups to halt construction of the Auburn Dam-Folsom South Canal and virtually scrap the \$550,000 multi-purpose reclamation project have figured prominently in this newspaper in recent weeks.

The news stories principally have dealt with a federal court suit which seeks to delay the project pending a review of its environmental impact report, and with a letter and anti-

dam forces have written to budget officials of the Nixon Administration in the hope that they will for all time quit funding the job on which more than \$100 million already has been spent.

Local officials of the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation and their regional bosses in Sacramento have declined specific comment on the stratagems and charges of the groups opposed to the project because they are, after all, involved in litigation resulting from the suit and, perhaps more important, because governmental protocol requires that the top brass—persons like U. S. Interior Secretary Roger C. B. Morton and whoever the new U.S. Reclamation Commissioner is—issue such statements.

The results has been that the conservationists, preservationists or whatever you want to call them have had a field day pasting the project because there's been nobody to take 'em on.

Oh, I guess that I could sit down at the mill and bat out a few thousand words in defense of the dam, but if I did I'd stand accused of being the bureau's stooge or, worse than that, being on the take.

I got to thinking about this yesterday when Frank Nissen, a longtime Auburn area resident, walked into the office and handed me a hand-printed letter which he said I might want to read and, perhaps, publish in the paper.

I read the letter—Frank surprised me with his flair for words—and agreed to print it because, in a fairness to the other side, it represents the feelings of a helluva lot of people who want to see the project completed and who have not had the time nor the resources—things like financial grants from foundations—to voice their opinions.

At this point I must identify Frank Nissen more fully. He resides in the Shirland Tract area and, by way of earning a living, is recording secretary of Local 1486 of the Carpenters Union.

Yipes! I can hear the screams already. Many of you are probably thinking, why the blazes should I read what a union official has to say in defense of the Auburn Dam? After all, the dam means jobs and that's what he's interested in, isn't it?

Well, you're wrong if you think this is what Nissen is trying to do. Nowhere in his letter—let's call it an essay—is there any reference to the employment and economic boosts that will be generated by the project.

Don't take our word for it. Read what Nissen has to say.

The arguments contained in the federal court suit against the project appear to be invalid and illusory for the most part.

It is claimed that "a scenic canyon will be destroyed." This conclusion is entirely debatable. Admitted that a portion of the canyon walls will be covered with water, but it is purely a matter of personal opinion whether or not something has been "destroyed" or something else "created"—and what is "scenic" and what is not.

Speaking for many property owners in Placer, El Dorado and Sacramento counties who enjoy a view of Folsom Lake, there is no question that the scenic value of the lake overshadows by far that of the canyon it "destroyed."

There has to be a similar evaluation regarding the scenic potential of the reservoir created by the Auburn Dam, as shown by the greatly accelerated land values, sales and development along the anticipated shoreline.

It is a well known fact that a certain amount of water will be diverted from the American River. However, the plaintiffs in the suit must concede that this "diverted" water will be supplied by the Auburn Reservoir and not necessarily by the normal flow of the river itself. An acceptable and guaranteed flow below Nimbus Dam should satisfy the desires and needs of everyone and everything involved.

It is significant to note that in all the arguments advanced by those who would maintain the status quo of our rivers and streams we never hear about the benefits or "scenic value" of free-flowing streams in times of flood, during excessive spring run-offs from melting snow or, conversely, the waterless stream beds during the dry season. We wonder how many valley flood victims and water users consider structures like Shasta and Folsom dams as "killer dams"?

The suit declared the project "would have deleterious effects on fish, wildlife and recreational opportunities for all citizens including the plaintiffs." For those who did not have their dictionaries handy when news stories of the suit were published, deleterious means, in effect, "to destroy." We must argue that construction of the Auburn Dam can only multiply the fish population, enhance the habitat for such wildlife as populates the area—except for rattlesnakes which might inhabit the area near the present river shoreline—and most certainly will greatly increase the recreational opportunities on and along each side "of the 23 and 25 miles of north and middle forks of the American River."

For almost 20 years Folsom Lake has been living proof of how the fish population can be increased, along with a variety of recreational activity unmatched by anything the "destroyed area" had to offer, plus the capacity to satisfy the recreational needs of a growing population included in a much larger area than had ever been served previously by the river.

The plaintiffs (and we are wondering about the identity and number of individuals actually involved—are they a majority of the citizenry?) claim that "construction of the unit would cause substantial, irreparable environmental loss." It would seem this so-called "loss" should be spelled out in considerable detail if the argument is legitimate. We fail to recognize any loss, especially when the obvious benefits of the project are considered.

We would remind the environmental groups involved in this suit that a severe power shortage is at hand. If the construction of nuclear and fossil-fueled power plants is curtailed, we will certainly need something besides geothermal installations and future breeder reactors to supply our power needs. What cleaner and more natural source do we have than the powerhouses such as those included in the Auburn Dam Project?

In conclusion, we submit that, while environmental preservation is everybody's job, the needs of the people—all the needs of all the people—should receive consideration as well. Construction of the Auburn Dam-Folsom South Canal will contribute to the environment—in the valley as well as locally—and will most certainly satisfy a multitude of human needs.

Thank you, Frank. Take a bow for giving us the other side of the hassle.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON TREATMENT AND REHABILITA- TION OF NARCOTIC ADDICTS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Judiciary Committee is continuing their series of hearings on the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotics addicts.

The latest report from the Office of the Comptroller General on "Narcotic Addiction Treatment and Rehabilitation Programs in Chicago, Ill." will be the topic for these hearings.

The hearings will commence with testimony from the Office of the Comptroller General of the United States on Thursday, March 8, 1973, at 10 a.m. in room 2226 of the Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Those wishing to testify or to submit statements for the record should address their requests to the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies' auxiliary annually conduct a most commendable program, the Voice of Democracy contest. This year's theme was "My Responsibility to Freedom," and the winning speech from the State of Oregon was written by Jim Montgomery, a senior at Beaverton High School in Beaverton, Ore.

It is both refreshing and inspiring to read the words of Mr. Montgomery; therefore, I proudly insert a copy of his fine, prize-winning speech for the benefit of my colleagues and the general public:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Jim Montgomery)

The time: July 4, 1776

The place: Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

The event: The signing of the Declaration of Independence

It's been almost a month in the making, but it's finally ready. The unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America is now being signed by the representatives of the thirteen colonies. The colonies, who have been at war with England ever since the battles at Lexington and Concord over a year ago, are finally coming out and declaring their independence from England. It's too bad that these "Americans", as they call themselves, will probably lose. Even though they have great spirit and loyalty, that's no match for England's superior training and armament. At least in my mind, the outcome is obvious. I only hope England doesn't abandon the new world after crushing the revolution—it's really quite a nice place . . .

I wonder if that's what it was really like two hundred years ago. July 4, 1776. And to think, from those shaky beginnings, that brash young nation grew into one of the largest and most powerful in the world. That may not seem like so much, but think of this. As America approaches her 200th birthday, she has the distinction of spending all of these years under one single government.—A government that belongs to the people, not just a monarch or a dictator.

America has changed a lot since then. She's added 37 stars to her flag, has covered half a continent, and has increased her population by over 200 million people. She's been through on the winning side of two World Wars, and has put a man on the moon, but through all of this, she's still maintained

that unique quality that makes her what she is. As Abraham Lincoln put it, "A government of the people, by the people, for the people". No other country can claim having such a government that has lasted so long.

But what is it? What is it that has made America last so long?

I think it's something very, very special. Something called freedom.

But what is freedom? Does it mean you can do whatever you want? Or does it involve more than that? That's a question many people wonder about. The answer is yes—it does involve more than that. It involves responsibility.

And there's another rather indiscriminate term. Responsibility. It can mean so many different things. To some people, it means the responsibility to register and vote. To others, it goes deeper. They feel it means to run for office, or to help someone else run for office. To me, it goes even a bit farther. It's not just accepting that freedom, it's also acknowledging other people's rights to that freedom, and protecting and preserving that freedom, so that everyone, everywhere can partake of it.

Of course, there's a hitch—there always is. To some people, the freedom of others isn't as important as their own freedom. That's alright as long as they stay to themselves. Unfortunately, though, the reason they forsake the freedom of others is to grab more for themselves. They want the power that unlimited freedom gives them. And in getting this power, if they step on someone else, well that's life. All they care about is themselves.

And that's why everyone who feels this strong sense of responsibility has got to stand up and put a stop to those who are so disrespectful of the freedom of others. And they do. They did in 1940, they did in 1918, they did in 1860, and they did in 1776.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, for more than 3 years, I have reminded my colleagues daily of the plight of our prisoners of war. Now, for more of us, the war is over. Yet despite the cease-fire agreements' provisions for the release of all prisoners, fewer than 600 of the more than 1,900 men who were lost while on active duty in Southeast Asia have been identified by the enemy as alive and captive. The remaining 1,220 men are still missing in action.

A child asks: "Where is my daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife wonders: "Is my husband alive or dead?" How long?

Until those men are accounted for, their families will continue to undergo the special suffering reserved for the relatives of those who simply disappear without a trace, the living lost, the dead with graves unmarked. For their families, peace brings no respite from frustration, anxiety, and uncertainty. Some can look forward to a whole lifetime shadowed by grief.

We must make every effort to alleviate their anguish by redoubling our search for the missing servicemen. Of the incalculable debt owed to them and their families, we can at least pay that mini-

mum. Until I am satisfied, therefore, that we are meeting our obligation, I will continue to ask, "How long?"

ATROCITIES IN NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, stories of atrocities occurring daily in Northern Ireland are beginning to fall upon deaf ears. Too many individuals the world over are now turning their eyes from the conflict raging constantly in Belfast.

Unless the day-to-day horror of their situation can be dramatized on a regular basis, we run the risk of allowing the bloodshed to continue while peaceful nations stand by in apathy. It is the responsibility of the Members of this House to see to it that the true story of what is happening in Northern Ireland is kept before the eyes of all Americans.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to read into the RECORD the heart-rending letter which Paul Nathanson, an English citizen whose family was directly affected by the ongoing Belfast tragedy submitted to the editor of the London Evening News. He speaks of 12-year-old Philip Rafferty—a cousin of the Nathanson family—who was recently abducted, hooded, and shot through the head. This frail, asthmatic child was just one of the hundreds and hundreds of innocent victims who have been chosen by heartless murderers for senseless execution.

Mr. Speaker, if the people of the United States and their elected representatives succumb to indifference in the face of such an outrage, then we must share responsibility for the brutal death of Philip Rafferty. I would encourage my colleagues to join in the effort aimed at keeping the Northern Ireland issue before the American public. If the pressure of international opinions can contribute to bringing about peace in Belfast, then we must register our sense of outrage at the slaughter of such defenseless victims as Philip Rafferty.

Mr. Nathanson's letter to the editor follows:

LONDON, ENGLAND.

SIR: I am a Jew. I came from Austria to England as a little boy over 30 years ago when six million of my people were put to death.

I recall among my murdered family a cousin, with whom I shared my early childhood, who was made to give up his life for being a Jew in Hitler's gas chambers at the age of 12.

My wife was born in England. Her father was Irish. Her mother is of the same background as me—we shared the same six million dead.

My wife and I have two little girls. Now, nearly 30 years after the Second World War, the journey to the moon and other various wars, my little girls have just lost their own little cousin.

He was a small, frail boy who suffered from asthma and who had a Mum and Dad, Brother, sister, uncle and aunts.

One day while the kids played, he was abducted, hooded, shot through the head and his body dumped.

Why did he die? What had he done? For what cause did he die? Why? Why?

Were the Jews murdered throughout the ages for the religion they were born into? Was Philip murdered because he was a Catholic? Did he die for Ireland? For Glory? For God? Oh no!

No, never!

I am a Jew. I am alive! To You who murdered my people, to You who kill in other corners of the world, to You who murdered a terrified innocent child because of his Christian label, I say:

"Philip Rafferty, and all other 'Philips' whatever their creed, do not die as heroes or martyrs, nor do they die for a cause—they die in vain—for nothing!"

"You murdered a child for no reason!"

"One day, when you will have to justify your deeds, there will be no defence—for any of us. And only then, when this is realized, will Philip Rafferty have died for a cause."

I am dear Sir,

PAUL NATHANSON.

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, on January 25, the Honorable Homer Thornberry, judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, delivered a most moving and eloquent memorial for President Lyndon Johnson to a joint session of the Texas Legislature.

Judge Thornberry was a long-time and dear friend of President Johnson. When President Johnson was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1948, Judge Thornberry was elected to take President Johnson's congressional office for the 10th District of Texas. Judge Thornberry served ably in that office until 1963 when he resigned to take a place on the Federal court. At that time, I succeeded Judge Thornberry as the Congressman for the 10th District.

But Judge Thornberry's contacts with the Johnson family go back even farther, far in 1923. Judge Homer Thornberry was a page in the Texas House of Representatives where Sam E. Johnson, the father of Lyndon B. Johnson, served as a member.

I know for a fact that Judge Thornberry knew our mutual friend President Lyndon Johnson as well as anyone in America, and I know President Johnson admired and respected Homer Thornberry as much as anyone in America. I thus insert in the RECORD at this time, Mr. Speaker, a copy of Judge Thornberry's remarks to the Texas Legislature:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HOMER THORNBERRY

For I, the Lord thy God, will hold thy right hand, saying unto thee, fear not: I will help thee.

I first came to this chamber officially in 1923, employed as a page in the 39th legislature, in which the Honorable Sam E. Johnson, father of Lyndon Baines Johnson, served as a representative; I came again in 1937 to serve as member of the House in the 45th legislature. I return because of the high honor you have bestowed on me by inviting me to participate with you in honoring the memory of our friend and neighbor.

No mortal words which I might say here

can add to the illustrious memory of the great and magnificent Lyndon B. Johnson.

When the news of his passing reached us, there came a solemn and sober moment in the lives, not only of those of us who knew him and loved him, but in the lives of countless people throughout this Nation and the world who never knew him personally.

While we are staggered by an overwhelming sense of loss, a new sense of values takes charge of our minds and hearts.

Lyndon Johnson was one of the most thoughtful persons I ever knew. He understood what it meant to be a good neighbor. Lyndon Johnson was his brother's keeper.

That great heart, which finally failed him, prompted him time and again to provide succor and relief to a multitude of friends—in time of bereavement, illness, or financial need.

Many times he and his noble wife, Lady Bird, were the first to provide love and consolation or the solution to a critical problem. Compassionate beyond belief, he was a friend to every man—in every city, in every village, in every mansion, in every hotel—encompassing the globe.

He had a warm sense of humor. He was a picturesque story teller. Time and time again, we have heard him tell a down-to-earth story to illustrate an important point. I think he would want me to say this. He was the most superb domino player I've ever known. I give personal testimony—I never won a game!

In that rugged hill country just west of here he developed the strength of character, the courage, the vision, the sense of realism, the compassion which enabled him to perform with effectiveness the tasks of his office.

He understood the principle—so often overlooked and forgotten—that the art of politics is the art of achieving the possible. He truly believed there was more good than bad in every person.

Lyndon Johnson has been rightly called a skilled political and legislative leader, unexcelled and unequalled. He was recognized as leader of his political associates. Now, in retrospect, we recall the many times in this nation's history he rose above the partisan and political differences of the moment to fight with courage and wisdom for the security of our country and the enduring freedom of men, women, and children everywhere. One of the greatest periods of our history unfolded under his leadership, both in the Congress and the White House. As President, he once said, "I would like to be remembered as the President who helped those unable to help themselves."

In his first address before the Joint Session of Congress, November 27, 1963, President Johnson said, "we will carry on the fight against poverty and misery, ignorance and disease—in other lands and in our own."

From that moment, he moved directly to the solution of age-old problems which have assailed mankind in our beloved country.

He sought removal of barriers and limitations which have humiliated fellow Americans.

Can we ever forget that speech to a Joint Session of Congress on March 15, 1965, when he said, "their cause must be our cause, too. Because it is not just Negroes, but really it is all of us, who must overcome the crippling legacy of bigotry and injustice. And we shall overcome." No other President has said words like those. Having said them to us, no one of us in this living America will ever be the same.

He sought the elimination of poverty and ignorance from sections of our Nation.

He sought the building of a great society for all America.

He sought to accomplish, through every possible avenue, peace on earth.

We mourn—and yet we rejoice—for Lyndon Baines Johnson was triumphant in the eyes of those who shared the drama of his vision.

Other Presidents had dreams and aspira-

tions which momentarily seemed lost in defeat.

Abraham Lincoln dared to believe in a viable citizenship for the enslaved.

Woodrow Wilson envisioned nations banded together in a quest for peace; he was scorned by his own countrymen.

Always there are those who would doubt, deny, or diminish. We have seen and heard indications that the great society is no longer viable.

The great society is no tangible, physical institution which can be closed down overnight. It exists in the hearts of us all—never to be forgotten. Like a seed which germinates to full fruition, the great society will continue its undying influence.

Some have said his was an impossible dream, but "he fought for the right—without question or cause—to right the unrightable wrong."

These words well could have been written for him,

"I know that if I'll only be true to this glorious quest

That my heart will be peaceful and calm when I'm laid to my rest

And the world will be better for this

That one man, scorned and covered with scars,

Still strove with his last ounce of courage To reach the unreachable star."

We mortals say in the words of the poet—"Mr. President, 'approach thy grave like one who wraps the draperies of his couch about him and lies down to pleasant dreams.'"

For now, Lyndon Baines Johnson has gone to "join that innumerable caravan that moves to that mysterious realm."

An immortal voice must be saying, "well done thou good and faithful servant. Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

Farewell, great spirit! Lyndon Baines Johnson now belongs to the ages.

TRANSLATORS

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to amend section 318 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. Its purpose is to enable the Federal Communications Commission to authorize translator broadcast stations to originate limited amounts of local programming and commercials and to authorize FM radio broadcast translator stations to operate unattended in the same manner as is now permitted for television broadcast translator stations.

Translators were conceived as simple, inexpensive devices which would serve to provide small communities with TV and FM radio programming. Financial rewards for installation and operation of this equipment is modest at best. Population in areas served by translators is sparse and all the operator is permitted to transmit is the program material that his translator has picked up. He cannot originate any local programs nor can he run commercials. This service, so much appreciated by small remote communities must depend on public generosity for its support.

FM radio suffers from an additional handicap under existing statutes. The

FM translator, frequently installed on a remote mountain top, cannot be operated remotely, unattended. Keeping an operator at the translator site during operating hours is prohibitively expensive.

Translators offer great promise for rural America if their functions can be expanded even to a limited extent. This can be achieved through amendment of the statute. This legislation will permit the FCC to revise its rules to allow remote operation of FM equipment, limited local programming and the transmission of commercial material. I would welcome support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of my bill in its entirety at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. —

A bill to amend section 318 of the Communications Act of 1934

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That clause (3) of the first proviso of section 318 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 318) is amended—

(1) by striking out "solely" and inserting in lieu thereof "primarily", and

(2) by striking out "television".

THE MONETARY IMPLICATION OF THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, an article in today's Wall Street Journal, which we include hereinbelow and ask unanimous consent to be inserted, serves as only a vague outline of one of the most serious problems facing our Nation. The foreign policy implications of the energy crisis have been very carefully documented in a report from Congressman CULVER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Foreign Affairs Committee. What would be equally important is a report on the monetary and balance-of-payments implications of the same energy crisis and particularly as it involves the problem described in the Wall Street Journal article.

The buffeting the dollar received in the shifts of reserves, which include, as the article indicates, a sizable portion of Arabian and Middle East holdings, while disturbing in its implications for the present, is fraught with panic in terms of the future projections of the increased cost of oil in the Middle East together with the probable increases of imports between now and 1980. It appears predictable that the same nations which are already a disrupting element in the \$80 billion ocean of reserves will increase to a figure in excess of \$100 billion by 1980. This represents a force which could bring down any currency, including the dollar, which shows any signs of weakening in the international monetary system. The knowledge of this fact and that this knowledge is reasonably available to any inquiring and interested mind should suggest not only the scope of the problem

but as well the challenge of finding some answer for this problem.

It is additionally important to question the alternatives. One of them quite obviously would be a restriction of production. However, since the available alternative sources of oil are not at all evident, this is a threat to present levels of economic activities in the industrialized countries, especially here in America. Another alternative lies in encouraging a volume of investment by the Arabian countries which would suggest an immense input of assistance, not presently visible, for the Arabian money managers—assistance in assessing the quality of investment and the requirements of a presently nonexistent policy which such investment would serve. It is rather ironic that we in the United States who stand in the eye of this monetary storm are at the present time in such poor stance to work cooperatively and intelligently with these oil-producing countries. We should help find a use of the Middle East oil fund which will be constructive rather than contributing to the turmoil described in today's Wall Street Journal article. The complete contents of the article are included below and we believe it would be of interest to the Members to read carefully this report and think about it in relation to the points we have made:

MIDDLE EAST OIL FUNDS PLAY AN INCREASING ROLE IN MONETARY TURMOIL—DESPITE EARLIER ASSURANCES, ARABS HELPED SINK DOLLAR; IRAQI AIDE: "WE PROFITED"—"HOW CAN YOU BLAME THEM?"

(By Charles N. Stabler and Ray Vicker)

The prospects for any lasting stability in the world's monetary system seem dubious indeed. And a major reason is the role played by Middle Eastern nations in the turmoil in gold and foreign-exchange markets.

This is the gloomy conclusion of some international economists and other analysts, who have watched with alarm as oil money flooded first into Swiss francs, then into German marks and now into gold. How much of this volatile money is involved in the current crisis can't be determined, but, whatever it is, the volume is bound to rise in future years. This means that a major and growing source of instability is being added to an international monetary system already tottering under massive money flows from international corporations and speculators. And, most analysts agree, there isn't much if anything, that can be done about it.

"The problem poses nearly impossible dilemmas," says Walter J. Levy, a New York petroleum-industry consultant. Any way you try to sterilize the money (from oil sales or put rules on (the oil nations') use of these funds will just mean that they won't increase production" to meet the world's growing energy needs.

OIL ON TROUBLED WATERS

The Middle Eastern threat to the world's monetary system had been anticipated by many analysts. But prior to the recent flare-up of money troubles and the devaluation of the dollar Arab leaders had been making soothing statements. They would not, they said, use their funds to disturb the monetary system any more than they would use them for political pressures in the turbulent Middle East.

Just days before the flare-up, for example, Anwar Ali, the governor of Saudi Arabia's monetary agency, said, "We realize it is to our advantage to handle our surplus funds in a manner that doesn't disrupt the system.

Stability is as important to us as it is to the Western world."

But with the first breath of doubt over the dollar, official agencies of the oil states took steps to protect themselves, some of them now confirm. And there seems little doubt that their sales of threatened dollars helped bring that currency down, just as their purchases of German marks, Swiss francs and gold are driving those prices up.

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

"Who can blame them?" a New York banker asks with a sigh. "The head of an Arabian central (government) bank is in the same position as the treasurer of a multinational company, only worse. If the Arab gets caught in a devaluation, they cut off his head."

In London, an official of a major American bank says: "It's common knowledge around the London money market that a considerable volume of Middle Eastern money was getting out of the dollar in the recent monetary crisis. It probably will go back into dollars before long, until the next money crisis."

Like international money managers everywhere, most Arab officials are closemouthed about their operations. But some are willing to talk.

"We profited from the devaluation of the dollar," an Iraqi government official says in Baghdad. In Kuwait, which reportedly threw hundreds of millions of dollars on the market in the days leading up to devaluation, a government agency now says: "Precautions had been taken in anticipation of possible devaluation." Similar reports come from Jeddah in Saudi Arabia. In Tripoli, a Libyan source says, "We have been protecting ourselves."

THE ART OF SELF-PROTECTION

In foreign-exchange trading, protection means cutting the risk of loss caused by a reduction in the value of foreign funds held mostly dollars. When the dollar appears weak, these assets are exchanged for stronger currencies, such as the Swiss franc or mark. Then, if devaluation occurs, the upward revaluation of the strong currencies results in a profit. This profit affects the loss on dollars still on hand or on those sold earlier at low prices.

Kuwait, for example, has the equivalent of \$2.5 billion in officially held foreign-exchange assets. But, according to the finance ministry, only about \$300 million was "fully exposed" to devaluation of the dollar.

Reserves of Middle East nations are held as deposits with commercial banks, in Eurodollar investments, in gold and in financial instruments of various governments and agencies. Because the U.S. has frowned upon central-bank investments in Eurodollars—that is, dollars on deposit abroad—big European central banks have all but withdrawn from this market. But central banks of smaller nations have taken their places.

One major American bank recently made a confidential survey of the Eurodollar market. It concluded that as much as \$15 billion of the \$80 billion total outstanding had come from central banks. A little under half that total may be from Middle Eastern and North African countries, one official of this bank says.

Money in the Eurodollar market may be transferred fast into a strong currency in any money crisis. Because any such money goes through commercial banks, it is almost impossible for any outsider to evaluate totals. A Middle Eastern nation, for instance, may have funds with a dozen different banks from First National City Bank to Union Bank of Switzerland in Zurich and from Bank of America to Deutsche Bank in Frankfurt.

If there is any dollar dumping, a foreign-exchange dealer may not know the source of it; he is usually dealing with commercial banks. Incoming dollars may be received by the dealer as if they were holdings of the banks rather than of their clients. Moreover,

banks, mindful of the huge amounts of business that may be coming their way in the future from the Mideast, fear being connected in any way with discussions of customer habits and inclinations.

When one London branch of an American bank is asked for information, a spokesman pleads, "Don't even call us a New York bank. Say we are in Philadelphia." Then he relents to add: "All right, make it New York, but please don't call us a big New York bank."

Central-bank holdings, of course, represent only a part of the money in the Mideast. There are substantial private holdings in the Persian Gulf, in major Saudi Arabian cities and in Lebanon. One estimate, made by the Financial Times of London, places Kuwait's total foreign holdings at about \$6.6 billion, for instance.

Middle Eastern money is of special significance because that area can claim to be the world's fastest-growing store of capital. And the outlook for further gains in revenues from oil is staggering.

Economists at New York's Chase Manhattan Bank estimate that crude-oil production from the Middle East will double by 1985, rising to 40 million barrels a day, says John D. Emerson, a bank vice president. Saudi Arabia, probably destined to be the world's largest producer of oil, received about \$13 billion in oil revenue between 1960 and 1972. During the next 13 years, from 1973 through 1985, "a conservative estimate of Saudi Arabian receipts from oil is \$150 billion," Mr. Emerson says.

PROBLEM: HOW TO SPEND MONEY

Add in Kuwait and the Persian Gulf states including Abu Dhabi and Dubai, and expected oil revenues would rise from \$27 billion during the last 12 years to \$227 billion this year through 1985, Mr. Emerson calculates.

Some of the revenue being collected by these Middle Eastern oil nations can be spent, of course, on domestic economic development. But Mr. Emerson says, "There are limits to the rate at which a country with a small, poorly educated population can spend money."

If one assumes that these countries can spend, say, 50% of their annual oil income on economic development and investment, their reserves of gold and foreign exchange will rise to well over \$100 billion in 1985.

"Entire world reserves currently amount to \$150 billion," Mr. Emerson says. He adds that he isn't trying to make an accurate prediction of how much Middle Eastern gold and foreign-exchange reserves will actually amount to but is "only trying to show you the extent to which their power and influence in the world of finance will grow."

And political influence will grow, too, some analysts fear. Already, Japan, which is even more dependent on Middle Eastern oil than the U.S. or Europe, "apparently feels it has to be very cognizant of Arab feelings when its delegates vote in the United Nations," one economist says in New York.

Some efforts are already underway to reduce the world's dependence on the Middle East for oil or somehow corral the financial and political problems this reliance brings. One idea: The U.S. could improve its bargaining position with the Middle East by building enough mammoth tanks or other facilities to store a two-year supply of fuel. The cost of this move would add an estimated 40 cents a barrel to the present \$3.50-a-barrel price of oil. Thus, although expensive, the move would allow more effective bargaining on future supplies from Arab countries and would provide time for the development of other energy sources.

More immediately, private and official institutions in the West are trying to tap the Middle Eastern money pool for investments. This move is in line with Arab desires and would remove some capital from the "hot-

money" flows that periodically disrupt foreign-exchange markets. However, for various political and economic reasons on both sides, prospects are slim for sopping up a substantial amount of oil money in this way.

WORLD BANK AND THE ARABS

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) sees the Arab nations as a source of funds for relending to other nations. Robert McNamara, who heads the bank, recently visited several Arab nations to make such a pitch.

Venezuela is urging its partners in the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) to join in creating an OPEC bank. "The time has arrived for OPEC members to have a bank of their own for financing economic and oil development in their respective countries," says Hugo Perez la Salva, Venezuela's minister of hydrocarbons.

Bank of America and private Middle East investors have set up the Bank of Credit and Commerce-International in Luxembourg. International Maritime Banking of London has opened a Beirut office to cover the Middle East. Britain's National Westminster Bank recently opened an outlet in Bahrain, in the Persian Gulf, to cover the area. Morgan Guaranty has purchased an interest in a Beirut bank. The second-largest bank in Beirut is Moscow Narodny Bank, the Soviet Union's bid for garnering some of the financial traffic in the Middle East.

In Beirut, a key Mideast banking center, 37 of the country's 73 banks are foreign-owned or affiliated, with several big American banks represented.

Union de Banques Arabes et Francaises—a consortium established with Credit Lyonnais, Paris, and 22 leading Arab banks—has established branches in London and Rome. Shortly it plans to open another in Frankfurt. Recently, this consortium extended a \$10 million medium-term loan to the Brazilian state of Rio de Janeiro for highway construction. This was a typical type of deal for putting some of the Mideast money to work. Banque Franco-Arabe—a consortium of Societe Generale of Paris and several private banks in the Persian Gulf—is promoting trade between Europe and the Mideast.

This month another consortium, Compagnie Arabe et Internationale d'Investissement, was formed at Luxembourg, with European and Arab banks as members. Its prospectus says it intends to "contribute to the solving of financial and investment problems which, on account of their new size, will require broad, diversified and powerful international associations."

ABHORRENT AND CONTINUING PERSECUTION OF JEWS IN IRAQ AND SYRIA

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a concurrent resolution, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the treatment of Jews in Iraq and Syria, which is identical to the resolution introduced last week by my colleague, EDWARD L. KOCH, of New York.

It is shocking that citizens of these two countries should be denied basic human rights simply because they are Jews.

The rulers of these two countries seem determined not only to wipe Israel from the map, but to wage a domestic campaign, the only effect of which would be

virtual extermination of their own citizens who cling to their Jewish faith.

My resolution, which I hope all of our colleagues will join with me in supporting, calls for the President of the United States to condemn the anti-Semitic policies of those governments; and that the Attorney General should use his authority to make easier emigration of Jewish citizens of those countries to the United States.

I believe that passage of this resolution, and action by the Federal authorities called for in it, would serve notice that we will not complacently sit by while this persecution of our Jewish brethren takes place.

EULOGY OF THE LATE MICHAEL J. LYDEN, PRESIDENT EMERITUS OF THE OHIO AFL-CIO

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1973, Mr. Michael J. Lyden, first president emeritus of the Ohio AFL-CIO, died at the age of 93. With his passing, the city of Youngstown lost a good citizen, organized labor lost an outstanding leader, and I lost a cherished friend.

Mike Lyden was an Irish immigrant. Shortly after he came to America, he began working as a streetcar operator. He immediately joined the Amalgamated Street, Railway, and Motor Coach Employees Union. During the 1920's and early 1930's, Mike Lyden was a leader in the United Labor Congress of Mahoning County. In 1935, he was elected President of the old Ohio State Federation of Labor, and was unanimously reelected to that office every 2 years for more than 20 years. When the Ohio State Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations merged into the AFL-CIO, Mike Lyden was chosen as its first president. He retired from that post in 1960.

I have known Michael J. Lyden for a long time. In fact, I went to school with his twin sons, James and John. Later on when I was a member of the Ohio State Senate, I had the opportunity to work closely with him on labor problems. But, he was more than a labor leader; he was a kind and compassionate man. He will be sorely missed by his family, friends, and everyone who knew him.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 14, 1973, the Youngstown Vindicator published an editorial on Michael J. Lyden which I would like to insert in the RECORD at this time:

MICHAEL J. LYDEN, GOOD CITIZEN

Union labor in the Youngstown district and Ohio loses an important figure in the death of Michael J. Lyden who was the first president of the Ohio AFL-CIO and later became its president emeritus.

During the 1920s and 1930s, Mr. Lyden was a leader in the United Labor Congress of Mahoning County, the central labor body here which preceded the formation of the

Committee on Industrial Organizations and continued to function for American Federation of Labor unions after the CIO's formation.

Mr. Lyden was president of the Ohio Federation of Labor when in the late 1950s it finally merged with the CIO to form the Ohio AFL-CIO Council of which he became president.

Youngstowners also will remember Mr. Lyden as a street car conductor and later a bus driver with a friendly word for everyone and a cheerful countenance. He early gained notice as an orator of considerable distinction.

Although a vigorous union leader, Mr. Lyden by no means limited his regard and interest, but had many friends in business and other lines of endeavor. Moreover, he put his citizenship first and often was a peacemaker in the period of extreme contention over unionization of workers in the 1930s.

Unionization was a fundamental in Mr. Lyden's life but he never allowed it to obscure the demands of good citizenship and regard for others. Mr. Lyden will always be remembered as a good citizen.

THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday, February 24, marked the 55th anniversary of Estonian Independence. Estonia is a country in Eastern Europe, and it is the smallest of the Baltic States. The Estonians are a brave and fierce people who have always had to fight against terrible odds to maintain their homeland. They are right now involved in a struggle to be free, and I want to take this opportunity to say that I support their efforts.

The Estonians have always been a hard working people who wanted merely to live in dignity and have rights over their own land. Yet, they have suffered a history of aggression and subjugation from all sides. When in 1918 they had an opportunity to govern themselves once again, they seized upon the chance. Their Constitution was a mature example of democracy and a republican form of government. The Estonians emphasized human rights and dignity. Remembering their own subjugation, they allowed their minorities to use their own language in the courts. As a result of her efforts, Estonia was recognized as a nation by the world community, and she quickly became a spokesman for the small democratic states. The work of her people in staffing the League of Nations Secretariat is well known.

Estonia was not allowed to enjoy her freedom for long, however. Under a secret agreement Nazi Germany and Russia divided Eastern Europe, and Estonia was given to Russia. In less than a year, tiny Estonia was completely under Soviet domination. For her people began a reign of terror, imprisonments, and mass deportations which depleted the population by 10 percent. The Estonians today still suffer under Soviet rule, and their fierce

independent nature has caused the russification of their nation to be all the more strict.

Mr. Speaker, we as a nation have never recognized the Soviet takeover of Estonia. Therefore, I urge that our country continue to do all it can to work for the independence of Estonia. Her people are brave, and their struggle for the freedom we so often take for granted should not go unnoticed by the outside world. I certainly pledge to all of Estonian descent in my district that I will work for the independence of their homeland.

ELIMINATING "CATCH 22" FROM THE LAST SOCIAL SECURITY HIKE

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the social security system in this country has stood the test of time since its inception during the New Deal. Today, American life would be disrupted beyond belief if there were negative tinkering with this system. As time has gone on, in fact, we have grown increasingly to depend upon this vast operation to cure a variety of social ills.

As inflation has grown and eaten away at fixed income of the elderly, our natural response was to increase social security benefits going to the 25 million-plus elderly. During the last Congress, heeding their anguished collective cry, the Congress enacted a 20-percent increase in social security to bring some balance between their income and galloping prices.

Our intent was good, and I believe Congress did what should have been done. However, in the process, we forgot that every action has a reaction. In this case, while seeking to aid the elderly, we created a negative situation for others in American society intimately involved in a variety of Government undertakings.

Many other forms of Federal benefits use "income" as criteria for participations. Thousands of social security recipients are either not receiving the full benefit of the 20-percent social security increase, due to their participation in other Federal assistance programs, or their Federal benefits are being penalized as a result of the increase.

Major areas in which social security recipients stand to lose are: veterans pensions and benefits; federally assisted welfare payments, such as old-age assistance, food stamps, low-rent housing, and medicaid.

In some known cases, for example, veterans have found their pension reduced, and in some cases totally eliminated, because the increase has to be counted as income for the purposes of determining pension eligibility. The same holds true for other Federal benefits programs which use income as a criterion for participation.

So it seems that inadvertently, when

enacting the recent 20-percent social security increase, Congress gave with one hand and took from some with the other. The social security increase must stand by all means. But the oversight harming innocent people must be immediately corrected.

Mr. Speaker, the only way this can be accomplished is through corrective legislation, which I am joining in sponsoring. This comprehensive measure is being introduced to prevent the 20-percent social security increase from being counted as part of an individual's income for purposes of participating in Federal programs and to insure that all social security recipients will receive the full benefit of the increase. It covers all of the areas I have already referred to. As such, it qualifies as the most comprehensive of all the measures offered on this subject so far.

It is worth noting that the bill has broad bipartisan support, commanding support and sponsorship from both sides of the aisle and all elements of the political spectrum.

NIXON'S NEW BUDGET IS WRONG IN FAILING TO DISTINGUISH GOALS

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, a debate which began several years ago has come to a full head in the 93d Congress, and that is the constitutional prerogative of the Congress to maintain power of the purse and the attempts by the executive branch to usurp that power.

The legislative priorities established by the Congress have been rearranged by the executive branch. The legislative branch, being more aware of, and closer to, the needs of the people is challenging this attempt at executive supremacy.

Prof. Nasrollah S. Fatemi of Fairleigh Dickinson University wrote an article on this matter, which appeared recently in the Bergen, N.J., Record. He quite appropriately points out the divisive factors inherent in this problem, as well as the causes, nature and tragic consequences of this constitutional crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call this timely and informative article to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows.

[From the Bergen (N.J.) Record,
Feb. 20, 1973]

NIXON'S NEW BUDGET IS WRONG IN FAILING TO DISTINGUISH GOALS

(By Nasrollah S. Fatemi)

For some time there has been a serious controversy between President Nixon and the Congress on the question of the power of the purse. Unfortunately, neither congressional nor White House spokesmen have tried to present to the public the causes, the nature, the tragic consequences of this constitutional crisis.

The Administration has tried to portray Congress as the irresponsible big spender. Congress, not possessing the propaganda facilities of the Administration, has not been able to defend itself against these charges;

but a study of the records shows that many times Congress has sought to be more responsible and more thrifty than the Administration.

For example, some congressional leaders contend that the Administrations proposed 1974 budget of \$268 billion should be scrutinized very carefully and possibly reduced to \$250 billion. They are well aware that the federal budget has tripled since 1960, and that during the last four years the budget deficit has totaled \$100 billion and the deficit for the current year may be close to \$20 billion. Furthermore, both Congress and President Nixon have made it clear that they are against any tax increase and they will do everything possible to keep the budget as low as possible. Then, one wonders, what is the reason for the present crisis?

1. President Nixon's bid for executive supremacy.

2. The difference between the priorities of the Congress and the Administration.

MORE GUNS, LESS BUTTER

Administration's spokesmen before the House Appropriations Committee stated that even if Congress accepted President Nixon's ceiling or reduced it, but appropriated differently than the Administration suggested, they could not assure the Congress that Mr. Nixon would implement the budget.

As to priorities, the Johnson and the first Nixon administration believed in both guns and butter; but the second Nixon administration has increased appropriations for guns and has cut vital domestic programs.

This sudden shift, without consultation with Congress, has sharpened the debate on our purposes and priorities. Many congressmen believe that today's society should have three goals, and that the national budget should be arranged accordingly.

The first national purpose should be optimum real economic growth. This clearly defined in the Employment Act of 1946 means full employment, fair and equitable taxes, and training and opportunity for every American who has a desire to work and live a decent life.

The second national purpose is to supply our domestic needs as well as our defense requirements. Because of our involvement in the cold war and the Vietnam war, we have neglected during the last two decades many of our domestic needs.

The third goal is elimination of public poverty—shortcomings in public health, housing, education, mass transportation, care centers, antipollution measures, conservation, and the development of our natural resources.

The budget now before Congress hardly meets the national priorities. The request for the defense budget is the highest since the end of the Second World War. The \$20-billion annual cost of the Vietnam war has disappeared and the Administration is asking for another \$5 billion.

The lamentable confusion in the President's budget is its failure to distinguish the goals of the economic system and to plan toward their attainment.

The stability, nobility, and greatness of a nation depend on domestic happiness, harmony, and economic balance among all the sectors of private and public spending and the distribution of national wealth on the basis of priorities and economic justice.

PANAMA CANAL ZONE

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to my colleagues' special attention

the extremely important remarks made by Mrs. SULLIVAN, chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which appeared in the RECORD of Tuesday, February 27.

As ranking Republican member on the Panama Canal Subcommittee, I want to acknowledge the lead which Mrs. SULLIVAN has taken in the vital matter of retaining U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone. That Mrs. SULLIVAN, as chairman of our full committee, has seen fit to raise and champion this issue gives me great hope that the entire Congress may stand united on this question so central to our national security.

Mr. Speaker, the coming months are going to see challenges to the Congress and to the United States over our desire and ability to maintain control over this crucial area. I hope that each of my colleagues will read Chairman SULLIVAN's remarks and the resolution which they preface. They provide an excellent primer to the Canal question, and I want to thank Mrs. SULLIVAN for her astute leadership and concern with this problem so vital to our future as a free Nation.

NICOLAUS COPERNICUS

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have an honor shared by several others of my colleagues in that we represent districts which have a large percentage of citizens of Polish descent. It is my privilege today to talk about a man who is being remembered by Polish-Americans as well as Poles everywhere.

I speak of Nicolaus Copernicus, the Polish astronomer who changed our thinking about the universe and paved the way for the exploration of outer space. This year marks the 500th anniversary of his birth in Torun, Poland, on February 19, 1473. Throughout America celebrations are taking place to honor the memory of this great man. Plans are under way to have the President designate the week of April 23 as "Nicolaus Copernicus Week" during which a commemorative stamp will be issued in his honor.

Copernicus was a well educated man having spent several years in the study of religion, medicine, law, and astronomy. As canon of Frauenburg and also as an assistant to his uncle, the bishop of Ermeland, Copernicus made great and unselfish use of his religious and medical training among the poor. He was also known for his work as a mapmaker and his work on a coinage reform system. His secret love, however, was astronomy.

As he delved into this subject, he came to have doubts about the theories of Ptolemy which had been the basic thinking in astronomy for over 1,300 years. Ptolemy believed that the earth was the immovable center of the universe around which the sun and planets revolved. Copernicus found discrepancies in this theory, however; and he began doing research among the ancient Greek writings

as well as making his own observations. He finally came to the conclusion that the earth rotated daily on its own axis, and it also orbited around the sun. His theory astounded the scholars of the day, and he was ridiculed. His manuscript was not even published until shortly before his death. But the genius and persistence of Copernicus had laid the groundwork for those to follow, such as Sir Isaac Newton, Galileo, and Kepler.

Copernicus was truly the Father of Modern Astronomy, and he was a Pole. I join my friends of Polish ancestry in commemorating the birth of this great man. They truly have a forefather in whom they can be very proud.

PERSPECTIVES OF THE POET

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, in times of great turmoil we often are so caught up in the affairs of government and the pressing details of everyday life that we fail to see in its broadest perspective much of what is happening.

Perspective of ordinary men is distorted by the immediacy of events, by the emotions of the moment. Often, more is perceived with the passage of time or distance. The wisdom we associate with age is not so much the product of a superior intellect or the mere accumulation of knowledge as it is with the arrangement of events in their proper perspective. What passes for wisdom is as often as not the simple arrangement of things as they really were with the confusing chaff of trivia and emotion blown away.

Perhaps next best to that wisdom, which seldom accompanies anything but age, is the insights and rhythms struck by the poet. I recently came upon some verse of a poet, one of my constituents, Barry John Wiseman. Author Wiseman considered moments of some of our recent Presidents and in a series of four poems memorialized their deeds. The works are dedicated to Presidents Johnson, Truman, and Nixon.

With the thought that it may be some time before we have revealed to us the wisdom of the ages and the perspective it brings, I ask that some of the verse and the perspectives of Poet Wiseman be spread on the RECORD at this point for the insights it may reveal to us, as follows:

JANUARY 23, 1973.

ON A JOURNEY TO PEACE

(Dedicated to the memory of L.B.J.)

My father, My father
Where has thou gone?
You left us, you left us,
All alone.
But we're not alone.
Your Greatness,
Your Kindness,
Has shown you're on another mission.
Another Mission,
A Man of Wisdom,
A Man of Vision,
Has left us a New Dimension.
A man who grew into a Giant
Who cast his Shadow!

DECEMBER 26, 1972.

JUST PASSING BY

(Dedicated to the memory of Harry Truman)

I'm a Man of the Earth,
A man of the Sky,
I'm a Man of the People,
Just passing by.
But I wouldn't be gone,
I'll just return to the Earth,
As a tree has grown,
A tree has died,
This tree has only
Matured into the Sky.
So please be Wise,
Do you understand that
that I'm just passing by?

JANUARY 25, 1973.

A WORLD FULL OF PEACE

(Dedicated to President Richard M. Nixon and Dr. Henry Kissinger)

There's Peace For the World,
We Want Peace for the World
to bring Happiness to All.
Peace for our children,
And the Children of the World.
Peace for People who have
waited so long.
Peace for People who
have struggled so hard.
Peace for the Poor
who want nothing more,
than to be mighty and strong,
so there be no more wrongs!
Yes there's Peace,
Thank the Lord,
People of the World,
the President has made Peace.
Yes We Want Peace on Earth
nothing but more.
For Mankind must not do, any more wrongs!
The President Made Peace for People of All,
Yes there's Peace for the World
And A World Full of Peace!

JANUARY 28, 1967.

THE GREAT SOCIETY

(Dedicated to President Lyndon Baines Johnson—Great Society)

This is the land of the Great Society,
where everybody is so free,
can't you see, what I mean.
This is the daring triumph Great Society,
just made for you and me.
Where we all work in harmony
and share in our prosperity,
In peace and tranquillity,
here in the land of fertility.
That's the Great Society, in Our open Society,
where everyone loves everybody everyday,
that's the quality of equality.
In the Land of the Great Society,
where we all help one another to discover,
to learn from each other,
So we can now earn something in this Society,
In the Land of the Great Society.
Let us not forget our Great Society,
for Brotherhood and Peace across this land.
That's the Great Society to man, in Our open
Society.
This Is The Great Society, made just for you
and me!

CARL SCHURZ ANNIVERSARY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Friday, March 2, is the 144th anniversary of the birth of Carl Schurz, Senator from Missouri, Union brigadier general, Secre-

tary of the Interior, and Ambassador to Spain.

Carl Schurz was born and educated in Germany and received his doctorate from the University of Bonn in 1847.

In 1848, Schurz became involved through his gift of oratory in the German revolutionary movement. It was at this time that many Germans, regarding the United States as a model for establishing democratic institutions in Germany, joined in revolt against oppressive Prussian monarchy.

Royalist troops eventually crushed the revolutionary army, and, as one of the leaders of the uprising, Carl Schurz found his own life in jeopardy. He was forced to flee to Switzerland. Schurz, however, risked his newly found safety in a daring escapade to rescue his former professor, Gottfried Kinkel, who had also been deeply engaged in the attempt to bring democracy to Germany.

Kinkel had been sentenced to life imprisonment in a Berlin jail. Though himself on the proscribed list, Carl Schurz reentered Germany and for 9 months planned the liberation of his former teacher. Both men finally reached England, and Schurz' unselfish heroism was crowned with success.

In 1849, knowing he had no future under the tyranny in his homeland, Carl Schurz moved to the United States. Within 5 years, he had achieved a sufficient mastery of English to campaign for Lieutenant Governor of Wisconsin, losing by only 107 votes. Schurz then became very active in the 1860 presidential campaign and worked vigorously for Abraham Lincoln in the Midwest.

Out of gratitude for his efforts, Lincoln, on becoming President, appointed Schurz U.S. Ambassador to Spain. Schurz, however, bored by the largely ceremonial post, returned to the United States after only 6 months and requested a part in the winning of the Civil War. Highly regarded by his troops for his personal courage, Brigadier General Schurz led several major campaigns. His capable leadership won him the respect of Sherman, Hancock, and others who ranked among the best of the northern generals.

Around the end of the Civil War, Schurz dedicated himself to journalism as Washington correspondent for Horace Greeley's New York Tribune and as editor-in-chief of the Detroit Post. During this time, Schurz moved from Detroit to St. Louis where he again went into politics and became a Senator from Missouri in 1869. Schurz remained a Senator for one term and would pack the galleries of the Senate with his incessant attacks on corruption in Government.

In 1877, under the Hayes administration, he became Secretary of the Interior. As Secretary, he installed the merit system in the civil service, was a pioneer in the conservation of natural resources, and kept the War Department from taking over Interior's affairs because of the Custer massacre.

Throughout his long and varied public career, Carl Schurz had an unassailable reputation for personal integrity. A perceptive man for his time, he dedicated himself to such causes as a low tariff, free trade, sound money, justice for the

Indian, and around the turn of the century, he came out vociferously against American imperialism.

Mr. Speaker, in Chicago we have honored Carl Schurz by dedicating a high school to his memory. Carl Schurz High School is located in the 11th district, which I am proud to represent, and in the years 1939-41, I taught at this fine educational institution. I send my greetings to J. P. Maloney, principal of Schurz High School, and to all the students, faculty, and staff at the school.

It is a privilege for me to join the residents of German descent in the 11th district, in the city of Chicago, and across the country as they commemorate the birth of this distinguished statesman, and his amazingly productive record of contributions to this Nation of Emigrants.

JOE MOLONY REMEMBERS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, although he has been away from our city for the past 7 years, Buffalonians know well of Joseph P. Molony, one of the best labor leaders of our time.

I have known Joe personally for some 30 years, during most of which time he was a leader of the United Steelworkers of America with headquarters in Buffalo. It was in 1965 that he was picked by union members to be their national vice president with headquarters in Pittsburgh.

Joe is about to retire under his union's mandatory age rule. His has been a career that bridges the lean and the improved days for the steelworkers.

A Pittsburgh bureau writer for the Wall Street Journal has put together an excellent story on Joe Molony which I call to the attention of my colleagues. The kudos it contains could not be more fitting, as anyone who knows Joe personally—or professionally—will immediately agree.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include the text of the Journal's excellent profile:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 28, 1973]

JOE MOLONY REMEMBERS THE PICKET LINES

(By Michael K. Drapkin)

Samuel Gompers may well have enunciated the labor movement's guiding principle—"More"—but for 36 years Joseph P. Molony of the Steelworkers, an Irishman of impish wit and glib tongue, has surely helped refine it.

Once, during the bitter copper strike of 1967-68, a company negotiator suggested he might add a few cents to the wage offer—if only Mr. Molony could get the miners to eat their lunches underground.

"And what'll you be givin' me," the union man replied in his soft, measured brogue, "if I can get 'em to live underground?"

For Joseph Molony, who grew up in the famine-ridden Ireland of a half-century ago, and who helped organize the Steelworkers in the face of company police atop the mills with machine guns, "More" has never been defined as money alone.

First as an organizer, then as district director and finally, for the past eight years, as vice president of the United Steelworkers of America, Joe Molony has always stressed the other concerns of his members—the working man's status as a man, the safety of his work place, the ability to buy a decent home and to send his kids to college.

Now, after years of speaking with great authority in the inner councils of the nation's second-largest industrial union, Mr. Molony reaches the mandatory retirement age of 65. Pausing over a cup of coffee at a Pittsburgh hotel the other day, he could sum up his views of the labor movement—past, present and future—very simply as "the last, best refuge of the poor."

That's not a fashionable view today, when much of the public castigates organized labor for a range of real or fancied ills. The unions often are seen as the epitome of the greed that fuels inflation, as bastions of racism and corruption, as harboring a public-betrayed attitude, and for their authoritarian internal rule.

THE WAY IT USED TO BE

But those weren't the concerns of Joseph Molony and his compatriots of four decades ago. They worried, instead, about the basic wage rate in the unorganized steel industry—47 cents an hour—and the unceasing hate with which management greeted the Steelworkers Organizing Committee (SWOC), headed by Philip Murray, an organizer on loan from John L. Lewis and his United Mine Workers.

"At first the issue was recognition, not money," Mr. Molony recalls of those days in the 1930s. Franklin Roosevelt and the National Labor Relations Board helped settle that issue. "We probably all would have failed but for F. D. R. and the Board," said Mr. Molony. Typically, he credits the late President, rather than his union's organizing efforts, for bringing "the industrialists to heel."

Progress was slow in steel, but then U.S. Steel Corp., the industry leader, stunned other companies by granting SWOC a contract in 1937. The rest of the steelmakers, known collectively as "Little Steel," took a strike for more than a year. SWOC failed to crack them then, but by 1942 all the big steel producers had recognized the union.

Mr. Murray sent Joe Molony to organize deck hands on the ore boats working the Great Lakes. Then when the USW was formed out of SWOC in 1942, Mr. Molony became its director in New York State, a post he held until 1965 when he teamed up with I. W. Abel, his friend and ally, to challenge the leadership of then USW President David J. McDonald.

PLAYED KEY ROLE

As a \$42,500-a-year vice president, Mr. Molony has been a perfect counterpoint to Mr. Abel, a skilled administrator and negotiator. It's been Mr. Molony and the excitement that his speeches can generate that Mr. Abel has called on to rally rank-and-filers to the union cause, be it approval of a dues increase or ratification of a hardwon contract.

Invariably, those speeches have a reminiscent tone, recounting past struggles and ultimate triumphs. Today Mr. Molony can speak of "deadly dull" days on the picket lines, but at a Steelworkers convention his tales of the same event sparkle with meaning and purpose.

It troubles Joseph Molony that so many people don't share his enthusiasm and, in fact, have a negative attitude toward organized labor. People think "we take a great glee in mucking up the system, that we have supreme power, that we use the strike weapon with abandon," he says. "Of course, none of that is so."

Rather, he says, there's the great faith on the part of most unionists in capitalism as a

system. "It's put more goods in the hands of more people than any other," he says. But it's the unions, he believes, who've made the system work. "Capitalism never was worth a damn, except to a handful of millionaires—until the unions came along."

To make the system work, it takes militancy and, yes, occasionally even a strike, Mr. Molony suggests. While there hasn't been a strike in the steel industry since the record 116-day walkout of 1959, Mr. Molony is wary of suggestions that the USW lay aside its chief economic weapon. "The right to abstain from work is something we can't surrender," he says resolutely.

NOT ORGANIZING TODAY

Such economic pressure has served well in the past, he says, and continues to be useful today. Thus as the nation turns from an industrial to a service economy, the labor movement should follow. "If I've a harsh word for labor today, it's not that it's cozying up to Nixon. After all, you've got to live with the people who are in power. It's that we aren't organizing fast enough." Only 25% of the nation's work force is unionized, he notes.

Thus, Mr. Molony applauds the efforts of militant young labor leaders like Victor Gotbaum of the Municipal Workers and Jerry Wurf of the Government Employees, who, he feels, are seeking the same goals he sought in those early days.

"They may be dealing with a new era, but they're asking the same questions we asked," he says.

Looking up from his cup of coffee, he waves his arm in a wide arc. "You can throw a stone from where we're sitting and hit people making lousy wages. These people need a union as badly as I needed one 36 years ago."

But it's a special kind of unionism he's calling for, a kind that believes strongly in the working man. Unions "have to be big and strong," he says, "and, above all, honest."

But they need another element as well. "You can hire lots of smart guys to run your union, but to do the job you've got to have compassion."

That's the kind of union man Joe Molony of the Steelworkers has been for more than four decades.

THE FIRST AMENDMENT: WHO HAS THE FINAL WORD?

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, among the many items of major concern before the 93d Congress is the matter of the newsman's privilege under the first amendment. As we all know, both the House and Senate Judiciary Committees are currently conducting hearings on legislation redefining the establishment of such a privilege. The conflict now raging between the claim of privilege by the free press and the claim of right for essential information by prosecutors raises the thorny question: In a collision between the prosecutors' rights and the press' privilege, who has the last word?

The most significant recent battle in this war resulted in the Branzburg against Hayes decision by the Supreme Court in June of 1972, in which the Court refused to make an exception for newsmen from the general obligation of all

citizens to appear before grand juries and answer questions presented them in that forum.

What this case and the resultant legislation has accomplished is to bring us to the ultimate test—quis custodiet ipsos custodes; who will watch the watchdog? A free press is considered by most to be a watchdog over all institutions, Government included, but we must ultimately consider whether we as a people are safer trusting the press with an absolute privilege rather than trusting the law enforcement agencies not to abuse a less than absolute privilege.

Looking at the Branzburg decision, we note the dissent by Mr. Justice Douglas in which he argued for an absolute right for a journalist not to appear before a grand jury at all, and if he agreed to appear voluntarily to respond only to those questions he, in his sole subjective judgment, felt were appropriate on first amendment grounds. Taking another approach was Mr. Justice Powell, who asserted in a concurring opinion that a case-by-case methodology could strike an appropriate balance between the freedom of the press and a citizen's obligation to give testimony when relevant to suspected criminal conduct.

For the majority, Mr. Justice White dismissed the broad brush advocated by Justice Douglas and he tempered the stand of Justice Powell, as presenting major practical and conceptual problems, and noted the Court's unwillingness to "embark the judiciary on a long and difficult journey to such an uncertain destination." We contend that the Court has not and should not avoid such "long and difficult" journeys in appropriate and necessary circumstances. We, nevertheless, find ourselves endorsing the majority's views that, in such an "uncertain" field, an appropriate self-restraint should be exercised by the courts in granting subpoenas on newsmen for grand jury activities.

We do believe, however, that the court should have appropriate guidelines in achieving this balance:

First. Newsmen, when subpoenaed, must make a solid case for a refusal to reveal the subject sources; and

Second. Prosecutors, when subpoenaing, must show both a solid case for the disclosure of the requested information and that no other source for obtaining the information is available.

In this way, the courts can insure that our law enforcement authorities do not abuse, and possibly ultimately destroy, the valuable function a free press can provide to our society. For, as noted in an editorial in the January 1973, issue of *Judicature*:

The courts and the press are partners in combating crime and in making democracy work. When the newsmen's leads uncover information important to the administration of justice, they should not want to withhold it; but if disclosing it would dry up the source of important additional information, law enforcement officers should not want it disclosed. Here is an area tailor-made for high-minded cooperation between the two. If trust and cooperation exist, there should be no problem. The problem arises when mutual trust and cooperation are less

than perfect and someone has to have the final word.

Our suggestion is that legislation should make it clear that the courts have the final word—guided by the restraints recited above as balancing the contending interests.

ST. MARON'S FEAST DAY MARKS DEDICATION OF NEW MARONITE CENTER IN YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 25, 1973, I had the honor and the pleasure of attending the St. Maron's Feast Day Banquet in Youngstown, Ohio.

This year the St. Maron's Feast Day had a special meaning for the Maronite community of the Mahoning Valley because it marked the dedication of the beautiful new Maronite Center located at 1555 South Meridian Road in Youngstown. Nearly 1,000 Maronite Rite Catholics—Catholics of Lebanese descent—gathered to dedicate the first phase of the "Center of Bet Moroon." A delegation of Maronite clergy, including most Reverend Francis M. Zayek, D.D., bishop of the St. Maron's diocese of Detroit, were in attendance.

Mr. Speaker, I had the distinct privilege of introducing the guest speaker for the occasion, a former colleague in the U.S. House of Representatives and now a distinguished Member of the U.S. Senate from South Dakota, the Honorable JAMES ABUREZK. JIM ABUREZK is a Maronite Catholic and the first American of Lebanese descent to be elected to the U.S. Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my sincere congratulations and best wishes to the St. Maron's Parish of Youngstown for the fulfillment of all their noble goals and prayers. I insert several documents pertaining to the St. Maron's Feast Day Dedication Banquet in the RECORD at this time:

ST. MARON'S DIOCESE OF DETROIT—
U.S.A.,

Detroit, Mich., February 8, 1973.

REV. PETER TAYAH AND PARISHIONERS OF ST. MARON CHURCH,
Youngstown, Ohio

DEAR FATHER TAYAH AND PARISHIONERS OF ST. MARON: It is with pleasure and pride that I will join you on the occasion of the dedication of your new "Center of Bet Moroon". Your unity, determination and generosity will lead you toward the achievement of your ideals, which could set an example to be followed by many of our Maronite communities in these United States.

You are to be commended for your decision to build a new church and facilities of first class, second to none. If only our Maronites will unite and set for themselves these same goals, our Diocese will not be hindered in its prosperity and progress.

It is not with words that anyone builds, but with deeds, generosity and sacrifice. This is what I will be witnessing on the Dedication Day and hope to always see the future in our parish of Youngstown, Ohio.

May the good Lord, through the intercession of St. Maron, our patron, bless you and your efforts that you may glorify and praise His Holy Name and uphold our Antiochene Maronite Rite and our beloved people.

With warm congratulations and prayerful good wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours in Christ

The Most Reverend FRANCIS M.

ZAYEK, S.T.D.,

Bishop of St. Maron Diocese, Detroit—
U.S.A.

HONORED GUESTS AND FRIENDS,

MY DEAR PEOPLE OF BET MOROON, tonight, the privilege of being the soul of this great Dedication, and your presence to share in this Agape of Love, make me realize the awesomeness of the hour. Time seems to suspend its course. Past and future meet the present. Generations of saints and heroes, multitudes of little ordinary people join us in praising the One who made all dreams become reality.

One of the great hours in the history of Bet Moroon!

Bet Moroon: a Name, a Palmares, a Chart of Life!

Like the Brethren of Antioch were called "Christians," the followers of St. Maron, staunch defenders of the Council of Chalcedon, were scornfully named Bet Moroon. For this name, three hundred and fifty martyrs gave up their lives in 517, ten thousand were massacred in 1860; and between these two immolations, the Maronite name has stood a symbol of fidelity and self sacrifice.

But we are not simply trying to evoke glorious moments of the past. Bet Moroon, for each Maronite, stands as a Chart of Life. This semitic expression tells of the openness, the hospitality, the willingness to serve and to suffer, that the Church itself, in the wake of Vatican II, wants to be. Bet Moroon translates to the best, the human and the social face, as well as the dynamic presence of the Church in the world. Bet Moroon suggests the people of Maron, as well as the place, the house, where these people live, suffer, pray and strive for the better.

Bet Moroon: a long history of glories . . . and miseries. From the highlands of Northern Syria in the Fifth Century, to the slopes of Mount Lebanon in the Tenth, to the Mahoning Valley in the nineties, to the gentle site where we stand now. From Saint Maron, to Patriarch Howayyek, principle maker of Lebanon, to Francis Zayek, protagonist of our Maronite awakening in this country. What a pilgrimage! Our semitic body must have kept the vigor of the original nomadic ancestor! "Nomadism," says T. E. Lawrence, "that most deep and biting social discipline," so desperately missing in our "relaxed" society.

Isalah the Prophet, singing the return from exile of the People of God; and return means our spiritual revival, could not find better than these words, "The Glory of the Lebanon shall be given to them." (35,2).

May the Glory of the Almighty inhabit our dwelling, and may you, Dear Friends and all you of Bet Moroon, be filled with His saintly joy!

Devotedly yours in Christ,

Reverend WADIH PETER TAYAH,

Pastor.

PROGRAM

Processional March, Joe Ranalli Orchestra.
National Anthem, Miss Helene Dohar.
Lebanon's National Anthem, The Moroon-singers.

Invocation, Very Rev. Seely Beggiani, Rector, Maronite Seminary, Washington, D.C.
Toastmaster, Dr. Elias T. Saadi, M.D., Chairman, Vice President, St. Maron's Parish Council.

Welcome, Rev. Wadiah P. Tayah, Ph.D., Pastor, St. Maron Parish, Youngstown, Ohio.

Remarks, Atty. Ronald G. Galip, President, St. Maron's Parish Council; Mayor Jack

Hunter, *City of Youngstown*; and Very Rev. Msgr. Peter A. Eid, *Former Pastor, St. Maron's Parish, Youngstown, Ohio*.

Message, Very Reverend Msgr. William A. Hughes, *Vicar General, Representing The Most Reverend James W. Malone, D.D., Ph.D., Bishop of Youngstown*.

Speaker, The Honorable James Abourezk, *U.S. Senator, South Dakota*.

Concluding Remarks, The Most Reverend Francis M. Zayek, S.T.D., J.C.D., D.D., *Bishop of the Saint Maron's Diocese of Detroit-U.S.A.*

Benediction, Rt. Rev. Chorbishop George J. Webby, *Vicar General, St. Maron's Diocese of Detroit, U.S.A.*

Entertainment by Joe Ranalli Orchestra.

BET MOROON'S MINISTRIES

REV. WADIH PETER TAYAH, PASTOR

Parish council

Executive Committee

Atty. Ronald G. Galip, President; Dr. Elias T. Saadi, Vice President; Anthony Thomas, Treasurer; Michael J. Dohar, Secretary; and Joseph Beshara, Member at Large.

George Abraham, Mrs. Elias Alexander, Remon Hayek, Joseph T. Joseph, Mrs. Martin Joyce, Michael Mike, Joseph Nohra, and (Helene Dohar: Recording Secy.).

Building and Finance Committee

Executive Committee

Joseph Beshara, Chrm.; Albert Abraham; Louis Ellis; Maroon Gabriel; George Hanna; Joseph T. Joseph; Joseph F. Simon; and George Abraham.

Joseph Alexander; George Barkett; Fred Beshara; Jeffrey Chahine; Norman Coury; Thomas Joseph; and Anthony Landis.

Joseph Mike; George Rohan; Russell Saadey; Minnie Simon; Elmer Thomas; James Thomas; and Tommy Thomas.

Social Games Committee

Elmer Thomas, Chairman; Nassef Thomas, Co-Chairman; Aniece Matta, Secretary; George Barkett; Donald Dempsey; Thomas Joseph; and Joseph Beshara, Parish Council Liaison.

Organizations

Immaculate Conception Sodality, Mrs. Alexander Hayek, President.

Daughters of Our Lady of Lebanon Sodality, Mrs. Willie Lewis, President.

Saint Maron's Club, Sr., Patrick Simon, President.

Saint Tobias Society, Calser Joseph, President.

M Y O (Maronite Youth Organization), Rochelle Galip, President.

CCD Classes

Sister Etienne Abood, Coordinator; Mother Lawrence Massoud; Mrs. Antoine Khoury (Terry); Joann Bukovinsky; Tawnya Brenner; Barbara Thomas; and Marilyn Markovich.

Choir: The Morooningers

Elaine Hanna, Director; Barbara Ellis, Organ; and Tawnya Brenner, Flute.

Mother Lawrence Massoud, Mrs. Kay Nakley, Mrs. Wadhi Mike, Helene Dohar, Linda Dohar, Joe Dohar, Nina Abraham, Anne Marie Rouhana, and Mary Lisa Joseph.

George Abraham, Peter M. Dohar, Jr., Gabriel El-Hage, Adwana Sleiman, Violette Tayah, Terri Thomas, Dawn Thomas, Jamie Thomas, and Mary Ann Nohra.

DEDICATION COMMITTEES

Dr. Elias T. Saadi, General Chairman.

Atty. Ronald G. Galip, Co-Chairman.

Protocol Committee

Rev. Wadhi P. Tayah, Dr. Elias Saadi, Atty. Ronald Galip, and K. Anthony Hayek, AIA.

Ticket Committee

Joseph Nohra, Chairman; Joseph Beshara; Joseph T. Joseph, and Mrs. Martin Joyce.

Arrangements Committee

Mrs. Elias Alexander, George Abraham, Michel Dohar, George Ellis, and Michael Mike.

Food Committee

Mrs. Michael Mike, Coordinator; Mrs. Joseph Beshara; and Mrs. Michael Dohar.

Acknowledgements

Building

K. Anthony Hayek and Associates, A.I.A., Architect.

B. & B. Construction Company, Inc., General Contractors.

Mr. Steve Sabanick, Superintendent.

Food

Mrs. Albert Abraham, Mrs. Mae Alexander, Mrs. Roger Clouse, Mrs. Fred David, Mrs. Kamille Dohar, Mrs. Sadie Dohar, Miss Alice Ellis, Mrs. George Ellis, Mrs. Louis Ellis, Mrs. Carroll Essad, and Miss Alice Galip.

Mrs. George Galip, Mrs. Ferris George, Mrs. William Hammond, Mrs. Calser Joseph, Mrs. Mary Kanaan, Mrs. Nassif Mansour, Mrs. Joseph Mike, Mrs. Mary Nohra, Miss Violette Tayah, Mrs. Elmer Thomas, and Mrs. Thomas Joseph.

Decoration

Mrs. Willie Lewis, Mrs. James Thomas, Mrs. Charles Thomas, and Miss Rose Abraham.

Parking and Coat Room

MYO—Maronite Youth Organization.

Hostesses

Mrs. Albert Abraham, Mrs. William Beshara, Mrs. Fred David, Mrs. Adele Dohar, Miss Helene Dohar, and Mrs. Carroll Essad.

Mrs. Ferris George, Mrs. Margaret Landis, Mrs. Joseph Mike, Mrs. Ray Nakley, Mrs. Donald Sunderlin, and Miss Violette Tayah.

Ushers

Claude Abraham, Randy Abraham, Michael Dohar, Jr., William George, and Joseph Mike. Michael Mike, Joseph Thomas, Richard Thomas, Ray Nakley, Jr., and Joe Farris, Jr.

Special Thanks

Edmund Salata, City Engineer.

William Wade, 5th Ward Councilman.

Special Ticket Committee

Miss Beverly Galip, Chairman.

Miss Mary Beth Burke, Miss Alice Marie Ellis, Miss Debbie Ellis, Mrs. Ronald Galip, and Mrs. K. Anthony Hayek.

Mrs. Anthony Landis, Mrs. Vincent Morglone, Miss Ida Nassar, Miss Cyndy Thomas, and Mrs. Nassef Thomas.

Additional Acknowledgements

St. Maron's Center Contractors

Crogran Heating & Plumbing, DeAntonio Plumbing, Waynco Electric, Roth Brothers, Joseph Painting Contractors, and Cabinet Design Industries.

Gennaro Pavers, Standard Floors, Acme Tile Company, Century Equipment Co., Youngstown Office Equipment, and Youngstown Carthage.

SENATOR JAMES ABOUREZK BIOGRAPHY

A biography of newly-elected Senator Jim Abourezk goes a long way toward explaining why he became, in 1970, the first Democrat in 36 years to be elected from South Dakota's Second Congressional District.

Jim was born in Wood, South Dakota in 1931, which at that time was part of the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation. His father had emigrated to the United States from Lebanon in 1895 and worked as a pack peddler throughout the area, walking from house to house with a pack on his back until he could later afford to buy a horse

and then a buggy. He finally opened his first store in Wood, South Dakota in 1910. Jim's family still operates one of his father's stores in Mission, South Dakota.

Jim Abourezk attended elementary and secondary schools in both Mission and Wood. After service in the United States Navy, he went on to receive a Bachelor of Science degree in Civil Engineering from the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology. After working for a time as a civil engineer, Jim attended the University of South Dakota School of Law and received the Juris degree with honors.

Jim established a law practice in Rapid City where he still maintains a home. While achieving a high degree of success in private law practice, Jim was also prominently involved in the civic affairs of the area: he served on the Board of Directors of the West River Mental Health Center, the Black Hills Consumer League, and the Rosebud Legal Services Program, and was elected by members of the Rapid City low-income community as their representative to the Western South Dakota Community Action Board of Directors.

During his freshman year in Congress, Jim authored major legislation such as the Family Act of 1972, the National Power Grid Act, and amendments to the 1970 Disaster Relief Act. Jim served on the house Judiciary and Interior Committees.

Senator Abourezk has been assigned to the Committee on Aeronautics and Space Sciences and the Committee on Small Business Administration.

DEDICATE MARONITE CENTER

The feast day of St. Maron, 1973 was of special significance in the Mahoning Valley Sunday as nearly 1,000 gathered to dedicate the new Maronite Center on S. Meridian Road, the first phase of the new complex of Bet Moroon (House of the Maronites).

The celebration brought to Youngstown a large delegation of Maronite clergymen, headed by the Most Rev. Francis M. Zayek, D.D., of Detroit, first bishop for Maronite Rite Catholics in America, along with political and community leaders.

Congratulatory messages were read from President Nixon and Gov. John J. Gilligan at the banquet which climaxed the day-long events for which Dr. Elias T. Saadi was general chairman.

Bishop Zayek was principal celebrant at a concelebrated Mass in the center Sunday morning and U.S. Sen. James Abourezk, D-S.D., the first U.S. senator of Lebanese descent, was the principal banquet speaker.

The \$1 million complex at 1555 S. Meridian Road is to include, in addition to the center, a 400-seat church which is under roof, parish hall, offices and rectory on the 23-acre site. The center will be available for all kinds of public events.

FRAISES CARNEY

Sen. Abourezk drew heavy applause for his remarks that Youngstown Rep. Charles J. Carney represents the people of this district "extremely well" and for his praise of Fred Beshara, president of B. & B. Construction Co., who, the senator said, was a generous contributor to his campaigning in South Dakota and asked him to come to Youngstown. Beshara's firm is constructing Bet Moroon.

The senator issued a strong call for unity among all Arabic-speaking people in the United States, stressing that they could become a significant political force by joining together.

He pleaded with them not to become factionalized by villages or religion but to have one common goal—unity for the benefit of the United States.

CALLS FOR PEACE

Sen. Abourezk mourned the tragic events of recent years in the Middle East.

"Peace in the Middle East can never come so long as vengeance is practiced by both sides," the senator declared.

"I think what I want to do, if I have any power in the Senate, is bring peace to that part of the world and I ask your support," Sen. Abourezk said.

He also asked for support in his campaign to help small farmers and, as chairman of the Indian Affairs subcommittee of the Senate, for support in "righting the wrongs" against American Indians.

Sen. Abourezk, who grew up on the Rose Bud Reservation of the Sioux in South Dakota, told how his father, an immigrant from Lebanon, was first a pack peddler and then a store owner, and helped both whites and Indians during the depression. He recalled how the Indians lined the streets in respect at his father's funeral in 1951.

In a general discussion of ethnic revival, Sen. Abourezk said the "melting pot" is a misnomer for the United States because it implies that heritage should be forgotten.

"One of the great things in the United States is that we have been able to live together. Instead of destroying our differences, let us celebrate them, retain our religions, music, and other values," he said.

BISHOP HAILS PARISH

At both the Mass and the banquet, Bishop Zayek congratulated St. Maron's Parish. "Your unity, determination, and generosity will lead you toward the achievement of your ideals, which could set an example to be followed by many of our Maronite communities in the United States," he said. He noted that this is the first Maronite complex of its kind in this country.

The Rev. Wadiah Peter Tayah, pastor of St. Maron's since 1970, expressed his gratitude to all parishioners for their devotion and hard work in bringing to fruition a "golden dream." His sentiments were echoed by the Rev. Msgr. Peter A. Eid, now retired after serving St. Maron's for 32 years.

Congratulations from the Roman Catholic Diocese of Youngstown were extended by the Rev. Msgr. William A. Hughes, vicar general, who said, "Our lives are enriched by the various rites of the Catholic Church, all of them contributing to the vitality of faith in the Mahoning valley."

Plaques and resolutions commemorating the occasion were presented to the bishop and senator by Mayor Jack C. Hunter, State Sen. Harry Meshel for the Ohio Senate, and 5th Ward Councilman William Wade for City Council.

OTHERS PARTICIPATE

Other banquet speakers were Dr. Saadi; Atty. Ronald G. Galip, president of St. Maron's Parish Council, Rep. Carney, who introduced Sen. Abourezk; the Rev. Ronald Zidian, administrator-director of the National Shrine of Our Lady of Lebanon at North Jackson, who gave the invocation; and the Rt. Rev. Chorbishop George J. Webby, vicar general of the Maronite Diocese, who gave the benediction.

At the Mass, celebrated in English, Arabic, and ancient Syriac, the concelebrants with Bishop Zayek were Chorbishop Webby, Father Tayah, Rev. Msgr. Elias el-Hayek, professor of liturgy and canon law at St. John Seminary, Plymouth, Mich.; Msgr. Eid; the Rev. Seely Beggiani, rector of the Maronite Seminary in Washington, D.C., and Father Zidian. Msgr. Hughes was on the altar representing Bishop James W. Malone.

In his homily, Msgr. el-Hayek said, "This house is your house. It is here that our spiritual destiny will be decreed. Let Bet

Moroon Center be a monument to your love of God." Joseph Nohra was commentator and Albert Abraham and Atty. Galip were lecturers.

The Moroon singers sang at the Mass with soloists Mrs. James Peters and Norman Nemer. Also singing was the CCD junior choir.

In the evening entertainment was presented by Bernie Johnson and Joe Kohut and the Joe Ranalli Orchestra.

93D CLUB

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the Republican 93d Club, under the leadership of our colleague from Arizona's Fourth Congressional District (Mr. CONLAN), has undertaken an effort in behalf of budget reform which I think merits serious consideration. Their proposal that all Federal spending be wrapped up into a single appropriations bill instead of the present system of approving funds for the various departments in separate measures has, I know, the support of many of their colleagues.

Recently, Mr. Frank van der Linden discussed this point in a column about the 93d Club, distributed nationally by the United Feature Syndicate of New York. I insert Mr. van der Linden's column at the conclusion of my remarks.

The column follows:

UNITED FEATURES SYNDICATE, WASHINGTON.—A fight to hold down Federal spending and to avoid a tax increase will be the Republicans' main issue in this Congress and in their efforts to take control of the House away from the Democrats in the 1974 elections.

In private strategy conferences on Capitol Hill, the Republicans have agreed to give maximum help to President Nixon's coming clash with the Democratic Congress over control of the budget.

The Democrats will try to pass popular bills over the President's veto—bills containing billions for water and sewer projects, schools, health, welfare, farm programs. It will be tough for his own party members to stand with him.

"We'll be whip-lashed by the lobbyists for each pressure group," said Representative John B. Conlan, the articulate conservative from Phoenix, Arizona, who is the newly-elected president of the "93rd Club." It's composed of the 43 new minority members of the 93rd Congress.

In an effort to curb "the grab-bag boys," as Conlan calls the pressure groups, many Republicans will support a bill to wrap up all Federal spending into a single bill, instead of the present system of approving funds for various departments in separate measures.

"We freshmen will push very heavily for budget reform," the former Arizona State Senator said. "We think it's incredible to have a bill zinging out one day for the Defense Department, another bill for education, another for something else. This causes 'pork barrel-itis.'"

"Instead, we want a single money bill," he said. Let's see it all out in the open and make an intelligent decision. If it's too much, send it back to committee and cut it down."

Warned that the single money bill would be fiercely opposed by the veteran Democrats who head the Appropriations Subcommittees and by the whole party hierarchy in Congress, Conlan replied: "We'll put them on the spot. If the Democrats refuse to pass the bill we will take it to the voters in 1974."

Has he had some encouraging conversations with presidential assistants about the single money bill proposal?

"None that I can talk about," Conlan said. "I'm sure that we'll get White House cooperation, though."

Conlan, 42, won Arizona's new congressional seat last fall by beating Jack Brown, a liberal Democrat who endorsed Senator George McGovern in the state's presidential primary. Senator Barry Goldwater crisscrossed his home state by air, campaigning for the Nixon-Agnew-Conlan ticket.

When the "93rd Club" met a few days ago, the conservatives smoothly elected their entire slate of officers after beating down, 30 to 10, a motion by the moderate-liberals to adjourn without electing anybody. Chosen with Conlan were George O'Brien of Illinois, vice president; Donald Mitchell of New York, secretary; Marjorie Holt of Maryland, treasurer; Trent Lott of Mississippi and Harold Froehlich of Wisconsin, Policy Committee members; and David Treen of Louisiana, the freshmen's spokesman on the executive committee that assigned all Republicans to their legislative committees.

Conlan insisted "it was no coup de' etat," just a harmonious election.

NEANDERTHAL MAN IS ALIVE AND WELL IN IRAQ AND SYRIA

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the world is full of moral souls mouthing solemn profundities over the evils one people visits upon another. In fact, one is hard put these days to pick up a paper, watch a news show, or read a publication without coming across passionate mention of the fate of some innocent group or another.

Recently, world opinion has risen in righteous wrath over the shooting down of a Libyan airliner by Israel, after it had flown 50 miles into the Israeli-occupied Sinai area.

The United Nations has added pious pronouncements to the universal chorus of condemnation. Across Europe, self-appointed guardians of the world's conscience, immune themselves from daily threats to their lives, have launched vocal crusades against the Israeli action.

Here at home, many papers have carried editorials condemning actions of the Israelis, who, conditioned by 25 years of bloodcurdling threats of annihilation, made a dreadful mistake and shot down that plane. I do not excuse any excess the Israelis may have committed in the name of defense, although I certainly understand how it could have taken place.

Resulting world opinion, however, leaves me all the more puzzled at the curious blind spot the world seems to show to the plight of Jews wherever they

are persecuted, and persecuted they are, with a vengeance.

Today, 3½ million Russian Jews live under a regime which penalizes them daily for their religious faith. Few righteous voices in Europe or in certain media outlets seem to find their plight worthy of moral condemnation. The unique Russian exit tax, applied almost exclusively to Russian Jews, does not offend the conscience of many who seem to consider themselves guardians of mankind's morals.

Today, the Jews of the Soviet Union are not being physically wiped out on a methodical basis. Occasionally, a few die in a Soviet forced labor camp, but the rest are relatively immune from the old practices of mass murder that have characterized the life of Russian Jews for so many centuries. That syndrome, however, has shifted its location, and is still to be found.

Nowadays it dominates the lives of those Jews remaining in certain nations of the Arab world.

It is worth noting that for every Arab who fled from what is now Israel and became a refugee, in spite of Israeli pleas for them to remain, a Jew was forcibly exiled from an Arab land. Most Arab countries of the Middle East for centuries boasted flourishing Jewish communities. Virtually all these groupings have been forcibly uprooted, violently assailed and relentlessly scattered to the winds. Many found haven in Israel. In almost all cases, their significant property holdings were confiscated by various states, with no compensation offered. Most Jews from Arab lands, as a matter of fact, considered themselves fortunate to have escaped with their lives intact. Many were marked in body and mind for the remainder of their existences, as a result of policies followed by several regimes in question.

Some, however, remained behind, either by choice or because they were simply unable to leave. Today they are trapped, at the mercy of implacably hostile governments who take out their frustrations and rage upon them, notably in Syria and Iraq.

Both countries are today characterized by barbarous regimes, closely allied with the Soviet Union, and blatantly anti-Semitic. Neither of these two states, whose internal politics would do justice to Byzantium at its worst, is known for reason, logic, or adherence to accepted rules of international behavior.

Woe unto any Israeli who falls into the hands of the Syrians, who also are the most fanatical adherents of the terrorist cause and its bloody methods. Syria's minuscule 4,500-person Jewish community today lives in acute daily terror, awaiting that inevitable violence the regime will visit upon it, either as a group or individually. Denied any basic human rights, these people are spied upon, arrested, blatantly discriminated against and violated in every conceivable manner. All they wish is to leave and flee to any of several countries which would gladly accept them.

In Iraq the situation is even worse, if possible. Iraq, it should be recalled, is that same nation which in 1969 staged

public executions of a number of its Jewish nationals in a Baghdad square.

Only a few hundred Jews remain in that unhappy nation, tiny remnants of a community which once numbered several hundred thousand. Once again, the neanderthal Ba'ath regime has begun violent persecution of these few people, who of course are guilty of the most heinous crime of all—being practicing Jews.

Arrests are made with frightening regularity by the Iraqi secret police, and a number of these Jews are today held incommunicado in their prisons. We have learned that in the past few weeks a number of these Jewish prisoners, reputed to be at least 9 or 10 in number, have been foully murdered by their captors in the secrecy of these prisons.

Despite media attention to what is supposed to have transpired, Iraq has issued no charges, announced no trials, and absolutely refused to confirm reports of their deaths. It is feared, and with good reason, that Iraq may be on the verge of repeating its bloody deeds of 1969 at the expense of these few remaining Jews. These people, like the Syrian Jewish community, only seek the privilege of emigrating, with only the clothes on their backs, if that is the sole manner in which they may be freed. Again there is no word.

Where, I wonder, are the outraged voices of conscience? Where are the outcries from civilized nations of Europe who are so outraged at the recent Israeli action in Sinai? Could it be that it has something to do with the politics of oil?

Where is the voice of the United Nations, which leaps so eagerly to condemn Israel? How about some of the media? I listen intently, but hear them not.

A resolution has been introduced in Congress expressing the outrage of that body over persecution of these two isolated and helpless Jewish communities by publicly condemning these two governments for this abominable policy they share and follow. It also urges the Attorney General to authorize parole authority for any Syrian or Iraqi Jew who wishes to enter America. In the past, stretching back to the early days of the republic, we have spoken out against such oppressed people. It would be an act of morality and compassion to save them from excesses now being perpetuated against them.

The floor of the House is usually no place for philosophical dissertations, but a further word is in order here.

Does not anyone wonder about the fate of all mankind when the civilized world watches silently while still another generation of these people walk the ancient path of persecution worn so smooth by their forebears?

Sad to say, many have a total blind spot where the Jews are concerned. Today the Arabs, armed by the Soviets, still believe in and seek total annihilation of the Jewish state, and would leap to the task with alacrity if given the opportunity.

Would the world watch in silence while such a bloody deed was perpetrated, wringing its hands all the while?

Would the world cry out if the entire

Jewish population of Iraq and Syria were massacred tomorrow? The same questions arise regarding the Russian Jewish community.

When so much is said of conscience, and so little is done in its name on behalf of the helpless, what will we call those who beat their breasts and cry out? The answer is obvious.

AMEND THE TARIFF AND TRADE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, 1973, I introduced H.R. 4515, for myself and Mr. SAYLOR, a bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States.

The purpose of the bill to assure a healthy growth of foreign trade while establishing conditions that will prevent the ill effects of unduly rapid increases in imports and unduly deep penetration of our market from disrupting and even halting normal economic growth in the United States.

To this end it seeks restoration of the competitive conditions that fostered the development of the world industrial leadership achieved by this country in the past 75 years. The system of production and distribution developed in this country represented a sharp departure, not only from our own past, but also from our economic forebears in Europe. While the industrial revolution which brought such great industrial changes to England predated our industrial development, our subsequent adoption of mass production in the 20th century as an offspring of a dynamic technology, soon moved us far afield from our earlier industrial heritage.

Particularly noteworthy among the basic supporting actors in our great departure were: First, a recognition of competition as an incitement to effort by producers to merit consumer favor as a condition of producer reward, second, perception of the dependence of mass production on mass purchasing power, and third, appreciation of the role of employee compensation as the predominant ingredient of the buying power of the marketplace.

Pursuit of production in this framework, guarded by laws against monopoly, by laws designed to prevent erosion of purchasing power through low-wage competition, such as outlawing of child labor and sweatshop operation, plus minimum wage laws, and laws in support of collective bargaining, led to an amazing proliferation of production of a vast variety of consumer goods far beyond the level of necessities—propelled by the profit motive.

Because of dependence of production on consumption, and the propensity of consumers to respond to the condition or anticipated condition of their pocketbook, the system, so highly geared to the production of nonessentials, became sen-

sitive to any factors that might be expected to affect the market, either favorably or unfavorably. Such factors might be visible and stubborn and therefore directly influential with consumers, or anticipatory or suspected and therefore psychologically operative in either a negative or positive fashion on both producers and consumers. The antennae of producers were sensitized to both actual and anticipatory movements that might affect the market, that is, consumer inclination to purchase more or less.

Negative factors led to producer hesitation or outright retrenchment while positive factors or interpretations fostered expansion.

Although imports and exports each represents only approximately 4 percent of the gross national product, different products partake in widely varying degrees above and below the average. In other words, both imports or exports may be important in particular industries.

In combination the effect of imports may produce a depressing effect on domestic production beyond the positive displacement of workers in domestic plants because of repercussions of the market outlook thus induced and entertained by domestic producers. If imports increase rapidly because of a decided market advantage the domestic producer may cancel any current plans to expand his operations, and await developments. He will not hire any part of the increasing work force that appears on the labor market each month and each year.

If he is a producer of a new and developing product such as historically in this century have expanded into great industries or even into smaller ones and have thus employed in the aggregate millions of workers in newly generated jobs, he will not commit his capital nor will his enterprise attract risk capital very copiously, if he cannot have reasonable assurance that the market will be his if he develops it; or if it seems quite clear that despite his patents he will face competition from abroad that will rob his patent of all meaning.

It is not necessary that his product be a wholly new one. Thousands of existing products are constantly undergoing improvement through invention and research, in efforts to reduce costs and to gain a march on competitors who are in the field, similarly motivated. At home a productive innovation may be protected by patents, and the producer can feel reasonably assured—patent infringement aside—of the fruits of his labors for a reasonable period of time. He willingly undertakes projects that may require several years to mature.

If, however, he knows that he may be outflanked from abroad his outlook is clouded. He may even decide to move a substantial part of his own operations overseas because of wage differentials, particularly if the export of his product beckons as a source of additional profit. Because he finds that by employing workers abroad he can produce at a lower cost, he will forego his efforts to export from this country or he will supplement his exports by producing abroad, thus hedging his future. Alternatively, he

may license foreign producers to use his patents.

Meantime the increased employment that he would have provided in this country is curtailed or set aside completely. If unemployment in this country is not to increase, someone else must then hire the additional workers that come on the scene by population increase. The workers he employs abroad do not absorb the new workers in this country.

Thus is subverted the formula by which this country rose to world industrial leadership in this century. New products or radically improved products can no longer be put on the market in this country with the assurance that the great national consumer potential might be tapped through progressive cost reductions aimed at an elastic demand, because of the danger and the overt evidence of outflanking possibilities from abroad.

Even if the producer protects himself by going abroad, American employment is outflanked.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The bill is designed, not to reduce our foreign trade, but to bring its growth under control in such fashion that the American producer can operate under the same assurance that he had during the years before the American technology had been adopted and so energetically pursued by other industrial countries. Under present conditions he can no longer do so for the simple reason that foreign products may virtually preempt the market growth that he could formerly claim confidently as his own.

The bill provides for import limitations under specified circumstances, with well-defined exceptions. At least 10-percent market penetration must have occurred during the two immediately preceding years to qualify for a quota. Also there must have been an upward trend in the past few years in the imports of any given product before eligibility can be established.

The base year for the quota is the average imports during the 3-year period of 1969-71. If imports have increased rather sharply during the past several years a moderate cutback in imports may be made from the base period.

Items on the free list will not be subject to quotas, nor items that are now under quota limitation so long as they remain so limited.

Imports once under a quota may increase or decrease in proportion as domestic consumption of the article increases or declines in this country.

The bill makes no effort to discourage foreign investments.

However, it seeks to prevent the objectionable effects that are imputed to foreign investments: First, by limiting imports to a defined share of our market if the penetration is over 10 percent, and then restricting import growth to that recorded by our domestic market, second, by fixing limits on the share of the market that may be supplied by imports of products that have patent protection. During the first 5 years of a patent's life imports may not rise above 5 percent of

our market for the same article. During the second 5 years not over 10 percent of our market for the article may be supplied by imports in any one year. In the next 5-year period the limit is 15 percent, and this will be the final limit.

Once the patent expires the imports will be governed by the other provisions of the legislation.

By thus controlling imports of patented products the usurpation of our market by imports will be inhibited. Domestic patent-holders are then assured of a market that will enable them to proceed in full confidence that they will not be prevented by cost-advantaged imports from reaping the benefits of their efforts to establish a national market.

The domestic investment climate will be restored to the conditions under which this country developed the world's most productive economy. Expansion of production, the opening of new facilities and the hiring of additional workers to meet using production schedules, will be sparked by the vision of a mass market as costs are cut to a level low enough to tap the mass pocketbook. Under these conditions assuming elasticity of demand, consumption will rise sufficiently to call for rising employment in this country. Imports, limited as provided in the bill, will not remain a hovering threat as they are now, poised to despoil the market for domestic producers; nor, on the other hand, will they be discouraged insensibly or unreasonably.

Any article may be produced abroad by domestic or foreign capital without limitation. The domestic market will not be closed to such products produced abroad, but it cannot be ruined as a source of employment or as a source of profit for domestic capital invested in the home market by unimpeded imports of products from low wage, low unit cost areas of the world.

THE TWO-WAY STREET OF THE INTERNATIONAL ECONOMY

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in further regard to my concerns as expressed to this body of late as to the American future in the international economy, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention a recent article in the Wall Street Journal.

I have long felt and argued that the flow of capital, trade, and investment in the international economy must be on a two-way street. Throughout the 1960's, I believe the statistics would show that these three items would fall in the "outgoing" column in our ledger. It is time now—and Mr. Janssen's article illustrates the beginning of this trend—that these items fall in the "incoming" column, that in the 1970's the United States will be the recipient of these flows, for a variety of reasons. In the interest of educating ourselves in this area, I commend the following to the close scrutiny of the Members:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 26, 1973]

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN
BUSINESS AND FINANCE

BRUSSELS.—You're a successful European industrialist, looking for a good place to put a plant abroad. In your direct investment dreamland, inflation isn't rampant, taxes aren't confiscatory. Preferably, the populace isn't given to paralyzing general strikes, the authorities aren't inclined to expropriation, coups aren't a constant threat, and neighboring nations don't dispatch guerrilla raiders across the borders.

Italy, or Uganda, or Chile or, almost any place you can think of falls short on one score or another. But you do think of them, and you don't think of the most obvious place—the United States.

So far, that is. There are some signs that foreign businessmen are becoming more interested in putting roots in the vast American market. Signs such as the "BP" emblems at British Petroleum service stations in the U.S., or Sony's decision to expand its color TV tube plant at San Diego. Companies such as Shell, Lever and Olivetti are so well entrenched that they're scarcely thought of as basically foreign any more.

In total, though, the traffic has been heavily the other way. The Commerce Department figures emerge slowly, so that the latest ones are for 1971. But in that year, the increase which brought U.S. direct investment abroad to \$86 billion was \$7.8 billion. The increase alone equalled more than half the total book value then of foreign direct investment in the U.S.—a slim \$13.7 billion, up \$434 million from 1970.

Moreover, foreign investment in the U.S. tends to be rather narrowly concentrated, both as to origin and purpose. The table below shows the book value at the end of 1971 by major industry and by selected countries of origin (omitting Japan, because a gush of debt prepayments statistically pushed the book value to below zero from \$229 million in 1970):

Industry and billions:	
Manufacturing	\$6.75
Petroleum	3.11
Insurance	2.35
Trade	0.568
Other	0.921
Natl. origins and billions:	
United Kingdom	4.43
Canada	3.34
Netherlands	2.22
Germany	0.767
France	0.315

The figures suggest something of the obstacles, one of which is language. "It shouldn't be, but it is," sighs a U.S. banker here. More than half the foreign direct investment in the U.S. (as opposed to portfolio investment in stocks and bonds) has come from the U.K. and Canada, with the third biggest chunk from the Netherlands, where English is a strong second tongue.

Closely related to language is what former Common Market official Raymond Barre calls the "inferiority complex" of Continentals, a legacy of World War II and its aftermath of massive American foreign aid and investment. "There is a certain timidity" among Europeans about starting or acquiring American facilities," agrees Jeffrey S. Howles, the Bank of America's London-based regional vice president. "They just don't think their management abilities are up to modern American standards," says another U.S. financial man.

The very vastness of the U.S. market that makes it tempting also makes it forbidding. "They look at the map and see Seattle way over there and Miami way down there, and say, 'How the hell can I possibly handle that?'" observes a U.S. expert.

Similarly, the European impression of the size of native competitors to be faced on

American soil is often frightening. "They only think of IBM and GM, because those are the names they see over here," explains Charles A. Fagan III, industrial development attache in the U.S. embassy at Brussels. To reassure them, he cites the existence of "more than 400,000 manufacturing firms in the U.S." most of them obviously small.

The most frequently mentioned deterrent to more foreign subsidiaries in the U.S., though, is clearly the belief that the Justice Department will go gunning for them while winking at anti-trust infractions by American companies. The European Common market fosters this fear, stating matter-of-factly in a recent publication that would-be European direct investors are "hampered by U.S. laws that discourage the establishment and operation of subsidiaries of foreign companies."

The U.S. government vigorously denies any such bias, of course, as it is anxious for the balance-of-payments help that such investment inflow would bring. The charges of anti-trust bias are "a whole lot of horsefeathers," fires back Mr. Fagan. "Certain antitrust difficulties" can and do arise, Mr. Howles of the Bank of America advises, but stresses that any deals between large companies with big shares of the market bring this risk regardless of whether one is foreign.

European industrialists fret, too, about tighter U.S. controls on selling strategic goods to the Communists, whether the Commerce Department's complex curbs on capital outflows could hamper repatriation of profits, higher hourly wage rates, the need to deal with unfamiliar small local banks in factory towns, and the much stricter public disclosure rules.

All these mental reservations form a formidable obstacle. But in launching a promotional campaign to overcome them, the Bank of America may have hit upon the most effective appeal—fear. The bank's brochure puts it subtly and at the bottom of the list of advantages, but the message comes through clearly enough:

"While a trade war is not anticipated, if protectionist sentiment should succeed in insulating world trading blocs, foreign subsidiaries located in the United States would not be subject to U.S. import restrictions and thus would maintain their access to the market."

Now that President Nixon once again has devalued the dollar, Mr. Fagan finds foreigners much more receptive to the message that "there just isn't any way to protect their share of the market" aside from actually manufacturing in the U.S. It isn't just that the cheaper dollar makes exporting to the U.S. harder and investing in it easier, but that the abrupt action was accompanied by tough talk about new trade barriers.

Fear, to be sure, isn't the sort of reason businessmen like to cite for investment decisions. But, in this situation, it could be both a compelling and a constructive force.

ALGERIA: ARE WE FINANCING TERRORISM?

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, fortunately, the last few months have been free of incidents of terrorist skyjackings. However, every time I travel between Washington and New York, I am reminded of the paranoia which has become an integral part of air travel. My baggage is inspected, my person is elec-

tronically searched. I am not immune from such things because I am a Member of Congress—nor should I be. It is a sad commentary on mankind that a handful of aberrant desperadoes have made us so distrustful of one another. And yet, until there are mutual extradition treaties between all nations of the world, skyjackings will continue to threaten our safety.

Protection of air travel is currently a major concern of the 93d Congress. There are now a number of bills before the committee on which I sit, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which offer solutions to the problem of air piracy. Most focus on the posting of armed guards at airports. My own bill would have specially trained military personnel stationed as guards at Federal expense.

However, even with increased protection on the ground, hijackers may still slip through and endanger the lives of hundreds of people. And as long as they feel they can get away with it by escaping to a safe haven, these pirates will continue to extort money and political concessions from civilized governments.

In the mid-1950's the United States all but openly supported a revolutionary named Castro in his bid to overthrow the Battista military dictatorship in Cuba. Almost immediately thereafter, Castro threw in lots with Russia giving Communist imperialism its biggest single base in the Western Hemisphere. It became a safe-haven for criminals and revolutionaries hijacking American commercial aircraft.

Things recently took a turn for the better when the United States and Cuba reached an agreement on the extradition of skyjacks and the return of stolen aircraft. This event augurs well not only for the average air traveller, but for the state of American diplomacy in the Western Hemisphere. It is the first dealing the United States has had with Cuba in over 10 years, and is a more realistic approach in our attitude toward Castro's government. However, there is still a major blind spot in our attempts to secure safety for air travellers: Algeria.

Algeria has long been anti-West, and particularly anti-American. Its leftist dictatorship openly encourages criminal acts and turmoil in North Africa and the Middle East. In recent years, Algeria has become a haven for skyjacks that not even Cuba would admit. It has harbored black nationalist fugitives from the United States, such as Eldridge Cleaver. The Algerian Government has given aid, comfort, and support to the very Arab terrorist groups who have hijacked so many airplanes. The United States has no diplomatic relations with Algeria. And yet, we are indirectly giving them a form of financial assistance, much the same as we did Cuba in aiding Castro to consolidate his hold on the country.

In the last fiscal year, the Export-Import Bank, which is a U.S. government-owned corporation run along the lines of a typical commercial bank, authorized over \$21 million in direct loans to Algeria. It should be noted that this money never leaves the United States but is used in transactions between the Algerian Gov-

ernment and American companies supplying equipment and services for various projects in Algeria. Algeria then repays the loan at an interest rate of 6 percent. The loans finance ordinary commercial transactions for American-made goods exported to the borrowing country. Ordinarily, these transactions prove of great benefit to the United States, by improving our balance of trade, stimulating industry and economic growth, and opening new markets for American goods. In Algeria's case, however, the benefits are highly dubious in light of Algeria's role in encouraging Arab terrorism.

Loans the Export-Import Bank has given to Algeria have financed the purchases of a wide variety of products. Outstanding among them are large purchases of commercial aircraft and oil drilling and refining equipment. The most recent loan authorization, for \$3.5 million, was in September 1972, and would be used for a feasibility study for agricultural and industrial projects in Algeria.

I objected when that loan was made and was told that "The Department of State does not find that the Export-Import Bank's loans to Algeria are contrary to U.S. foreign policy." However, I see a total lack of coordination between the Export-Import Bank's actions, on the one hand, and the avowed policy of the United States on the other, which is to cut off nations that harbor hijackers and terrorists from the community of civilized men. The Export-Import Bank is acting in total disregard of American public opinion in continuing to finance Algerian purchases in this country.

I find it unconscionable that American commercial interests are permitted to take precedence over the lives and safety of American air travelers. Loans to Algeria should be withheld until such time as that nation shows itself willing to engage in responsible, nonviolent solutions to world problems. As long as Algeria continues its open support of terrorists, we are worse than fools to give her even the most indirect form of financial assistance. By making it possible for Algeria to borrow U.S. dollars with which to purchase U.S. goods, we are in effect permitting Algeria to devote more of her own resources to financing the Palestinian terrorist movement.

We are, in the final analysis, creating a situation in which planes will continue to be hijacked and passengers' lives will continue to be threatened. The U.S. Government must once and for all coordinate all its branches so that the left hand is not working against the right hand.

The Export-Import Bank must stop financing terrorism.

DRUG ABUSE—PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 1

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, one of the great problems facing our Nation and its youth is drug abuse. This

dilemma does not respect status or background, but seems to have its strongest appeal to youth during their turbulent teenage years. The problem is under attack by Federal, State, and local governments, and by religious authorities, parents, and various youth organizations. The power and weight of these groups, and the affirmative action they are taking, would seemingly solve almost any problem. But such is not the case with drug addiction.

There have been inroads. The results of the efforts of dedicated people can be seen. And yet the problem is still with us, indeed in some cases it appears to be worsening. This Nation owes a great debt to the many people devoting their time to remove this blight from the United States.

One of the unanswered questions facing us is what makes teenagers turn to drugs. The potential horror facing a drug user would seemingly keep people from using drugs, but it does not. At this time there is no answer, no simple formula, no one statement that can identify for us the reasons for the appeal of drug abuse.

Perhaps we can only learn from examples, the life history of addicts. Perhaps by listening to their story we can begin to understand.

Recently two articles in Navy publications were brought to my attention by the Honorable Joseph Campbell, Commonwealth's attorney for the city of Norfolk, and Police Lt. L. W. Hurst, head of the Narcotics Squad of the Norfolk Police Department.

Mr. Speaker, these two individuals are leading the fight against drug abuse in Norfolk, a city I proudly serve and represent in the House of Representatives.

The Navy magazine articles reveal the outstanding cooperation between the Navy and Norfolk officials in the battle against drug abuse in Tidewater. As a member of the Armed Services Committee and Second District Representative, I am pleased to report this cooperation and coordinated effort between the military and civilian officials, and I commend all those involved.

Mr. Speaker, I include the first of these two articles, entitled "Mech Interviews a Drug Addict," from the fall 1972 issue of Mech the Naval Aviation Maintenance Safety Review magazine to be inserted in the RECORD at this point. The article follows:

MECH INTERVIEWS A DRUG ADDICT

Kris is 22 years old, and a pretty girl as you can see. She started taking drugs at the age of 16, and for 4 years lived the life of a junkie. She tells here how she made the trip to hell, and what near tragedy caused her to try the difficult return trip.

Until her 21st birthday, Kris was a Navy dependent. She was first busted at age 18 and charged with drug possession.

Kris is still on drugs, but now the drug is methadone. It is being administered under clinical supervision.

Kris exposes her drug experience to Mech readers for one reason—to possibly deter others from making the same scene.

MECH. Kris, what type of drug or narcotic did you start with?

KRIS. I started with diet pills because I used to be real heavy in high school and my girlfriend was stealing them from her doctor

in sample packs. I asked her for some and she started giving them to me.

MECH. Was there any emotional problem involved about being heavy?

KRIS. Yes, as I said, I was heavy, almost fat, and I couldn't get dates all through high school and I was miserable and I drank a lot.

MECH. You drank?

KRIS. Yes, I drank pretty heavy—especially on weekends.

MECH. When did you graduate to other drugs?

KRIS. I started smoking grass right after I started taking the diet pills.

MECH. How long after?

KRIS. Oh, a couple of months. I started dating a guy from California and he had a lot of grass and I started smoking it and I enjoyed it.

MECH. How long did you stay on grass?

KRIS. About 5 or 6 months, grass and diet pills.

MECH. Then you went into something else?

KRIS. I went into acid. I met another guy from California who was in the Navy and he brought 2 kilos of Mexican grass with him and some LSD. So, I smoked a lot of grass and did some acid with him and I liked the acid even better than grass because, I always liked grass, but I didn't like it that much—you know. I could take it or leave it. I liked the diet pills better, and once I did the acid, I liked the acid better, so I thought whatever other drugs I ran into, I'd probably like them even better.

MECH. When you were 16 and started on diet pills, were you in school?

KRIS. Yes. I was in junior high school.

MECH. And did you go on and graduate from high school?

KRIS. Yes, I did. Barely, just by the skin of my teeth, because after I started doing those drugs, during my senior year, I started doing heroin and once I started doing that and all the other drugs...

MECH. How did you get introduced to heroin?

KRIS. Another girl and I got started together. She was hanging around with a rock band at the time and I started hanging around them too, and they had just been introduced to heroin by a cat, so I saw how they felt on it and they looked like they felt better than I've seen anybody feel on anything so I thought, "This has got to be the best feeling drug I've ever seen." So, I tried it too, and it was. To me, before I got strung out, it was like artificial love. I loved everybody and I was completely happy while I was doing it.

MECH. After you got on heroin, how often did you take it?

KRIS. A couple times a week for the first 2 years.

MECH. Did you have to buy it or did somebody supply it free?

KRIS. No, I had to buy it.

MECH. How much was it then?

KRIS. It was \$4 a cap. Sometimes \$3. Since then, it's gone to \$7.50 to \$10 a cap.

MECH. Where did you get the money to pay for drugs?

KRIS. Well, the first couple of years I did it, I got it from different places—I'd steal money from my mother now and then. I had a few jobs where I got money. Sometimes I had a boyfriend who would just buy it for me.

MECH. Did you ever do anything illicit to get it?

KRIS. Not during the first 2 years.

MECH. So, you really started paying from the beginning—no one gave it to you?

KRIS. Right. Nobody came around the school turning people on like it's heard to be. I've never seen that done.

MECH. Now when you bought it, were the people you bought it from addicted themselves—were they junkies?

KRIS. We started copping from a cat down on Charlotte Street. That's right near Church Street, downtown. I later found out that the guy we were copping from was a big pusher in Norfolk and he was probably strung out himself, I'm not sure.

MECH. Did you generally do drugs alone or with other people?

KRIS. No, it was always with other people. The first 2 years I did it, it was almost always with other people, but when there was nobody around, if I could cop, and had the money, I'd do it by myself.

MECH. You say you met someone who never took anything himself but he was giving it away—you never saw him take money for it, as such, but he gave it to his pushers, to give away?

KRIS. Right. Well, I was doing . . . Do you want me to explain it?

MECH. Yes.

KRIS. Okay, I was doing all sorts of drugs for the first 2 years I was on drugs. Two and a half years, but I wasn't strung out on anything except the speed—well, at one time I was doing LSD every night for a month. A couple tabs every night and I started having bad trips, so I quit doing that. So, I got strung out on methadone after that. I'd moved to Washington where I was doing a lot of junk and I left Washington and moved back home because I didn't want to get strung out. Right after that I moved to New York and bought 2 ounces of methadone, which is speed, the kind that you shoot up or snort; you can't eat it. I got really strung out on speed, which is physically and mentally brutal—like it says, 'Speed Kills'—and it does. I came back to Norfolk after 3 months of being strung out on speed in New York and by that time I was so messed up and so mentally disturbed that I started doing a lot of junk to come down. The first month I'd steal money from my mother and father—I'd get money however I could, but I didn't do anything illegal to get it—except for stealing from my mother—which is not illegal with the law, but it was bad. The first month I was doing one or two caps of heroin a day and I got strung out. It wasn't a bad habit, but it was mentally bad and physically a little bad and I knew I was strung out so I started 'tricking' after that to get my money. When I started 'tricking', I got a lot more money.

MECH. What is 'tricking'?

KRIS. Oh, prostituting. I got a lot more money so my habit could come up and I'd say I got up to five and six caps a day. My girlfriend and I were both living together and 'tricking' together. So after being strung out about 3 months we met a guy from Portsmouth, who was the biggest dealer in Portsmouth. He'd go to New York and cop thousands of dollars worth of dope and bring it back or have somebody bring it back for him. He would never touch the stuff but he would give it to his dealers to sell for him. His dealers were junkies. They'd sell it for him and take their junk out of it to support their habits and then give him the money so that he hardly ever had any heroin in his possession, except for when he copped it and when he cut it and capped it. Other than that, it was always in the dealer's possession and eventually all of them have gotten busted and he's gotten all new ones since we met up with him. He started out giving us 10 caps of heroin a day. He rented us an apartment, bought us clothes, bought us food and gave us spending money. Then from 10 caps a day, he started giving us between 10 and 15 caps a day. After he'd go to New York and cop, he'd give us 15 caps a day. Some cocaine, sometimes too, after he'd cop some of that. After about 3 months of living with him, my girlfriend and I—well, we weren't living with him, but he was keeping us—I got sick to death of it and I got in a fight with him and I left but my

girlfriend stayed on with him. I left and I had to start tricking again to get my money and by that time my habit was so big, I couldn't get enough money to support it—by tricking alone. So my habit came down. I was sick for quite a while but I could only get so much money. My habit came down to between 6 and 8 caps a day.

MECH. Where were you living during this time?

KRIS. I moved back home and I was tricking. I was like a call girl. My tricks would call me at home and I'd meet them around the corner or down the street or somewhere.

MECH. Did they call you at home?

KRIS. Right. At my mother's house.

MECH. And she didn't realize what was going on?

KRIS. Not at first, but after a couple of months she did start getting suspicious because of all the different guys that were calling. I started out with just a couple of tricks and those couple of tricks spread my name by word of mouth and I started getting dozens of them—just from having a couple who told their friends about me. My mother found out about it and she asked me and—my mother and I are so close, I can't lie to her. I can try to, but she knows, and then I break down and I tell her. So I told her, and during that year and a half she put me in the hospital four times to kick and each time I got out—they put me on methadone for 2 weeks—and each time after the 2 weeks were over and I was off the methadone, as soon as I would get out of the hospital, I'd go out and cop again and get strung out all over again. I just couldn't do without it.

MECH. You came in contact with lots of people. Would you say that a good many of them were Navy, or let's say, military personnel?

KRIS. No, I didn't come in contact with many military guys, hardly, at all. I knew there were a lot of—well, I did come in contact with some—I was thumbing from Portsmouth one day and these three Navy guys picked me up, who had copped themselves in Norfolk a little while before and they were doing a lot of junk, so they took me down to their house in Ocean View. They went out and copped some more and brought me back some junk and we became friends because they weren't strung out on junk but they liked it a whole lot, and I was, and whenever I'd go there, they'd usually give me some. But they were—I think they were the only military I came in contact with. It was due to the junk.

MECH. When was it that you injected your arm and had the problem there?

KRIS. It was in July 1970.

MECH. What happened?

KRIS. I had just gotten on methadone a couple months in April of 1970. It was a methadone maintenance program. It was supposed to be only about 6 weeks of short maintenance. I got on the program through my psychiatrist, which was 2 years ago. It drew out and drew out. I couldn't get off methadone in 6 weeks, so after a couple of months of that, I was hitting up every now and then. I wasn't completely off drugs. A friend called me up one night. He was having a party down the beach. I went down there. They were all shooting up reds, which are seconals, sleeping pills, and they were all messed up, so I got a couple of reds from them and I tried to hit up one. Reds are real chalky when you mix them up with water, and with heroin you put a match to the cooker underneath it and it all dissolves completely, so it is clear. But with seconals, you have to mix it up with a lot of water and it's chalky and there's no way to make it unchalky. So I drew it up through the water about three times and it was still chalky, but that was as clean as I could get it. So I injected it into a vein I'd been using for 3 years but it was sunken—it was used so much it had sunken down into my arm real deep.

So I had to put the needle in real deep to get it. But instead of getting the vein, I went right through it and I hit the artery which, unexperienced I, can't tell the artery from the vein. Some people think that you should be able to, but the blood's darker and redder—brighter red with the artery. But I couldn't tell. Only a doctor can tell that. I had no idea I was hitting the artery. So I pulled the plunger to see if it registered blood and it did. So I shot the seconal in. Within a second after I shot it in, my arm became completely paralyzed, and it was the most painful thing I've ever felt in my entire life. I just didn't know what could have happened, so I booted it in. I pulled the plunger out to see if it registered and it still did, so I shot it in again and shot the blood in again and the pain was excruciating and I just started screaming and crying. I called my psychiatrist and he said, 'Oh, you probably got a bad needle or something. Go to the hospital.' But I knew a bad needle couldn't do that—a dirty needle, so I went to Portsmouth Naval Hospital. After 12 hours of being in the emergency room and the ward, they finally operated. They cut my arm open from my wrist to my elbow on the other side. It was completely black inside, they told me later.

Just almost completely dead because all the circulation had been cut off. For 2 weeks they told my parents that they didn't know if they could save the arm—that they might have to amputate. But they never did tell me that. After a couple of weeks they operated again and they thought after that that they probably wouldn't have to amputate, but it would be paralyzed, maybe, the rest of my life, or for a good long time. They didn't know how long it would be paralyzed. Altogether, then, I had three operations on it, and I was in the hospital 6 weeks. When I got out it was paralyzed for about 6 months, just about completely, where I couldn't use it at all. After about 6 months, real slowly and gradually, I was working on it and getting therapy and the feeling started coming back in it, and I could move it a little bit until about a year and a half later after it happened. I started writing again and it's just like a miraculous thing, you know, where I came so close to losing it, and came so close to having it paralyzed for life, that it's almost completely well now. I can write, I can do everything with it, except I can't close it tight—you know, I can't ball it up in a fist. I can't straighten it up real well but other than that I can do most normal things with it.

MECH. You still hadn't given up drugs even though you'd done this?

KRIS. Yes.

MECH. You had?

KRIS. Yes, after I did this, I gave up drugs completely.

MECH. When was it, then, that the police got hold of you?

KRIS. Oh, they got hold of me before then—a couple of months before then.

MECH. But you were out?

KRIS. Right. I was out on bail when it happened. After it happened and I went to court, one of the cops in court tried to say, 'We busted her and after we busted her, she messed up her arm, so evidently she was still doing drugs.' But then my lawyer said, 'She was evidently still doing drugs then but after she went through all this, the pain and agony, she quit doing drugs altogether, so she has learned a lesson.' And I have.

Let me say one thing, after this happened to my arm, for the next year I never touched any drugs at all. After the year, I did try to do heroin again twice but I didn't shoot it and it didn't do me any good, and I didn't like doing it so I haven't done any since.

MECH. What do you mean, you didn't shoot it?

KRIS. I snorted it. I was too scared to shoot anything. I've given it all up. I've only done

it twice in the past 2 years and I'll never do it again—I don't think; I hope not.

I'm still on methadone now and I don't seem to be able to get off it, or at least any time soon, but I'm gonna try to get off it again. I don't know how I'll do it, but at least I'm working now. I've got a good job and I'm living a normal life.

MECH. How long have you been on methadone?

KRIS. Two years.

MECH. Have they been decreasing the amounts?

KRIS. Yes, at first they decreased the amounts and I couldn't stand it, so they increased them again. I came into this program, the new Renaissance Program, at the Mental Health Center. I've been on that for about 2½ months and they tried decreasing me then, again. I wanted to detoxify, to try to get off it altogether. They'd taken me down 40 milligrams, and I got so sick. I swear, I got so sick; I almost lost my job. The first week I stayed in bed every day because I couldn't stand getting out of bed; I was so sick. I almost lost my job and I was getting ready to go out and cop dope again and do junk so they increased it again, and I've been maintained on a regular level for about the past month and a half. I guess I'll try again sometime soon to go down. I don't know how it'll be but I know this past time, I couldn't stand it. It's not good being on methadone, but it's better than being on junk and I'm as normal as I can be.

MECH. It's administered by medical people?

KRIS. Right. They give it to you at the clinic. It's in pill form and they dissolve it in a little bit of water and pour orange juice in it to make it taste better. You have to drink it right there so there's no chance of . . . Like, when they give it in pills, people could stick it under their tongue, or hide it and save it up and get high on it, or they could sell it. This way, you have to drink it there and there's no way of that happening.

MECH. You think the biggest single factor that influenced you to take the cure is when you messed up your arm?

KRIS. Yes. Before that I'd wanted to get off it, but I just couldn't. I was on the methadone, but even with that, I couldn't. I just didn't think it was enough. When I messed my arm up I knew that it was a God-send; that I wasn't meant to do drugs anymore. I haven't. I don't want to.

MECH. I'm sure you know a lot of other people who are in this program. How many people, actually, do you think are successful in giving up drugs?

KRIS. Well, a lot of people on the program are 'chipping.' They do the methadone, and when they have a chance, they do heroin, too. Some of them aren't sincere at all. They just want to get detoxified so that they'll be clean so they can start their habit off again and have it so that they won't have to do as much. You know what I mean? Their habit will be cheaper and they can get high easier. They're not sincere on getting off of it. Those are the people who give it a bad name and the people who try to 'rip things off' from the clinic. But a good number of the people are sincere and the number of them that I've talked to haven't been 'chipping' at all, or they try not to, and they've been doing pretty good. I think.

MECH. What would you say to anybody who would even think about taking drugs?

KRIS. Oh. For the past 2 years I've gone to a junior high school in Virginia Beach a couple of times, I've talked at American Legion meetings, church meetings, PTA meetings, all sorts of places. A couple of weeks ago, I went up to Washington and spoke to the Senate—the Senate Subcommittee that Birch Bayh headed—about drugs. The older kids that have already tried drugs, I can't reach—they're already in it too deep or they don't want to listen, but the younger kids who haven't tried it yet . . . I don't try to scare

them; I just tell them what can happen—what's happened to me and if they do get into it, what hell they might go through if they get into it too heavy. I don't recommend it.

MECH. Do you think that there was some point where you could have given drugs up without having the serious problems you've had up to now?

KRIS. I really don't know. I've never thought about it. I don't even know if I had looked ahead when I started doing drugs . . . if I saw what would have happened—you know, how I got strung out and messed up my arm—I don't know if it would have stopped me. I can't say.

MECH. You can't define any one place that you might have been able to say, 'Alright, let's knock it off,' and you feel that you could have?

KRIS. No. Not at all. I enjoyed drugs too much and when I wasn't strung out on heroin, it was the most beautiful drug I'd ever done. Like, for example, a girlfriend of mine and her boyfriend were strung out. They met when they were strung out, and they got married when they were strung out. So, as I say, to me, heroin is like artificial love. They got married, and when they both got busted and went to jail and got clean, they knew they didn't love each other, but it was just the heroin they had in common. So, that's what I mean by artificial love and how happy it makes you. But once you get strung out, it's holy hell. It's not any fun getting strung out anymore. It's just that you have to maintain it to keep normal—to keep from getting sick and to keep from going through hell. Just to stay normal.

MECH. Was there ever a point in your drug taking that you contemplated suicide?

KRIS. Yes. I thought about it a lot. I didn't really want to, but I thought about it a lot. For instance, my mother had put me in the hospital about three times already, and I got strung out again. I just couldn't go to her again and tell her that I was strung out and needed to go to the hospital. So I took an overdose of phenobarbital, which I was taking for my epilepsy, that I knew probably wouldn't kill me because they were weak. But I took them, and right after I took them—I took about 35 of them—after I took them I told Mom I was going out and I thumbed to the hospital. I told them what I had done so they wouldn't put me in the hospital and they called my mother and by the time she came, I was passed out. I didn't have to face her, but they put me in the hospital and I told her why I had done it after they put me in. She understood. My mother and father have been the most helpful people and I think without them I would probably still be strung out or dead or something. I've OD'd three or four times, and once a trick took me to a gas station after I copped—he didn't know what I was doing, but I told him I had to go to the bathroom. So I went in the gas station bathroom and I hit up and the next thing I knew, I woke up 4 hours later on the floor with the needle still in my arm. I'd OD'd. I guess I was lucky nobody came in the bathroom because they would have called the cops and I'd been in jail. But I had to call my parents to come pick me up 'cause I couldn't walk. I told them what had happened and they came to pick me up. They've gotten really mad but they've understood, and they've helped me.

MECH. Do you think most of the kids take drugs for emotional reasons or do a lot of them take it because they are called chicken?

KRIS. Yeah, they want to be around in the crowd . . . I think that a lot of kids take it because of the influence that friends have on them—because their friends were taking it. They want to be liked, and they take it so they will be liked. I hear kids talk nowadays, like young kids—15, 16 years old—like, "Wow! I did some skag last night; it was

really good, Wow!" Like they're bragging about it because they think it's neat. Like, I took it because these people I met were taking it—and they looked so happy taking it. I didn't take it to go along with the crowd, but they looked like they were enjoying it immensely.

MECH. What is skag?

KRIS. Heroin. They think it's neat. They think it's the "in" thing to do.

MECH. You mean they jump right in with heroin?

KRIS. Some people do. But, most kids start out doing other drugs first.

MECH. I understand with heroin you have to work slowly before you start shooting it directly into your system.

KRIS. Well, I did. The first time I did it, I shot it up. But when you first start out, you can't shoot a lot of it. Like, you have to build up to do more and more of it. If you shoot a lot, you'll OD right away.

MECH. That's why some of these people take overdoses?

KRIS. Right. Plus you can't ever tell how much you're getting. You can't ever tell that.

MECH. You don't know what the percentage of heroin is?

KRIS. Right. Some people say, "Well, I got some pure heroin yesterday." If they'd gotten pure heroin, they'd be dead right on the spot. You know, it's cut so much, it's just outstanding how much it's cut. It's got to be cut a lot.

MECH. Do you have a job?

KRIS. Yes, I work for a TV station, although it's hard for addicts to get jobs. A lot of them have records; people don't want to hire them because they have records, and stuff. Like being on the maintenance program. I'd gone to Nursing Aid School for 3 months and then found out that none of the hospitals would hire me because of my drug addiction. I am thankful that the TV management knew I was an addict, but still gave me a job.

MECH. How long have you been working?

KRIS. I've been working 8 months now. That's the longest I've ever worked in my life. I've never worked over a month at anything, so it's really an accomplishment.

MECH. Kris, what do you think the future holds for you?

KRIS. I can't really say. No, I can't really say.

JAPANESE WAGES AND OUR TRADE DEFICIT

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with our adverse trade balance with Japan. In 1972, our trade deficit with that country was a little over \$4 billion, or nearly a billion dollars higher than in 1971.

The highly unbalanced state of our trade with Japan has given rise to a succession of negotiations, and has been an important contributor to the financial difficulties we have experienced in the past few years and which became acute once more very recently.

Many ideas have been advanced toward a solution of our difficulty in trading with Japan. There is one approach, however, that seemingly has escaped the notice it deserves. It has to do with the wage levels prevailing in Japan, linked

with the greatly increased productivity of Japanese industry.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer a short paper on this subject prepared by O. R. Strackbein, who heads the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy. I am convinced that the paper will provide not only food for thought, but also a course of action that would be inestimable benefit to Japan herself:

JAPAN'S NEED FOR A BROADER HOME MARKET

(By O. R. Strackbein)

In 1971 Japan had a civilian labor force of 51 million, of which only 1.3% was unemployed.

The United States had a civilian labor force of 84 million in the same year. 5.9% was unemployed.

The per capita gross national product in the United States in 1970 was \$4,734. In Japan it was \$1911.

While the per capita gross product of Japan quadrupled between 1960 and 1970 compared with an increase of only 67% in the United States, Japan was still nearly \$3,000 below the level in this country, or only 40% of our per capita product in 1970. (Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1972, Table 1326, p. 812, and Table 1329, p. 813).

While the Japanese economic ascent has been very rapid the gulf between her level and that of this country was so wide in 1960 that it is not yet bridged in spite of Japan's rapid rise.

In the field of industrial production Japan rose from an index of 70 in 1960 to 270 in 1971, where 1963 equals 100. This was a 2.86 fold increase.

The comparative U.S. industrial-production growth went from 87 in 1960 to only 139 in 1971. This was an increase of only 59%. The Japanese growth was therefore 4.8-fold that of this country. (Stat. Abs., 1972, Table 1332, p. 815). The Japanese growth was particularly steep from 1965 to 1971. It moved from 120 to 270 during that period. This country moved from 117, which was close to the Japanese index of 120, to only 139. To repeat, Japan moved to 270, i.e., over twice the 1965 figure. This meant, of course, that the growth of the Japanese economy really took wing after 1965.

The Japanese output per man-hour in manufacturing rose to 152.3 in 1970 from 52.6 in 1960 and 79.0 in 1965, where 1967 equals 100. Here again the jump since 1965 was 73 points compared with only 26.4 points from 1960 to 1965.

By comparison the output per man-hour in manufacturing rose to only 107.8 by 1970 in this country, compared with 152.3 for Japan. Moreover, we were already at 80.5 in 1960. Therefore our increase was only 27.3 points in ten years compared with the nearly 100 point increase in Japan. From 1965 to 1970, the U.S. increase was only 9.1 points compared with 73 points in Japan. (Stat. Abs. 1972, Table 1328, p. 812).

In the case of man-hour compensation, in national currency, this country rose from 76.6 (where 1967 equals 100) to 121.6 in 1970, whereas Japan went from 43.3 to 164.6. Our increase was 58.7%; that of Japan 180%. However, our hourly earnings (production workers) were already at \$2.26 in 1960, whereas the Japanese pay averaged barely 40 cents per hour. An increase of 20% above our \$2.26 per hour would be 45 cents and this would be equal to a 100% increase in the Japanese 1960 rate of 40 cents per hour.

Therefore the sharp increase in Japanese wages in terms of percentages was still insufficient to close the gap. Today the average hourly pay in manufacturing in this country is \$4.00.

In 1971 the average nonagricultural pay in Japan was approximately \$236 per month

(calculated at 360 yen to the dollar). Weekly hours were 43. The monthly hours therefore was approximately 185. Therefore the average hourly pay was about \$1.27. In this country the rate was \$3.43, still leaving a gap of \$2.16 per hour or 164% above the Japanese wage. (Bulletin of Labor Statistics, International Labor Office, 4th quarter 1972, pp. 41, 50).

SOLUTION OF THE JAPANESE TRADE PROGRAM

The growth of the Japanese economy has been phenomenal. It reflected the great post-war technological advancement in the production facilities. This advancement greatly exceeded that of the United States, as might be expected, because the new technology in Japan replaced a technology of a lower order, thus resulting in great leaps in productivity, while in the United States replacement machinery was usually only a moderate improvement over the existing equipment.

As in the United States, employee compensation no doubt represents the greater part of the gross national product in Japan. As we have seen the per capita GNP of Japan is only 40% of the level in this country.

The great rise in Japanese productivity has been such that the economy would support a higher per capita product than the \$1911 of 1970, compared with \$4,734 in the United States. Had it been \$2500 in 1970 instead of \$1911, the purchasing power of the Japanese people (103,000,000 in 1970) would have been increased by about \$60 billion. It would have been about \$257 billion instead of the actual \$197 billion (Approx).

Japan would have found its home market much more attractive than the American market which even in 1972 took only \$9 billion in imports from Japan.

Should the American per capita GNP shrink to the \$1911 level of 1970 Japan our economy would collapse beyond resuscitation. In 1970 when our GNP merely failed to grow by more than 5% we went into an uncomfortable recession.

An increase of only \$200 in the per capita GNP of Japan would widen the Japanese home market by over \$20 billion. Total Japanese exports were \$19.3 billion.

While it is true that Japan needs heavy exports in order to purchase her needs for food and raw materials, a richer market at home would enable her to import more as well as export more; but the need to export would be much less pressing. The increase in wages that would swell the gross national product would also expand demand, i.e., effective, money-backed demand for consumer goods at home. Japanese consumers could buy more, both of home-produced goods and of imports.

Japan's undoubted need for foreign markets would shrink hand in hand with an upward curve in the standard of living at home. There is a built-in potential market at home that, if more fully developed, would reduce dependence on exports while increasing consumption of domestically-produced goods within Japan.

The business community need have no fear that this course would reduce profits. The American experience proves the contrary. The same rate of profit on a larger sales volume produces a higher total profit than the same rate on a lower volume of sales.

OEO DESERVES TO CONTINUE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's termination of vital

social programs will deprive many Americans of the Federal assistance they need and deserve. The agency most directly attacked is, of course, the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The elimination of this agency which has become a symbol of hope to millions would truly be a regressive step. Howard Phillips, the Acting Director of OEO, made the administration's position clear when he said:

I think in many ways OEO has had negative impact.

Mr. Phillips has previously stated:

We found that the Office of Economic Opportunity was functioning mainly as a make-work program designed to lay off summer riots.

Statements such as these are indicative of the callousness demonstrated by the administration toward those Americans who are in the greatest need of Government services.

Any major agency will undergo various administrative difficulties. OEO is no exception, but has taken admirable steps to avoid excess complications. The agency has consistently responded to changes through self-evaluation and reform. A recent study conducted by OEO, known as the "Utilization Test Data," revealed that most of the 591 agencies evaluated, were working closely with local governments and adjusting to achieve more effective administration.

Lou Cannon writing on OEO in the Washington Post, Sunday, February 4, 1973, discussed the situation. The article follows:

OEO CHIEF SAVORS SHUTDOWN

(By Lou Cannon)

The man who is to dismantle the Office of Economic Opportunity believes that OEO has undermined authority, challenged the family, promoted the welfare ethic and eroded democratic safeguards.

Howard Phillips, 32, acting director of the agency, is cheerfully looking forward to his task.

"I personally believe in what I'm going to be doing, so it's going to be a very easy job for me to do from that standpoint," Phillips said. "I'm not going to have any mental hangups or reservations and I'm just going to hope that I have the judgment and the skill to do it well."

The chief casualties of the dismantling—and the backbone of what Lyndon B. Johnson once called the "war on poverty"—are the 907 community action agencies scattered around the country.

The budget presented to Congress by President Nixon last week suggests that local communities may want to use revenue-sharing funds to keep the community action agencies going. Phillips has no doubt that many of them simply will be closed down, and that is all right with him.

Community action agencies, in Phillips' view, often have become "captives of their staffs" and "really representative of no one." He thinks that these programs and OEO itself have fostered "harmful illusions" about the nature of poverty.

"I think in many ways OEO has had negative impact," Phillips told The Washington Post in an hour-long interview. "When we spend public dollars, we have to decide not merely whether they're being spent effectively but whether there are some ways in which they've been harmful. And to the extent that we have promoted the welfare ethic out of OEO, to the extent that some people funded by us have advanced the

notion that the main values of American life are without merit, then I think OEO has done a great disservice to this country. And unfortunately there have been a number of instances of that."

Phillips concedes that OEO has become a symbol for the poor, but he does not believe it a symbol that should be perpetuated.

"To me, OEO has come to symbolize a number of unfortunate things," Phillips said. "It's come to symbolize challenges to the importance of the family. It's come to symbolize the seeking to change beyond the ken of orderly democratic process. Boycotts and demonstrations and riots and so forth and so on may be legal. They shouldn't be subsidized by the federal government. And even if they're conducted privately, they tend to erode the kind of normal majoritarian democratic safeguards that are incident to the electoral process."

The destruction of community action agencies—whose representatives met in Washington last week and voted to raise a war chest of \$75,000 to fight the issue in Congress and the courts—comes at a time when an OEO evaluation of the agencies celebrated them for their effectiveness in mobilizing local resources "to help the poor become self-sufficient."

The evaluation, based on a study of 591 of the 907 agencies, found them working closely with local governments and making institutional changes of benefit to the poor.

"The total emerging picture of community action clearly shows that CAAs are rapidly becoming very positive forces in their communities that can play significant roles in helping communities rise to the challenges of revenue-sharing and other forms of government decentralization," the evaluation stated.

The biggest challenge to revenue sharing, as it has turned out, may be trying to stretch the money to pay for the community action agencies in communities that want to keep them.

The evaluation was published in limited numbers in January but Phillips, acting at the direction of the Office of Management and Budget, halted its distribution.

A number of employees nonetheless passed the survey around, and the document is likely to become a cornerstone of the political arguments made by community action representatives on Capitol Hill.

Many of the OEO agencies have an admittedly small constituency in Congress. But the community action agencies, in the views of their backers, have the potential for generating congressional support because they are scattered around the country and have local ties.

"Even where they're not popular, the city governments have used them as a buffer zone with poor people," says one OEO employee. "When they go the buffer goes too."

This is why such big-city mayors as Chicago's Richard Daley have protested the community action close-down. In the big cities, the community action agencies employ a heavy proportion of blacks and other racial minorities. In the rural South, community action agencies are sometimes a major employer.

Across the country, community action agencies employ 184,500 persons, half of whom were below the poverty line when they were hired. They make an average annual wage of \$5,200.

"There's very little chance that many of these people will be picked up by local government," said Wayne Kennedy, president of the National Council of OEO Unions. "Many of these people are poor people who are going to be forced back onto welfare."

In the eyes of Kennedy and other OEO activists, the closedown also will put pressure for jobs on the all-white construction unions. He says that AFL-CIO President George

Meany "is not prepared to deal with this pressure."

The supporters of OEO see the closedown of the agency as an indication that the government, under the Nixon administration, has given up on the poor.

"Even when you earmark funds for the poor, it's unlikely that the money will get there," Kennedy said. "When you throw it into the general pot, there's no chance they will get it. What we're asking for in seeking the retention of the community action agencies is spending \$328 million on the poor, the equivalent of one lousy subsidy for a big corporation."

Kennedy's hope is that the Nixon administration will report a reorganization plan including OEO to Congress and that Congress will reject it. Even if this happens, however, it is questionable whether Congress can force a President to spend money on an agency that is part of the executive office of the President.

On the other hand, Congress will definitely have a say about the future of the OEO legal services program, which President Nixon maintains he wants to preserve in the form of a legal services corporation.

Last year, Congress substituted its own legal services corporation for the President's plan after both sides refused to compromise. Mr. Nixon promptly vetoed the bill.

This year, the administration has earmarked \$71.5 million for legal services and declared its intention to resubmit a bill to Congress. Phillips, who played an important role in the fight over the corporation last time, said the new bill hasn't been written yet.

When the legislation is submitted to Congress, probably in mid-February, the administration will have the whip hand. Legal services will have no home in OEO after the office is abolished July 1, and the administration, in effect, is saying to Congress: pass the President's bill if you want to keep legal services going.

Five Democratic senators nonetheless introduced their rival bill for a legal services corporation Friday and proposed appropriating \$171.5 million to fund it instead of the \$71.5 million requested by Mr. Nixon.

The main issues on legal services, however, are ideological rather than economic.

The President last year proposed a corporation that would be appointed entirely by him and that would restrict political activity and lobbying by the legal services lawyers as well as the type of legal actions that could be filed. The Democrats, led by Sen. Walter Mondale of Minnesota, Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts and Alan Cranston of California, responded with a board that would be appointed from a variety of sources and would impose few restrictions on attorneys.

The same kind of fight is brewing again. Phillips says that legal services programs have in many cases served the objectives of the lawyers rather than of the clients. He gave this example:

"The way the legal services program is now structured, if a client comes in and says, 'Mr. Legal services attorney, I want a divorce,' the attorney can say, 'Gee, I'm sorry. This week we're just suing the President, try us next week,' and the client doesn't have much choice. Similarly, if the attorney pursues a particular course of action and the client doesn't like it, there isn't much the client can do about it."

He also points to political and organizing activities conducted by lawyers who have tried to "politicize" and "radicalize" the poor and who spend a disproportionate amount of their time with anti-government test cases.

This picture of an OEO-sponsored legal services program which serves mainly as a battle station for harassing the establishment is contradicted by Theodore Tetzlaff, who heads the OEO legal services program.

He says that OEO attorneys have 1.2 million clients. These attorneys spend 42 per cent of their time on domestic relations programs, 18 per cent on consumer and job issues, 12 per cent on housing problems, 10 per cent on juvenile problems and most of the rest of their time on issues of veterans' benefits, welfare and Social Security.

"Less than one-half of 1 per cent of the time spent by the lawyers was in group representation or class actions," Tetzlaff said.

A similar conclusion was reached in November by William R. Klaus, chairman of the American Bar Association's Committee on Legal Aid, in a reply in the *ABA Journal* to criticisms of legal services made by Vice President Spiro T. Agnew.

"The professional record of legal services lawyers as a group has been exemplary," Klaus wrote. "This record, far from showing that these lawyers have been irresponsible or unresponsive to their clients' needs, shows that they have vigorously and in the preponderance of cases successfully represented their indigent clients."

Phillips would not agree.

"Legal services lawyers . . . have been organizing chapters of the National Welfare Rights Organization, they've been organizing chapters of the National Tenants Organization, they've been organizing United Farm Workers Unions around the country with taxpayers' funds," he said.

It is an open secret in the dying OEO that Phillips and Tetzlaff, 28, the office's legal services director, disagree on fundamental issues.

Tetzlaff is a staunch defender of legal services and wary of restrictions on the type of service an attorney can offer a poor client. He believes that good attorneys will be reluctant to work for any legal services programs unless they offer their clients the full range of actions that would be available to a paying client.

But Tetzlaff, who has been caught in a crossfire between Phillips and poverty-lawyer groups, also believes that local boards of attorneys should advise lawyers and even impose restrictions consistent with the canons of judicial ethics.

Too often, Tetzlaff said, a young attorney in a legal services program is like a doctor just out of medical school "asked to perform open heart surgery."

Another medical analogy, one that is far more critical of OEO attempts to limit legal service activity, is offered by Michael Bennett, administrator of California Rural Legal Assistance.

"Phillips apparently wants a legal services program with lawyers prohibited from using the traditional tools of their profession," Bennett said. "That's simply fraud. It would be like establishing a program of 'doctors for the poor' and prohibiting the doctors from prescribing anything but aspirin."

The "medicine" prescribed by Phillips last week for the entire OEO was strong.

Taking over as acting director at a time that job security fears were sweeping through the agency, Phillips ordered a flat ban on promotions, hiring and nonlocal travel. He also sent out an order limiting refunding of grants to a 30-day basis.

The limitation was an understandable one for programs which are being phased out or transferred. In the case of legal services, complains legal rights lobbyist Noel H. Klores, the action "simply amounts to harassment."

Phillips also distributed an explanation of the OEO phaseout which showed the work force reduced from 2,271 on June 30, 1972, to 1,500 this June 30. These 1,500 will be transferred to other agencies with more than half of them (834) going to the General Services Administration.

Of the declining OEO appropriation, \$33 million will be transferred to the General

Services Administration for "liquidation activities."

This bluntly worded phrase and Phillips' actions in his first week as OEO acting director showed that the administration was wasting no time in bringing the war on poverty to its inconclusive end. No one could have been happier about it than Howard Phillips.

CUTS IN SOCIAL SERVICES

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration is planning to make drastic cuts in a wide range of federally supported social service programs such as aid for children, the elderly, the retarded, and the addict.

These cuts will be accomplished through substantial changes in HEW regulations proposed on February 16. The net effect will be to cut social services by more than \$700 million below the already restrictive \$2.5 billion ceiling set by Congress last fall, and to deny millions of working poor a chance to become self-sufficient.

It is clear that this is nothing more nor less than a device to effect improper impoundment of urgently needed funds. It is a devious and unconscionable invasion of legislative prerogative which will work incalculable hardship upon innocent children and families who through no fault of their own are economically deprived.

Standards for social services have been so narrowed that only the working welfare recipient is eligible. Thus the working poor are denied a chance to achieve independence and many will, in fact, be forced back onto welfare. Federal standards for child care have been eliminated, an invitation to a return to mere warehousing of children. The use of private funds as part of the State's share in claiming Federal reimbursement has been prohibited. States which rely heavily on these funds will be forced to make up the deficit or suspend services and private enterprise is denied a chance to make a meaningful contribution to community involvement.

On February 22, I sent to Secretary Caspar Weinberger a letter protesting the new regulations, signed by myself and 67 Members of the House. A copy of this letter is attached.

Within the next several days I plan to introduce legislation to prevent implementation of these regulations. I urge all my colleagues who care about helping the poor gain a meaningful place in our society to sponsor this legislation.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., February 22, 1973.

HON. CASPAR WEINBERGER,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We are writing to register our strong protest over the new social service regulations issued on February 16, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In our opinion, these regulations are not only inhumane, but fail to carry out the mandate of Congress under which your Department operates.

Last year Congress established stringent spending limits for social services. But these regulations go far beyond this budgetary efforts. Not only will spending be curtailed by over \$700 million, but further, the primary intention of the law—to move the poor toward self-sufficiency—has been thwarted.

To make additional cutbacks in vitally needed services for children, mothers, the retarded, the aged, the drug addict is unconscionable. To so constrict eligibility for these programs that only the working welfare recipient is eligible is to deny the working poor a chance to become independent. To eliminate standards for child care is to relegate our young children to ghettoized warehousing or babysitting at best. To prohibit the use of private funds for matching is to deny private enterprise the chance to share in responsibility for community involvement.

We urge you, on behalf of the millions of affected Americans, to withdraw these regulations and return to regulations consistent with Congressional intent.

Sincerely,

Ogden R. Reid, Joseph P. Addabbo, Thomas L. Ashley, Herman Badillo, Jaime Benitez, Mario Blaggi, Jonathan B. Bingham, John Brademas, George E. Brown, Jr., Phillip Burton, Shirley Chisholm, William Clay, John Conyers, James C. Corman, Dominick V. Daniels, Ronald V. Dellums, Ron de Lugo, John H. Dent, Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Robert F. Drinan, Bob Eckhardt, Don Edwards, Joshua Ellberg, Dante B. Fascell, Walter E. Fauntroy, Donald M. Fraser, Richard H. Fulton, Kenneth J. Gray, Gilbert Gude, Michael Harrington, Augustus F. Hawkins, Ken Hechler, Henry Helstoski, Elizabeth Holtzman, Barbara Jordan, Edward I. Koch, Peter N. Kyros, Robert L. Leggett, William Lehman, Spark M. Matsunaga, Romano L. Mazzoli, Lloyd Meeds, Ralph H. Metcalfe, Patsy Mink, Parren J. Mitchell, John Moakley, William S. Moorhead, John M. Murphy, Claude Pepper, Bertram L. Podell, Melvin Price, Charles B. Rangel, Donald W. Riegle, Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Fred B. Rooney, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Edward R. Roybal, Paul S. Sarbanes, Patricia Schroeder, Fortney H. Stark, Louis Stokes, W. S. Stuckey, Jr., Frank Thompson, Jr., Robert O. Tiernan, Lionel Van Deerlin, Lester L. Wolff, Antonio Borja Won Pat, Andrew Young.

REALITY: HOME AND ABROAD

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the subject of the multinational corporation and its impact on our economy is very much on the minds of the Members of the House. I am providing for their benefit the following informative speech by Mr. James W. McKee, Jr., president of the CPC International Inc. of New Jersey:

It is appropriate that Los Angeles is the focal point of Southern California and Southwest industry, and a gateway port to the Pacific Basin and trade with Latin America, Australia, Japan and the Far East. For I am going to urge today that business and opin-

ion leaders of this country must look in both directions—abroad as well as at home—for our own prosperity and survival.

There are growing numbers of people in this nation who would have us look inward only, and reject the larger world of opportunity that lies beyond our shores. And I believe that this is a defeatist and dangerous attitude.

NATIONAL SELF-INTEREST

We must—as indeed all nations must—look inward to the well-being of our domestic industry, our labor force, our economy. And follow those courses of action that will yield the most benefit, over the long term, and for the greatest number of our people. A healthy self-interest, if you will, that looks to keep our house in order.

But the near-sighted vision of protectionism, that sees only those factors closest at hand, and cannot or will not see their relationship to all the other elements of the world situation outside our borders, is not a healthy self-interest. A course of action that attempts to seal this country off from the rest of the world is simply not realistic and will not create domestic strength, but weakness.

To a certain extent in the world of economics we can see a parallel to the law of physics which states that every action has an equal and opposite reaction. What we do inside this country produces a reaction outside, and actions taken abroad have an effect on our domestic well-being.

If we look at events of recent times with a broad vision, we can see the ways in which these inward and outward actions have affected this country and will continue to do so.

In the years since World War II, the reality of a world united in mutual trade and interdependence has grown to a degree that seemed impossible 50 years ago. Economic cooperation has accomplished more in two decades than politics and ideology have ever been able to do. We have seen the beginnings of rapprochement with the Soviet Union and China. We have witnessed the Common Market override the centuries-old animosities of Western Europe through economic cooperation. These nations have come to trade with us and each other because of the needs of their people for food and other necessities of life, by a need for resource development and utilization, and a desire to expand trade.

These gains can be extended and enriched, and a world united in prosperity brought closer to reality, with this country as a leader. The outward trend to unity should be continued through active encouragement and promotion not only by the government but by all responsible persons.

These economic gains have not been achieved without some problems in all nations, of course. There has been some slowing down of the pace of growth recently. There is inflation. There are areas of unemployment, worldwide. There have been monetary imbalances. There have of course been strains in the patterns of things-as-they-were as national economies have moved from the narrower confines of country and regional markets into the broader sweep of a global economy. These real problems have generated fears both here and abroad which form the emotional and unreal basis of protectionist sentiment.

TO ENCOURAGE EXPANSION

But the stresses of this expansion in our country can be eased by adjustment of the instruments that have worked generally quite well, rather than by dismantling them and returning to more localized parochial outlooks and limitations on this expansion... including tariffs, quotas, investment restrictions and the infinite variety of devices that block the international movement of goods,

capital and technology... the economic warfare that has so often led to political turmoil and war. Rather, let our internal actions produce an external reaction which encourages worldwide economic expansion.

I am most concerned that one of the major targets of protectionist forces is the multinational corporation. Not only because I am president of such a company, but because the multinational corporation has become one of the dynamic sparkplugs—a vital energizer—of the world economy. The MNCs have been one medium through which capital, science, technology, and human resources have flowed between the industrial nations. And, of increasing importance to the future of the industrial nations, the multinational corporation is the most important active interface—where the most practical actions are going on—between the have and have-not nations.

Government aid programs—with the Marshall Plan the most spectacular success—have played their part in building the early foundations of the present world economy. But in recent years, it has been private capital, carrying the explosion of new concepts in science, technology and management across borders and oceans, that has sparked prosperity on a global scale. And brought mutual benefit to investors, including Americans, and the recipient peoples and countries.

The very success of the multinational has attracted an increasing public awareness of the extent of their activities... their size and resources... their very multi-nationality. Awareness of what may seem a totally new creation of world business has engendered confusion and misunderstanding.

And, indeed, some legitimate confusion does exist. No one, for example, seems to agree on the definition of a multinational corporation. The American Office of Foreign Direct Investment, for purposes of regulation, lists 3,350 U.S. companies that invest directly outside our borders to one degree or another, although not all of these would be considered multinationals.

MULTINATIONAL TRADITION

Actually, multinational corporations have been in business for many years, of course. My own company began manufacturing and marketing abroad over 50 years ago. Our experience has not been unique, although we happened to start investing abroad earlier than most other firms to hold and gain markets that could not be reached by export with our types of food products.

And what we have done abroad has benefited us—and our nation—at home: Interaction outward and inward. Like other multinationals, earnings from abroad have been distributed to American individuals, institutions and funds holding shares, and have been re-invested in the business. Our net return flow from dollars invested abroad has made a substantial contribution to the U.S. Balance of Payments. Our manufacturing operations abroad have generated the export of American machinery and agricultural commodities (produced by other firms) currently in the range of more than \$85 million a year. We import some raw materials, as well, but the net balance is over \$35 million on the export side. So, our investments abroad, by helping to generate U.S. exports and a return flow of dollars, have contributed to the U.S. domestic economy.

At the same time, investments abroad have created wealth in the host countries, providing employment and economic stimulus, as well as raising living standards. Both sides—U.S. and host—have gained from a mutual exchange of benefits.

What my company has been able to do has been done by many other multinationals. And, more importantly, the potential for much more economic development lies with

the concept of the multinational corporation.

For the great surge in world economic development to date has been sparked by just such private capital and technology flows among nations, in an atmosphere of investment and trade freedom. Regarding trade, it is generally recognized today that fully 50 percent of Western world trade per se is the result of direct capital investment among nations.

But only a small part of the task has been accomplished so far. For we of this nation and other developed countries face beyond our borders almost three-quarters of a world which has not had the same economic advantages in such basic areas as food, housing and clothing. Nearly three-quarters of a world which consumes as little as one-seventh of the global resources at mankind's disposal.

While there has been some improvement in the number of developing countries showing gains in basic living standards, the gap between fundamental needs and true well-being is still considerable. In the vital area of agriculture, for example, the developing nations are falling farther behind in food production.

CHALLENGE AND OPPORTUNITY

The condition of this great majority of the world's peoples represents for us both a challenge and an opportunity—but also a potential danger. Looking outward, we can see the danger that could affect us inwardly. The imbalance in distribution of the world's food and basic goods necessary for a satisfactory life—the existence of hunger, poverty and hopelessness side by side with comfort in a world of almost instant communication—bears a potential for social unrest, violence and political adventurism. For, as psychologist Rollo May points out in his recent book, "Power and Innocence," it is not power, but its opposite—impotence—that leads to violence.

I am proposing that the developed nations have the means at our disposal to create the potential for betterment of living conditions where that possibility does not now exist. For this country, our failure to act outside our borders could lead to economic and political turmoil abroad that would profoundly affect our domestic well-being.

And governments alone cannot do this job, although they have the potential to facilitate or frustrate the task. As far as aid is concerned, the total aid of the industrialized countries to the under-developed amounts to less than one per cent of the Gross National Product of the industrialized nations.

Private industry of the world, however, has amassed a great reservoir of technology, skill and expertise required to direct the employment of development capital creatively, in ways that can build solid foundations for further economic growth and development.

Another factor has been emerging worldwide in recent years which favors a logical, meaningful use of development funds. This is the increasing focus on values growing out of the needs of the individual—with human beings as the end, not the means, of economic development; the desire to make capitals and technology the tools of men, rather than the other way around.

NEW VALUES WORLDWIDE

We have seen this value-shift in our own country expressed in the goals of Consumerism, of Corporate Responsibility, of Zero Economic Growth and Zero Population Growth, in the demands for environmental improvement—and in Europe, in the questions posed by the Club of Rome—all of which reflect deeper historical movements in the value-direction of our technological society.

The same considerations are expressed in the Third World nations through their in-

sistence on participation in future negotiations on world monetary systems in the International Monetary Fund. By the so-called Group of 77 in the United Nations, now actually numbering over 90 Third World nations, concerned with employment, hunger, and malnutrition. Third World nations are demanding a voice in the direction and employment of development capital to match their internal re-ordering of priorities from a preoccupation with straight-line economic growth in conventional terms to a regard for the basic needs of their people—for food, employment, housing, education. New Priorities, for example, that rank food before automobiles and housing before steel mills.

The situation, then, as I see it, is an enormous amount of economic wealth and ability in the industrialized quarter of the world, and an overwhelming need now—not in some indeterminate future—for scientific, technical, and financial assistance in the underdeveloped quarters of the world, to bring their people above the level of hunger and bare subsistence.

There can be a healthy self-interest here, too, for the concerns of our domestic economy. We know from experience that our capital invested abroad earns dollars for our home country. We also know that when we invest our technology and expertise abroad, we earn not only dollars on the transaction, but increase the productivity—the utilization—of these resources and receive valuable technology in return. It is common knowledge, as well, that raising the level of living standards of other societies creates demand for export products from our home industrial base.

I believe that experience has also shown that generally, one of the most viable, practical pipelines already working to transfuse the lifeblood of capital from the haves to the have-nots, is the multinational corporation.

And yet at this juncture the multinationals have come under increasing questioning and attack. There are fantasies aplenty but precious little fact in the current controversies, both inside the U.S. and outside. Within the short space of a few months, some four different international studies of multinational corporations have been launched: The International Labor Organization, the U.N. Economic and Social Council, the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development and, in our own country, The Brookings Institution. Others will undoubtedly be undertaken by our new Congress.

MORE HARMONY NEEDED

But the international need now is not more or less government involvement, but more inter-governmental as well as inter-corporate harmony in the new priorities affecting multinational enterprise. The accusation is often made that multinationals are subject to the laws of no nation. This could almost be amusing to corporations such as mine, which is subject to the laws, regulations—and tax structures—of 42 different nations outside our own. We face almost unbelievable complexity in meeting the regulations of so many different nations in regard to taxation, tariffs, financing, product standards, labeling and packaging, ingredients, container sizes, and even definitions. Some of these requirements reflect genuine regulatory traditions peculiar to the different nations. But some, however, are thinly-veiled protectionist actions that erect barriers to trade.

Some efforts have been made to reach international agreement on standard requirements, such as the International Organization for Standardization in the field of mechanical standards and, in the food field, the work toward a *Codex Alimentarius* of uniform worldwide food standards, by the Food and Agriculture Organization and the World

Health Organization. These efforts indicate, to me, the most sensible course—an adjustment and reorganizing of existing instruments of world development with proven ability to get the job of economic growth done.

Therefore, I most fervently hope that the studies of multinationals now getting under way will lead to a sensible reordering of regulations and agreements on international requirements affecting broad areas of trade and investment. Collaboration and planning among national governments and multinational companies could, as well, lead to more orderly development and a building of mutual trust.

There are infinite varieties of *new* possibilities open to us in the United States and other developed nations. New instruments and bodies of international cooperation and harmony. New codes of law and conduct multilaterally agreed to among nations. New means of moving scarce capital and technology—as, indeed, knowledge itself is capital—to the peoples and nations where it is needed.

FORCE OF WORLD ECONOMICS

We are already wrestling successfully with techniques of economic cooperation between nations of East and West whose ideologies and politics are directly opposed on a theoretical basis. East and West are moving on converging courses because of the inexorable forces of world economics powered by a totally new value system based on human need. We are seeing the separation of economic and political power advocated by Servan-Schreiber.

Looking outward, we can see the evolution of a global combination of systems working towards the protection and utilization of the world's resources for the benefit of all the world's peoples. And the dynamic mover is the *multinational concept*—whether it be the multinational company as it exists today or a new combination of instruments that will evolve to meet tomorrow's needs.

Looking inward, we can see these forces at work now in the United States, as they have been in our recent years of turmoil and change. Our institutions of government, education and industry are responding to the pressures of the new needs and values. American corporations have undergone more change in their response to our society's needs in the past four years than in any comparable period before. On questions of poverty, urban problems, racial and sexual discrimination, the environment, education, nutrition—a whole range of issues once thought to be outside the realm of corporate concern.

And it is precisely because business is concerned and is using its enormous resources to effect progressive changes in our society, that our country is making headway in coping with and surmounting its problems. Contrary to traditional dogma, it is America and American business which are in the forefront of radical evolutionary changes in our society—positive changes wrought through innovation of new and adaptation of *existing* institutions that are fundamentally sound.

If we have difficulty seeing ourselves in this role, others have perceived it. Jean-Francois Revel, in his amazingly fresh view of the world, "Without Marx or Jesus," declares that "the new American revolution has begun" and that it will lead to a Second World Revolution.

The United States was a major instrument of the First Revolution, which Revel sees as the substitution of institutions for the despotism of personal rule in the domestic affairs of state. The Second Revolution he foresees as the substitution of institutions for the despotism of power politics in international relations, with its goal the establishment of a human world order based on equalization of the standard of living throughout the world.

NEW DEMANDS, NEW INSTITUTIONS

But we are concerned with evolution of new institutions built on the old, to accommodate new demands, rather than with destruction of what is workable. Above all, Revel sees the United States as the great innovator, the creator of new institutions and instruments, free of the rigid ideologies of the past, to bring about change—like his compatriot deToqueville a century earlier, today Revel reaffirms a greater capacity for change in America than in any other country.

Contrast the boldness, the forward-looking hopefulness of these concepts with the narrow provincialism of protectionism and its proposals, which have been described as "a United States declaration of war on our trading partners." The proposals made to date would not, in fact, serve the long-term self-interest of our nation. I believe that enactment of the stringent protectionist measures proposed would, in the long run, suffocate our business and industry, and lead the United States to the status of a second-rate power in the world.

We have made a beginning, with our investment in world development, toward the creation of a world economy offering equal potential for better living standards. These investments have served us inwardly, as well, in the stimulation of our domestic economy. I firmly believe that the best way for all Americans to prosper is to look and work in both directions—inward and outward—to leadership and participation in the massive global economy from which we can benefit—and to which we as individuals, as business, and as a nation, can contribute so much.

AID TO NORTH VIETNAM

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, now that American involvement in the unhappy war in Vietnam is ended, we are told that a new, sophisticated diplomacy demands that we pay our enemies billions to rebuild their economy. But I cannot agree. When President Johnson first advanced this proposal, on April 7, 1965, the late Senator Dirksen of Illinois responded with words which exactly express my feelings today:

The President offers a billion dollar lure as a step toward peace in Vietnam. . . . Do we actually buy peace with an American aid program? Do you buy freedom for a humble people? I doubt it, and I doubt also that we can preserve face and prestige with such an approach.

Some say that aiding our defeated foes is "traditional policy" for the United States. But we have never before aided a government with whom we went to war. We helped Germany and Japan after World War II. But the dictatorships with whom we fought we removed from office and replaced with free governments. Germany and Japan surrendered and were scheduled to pay reparations to us, which we canceled to help them get on their feet. The North Vietnamese are not asking us to cancel their reparations—they are brazenly demanding that we pay them. And we do not owe them a thing.

At the end of World War II, world

markets were disrupted. By helping Germany, Japan, and other nations, there was at least some possibility that we were revitalizing our own prospects for world trade. But this is certainly not the case with North Vietnam.

The major political aim of foreign aid after World War II was to prevent war-ravaged nations from turning Communist. Secretary of State Marshall, in proposing massive aid, said that if we did not support Europe financially, then "we must accept the consequences of its collapse into the dictatorship of police states." But North Vietnam is already under Communist domination. Giving them billions would only stabilize their economy and thus further their capacity to disrupt life in Southeast Asia.

Germany and Japan were industrialized nations which welcomed a massive rebuilding through private enterprise. North Vietnam had no industry to speak of before the war. If we spent billions giving new life to their economy, they would actually be better off for having fought us. To reward them under these circumstances would open the gate to a flood of requests for more foreign aid by the other nations of the world. We could not, and ought not, respond by increasing grants everywhere. But what lesson would we leave with the international community if we rewarded countries with whom we went to war more generously than those with whom we maintained friendly relations? Any dictator with a slide rule could see that it was to his advantage to stir up conflict.

Payment of billions to North Vietnam would also make necessary cuts in domestic spending politically impossible. We cannot cut back questionable spending at home only to substitute more questionable aid to our enemies.

The U.S. Treasury is broke. The budget is unbalanced. The value of our dollar is declining on an almost daily basis. To pay out billions to aid North Vietnam would be fiscally irresponsible even if it were not a bad idea for so many other reasons.

I hope the American people will make known to Congress, in no uncertain terms, their opposition to all aid to Hanoi, so that a majority of my colleagues will join me in voting for legislation to prohibit such expenditure of tax dollars.

CHICAGO: MARKETPLACE OF THE WORLD FOR FUTURES TRADING

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the soundness of the American free enterprise system and the overwhelming worldwide superiority of American agriculture is demonstrated through markets such as the Chicago Board of Trade and the Chicago Mercantile Exchange.

With prices for many farm products at all time highs and total farm income setting a new record high in 1972, the

great value and importance of these markets is clear.

The Chicago Board of Trade and the Chicago Mercantile Exchange claim 83 percent of the total commodity business of the Nation. This makes Chicago, the Nation's so-called second city, the world's No. 1 agricultural marketplace.

Although Illinois' 20th Congressional District which I represent is over 100 miles away from Chicago, farmers of this area, and indeed all of its residents, know well the importance of these markets.

Because of the vital roles they play in keeping our agriculture healthy and our people well-fed, it is time we paid tribute to these two great markets and the city that is the futures trading center of the world. For this reason, and because many of our colleagues may not be aware of the scope and significance of the Chicago Board of Trade and the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, I insert the following into the RECORD:

CHICAGO: AGRICULTURAL MARKETPLACE OF THE WORLD

Chicago, the city of "broad shoulders" as described by Carl Sandburg, was originally chosen as the site for U.S. commodity exchanges because of its central location between the producing areas of the west and the consuming sections of the east. The choice was well made.

THE CHICAGO BOARD OF TRADE

The Chicago Board of Trade was organized in early 1848. It was a semi-formal confederation of eighty-two grain merchants until 1859, when incorporation was granted by legislative act of the Illinois General Assembly.

At that time, Chicago's first grain exchange was little more than a meeting place (the second floor above a feed and grain store) where grain merchants discussed their mutual problems. Prior to the erection of the exchange building at La Salle and Jackson in 1885, the Chicago Board of Trade occupied space at a dozen different downtown Chicago addresses.

The exchange's present building, a forty-four story landmark, was completed in 1930 and is located in the heart of the City's financial district. Today, the Board of Trade's membership numbers 1,402 and represents farmers, elevators, grain companies, manufacturers and processors of commodities, and exporters.

In recent years, the achievements of the Chicago Board of Trade have been dramatic. In 1967, 1968, and 1969, the Board's trading, measured in dollars volume, was at a level of approximately \$40 billion. In 1970 it rose to \$73 billion; in 1971 it was \$88 billion, and in 1972, dollar volume jumped to \$123 billion. This makes the Board of Trade the largest financial organization in Chicago and one of the largest in the world.

This achievement has been the prime factor in moving to market the enormous American agricultural output. But while the Board of Trade has become established as the major marketplace for buying and selling agricultural products, it has also begun applying the principles of futures trading to non-agricultural products. In 1968 the Board began trading in silver and plywood and, just this past year, opened trading in stud lumber. Plans are underway to open a market in stock options in the near future, and gold also will be traded by the Board if Congress enacts legislation to permit American citizens to own gold.

CHICAGO MERCANTILE EXCHANGE

In 1919, members of the Butter and Egg Board, the forerunner of the CME, studied the possibilities of futures trading in other

commodities and formed the existing organization, with a clearing house to handle futures transactions.

Over the years, the CME has preserved the system of open, public and competitive pricing, reflecting the changing values of the commodities traded. It has become a most effective mechanism for reflecting supply and demand. As a consequence, the movement of commodities through all stages of production and distribution is made easier.

The commodities listed on the Exchange include frozen pork bellies, live hogs, live cattle, lumber, shell eggs, milo, which is a yellow grain sorghum, and Idaho potatoes. In May of 1972, a separate exchange, the International Monetary Market of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, Inc., was organized to provide futures trading in seven foreign currencies. The principles and economic benefits of trading in futures contracts are now applicable to what might be considered the ultimate commodity—money.

The contract specifications describe exactly the amount, quality, delivery period, and approved delivery points for each listed commodity.

Hedging opportunities on the CME are valuable to industry as an additional pricing tool. By buying and selling futures contracts, various industry segments reduce their risk of loss from price fluctuations. In other words, the hedger need not wait until his product is ready for market and then take what the cash market will bring at that time.

Bank loans are more easily secured and protected if one hedges on the CME or the IMM. Available financing for the hedger allows merchandisers or ultimate buyers to absorb surplus supplies and to carry that surplus until it is needed later when production is smaller.

Price and news dissemination relative to each listed commodity is another economic function provided to the nation by the CME. Not only is price information publicized instantly and nationally by the Exchange and its member firms, but numerous reports pertaining to demand, as well as potential production, are readily available to any interested parties.

Modern expansion of the CME began in 1961 when the frozen pork belly contract was introduced. After a slow start, pork bellies and later live cattle have become two of the most actively-traded commodities in the world.

The year 1972 proved to be an exciting one, highlighted by the establishment of the International Monetary Market, and the tally of a record-breaking 4.5 million futures contracts traded on the CME. The 1972 figure was some 40.7 percent above the 1971 total and 19.4 percent higher than the previous all-time record of 3.8 million set in 1969. The estimated value of contracts traded on the CME reached a record-breaking \$66.1-billion, compared with the previous record of \$40.8-billion set in 1971.

On the IMM, 143,699 contracts changed hands by the end of 1972. Approximately \$19.8 billion worth of contracts were traded in the British pound, Canadian dollar, deutsche mark, Swiss franc, Italian lira, Mexican peso and Japanese yen.

Finishing off the year in high style, the CME and IMM moved into their own new, \$6-million building, located west of Chicago's loop at 444 West Jackson Boulevard. The new facility has been called the most modern of its kind, and is providing improved and expanded services to members of the Exchange, agribusiness, multi-national firms, and the public.

On the floor of the Exchange, some 500 individuals and companies buy and sell contracts for future delivery of commodities listed for trading. This act of trading—a fascinating thing to behold—is done by open outcry. This occurs with such vigor, that the noise makes it virtually impossible in active

markets for anyone to hear what is being said and, as a result, the traders utilize hand signals.

Trading on the CME increases the competitiveness of pricing, because all transactions immediately become public knowledge and individual bargaining power is reduced in importance. Sellers have the opportunity to look for higher prices and buyers can look for lower prices, with the consumer benefiting through this competitive system.

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE ON THE GREAT UNITED NATIONS RIP-OFF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, today I reported to my people on the funding of the United Nations with their tax money. I insert the text of that report:

Every year around this time, when each American sits down to figure out his personal income tax, a common question echoes from coast to coast: Where did the money go? Today I thought we'd talk about one place where taxation without representation is the order of business: The United Nations.

When the U.N. crowd of internationalists came to Washington last year to get their annual Christmas present from the taxpayers of the United States, Congress thought it had spanked their wrists and sent them home with less money than they planned on. Over the years the U.S. Congress had dutifully picked the public's pocket and gave the United Nations crowd whatever it asked for—often upward to 40 percent of the U.N.'s operating budget. So when the assessed contributions to the regular U.N. budget were reduced from 31.5 percent to 25 percent you should have heard the howls from New York City and our foreign-aid friends. Headlines around the world rocked with dire predictions of U.N. bankruptcy and the perilous financial course the U.N. will surely face as a result of the Congressional action. The U.N. trembled in print with fear that the reduction could signal a slash of all U.S. contributions to the world organization.

And Congress patted itself on the back, for a job well done in the name of fiscal responsibility, and of slowing down reckless spending. Conservatives across the country breathed a sigh of relief: maybe now the United States government is coming to its senses. After all, the U.N. specialists told the committee that by reducing the assessed contributions to 25 percent would be a saving to the American people of \$25.1 million, and that's a start.

But let's not kid ourselves. After all the hand-wringing, and head-shaking of the UN money lobbyists from the State Department was over, and the UN crowd went back to New York City with the money the Congress had given them, the United Nations had ripped off more money from the U.S. taxpayer than ever before. It's amazing that year after year the United States treasury is plundered by the vandals from the UN, while the Congress sits by scratching its collective head, wondering where all the money went. In the 26 years that we've been a member of that "global village country club," our dues have cost the American taxpayer over four billion, seven hundred million dollars.¹ That's a lot of money. \$4.7. And that doesn't include the

¹Footnotes at end of article.

\$65 million club house we built for them in New York City.

When the American people began bankrolling the UN in 1946, the U.S. Congress opened a bank account in the name of, and signed a blank check made out to: United Nations, New York, New York. You may not be familiar with it, but the check the Congress signed, quote: "authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State, out of the Treasury, such sums as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of expenses of the United Nations as apportioned by the General Assembly. . . ." What this U.S. public law says is that the UN tells us how much, they decide our tax and we give it to them.

How does the Contributions Committee arrive at the amount the U.S. is expected to pay to support UN activities? They have developed a formula of assessments based on a member's "capacity to pay." The scale they use hasn't changed substantially over the past 26 years. Capacity to pay is determined on the basis of national income estimates which are gathered for the Committee by the UN statistical office. So the financing of the United Nations world government is based on an international income tax.

Does the phrase "capacity to pay" sound familiar? It should. It comes directly from the socialist-communist principle: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need." This was lifted by the founders of the U.N. from that wonderful humanitarian document, the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. The Russian Constitution is an interesting piece of propaganda literature but if you've read the U.N. charter you don't need to read the Russian constitution since whole passages of the U.N. charter were copied verbatim from it.

Our share of the financial burden of the U.N. has always headed the list of assessment percentages. It was initially suggested that the U.S. kick in 50 percent of the budget, but that amount was negotiated downward to 39.89 percent. Since then our assessment to the regular U.N. budget had been gradually lowered. But the United States still pays more than twice the amount paid by any of the other 132 members. Our closest competitor for the dubious honor of contributing the most money to the U.N. general budget is the Soviet Union. Their share is 14.18 percent, but that really doesn't mean very much since they don't pay their bills anyway. The Russians owe almost \$90 million back dues.

As of January, 87 or roughly two-thirds of the 132 member nations were \$167.7 million in arrears on contributions to the three major accounts of the U.N. The crowd that runs the U.N., are calling the shots with our money and they don't even pay their dues to their debating club. The U.S. pays the bill, they have the votes.

Almost one half of the members of the world debating body are assessed at the minimum rate. This minimum rate, incidentally, was lowered to two tenths of one percent when the U.S. assessment was lowered to 25 percent. So even though our so-called obligation was lowered, so was everyone else's, and inequity of the whole system of payments remains.

During calendar year 1972, the total amount assessed against the United States by the United Nations was \$130,522,000. While this is a great deal of money it's overshadowed by many of our other foreign aid giveaway schemes. Our contribution to the U.N. regular budget is the figure most often pointed to by the pro-U.N. lobby as just a drop in the bucket compared to the money we spend for national defense and other internal programs. But what these same people fail to mention is that our "voluntary contributions" to various "special programs" of the U.N. run more than the total U.N. regular budget.

These so-called voluntary contributions is the sly way that more of your tax money is being funneled into the United Nations system, often right under the noses of some well meaning Congressmen. The U.N. uses these funds to finance special programs. The legislative basis for our voluntary contributions to U.S. special programs is the Foreign Assistance Act, the same blank check legislation passed to fund the regular budget. It gives the President authority to make voluntary contributions on a grant basis to international organizations and programs. Only one of these special giveaways, the U.N. Development Program, has a ceiling for U.S. contributions and that is set at 40% of the total amount pledged by other nations.

There is no legislative limitation on voluntary contributions to other special programs. This loophole—a deceitful dodge—has been used by the State Department to siphon money from the treasury and pour it into the U.N. you hear talk of limitations assessed contribution and nothing about voluntary contributions. During calendar year 1972, \$351,445,000 of your money was drained out of this country in this manner. The percentages of our contributions to some voluntary activities of the U.N. last year ran as high as 78% on an entire U.N. program, with most of them well over the one fourth ceiling placed on the regular budget.

It's no wonder that the U.N. money lobby expressed concern when Congress lowered the assessed contribution percentage to 25 percent. It could start a trend that would cut off their gold mine. But they really had nothing to fear from the Administration. After all, the U.N. has an ace in the hole in the form of the Lodge Committee recommendation which has a key proviso often overlooked. But no concerned American should overlook this crucial statement of U.N. money manipulation from the American people: "Each reduction in the U.S. share of the regular budget must be clearly marked by at least a corresponding increase in U.S. contributions to one or more of the voluntary budgets or funds in the U.N. system." This statement summarizes the nature of the internal protection the U.N. enjoys from the White House. I call this the "Tar Baby Principle of U.N. finance." You remember the story of Brer Rabbit's bout with the Tar Baby. Every time he'd take a swing at the sticky little devil, he'd end up stuck worse than before. That's what the Congress has done. When Capitol Hill cuts off some fund to the U.N. general budget, the White House adds those same cuts back on to another U.S. program. It's a vicious circle, and the American public is the loser.

The State Department gave Congress an idea of what we have gotten for our money, when they justified the U.N. requests before the Appropriations Committee last year. "The U.N.," they tell us, "provides public forum for clarifying to a wide audience our position of issues of vital concern to us . . . and for enlisting support for international action on matters of prime concern . . ."

So for the \$481,967,000 the U.S. taxpayer shelled out in 1972 to the U.N., we bought a soap box upon which we could stand and "clarify" to the world our position. We paid almost half a billion dollars last year for a soap box, and an effective one at that. Instead of our excessive admission fee providing a soap box to sell American goals and solutions to the world what we really bought was a podium to sell U.N. and it's Red and Socialist members goals and ideas in America.

For the past two years Congress (to its credit) has killed the foreign-aid bill, and voluntary contributions to the UN are in this bill. So the unsuspecting citizen reading of this action may be led to believe that our massive giveaways are being phased downward. But don't you believe it.

The internationalists still hold the purse strings. Enough votes were mustered to pass so-called "Emergency Legislation" entitled "Further Continuing Appropriations, 1973." The annual funding level for fiscal 1973 amounts to more than \$3.6 billion, nearly one half a billion dollars above the 1972 level. So the voluntary funding of UN programs continues higher than before. But if you read the Continuing Appropriations bill, you won't find a single mention of the United Nations. The money they get is covered up, hidden away in the astronomical figures of the great foreign-aid steal.

All but eleven, 121 of the 132 members of the United Nations have received US foreign assistance since the end of World War II. A total that reached \$161.1 billion in 1971. Not only do we pay the vast majority of the UN's bills directly, but we also pay the other countries' dues indirectly with foreign-aid.

So the Tar Baby syndrome continues. And each year we get stuck tighter and tighter. The United Nations continues to grow on your tax dollars. Think about where your tax money goes when you sign your income tax forms this year.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Figures relative to US contributions, etc. researched by Library of Congress.

² United States Code, Title 22—Foreign Relations and Intercourse, Chapter 7, Sec. 287e, p. 5639 (1970).

³ Quoted: *Up Date*, January, 1973. (U.N.A. publication).

⁴ Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, 92nd Congress, p. 424.

MORE ON MEDICAID ABUSES

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the sixth in a series of excellent articles from the New York Daily News on the problem of medicaid abuses in New York: [From the New York Daily News, Jan. 31, 1973]

FOOT DOGS WEARING A \$35 MILLION GOLDEN SLIPPER

(By William Sherman)

(Sixth of a series)

Podiatrists have socked the city for more than \$35 million in the last seven years. The taxpayers are footing the bill for expensive and often unnecessary care, according to the city's Health Department.

A News reporter, posing as a welfare client with a medicaid card, recently asked for a podiatrist at a lower East Side group practice. He found that bills and X-rays come first, before he even took off his socks and shoes.

At the Delancey Medical Building, 80 Delancey St., the "patient" was ushered into a small room on the second floor where a young receptionist took his medicaid card, began filling out an invoice and then said, "We're going to X-ray your feet."

"But I want to see the podiatrist," insisted the patient.

"He's busy; go into that room for X-rays," she ordered.

"You haven't even asked me what's wrong yet, nobody has even seen my feet," he argued.

SAYS IT DOESN'T MATTER

"It doesn't matter," she said, the city requires that we X-ray everybody's feet before we see them."

The patient refused and a Health Department podiatrist said later, "It's absolutely ridiculous to X-ray someone's feet before you examine them. More important, it's unhealthy to expose someone to radiation unnecessarily."

Stuart Laurence, an attorney for the department, said that some podiatrists were X-raying so many feet without reason at about \$12 a pair, that an order had to be issued limiting foot doctors to X-raying no more than 40% of their new patients.

From 1969 through 1971, the city paid podiatrists \$23,094,030 for care of medicaid patients. Much of that sum, said Laurence, was billed for unnecessary bandaging, padding, X-raying, orthopedic shoes, and other services.

The podiatry inquiry came as part of the News' continuing Medicaid Probe series, an investigation into abuses of the city's \$1.3 billion medical assistance program with the close cooperation of the city's Health and Welfare Departments.

"Many of the high-billing podiatrists have rooms in group medicaid practices where their patients are generated from other specialists' referrals," said Laurence.

When the News reporter refused the X-rays, the receptionist, Maggie Rivera, brought in podiatrist Neil Blatt, who said he was "sitting in for somebody else."

Blatt examined the patient's feet, noted a slight rash on the left foot, sprayed the foot, rubbed some ointment on, bandaged the foot heavily and wrote out two prescriptions. He didn't comment about the X-rays except to say, "They are necessary for diagnosis."

The treatment took five minutes. Such an examination usually costs the city \$5.20, according to the standard medicaid fee schedule. Including the bandages and the prescription the bill would total about \$15.

The man Blatt was "sitting in for" was Jay Rosenberg, and Health Department records show that he earned \$69,611 in medicaid funds in 1971. During the first six months of 1972 he billed for \$43,086, an increase over his previous year's earning rate. That figure made him the number one billing podiatrist out of 702 practicing in the city last year.

Rosenberg works on the same floor with a group of more than 20 other specialists, including a chiropractor, general practitioners, optometrists and dentists. The center is one of the largest in Manhattan and will generate more than \$1 million in medicaid billing this year.

SAW 50 PATIENTS A DAY

A Health Department investigation of Rosenberg's practice last summer showed that on many occasions he was seeing more than 50 patients a day. Department podiatrist Benjamin Watkins maintains that 35 patients per day is the maximum a foot doctor can see to insure quality care.

Rosenberg, records show, also billed for 60 toe jackets, during one day's practice. Toe jackets cost the city \$11.20 each. They are made from a plaster cast of a toe, consist of moleskin and fit over the toe like a miniature sock.

The average podiatrist, Watkins said, rarely makes more than four toe jackets a day. The jacket is used in rare cases to prevent severe friction or to protect an arthritic, or deformed joint.

Some of Rosenberg's patients, the investigation revealed, complained that their toe jackets collapsed in a few weeks. The department found that Rosenberg was using polyfoam for the jackets instead of moleskin.

Rosenberg agreed to make a restitution of \$6,000 to the city and to a short suspension from the medicaid program.

The number two biller for the first six months of last year was Leslie Unger, who works out of offices at 2315 Mermald Ave., Brooklyn.

An investigation by the department shows that Unger was seeing whole families when only one family member requested treatment; was X-raying more than 40 of his patients; was billing twice for services rendered. In one case, he submitted nine bills for one patient. In another incident, he billed for a fracture when none was evident in an X-ray. He agreed to make a \$12,000 restitution to the city.

Another podiatrist called down to the department for review was Allen Feinberg who billed for more than \$80,000 in 1971 out of offices at 201 Dyckman St.

A sample review of 210 invoices showed that in 137 cases he billed for "toe slings," a treatment wherein a bandage is wrapped around one toe and then extended around several others to keep the injured toe secure.

A department podiatrist stated that the high number of slings "exceeded by many times," the proportion in the average podiatrist's practice.

Feinberg insisted that each of the 137 patients in a sample "had a hammertoe." The Health Department did not accept his explanation and he was suspended for several months.

COACH BILL TALLEY

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, today coaches of professional teams often make as many headlines as their players. And as a result of all this publicity they overshadow some of the great unsung coaches in sports—those unselfish and dedicated individuals who work with our sons and daughters in our high schools. Bill Talley of Walkersville High School is such a man as the following brief biography in the Hagerstown Morning Herald aptly points out:

BILL TALLEY LEAVES WALKERSVILLE HELM
(By Steve Nikirk)

WALKERSVILLE.—Twenty years of basketball at Walkersville High School under coach Bill Talley came to an end Tuesday night.

Following the Lions' final game of the season at Brunswick, Talley announced his retirement as head coach at the small Frederick County school.

"After twenty years of continuous coaching, I feel that it is time to turn the reins over to a younger man," Talley commented.

His decision punctuates the final chapter in one of the most illustrious coaching careers in Western Maryland.

In 1953, the Frederick High School graduate came to the old Walkersville High School as the first full time physical education teacher ever at the school.

Talley's duties were far reaching as he coached every sport with the exception of baseball.

Expanding the sports program in 1955, he organized and coached the first Lions' track and field squad.

With all the long hours put into building the sports curriculum at the school, Talley worked hardest at his basketball program.

Under Talley's tutelage, the Lions compiled a record of 271 wins and 133 losses while playing under three different state classifications. Five times in Talley's career, the Lions reached the state finals. Twice, Walkersville came home victors, as Class C champions in 1960 and as Class B titlists in 1964. Talley's Lions were runners-up in Class C in 1958, Class A in 1962 and Class B in 1965. Three of his varsity squads went undefeated.

Always looking to the future, Talley also

coached the junior varsity hoop squads for 19 years. The Lion Cubs compiled a 284-55, including two undefeated seasons.

Walkersville overwhelmingly dominated Frederick County basketball under Talley. The Lions reached the District playoffs 11 consecutive years.

Winning with Talley was not confined to basketball. Coaching soccer from 1953 to 1962, Talley led the Lions to 11 consecutive county championships. His track teams also were county powers in the 1960s.

In addition to being a capable coach, Talley was also an innovator. His string of "firsts" is impressive. He was the first small school coach in Frederick County to schedule Class A and AA competition from Hagerstown and Montgomery County. He was the first coach to organize a Christmas Tournament. He was also the first coach to voluntarily move up a classification in the state system, jumping from Class B to Class A in the 1961-62 season.

Chuckling as he recalled the latter change, Talley explained the reason for the upward movement.

"Brunswick that year was Class B and looked very powerful. I knew we would have a rough time beating them. As it turned out they beat us twice that year but lost in the district. By virtue of being Class A, we got all the way to the state finals and lost to Surrattsville. It's just funny, but that would have never happened if we had stayed Class B."

Talley singled out the 1964 state championship squad as his best at Walkersville. Made up of Gordon Smith (later captain at Cincinnati U. and drafted by the Boston Celtics), Sonny Barrick, Eddie Cook (later prolific scorer at Bridgewater College), Larry Haines and Joe Beeson, this squad ran over all competition, including a mighty Mt. Savage five in the District One Class B playoff, and eventually went all the way.

Talley rated that District One Playoff with Mt. Savage as the best game of his career. The Lions won, 103-93, over Savage, whose squad included Bobby Robertson (now a player with the Pittsburgh Pirates) and Ralph Wilson (later a top-notch player at Western Maryland College).

Regarding the greatest players he had ever coached, Talley pointed again to the 1964 squad and Gordon Smith. He also added, "I have coached many other tough competitors here at Walkersville, including Gordon Smith's brother Bob, Dick Murray, Denny Remsburg, Eddie Cook, Ronnie Cook, Mike Trout, Ron Linton, Tim Shaw and Larry Haines. All real fine ballplayers."

"I have really enjoyed coaching and I have struck up many fine acquaintances with not only my players as students, but also as adults," Talley said. "It has been just like a father-son relationship with these athletes, even years after having coached them."

On the future of Talley and his Walkersville sports endeavors, the coach said, "I will stick with the track team and remain as athletic director."

Talley said he will probably miss coaching, but laughingly shared the thoughts of his ten-year-old son, who was happy to see him quit. The coach's son who goes to almost all of the Lions' games, said to his father, "Dad, I'm glad to see you get out of coaching. That way they can't call any more technical fouls on you."

1973 AGRICULTURE AND FOOD FAIR PRESENTED WITH PRIDE

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 17, I had the great

pleasure of attending the 1973 Agriculture and Food Fair of St. Croix.

As Members who have visited the largest of our Virgin Islands may know, St. Croix, in its past history, was highly regarded for its agricultural productivity. Indeed, it was referred to as "The Garden of the West Indies."

For many years after the demise of the sugar industry agriculture on St. Croix languished. An island which was self-sufficient in vegetables, fruits, and livestock now depends on importation of most items for the tables of its residents.

The Agriculture and Food Fair was an informative exposition of the present potential for agricultural development on St. Croix. Virgin Islands Commissioner of Agriculture Rudolph Shulterbrandt, who coordinated this annual 4-day event, is to be commended for his efforts. I also wish to compliment the members of his staff, agriculture industry personnel and other citizens who participated in this undertaking.

The importance of this fair was noted in the editorial column of the St. Croix Avis on February 22, 1973. The Avis, as it proudly proclaims on its masthead, has been serving the Virgin Islands since 1844. Published today by Canute A. Brodhurst, the St. Croix Avis is one of the leading newspapers in the Virgin Islands. It is noted for its accurate and incisive reporting, its varied and entertaining features, and its reasonable and worthwhile observations on Virgin Islands' affairs. Mr. Brodhurst and the newspaper's able managing editor, Jerome Dreyer, are among the most highly regarded journalists in our islands.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the St. Croix Avis commentary on the 1973 Agriculture and Food Fair will be of particular interest to Members. The Avis well described the fair, its culinary delights, its air of community cooperation, and its fascinating exhibits. It also managed to elucidate the less than apparent essential value of this event.

I am pleased to now insert this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PRESENTED WITH PRIDE

It was a heartwarming four days, the annual St. Croix Agriculture and Food Fair. It was a get-together of a truly cross-section of the people of the island, thousands of them who came alone, in pairs and in families for what undoubtedly was the most successful affair of its kind in the history of St. Croix.

It was a holiday mood, not of the ram-bunctious nature of carnival but rather a display of residents whose smiles and friendly exchanges of greeting, even strangers unto strangers, revealed a pride in the excellence of the project, responsibility for which was in the most part in the hands of the island's people. To Commissioner of Agriculture Rudolph Shulterbrandt, who epitomized perpetual motion during the four days, his aides and those responsible for private exhibits congratulations of the highest kind are in order. And to those fine ladies in the food area, never were their native preparations more delicious. It took strong will-power to resist all of the offerings.

In the agricultural and plant booths we once more witnessed the results of people with pride in their endeavors.

All Crucians, not just the parents, can be proud of the handicraft of our girls and boys in elementary, junior high and high schools—

from knitted and sewn articles by the girls to woodwork, ceramics and vocational training projects by the young men. This certainly gave ample proof that the youngsters, willing and anxious to learn, can come through with the proper and sufficient material. There should be no reason why arts and crafts teachers should be forced to scrounge from private sources.

In any event, those of us who have seen the fair grow in scope over the years so that other Caribbean areas now exhibit can safely predict that the day is not far off when all of the West Indies will be represented as well as stateside groups.

MORE ON MEDICAID ABUSES
IN NEW YORK

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, again I call the attention of my colleagues to the New York Daily News series on medicare abuses in New York. The following is the seventh in the series of articles:

PAIR OF MEDICAID KINGS WITH A MIDAS TOUCH
(By William Sherman)

Meet the Medicaid Kings: Two men from Long Island who in three years parlayed a corner dental office on W. 125th St. in Harlem into a multimillion-dollar medicare conglomerate, the biggest in the city, offering services from allergy care to methadone and piercing ears.

According to Health Department records, examined by THE NEWS as part of an investigation of medicare, the top billing center in the city is run by Benjamin Schneider, 57, and his brother-in-law, Victor Marcus, 58.

Back in 1946, soon after they were discharged from the Army, Schneider and Marcus started to practice dentistry at 79 W. 125th St.

Twenty-three years later, medicare came to Harlem, and today, Schneider, who lives in Woodmere, and Marcus, of Roslyn, preside over the Ben-Vic Corp.

That corner office on the second floor has been expanded into the Lenox Medical Building, three floors of waiting rooms, 12 dental chairs, a \$100,000-a-year pharmacy, and offices for obstetrics, internal medicine, podiatry, pediatrics, optometry, ear-nose-throat and gynecology. The center is supported by medicare and is open six days a week, from 10 a.m. to 7 p.m.

"You know," said Marcus, "last year our dentistry did over \$400,000." It is the highest grossing medicare dental operation in the city.

One of the center's physicians, Dr. Donald Cunningham, 52, was the No. 1 medicare-billing physician in the city during 1971 with \$165,096 in earnings. For the first six months of 1972, he billed medicare for \$98,852.

Half of that sum went to Schneider and Marcus by a rental agreement under which the center provides Cunningham with an examining room, receptionist and nurses in return for 50% of his gross billing. Other practitioners at the building have identical agreements with Ben-Vic, or the NewMar Corp., another Schneider-Marcus enterprise.

"Everybody in Harlem knows me," said Schneider. "You see me walk down the street, all the blacks say hello. We've been up here for years, that's how we built up our practice."

But inside the center, the atmosphere isn't always that friendly. Marcus, Schneider

and Cunningham carry licensed guns in their waistbands.

"I never fired it, I've just had to pull it out a couple of times to threaten people who were getting rough," said Schneider.

"I hire all black help and I try to stay in the back. The blacks that come in here don't want to see a white face. It's bad for business so I let the girls handle the patients."

During peak periods last year, patients passed through examining rooms at the rate of one every five minutes. On some days, one doctor was seeing more than 75 patients in less than six hours, according to the Health Department.

Many ended their visits at the pharmacy, a 4-by-10-foot area partitioned from the main waiting room by glass.

The pharmacy is part of a chain of seven medicare oriented drugstores owned by the HTC Corp. "We do about \$100,000 a year here," said pharmacist Mark Skopov who said he is paid \$400 for his six-day work week.

"I fill from four to 500 prescriptions a week and we pay Schneider \$650 a month rent," he said.

In the basement of the center are two 3-by-5-foot rooms, that had been rented to Alpone Labs for \$3,000 a month. In return, Alpone had exclusive rights to process all lab tests for the center's patients.

Alpone billed the city for processing the tests at its headquarters at 903 Lexington Ave. In 1971, they were the highest billing medicare lab in the city with \$652,000 in earnings. Last year they doubled their earnings rate and during the first six months billed for \$616,052—and remained No. 1. The center has since dropped Alpone.

THEY'RE PAID \$10 AN HOUR

The dentists, who work in well-equipped rooms in a third-floor wing, are paid \$10 an hour, according to Schneider plus a small percentage of their medicare billing. The remainder goes to Ben-Vic.

"We do about \$1,000 a day, mostly in prosthetics (false teeth), and it's our biggest business—all clean and legal," Marcus said. He supervises the dental offices while Schneider runs the rest of the center.

In offices on the second floor, Arnold Regan, a podiatrist, sees patients and pays Ben-Vic \$355 a month rent. Optometrists, "who come and go," according to Schneider, work in another small room and pay the corporation \$35 a day in rent.

The center has its own X-ray apparatus, including a \$4,000 developer so that doctors can read most of their own plates. The more complicated X-rays are diagnosed by radiologist David Chastanet who billed the city independently for \$47,651 in 1971.

For the three floors of offices, Ben-Vic and NewMar pay building landlord Theodore Parisi \$1,100 a month rent, according to Schneider.

"When we started up here in Harlem, years ago, it was virgin territory, and gradually we built up our practice," said Marcus, a stocky congenial man.

"Then three years ago, when medicare got going strong, we decided to expand. Most of the first floor was occupied by a radio store. We took that over, invested \$130,000 and put up the center," said Schneider.

"Business started picking up when we started getting referrals from narcotics treatment agencies and we got into methadone detoxification," said Schneider. He said the program was "set up by the city."

Dr. Cunningham saw most of the addicts, and while billing as an interview with an average of \$8 a visit he was often seeing more than 80 patients a day.

"I gave them all the best care in the time I had," said Cunningham, a native of Guyana, who lives in St. Albans, Queens.

However, during a Health Department investigation of the center last summer, Cun-

ningham was warned that an internist should see no more than 25 patients a day to insure quality care.

"Look," he said. "I saw those patients because they came here. I worked long hard hours." The department, however, said that he worked only six hours a day at the center.

Then the Health Department probed further and senior medical auditor Dr. Howard Katz found other discrepancies and in reports cited double billing for services rendered, wholly inadequate patient records, and inadequate physical examinations.

Pediatric records reviewed by Katz showed that routine immunizations, such as for measles, small pox, and booster shots were omitted. The Health Department is now holding back \$20,000 worth of Cunningham's bills.

Cunningham denied the charge of double billing in a recent interview and said that the computer downtown was fouled up.

Schneider told a News reporter: "I'm not saying we give the best care, but we give good care and perform a service in the community. I wouldn't hire a doctor who wasn't high quality."

Cunningham, whose income last year was supplemented by a private practice, said, "They pay a man \$100,000 to throw a football and everybody cheers. A doctor earns \$200,000 and they scream bloody murder."

WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL PLANT PROGRAM

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, as was mentioned on Thursday, March 1, by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING), I was—along with him—one of a number of Members who were attending a luncheon in the Martin dining room here in the Capitol where, although the warning lights telling of the vote on final passage of H.R. 3298, a bill to restore the rural water and waste disposal planning and development grant program, did appear there was no accompanying warning buzzer with the result that we all missed, inadvertently, that vote.

Given the nature of this issue, to accept this accident in silence might be to comply with the old admonition that "discretion is the better part of valour." However, even as my aforementioned colleague advised the House that, had he gotten upstairs in time, he would have voted "yes" on this bill, I feel compelled to say that I, correspondingly, would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, I am growing increasingly concerned over the corner into which we seem bent on painting ourselves when it comes to issues such as this one and the several others that have preceded it as we play out what can only be called a game to see whether we, or the President, are indeed "king of the hill." I am as jealous as the next fellow of the true prerogatives of Congress. I believe the power of the purse belongs rightfully with the Congress. I am unhappy as any one else here over the accelerating tendency of the President to impound funds and to freeze programs, even though the fuzziness of the Constitution and the

precedents through the years as offered in the form of actions taken by former Presidents both seem—until we can fashion either a proper response or summon up the necessary self-discipline to make that kind of action unnecessary—to validate such actions by Mr. Nixon.

But I am, at the same time, equally convinced that we must find some better tactic to pursue, if we really mean to win this contest in a responsible fashion, than to continually seek—as we are with this series of "thou-shalt-spend" measures—only political confrontation after political confrontation with the President.

Now, lest I be misunderstood, let me say here and now that I generally favor—and have always supported—this particular program which provides assistance to rural communities in meeting their obvious needs for sewer and water systems, as well as for planning the same. I would be something considerably less than a proper Representative of the many communities of less than 10,000 population in my district if I did not try, thus, to help them meet those needs.

And, yet, if we wish to be honest with one another—and with our respective constituencies—it is clear that this program, like all Federal grant-in-aid programs, is probably not perfect; that it, too, could stand our own searching review—just as could the REAP program we have previously insisted upon, as is—and that, at the very least, the Presidential ideas for restructuring and reorganizing this small aspect of our overall pollution abatement effort do deserve our consideration. If, after such consideration, we were disposed to reject those Presidential ideas, that would be one thing. But to insist—as we do in this bill, H.R. 3298—that we know best, and that the President's ideas are, without even looking at them, of no merit, is quite another.

At this point in time, since I do not serve on the Committee on Agriculture and am no self-avowed expert in this field of concern, I truly do not know whether or not the proffered Environmental Protection Agency program is, or can become, a substitute for this specific program as originally fashioned. Nor, do I know whether or not, as some charge, shifting from grants to loans, alone, for rural water systems—through the Farmers Home Administration—would leave too many smaller communities across the Nation without the capacity to meet their more urgent needs for developing or repairing such facilities. The reason I do not know these answers is because this committee, in reporting out this bill, has rejected the President's arguments in defense of his position without even considering them.

That, I submit, is an irresponsible reaction on our part to the challenge the President has thus thrown at us. It may be a self-satisfying reaction but, at the same time, I believe it to be a self-defeating one, as we shall eventually find out.

Mr. Speaker, it is all very well for us to wave our arms and inveigh, as some of us are, against what some are calling Mr. Nixon's "Olympian disdain

for congressional powers." And it is all very well for the critics of both the President and the Congress to rail about the helplessness of the Congress in the impasse that presently confronts us and the Nation.

But, at the same time, we are not helpless.

We can choose as between responsibility and irresponsibility.

For it is a fact—no matter how painful—that Mr. Nixon has not usurped our rightful powers; instead, we have, over recent years, abdicated them.

Which is why, had I been present to vote on H.R. 3298, I would have voted "no" as the only responsible thing to do under the existing circumstances.

JUDGE LUCHOWSKI RETIRES

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, members of the judiciary frequently are criticized, often in blanket fashion.

We all know that blanket criticism usually is irresponsible because every profession and business have distinguished and dedicated members.

Within the judiciary, I would like to take this opportunity to cite the distinguished career of my lifetime friend and an outstanding lawyer and jurist, Frank J. Luchowski, of Buffalo, N.Y.

Born in Buffalo and a graduate of the University of Buffalo School of Law, Judge Luchowski has been in public service since 1947, when he was appointed to surrogate court, legal division, and subsequently became probate clerk.

Over the years, in his various roles as lawyer and judge, he has served with distinction and compassion which has endeared him to his colleagues and friends and earned the respect of all with whom he has come in contact.

Until his retirement several weeks ago, he had spent a decade first as deputy corporation counsel and then as associate judge in the Buffalo City Court.

At the retirement dinner in his honor Judge Luchowski, continuing his practice on the bench, focused his concern upon the youth in whose hands the future of our Nation lies. He recalled youthful adventures and campus eruptions which had been the subject of cases before his court. Then he told the gathering:

I have had the opportunity, as judge, of trying to impress our youth with the greatness and potential of this wonderful country.

With its rich heritage, created by the founders of this great Nation—and their successors—every one of us should contribute something to further enrich our heritage—by deed, action or, at the least, by proper and lawful conduct.

In acknowledging a gift of the proceeds of the dinner, Judge Luchowski said—

I feel it would be fitting and proper that we should share this moment with people who are not as fortunate as we are.

Then the judge asked that the net proceeds of the dinner be shared by the Bar Association of Erie County Foundation, to aid needy lawyers and their families, and the Police Benevolent Association.

The judge's closing comment, taken from the Bible, was:

What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God.

As an infant, Judge Luchowski was taken to Poland by his parents for several years but returned to Buffalo where he completed his elementary, secondary, and college education. Before he took up the study of law he worked as a chemist on the basis of his bachelor of science degree. He had a distinguished military record in World War II.

During his decade in city court he has presided over thousands of cases and has been a great inspiration to his associates who hold him in special respect and affection.

He is active in his church and serves on the Bishop's Lay Council of the Diocese of Buffalo and its Board of Governors.

Although Judge Luchowski has stepped down from the bench he is going to continue the practice of law in my home city of Buffalo, where I am certain he will continue to be the same inspiring participant in public affairs, particularly those dealing with our youth.

SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I joined with several of my colleagues in introducing legislation to provide that the recently enacted 20-percent social security increase be disregarded when determining income eligibility for a number of federally assisted programs, such as food stamps, low-rent public housing, medicaid, old-age assistance, and, of course, veterans' pensions and benefits.

In my 2 months in office, I have received numerous letters from older people in my district regarding the "give with one hand and take it away with the other" policy that an oversight in the enacting legislation created. For many of these people, the 20-percent increase in benefits meant a miniscule overall gain.

Three letters, which I recently received, point this up in very clear terms, and I include them here for that reason:

FEBRUARY 1, 1973.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEHMAN: Today, I received my check from the Veterans Administration in St. Petersburg for \$26.71 instead of \$38.88. They explain it is because of the twenty percent I got on Social Security. That is a cut of over thirty-one percent. It seems they give with one hand and take more away with the other.

I understand there was a bill in the House to counteract this sort of thing. I do wish

you would consider sponsoring a bill making it impossible for us to have a decrease in one pension when we are given a raise in another.

Yours very truly,

A VOTER.

FEBRUARY 22, 1973.

DEAR SIR: Having lost my pension of \$78.70 per month due to the 20% increase in my Social Security, I would very much appreciate your vote in favor of an increase in earned income, so I can get my pension reinstated.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

A VOTER.

FEBRUARY 18, 1973.

DEAR SIR: I am a veteran eighty-one years of age. Neither my wife or I are able to work. The recent increase in Social Security and subsequent decrease in my pension left me a net gain of fifty-one cents per day.

Not much to cover living cost increase which Social Security increase was intended to correct.

Therefore, I hope you will carefully consider any legislation which will help veterans of World War I.

Your truly,

A VOTER.

KOCH URGES PRESIDENTIAL INTERCESSION FOR VIETNAM ORPHANS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the tragedy of the orphaned and abandoned children left in the wake of the Vietnam war.

These children, estimated to number about 700,000, have suffered terribly during the course of the conflict and will continue to suffer even more as our forces withdraw from Vietnam, since a large number of these children, perhaps 10,000 to 50,000, were fathered by U.S. servicemen. At present the South Vietnamese Government has placed strict barriers on the emigration of these children of U.S. soldiers and has indicated its opposition to special aid for these children if it is not matched in equal amounts with aid for Vietnamese orphans.

The problem of caring for these youngsters demands resources much greater than the present South Vietnamese Government is capable of offering. Present Vietnamese adoption services are not always adequate or helpful in the case of children fathered and abandoned by U.S. soldiers, because these illegitimate and racially mixed children may have to face social ostracism in traditional Vietnamese society.

It is surely both necessary and appropriate that our Government help assume the moral obligation to help care for these unfortunate children. Last year in Congress legislation was introduced, which I cosponsored along with 41 other House Members, which would authorize the President to enter into arrangements with the Government of South Vietnam to provide assistance through the establishment of a Vietnam Children's Care

Agency for the purpose of improving the welfare of children in South Vietnam and of facilitating the adoption of orphaned or abandoned Vietnamese children, particularly the children of U.S. servicemen. This legislation has again this year been introduced by my colleague Representative KASTENMEIER, along with another bill sponsored by Representative MINK removing U.S. immigration barriers for these children.

In order that the President's attention be called to this most important matter, I have written to Mrs. Nixon—who has so many times before taken a lead in aiding unfortunate children all over the world—requesting that she urge the President to support such legislation and to intercede with the Government of South Vietnam in order to have the emigration and assistance barriers removed so as to permit U.S. citizens to adopt the unwanted children of American servicemen.

The following article by James Reston in the New York Times describes this tragic situation in Vietnam, and I recommend it to the attention of my colleagues:

ORPHANS OF THE WAR

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—The American troops in Vietnam are now down to about 11,000 and the prisoners, despite some delays, are coming home; but nothing has yet been done about the orphans of the storm, and particularly about the children fathered and then abandoned in Vietnam by American servicemen.

This is one of the continuing tragedies of the war. The State and Defense Departments say they have no official figures on the number of illegitimate children left behind by the departing G.I.'s, and no way of getting accurate information on the problem, but private estimates range from 15,000 to over 100,000.

Even in the case of an American soldier wanting to bring his own illegitimate child back to the United States, the problem of doing so is very complicated.

An illegitimate child born in this country naturally acquires all the rights of a citizen because of the place of its birth, but one born overseas must be "legitimate" or face an almost impossible set of legal complications before being allowed to enter the United States.

Also, the law insists that the father of the child must have lived in the United States for ten years before the birth of the child, and five years after the age of 14, before the child can be considered for entry into this country.

Harry J. Hennessy of the Bronx, New York, raises a moral question about this situation: "The progeny of our military personnel and Vietnamese girls," he writes, "are often branded as outcasts or half-breeds in Vietnamese society. Yet by virtue of blood, these children have as much right to be citizens of the United States as of Vietnam. Don't we Americans have responsibilities, morally compelling ones, to these children? To me they are the most pathetic of all the victims of the war."

This, of course, is a highly controversial question within both the executive and the legislative branches, but it is at least timely. For the Nixon Administration is now in the process of drafting legislation to provide economic aid to both North and South Vietnam, and unless the issue is now brought directly to the attention of the public, it could easily be overlooked among all the other more dramatic arguments over aid to Vietnam.

Among the issues to be considered are the following:

Should the U.S. Government not insist that part of the economic aid be set aside specifically to assist the abandoned children of G.I.'s in South Vietnam?

Should the military regulations and laws be amended to simplify the procedures for a soldier who wishes to bring his legal wife and children back to this country?

Same for a serviceman who wants to take responsibility for raising his own illegitimate child?

At a time when more Americans are seeking to adopt children than there are children for adoption, should the immigration laws and adoption regulations be changed to deal with this specific problem of the abandoned Vietnam children?

Senator Harrison Williams Jr. of New Jersey has introduced a bill, now buried in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to create a temporary Vietnam child care agency to help particularly those children fathered by U.S. servicemen.

The South Vietnamese Government, however, places strict barriers against permitting children of G.I.'s to leave the country, and also objects to special aid for the half-American children if it is not also available to Vietnamese children whose parents were killed in the war.

Nevertheless, there is a precedent for dealing generously with the problem. After the French forces were driven out of Vietnam in 1954, the French Government offered citizenship and educational assistance to the illegitimate children of French soldiers.

The U.S. Embassy in Saigon, which is closer to the problem of the abandoned children than officials here, has been urging the South Vietnamese Government to pass a modern adoption law that would allow Vietnamese children born out of wedlock to be adopted by American families, "while protecting the rights of the children."

But even if this were done, the laws of the United States, passed in 1952 to deal with normal situations, are not relevant to the special conditions of the war and its human consequences.

Accordingly, the immediate problem here is to raise the question to the level of official and public attention. People will agree and disagree over Pearl Buck's conclusion that "We Americans must take up our responsibility because we helped bring these children into the world," but at least the question should be faced and debated.

MASSACHUSETTS STATE SENATE RESOLUTION

HON. JOHN MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply distressed to learn that British troops, later to be deployed in Northern Ireland, were being trained at Camp Lejeune, N.C. With this latest information, the tragic question of Northern Ireland once again comes to the forefront.

I believe that we in the United States must act in a constructive manner to assist in finding a solution to this problem. What I consider a wise American policy is summed up well in a resolution passed by the Massachusetts State Senate. The members of that body have called upon our Government to use its good offices to urge the withdrawal of

all British troops from the streets of Northern Ireland and to request that the British Government declare an intent to withdraw all military personnel from this troubled area.

I believe these actions would be helpful in opening the way for an amicable political solution among the various factions involved in Northern Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution of the State Senate follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
RESOLUTIONS URGING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, AND THE U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT TO USE THE FULL WEIGHT AND POWER OF THEIR OFFICES IN IMPLOING GREAT BRITAIN TO REMOVE ITS TROOPS FROM NORTHERN IRELAND AND TO GRANT FREEDOM TO ALL POLITICAL PRISONERS

Whereas, It is the natural right of every nation to govern itself; and

Whereas, The artificial division of Ireland by outsiders has resulted in injustice and oppression; and

Whereas, The struggle for a United Ireland is a legitimate struggle for political self-determination; and

Whereas, The British propaganda machine has succeeded in depicting the age-old Irish struggle for freedom as an eruption of bigotry based on ancient and petty grudges; and

Whereas, Certain persons in the United States government have fallen prey to such propaganda and have involved themselves on the side of the British oppressors, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate urges the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States and the United States State Department to use the full weight and power of their offices in imploring Great Britain to unconditionally release and grant freedom to all political prisoners in Ireland and Britain, to withdraw all British troops from the streets of Northern Ireland and further requesting the British Government to declare an intent to withdraw all military personnel from Northern Ireland; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the Senate Clerk and Parliament to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of each branch of the Congress of the United States, to the United States State Department and to each member of Congress from the Commonwealth.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

HON. JOHN B. BREAU

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. BREAU. Mr. Speaker, much remains to be done in our fight to achieve and maintain environmental quality, but significant gains have been made by both the public and the private sector. I am very pleased to congratulate an industry facility in my district which has shown outstanding achievement in the field of pollution abatement and monitoring.

Cities Service Oil Co. shared top national honors this year in the gold medal awards program presented annually to industry for achievement in water pollution control. Cities Service this year accepted the grand award winner plaque in the single plant category from the Sports Foundation, Inc. This award was

given for technological innovation and demonstration of environmental concern at the company's Lake Charles, La., lubrication oil and wax plant. Effluent from this plant flows into the Calcasieu River, feeding into numerous lakes on its path to the Gulf of Mexico—important recreation waters for swimming, fishing, shrimping, and boating.

To help this effluent meet the criteria established by the Louisiana Water Quality Act of 1968, the company engaged in extensive feasibility studies of various processes for treatment of lube waste water. The resultant system, completed this past year, consists of an air flotation unit for removal of oil and suspended solids; an equalization basin; an aeration basin where biological treatment occurs; a clarifier for removal of solids; a final finishing pond—quality of this water is demonstrated by the presence of small minnows and other aquatic life; and post aeration for the final polishing of the effluent prior to discharge. Also incorporated is a chemical neutralization pit and retention basin for the segregation of strong wastes.

Established in 1968, the Gold Medal Awards cite those members of industry who have shown initiative and investment in pollution abatement, helping to solve the critical problem of environmental contamination.

Judges for the program are nationally recognized leaders in the field of water pollution control and the environmental sciences. Entries are evaluated on the basis of the technological innovations and advancements developed by the company in the area of pollution abatement; corporate awareness and initiative in the establishment and implementation of a water pollution control program; and the monitoring and evaluation system organized for the program's effectiveness.

It is my feeling that environmental quality and planned economic growth can go hand in hand. I am pleased to offer my congratulations to Cities Service for this striking illustration of that belief.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS EXES MEET IN OBSERVANCE OF TEXAS INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, every year during the first week of March, the University of Texas Ex-Students Association of Washington meets in reunion. This meeting brings together some of the outstanding citizens of Washington and this country—both present and future.

One does not have to search very far to find the imprint of the University of Texas on members of the highest circles of Government, as this great university has been providing public leaders for America since its birth in the late 19th century.

Last night the Texas Exes met and were privileged to hear remarks delivered

by former Ambassador Edward Clark of Austin, Tex. Ambassador Clark is a perfect example of the kind of outstanding public servants that have been associated with the University of Texas for so many years. This Austin attorney has served as assistant attorney general of Texas, as an assistant to a Governor of Texas, as secretary of state of Texas, as the Ambassador to Australia during the very difficult years of the mid-1960's, and as a Director of the Inter-American Bank.

It was entirely fitting that Ambassador Clark's remarks were delivered on the eve of Texas Independence Day. The uniqueness of Texas Independence Day was best stated by Ambassador Clark last night when he said:

Tomorrow is the anniversary of Texas independence, and I am reminded that I know of no other occasion in history where an independent Republic voluntarily surrendered its sovereignty to become part of a federation of states as did our beloved Texas as the Lone Star flag of the Republic was furled and she became the 28th and brightest star on the field of blue, February 19, 1845.

Ambassador Clark's remarks were both factual, statistical, and full of promise for continued growth of this great institution. I insert a copy of Ambassador Clark's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF HON. EDWARD CLARK, MEMBER, BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SYSTEM, BEFORE THE TEXAS EXES CLUB OF WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 1, 1973

On my last visit with you in Washington, I had returned only a few months before from Australia where I had the privilege of serving as President Johnson's Ambassador to that delightful and friendly land; the best friends we have in the world; our most responsible ally; no bums or gimme-crats out there. On that occasion, I spoke as the Chairman of the Ex-Students' Association special committee that was then planning the first successful International Alumni Reunion ever held on any campus.

Of the many activities of The University and its Ex-Students' Association in which I have been involved, I have to regard that as one of the finest. When that great International Ex-Students' Conference was held in May of 1970, we had Elizabeth Hutchinson on our steering committee, and more than 400 foreign nationals who call the University of Texas their alma mater came from more than 30 countries around the world to attend. It was an event that attracted headlines in newspapers everywhere and did much, I am sure, to raise the stature of The University as an educational institution in the eyes of the world. I know that it made me feel a deep sense of pride in being an alumnus of a great University whose influence is being felt today in every part of this globe, largely because of the leadership role in local, state and national affairs enjoyed by the more than 10,000 foreign nationals who hold degrees from The University of Texas.

Now, three years later, I am here to represent our University in still another role—that of Regent. As one of nine Regents, I am in somewhat the same position as the director of a corporate business or a city council member in a medium-sized community. And although I share with President Stephen Spurr the view that any great university is not a corporation or a political entity but a learning society, there are a great many parallels between The University of Texas today and a city—even a metropolitan city like Washington.

Whether my friends in education like to admit it or not, the fact is that all multiversi-

ties like The University at Austin have become more like self-contained communities within the larger city than purely institutions of learning. The Board of Regents can be compared with a city council, as I said, the President is as much a mayor as he is an academic officer, and the faculty, staff and students represent a political and social constituency as varied as can be found anywhere. They also are as diverse.

The University of Texas today is larger than two-thirds of all American cities. With a student body of 40,000, a staff of 6,000 and a faculty of 1,700, the population on and near the Austin Campus approaches 48,000. Add the number of visitors and others who are on the campus for one reason or another, and the average population of the square-mile area surrounding the old Forty Acres is well over 50,000 people at any given moment. And a population of 50,000 persons per square mile is a higher density of bodies than most large cities can claim.

Today the central campus, or central city, of The University occupies 400 acres in the heart of Austin. Like any other city, it has to have most of the municipal services that urban dwellers have come to expect. The one or two nightwatchmen which some of us remember as the total security force have been replaced by 129 highly-trained, uniformed and armed patrolmen who cruise the campus in orange and white scout cars equipped with blinking red lights and the inevitable siren.

Although The University still depends on the city of Austin for most of its fire protection, the campus does have its own fire marshal and a staff of assistants. It also has its own hospital and medical staff provides its own heating and power and even maintains the equivalent of a country club in the Forty Acres Club which now has been purchased by The University and is being renovated for the exclusive use of the faculty and staff, perhaps Regents and you distinguished Texas-Exes who honor us by coming home.

Naturally, a city has to have its suburbia, and The University does. About four miles north of the campus is the great Balcones Research Center, housing some of the nation's greatest scientific minds.

Two miles west of the campus on the Brackenridge Tract along Lake Austin are the hundreds of apartment units built by The University for its married students. About one-fourth of the students are married, and all are older than they were a few years ago. Today the average age is 21.4 years and almost one-fifth of all of the students are past the age of 21. Now that 18 year-olds can vote, Austin finds itself with a bloc of 40,000 new voters that sometimes do not agree with the city fathers on all issues.

Like any growing municipality, The University has a welfare problem among a large segment of its constituents. This year, 15,570 students—almost 40 percent of the total enrollment—are receiving some kind of direct financial aid. Another 11,349 work either full or part-time in jobs provided through The University's own employment bureau, the Office of Student Financial Aids. Several thousand others get their own jobs with local Austin businesses.

The University also is an ethnic and cultural mix in its self-contained city, although not quite in the same ratio of a New York, a Washington, or even a Dallas. Last year, out of an enrollment of 39,900, there were 33,654 Caucasians; 1,539 Mexicans and those of Spanish descent; 1,277 foreign nationals from more than 100 countries; and 327 blacks.

For the most part, residents of the University city have living standards that probably are a little above the average. Almost half of them—16,390—live off campus in apartments that range from tiny efficiencies

to luxury layouts. Another 6,120 owned or rented houses, another 1,256 live in sorority or fraternity houses, 364 in University cooperatives and only 5,227 live in the University dormitories.

Marriage is not as popular as it was only a few years ago. The latest figures show that only 8,115 students are married and 29,346 are single. The number who have made living arrangements without benefit of clergy isn't known, but *The Daily Texan* occasionally runs feature stories about couples who are living happily, and publicly, together in what we used to refer to in San Augustine as "living in sin."

Whether married, single or simply sharing, students find transportation and parking a continuing problem in The University city. Only 13,000 live within a mile of the campus. More than 10,000 live from three to five miles away and more than 700 live from 40 to 100 miles from classes and commute. They own 9,951 cars which are registered with The University, and at least several hundred more which are not. And, if they don't drive, they may be able to ride to the campus from almost anywhere in Austin aboard The University's own private transit system. These buses are operated for The University under a contract with a private operator and the students pay a fee each semester for unlimited riding privileges. The buses carry more than 10,000 riders each day.

To provide the housing, classrooms, laboratories, faculty and staff offices and other facilities demanded by the campus community, The University constantly is building. Last year, a \$10 million Physics-Math-Astronomy Building was completed and another \$15.6 million went into the addition of 14,000 seats in Memorial Stadium and the construction of Bellmont Hall, a 250,000 square foot building housing gymnasia, offices and other facilities as an addition to the stadium.

Presently underway are another \$35 million in buildings at Austin and another \$18.6 million in construction has been approved, including a \$5.2 million swimming pool (it's Olympic size) and a \$2 million tennis center. Plans for another \$66.4 million in buildings are on the drawing boards. The operating budget is \$120 million for The University of Texas in Austin annually.

There is no end to statistics like this which make the University appear to be more like a municipality than an institution of learning. To those of us who remember the campus when it was small and the enrollment was an eighth of what it now is, the very size of today's University can be a cause for concern. Recently President Spurr said in a speech:

"Perhaps the commonest question put to me is how, in a community of forty thousand students, can the individual student receive personal attention. My answer is a counter question. How in a city of fifty thousand inhabitants, does the individual receive personal attention? The parallel in this case is real.

"A city is not necessarily more impersonal than the country. The multiversity similarly is not necessarily more impersonal than a small liberal arts college. True, the freshman coming to The University of Texas may disappear into the university city just as the youth moving to Houston may have the opportunity of moving into a boarding house and live a lonely and remote life surrounded by people. The fact is, however, that the university has many subcultures and that the great majority of students find friends, companionship, and purpose for life in one or more of the subcultures."

In ever increasing numbers, University graduates are finding their place in the world. In 1972, The University conferred 8,858 degrees. This is a startling number when one considers the fact that from 1885, when the first class was graduate, through 1949, The

University of Texas granted a total of only 47,744 degrees—an average of less than 700 per year. Then came the post-war boom in enrollments and during the decade from 1950 through 1959, The University graduated a total of 32,921. Then the real enrollment increase came and between 1960 through 1972, a total of 70,800 degrees were awarded. This means that during the last 22 years, The University has graduated more than twice as many as it did during the first 64 years of its existence. More than half of these have graduated since 1960. As a result, more than one-third of all our graduates are under 30 years of age today!

Statistics like these are intriguing to hear, but they say little about what The University really is. It is not enough to have a great number of young alumni, or to brag that ours is the third largest campus in the nation. Neither is it enough to have land on which to build, and the means with which to erect more and bigger buildings. The important product of The University are the minds that it gives to the world. It is to these intellects that we look for the well-springs of a state and nation's future.

We must never become so preoccupied with growth and ever more bricks and mortar that we cease to demand wise leadership in the future from those we are spending our resources to train now. And never we forget the debt that our University owes to some of the great minds in its past. Whenever Texas Exes gather, as we have tonight, it should be our happy duty, even our obligation, to recall the tremendous contribution of men in fields as different as engineering and English, geology and the classics, law and medicine, who made today's great institution a reality.

John Udden didn't bury oil beneath Texas, but he predicted all the major developments of the petroleum industry. George W. Brackenridge was a businessman, but he founded a school of home economics at the University, gave 800 acres of land along the Colorado River for what he hoped would one day be the campus and offered to underwrite the cost of operating the university for a biennium out of his own funds when a governor vetoed its budget. George W. Littlefield was a cattleman, but the University owes its Wrenn Library, a dormitory and many other benefactions to his generosity. Swante Palm didn't build the great University library, 15th among all of the nation's book depositories, but he founded it. Ashbel Smith, Governor Roberts, Governor Hogg, Will Hogg and many another were not content to dream of the future of the University. They took off their official coats and labored for it.

To do the same for the University is the challenge facing us Texas Exes tonight, whatever our age or whatever our station in life. It matters little whether the "Forty Acres" of yesterday has grown ten times in size, or whether the friendly campus many of us knew has now become a city of tall buildings, snarled traffic and 40,000 unknown faces. It may be a different University, but it still is our University and we have a lasting obligation to it.

The Ex-Students' Association provides the best vehicle, in my judgment, through which that obligation we all owe can best be re-

paid. Like the University, the Ex-Students' Association also has changed. Founded in 1885 primarily to provide "fellowship between alumni," it still performs that function through a hundred simultaneous Texas Independence Day celebrations like this one tonight. But today its functions have been vastly broadened and improved to meet the needs of a growing University and a changing body of alumni.

Today, The Ex-Students' Association, through the *Alcalde* and other publications, provides the only regular communications link between its members and The University. Each year, its scholarship program enables more than 100 young men and women to get the best education available anywhere in the South. Its "Helping Hand" program not only helps graduates find a job, but helps them find friends and contacts in a new community when they relocate. And from the rolls of The Ex-Students' Association each year come the more than 1,000 volunteer alumni who serve on the Board of Regents. The Department Board, the various foundation advisory councils and the dozens of other committees and boards that provide The University with the kind of time and leadership talent that no amount of money can buy.

I am proud to be a Texas Ex. I am proud that, among the nine members of the Board of Regents, eight are Life Members of The Ex-Students' Association. Three have been given the Distinguished Alumnus Award—the highest honor that can be bestowed on any Texas Ex. All nine are active, concerned, committed alumni because they love The University of Texas.

It is that affection for The University from its alumni which has done more than anything else to make it the great institution that it is. After all, a university—any university—is mainly tradition. Sometimes it is the tradition of events or proclamations. It is Harry Benedict, one of the greatest of its presidents, saying that public confidence is the main endowment of a public university. It is Swante Palm hauling 10,000 books by mule up the long hill from his home to begin a library on the Forty Acres. It is yesteryear's annual raid on old B Hall and the cannon firing in protest against President Winston's edict against a holiday on March 2nd.

It is the stag lines at the old Saturday night Germans and the grading of engineering papers with a Ramshorn. It is Ashbel Smith telling Andrew White that education succeeds upon the idea—and that Texas had the idea. It is a pint-sized back scoring a touchdown from 90 yards out and getting called back on a penalty, and then running the same 90 yards on the next play. It is a wistful president hoping to induce better manners by constantly announcing, "The eyes of Texas are upon you." It is a student, scribbling what he considered farcical verse on the back of a brown laundry sack, setting them to the tune of a railroad section hand's lament, and giving Texas and the world a hymn that shall live always.

These, and a hundred others like them, are the traditions that make me proud to be a son of The University of Texas. I hope that it is a feeling that you share, and will always share. I hope, too, that you will always regard

those Forty Acres as some precious real estate in which you share title, and to which you are always welcome to return.

Thomas Wolfe's novel, "You Can't Go Home Again," doesn't apply to the sons and daughters of Texas. Although "The Eyes of Texas" may very well be upon you here in this great and beautiful capital City, and will be all the live long day, I hope you will always yearn to come home—at least before Gabriel blows his horn.

THE LATE HONORABLE GEORGE COLLINS

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who had the opportunity to work with the late Honorable George Collins of Illinois during his one term in the House soon became aware of the deep commitment which he had to the goal of improving the lives of our urban poor. He never relented in his efforts to provide them with adequate housing, health services, and jobs. As we continue our efforts to aid our cities' residents, we will greatly miss his perception and perseverance.

Yet George's service to the people of his Illinois district spanned a much longer period of time than the 2 years he spent in the House of Representatives. The children's Christmas party he was preparing was an event he had held for many years. Certainly, the people of Chicago were, indeed, fortunate to have a man with the concern and dedication of George Collins working for them.

Mrs. Whalen joins me in extending to Mrs. Collins and her son our deepest sympathy.

May George Collins rest in peace.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks of January 29 on the President's proposed budget, the RECORD is in error concerning the Headstart program.

While it is true that Headstart funding through the Office of Economic Opportunity is to be totally eliminated, the program will receive continued funding through the Office of Child Development at HEW.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, March 5, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Show me Thy ways, O Lord, teach me Thy paths.—Psalms 25: 4.

Almighty and Eternal God, who dost reveal Thyself in many ways, deepen

within us the sense of Thy presence as we face the duties of this day. As our fathers before us worshiped at this altar of prayer so do we now lift our hearts unto Thee with thanksgiving.

We thank Thee for Thy Word which reveals to us the way to life and for Thy

love which enables us to live fully and faithfully in the service of our beloved Republic. By Thy spirit may we bind all our prayers into one high resolve to keep ourselves devoted to Thee and dedicated to the welfare of our country.

Bless our Nation with Thy favor and