

quires the inclusion on such packages of a label bearing a statement of the tar and nicotine content.

Prohibits smoking in any enclosed area open to the public in any Federal facility or any interstate passenger carrier facility.

Requires the separation of smokers and nonsmokers in any restaurant, other dining facility, recreation room, or lounge in any Federal facility or interstate passenger carrier facility. Recommends, whenever possible, the separation of smoking and nonsmoking Federal employees.

Imposes an increased tax on cigarettes and authorizes the use of such revenues for cigarette-related disease research.

H.R. 13861. May 18, 1976. Interior and Insular Affairs. Directs the Secretary of Agriculture to review for suitability as wilderness specified lands in the Sam Houston National Forest, the Saline National Forest, and the Davy Crockett National Forest, Texas.

H.R. 13862. May 18, 1976. Ways and Means. Amends the Social Security Act by increasing the amount of outside income which an individual may earn without a reduction in Old-age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance benefits.

H.R. 13863. May 18, 1976. Ways and Means. Establishes a national lottery in the Department of the Treasury and creates a trust fund to be known as the Lottery Trust Fund. Provides that revenues from such lottery be used to render assistance to low-income senior citizens in paying their electric and telephone bills.

H.R. 13864. May 18, 1976. Atomic Energy. Directs the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to cease the granting of licenses for con-

struction authorizations for certain nuclear power plants pending the outcome of a comprehensive study by the Office of Technology Assessment. Requires a five-year independent study of the nuclear fuel cycle by the Office of Technology Assessment with final reports and recommendations to be made to the Congress.

H.R. 13865. May 18, 1976. Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Amends the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to modify regulations with respect to the taking of marine mammals incidental to commercial fishing.

Directs the Secretary of the Treasury to ban the importation of commercial fish or fish products which have been caught with technology which results in the death or serious injury of ocean mammals in excess of United States standards.

H.R. 13866. May 18, 1976. Government Operations. Amends the Federal Reports Act of 1942 to forbid the use of forms by a Federal agency to collect information from more than ten persons unless such forms were approved by the Comptroller General. Allows approval only if such information gathering is reasonably necessary and not overly burdensome on the persons to whom they are directed.

H.R. 13867. May 18, 1976. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Reaffirms the intent of Congress with respect to the structure of the common carrier telecommunications industry rendering services in interstate and foreign commerce. Grants additional authority to the Federal Communications Commission to authorize mergers of carriers when deemed to be in the public interest. Reaffirms the

authority of the States to regulate terminal and station equipment used for telephone exchange service. Requires the Federal Communications Commission to make specified findings in connection with Commission actions authorizing specialized carriers.

H.R. 13868. May 18, 1976. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants, contracts, and loan guarantees for the planning, initial development, and initial operation costs for comprehensive medical practices.

Directs that studies be made of health care delivery systems. Authorizes the Secretary to fund training and research projects related to support services, management, and education for comprehensive medical services.

H.R. 13869. May 18, 1976. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide a \$5,000 tax exclusion from gross income for any amount received as an annuity, pension, or other retirement benefit. Limits the exclusion to \$5,000 for married couples as well as individuals.

H.R. 13870. May 18, 1976. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require each registered issuer of securities to file periodic reports relating to any payment of money over \$1,000 to any person including one employed by a foreign government and a foreign political party or candidate.

Prohibits any issuer of securities to make use of the mails or any instrumentality of interstate commerce to offer, pay or promise such payments.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRINITY RIVER PROJECT

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of this body for over 30 years and, during that time span, I have supported and voted for the Trinity River project each time it was before this body for consideration.

The question of the continuance of the comprehensive improvement and development of the Trinity River has been raised in this body on several previous occasions, using the economic feasibility of the project as a basis for questioned continuance.

There have been any number of studies made in this regard, and I would like to list these studies in order that Members of this body will know of them.

First, Dr. Floyd Durham, professor of economics at Texas Christian University, reports that construction of this project will create an estimated 6,913 jobs and would produce an annual payroll in excess of \$65 million throughout the construction period of 10 to 12 years. This will further be enhanced by the purchase of building materials within the region and the need for housing and services for employees. Dr. Durham further states that by 1990 the project directly and indirectly will have produced 358,000 new jobs with annual payrolls in excess of a billion dollars.

Second, A study conducted by a team of agricultural experts from my alma mater, Texas A. & M. University, has de-

termined that the flood control aspects of the Trinity River project, if implemented would increase the agricultural production in the basin anywhere from 10 to 15 percent for most crops; and, the production of rice could be increased as much as 77 percent.

This team also reports that the primary flood control facilities affecting agriculture in the project are the Tennessee Colony Lake and the multiple purpose channel. The land inundated by Tennessee Colony Lake currently produces at only 48 cents per acre. Frequent flooding has precluded any productive use of this land. Increased production resulting from the project designed flood controls could increase household income in the region as much as \$12.1 million a year.

Third, Prof. Marvin Barloon, Carlton, professor of economics at Case Western Reserve University shows that the cost-benefit ratio, using Federal Government guidelines is about 1.71 to 1 after a reevaluation of the navigation economics. This figure is well above the 1.45 to 1 upon which the project was authorized. Professor Barloon noted that the traffic volume considered for the Trinity was extremely conservative, particularly in light of the market growth since 1968 and the energy crisis.

Further, Professor Barloon has stated that the 3 1/4 percent interest rate used in evaluating the Trinity River project is high. He pointed out that REA loans money at 2 percent to its cooperatives. The current interest rates of 7 to 10 percent constitute a reimbursement to lenders for future inflation. Professor Barloon pointed out, while the actual interest is somewhere between 2 1/2 to 4 percent. He further stated that Federal waterway and

harbor projects are not financed by borrowed funds, but rather by tax revenues, upon which no interest is actually paid. In closing his report, Professor Barloon stated:

The Trinity River navigation project differs from most public expenditures in that it represents an investment in a long-lived productive facility rather than a consumptive outlay. So viewed, it promises to return economic benefits to the public in the form of higher incomes and property values fully equivalent to the construction investment plus an annual return of about 6%.

BERLIN ANNIVERSARY

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, June 17, marks the 23d anniversary of the 1953 workers' uprising in East Berlin—a reminder to us all of the spark of liberty which burns within the hearts of all the German people. It was John Fitzgerald Kennedy who said:

There are many people in the world who really don't understand, or say they don't, what is the great issue between the free world and the Communist world. Let them come to Berlin. There are some who say that Communism is the wave of the future. Let them come to Berlin. . . . And there are even a few who say that it is true that Communism is an evil system, but it permits us to make economic progress. "Lasst sie nach Berlin kommen."

Despite a partial thawing of relations between the Federal Republic of Ger-

many and the "German Democratic Republic," we must not be lulled into complacency.

The catalytic force that transformed long-simmering unrest into open revolt against the Communists in 1953 was a demonstration by the so-called "elite brigade" working on the prestigious "Stalinallee" project, on the morning of June 16. Overnight, mobile units of the Volkspolizei and Soviet armored divisions moved into East Berlin. The Soviet Army, 275,000-strong, was deployed in and around the city and, on the morning of the 17th, when tens of thousands of workers from the capital and its environs gathered once again in front of government buildings, they were driven back by Soviet tanks.

It was an unambiguously anti-Communist and anti-Soviet revolt with 50,000 East Berliners gathering at the Brandenburg Gate to tear down the red flag in defiance of Soviet tyranny and the puppet Ulbricht regime. From Rostock on the Baltic to Chemnitz in the south, from Magdeburg in the West to Frankfurt-on-the-Oder, more than 370,000 workers in 274 localities participated in a general strike and were joined by farmers protesting the collectivist state, only to be crushed by Soviet tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, by the summer of 1961, some 3.5 million East Berliners left their homes and jobs for the refugee centers and airports of West Berlin, dramatizing to all the world their choice of freedom over communism. We are all aware of the Soviet response—the infamous Berlin Wall has blocked the passage to liberty ever since that fateful day in August 1961. To quote Vice President ROCKEFELLER who spoke in Frankfurt on May 15, on his recent official visit to Germany:

In Berlin yesterday, I experienced the powerful and unforgettable emotion of viewing at first hand the contrasting results of democracy and communism. And there can be no more striking proof of the superiority of our system than the fact that the Communists had to build and reinforce that wall to keep their people from escaping to freedom.

The Berlin Wall, Mr. Speaker, sealing off the border between the two sectors, a high, grim barrier of concrete and barbed wire separating families and friends, is but an extension of the brutality the Russians demonstrated in crushing the revolt of 1953.

On this day of commemoration, I salute our citizens of German descent and pray that their relatives in the East may soon enjoy the freedom that is theirs.

SUPPORT FOR RED CROSS APPEAL ASKED

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, the American National Red Cross is currently conducting a nationwide drive to raise at least \$10 million to pay for their emergency relief work on Guam,

which was severely damaged by a typhoon on May 21 and in other disaster stricken areas in the United States.

I have just returned from Guam where I was appalled at the extent of the destruction. Typhoon Pamela hit the island with winds up to 190 miles an hour. Almost 6,000 private homes were destroyed or very heavily damaged. Our entire network of public utilities, including water, power, and telephone was heavily damaged. Roads were cut off and at least \$5 million in structural damage was done to our schools, not counting supplies and equipment.

Worst of all is the effect on the lives of our citizens. As of this writing, emergency assistance officials are working to find shelters for 5,000 families. For many of these unfortunate individuals all they own, except for the clothes on their backs, is gone forever.

The Red Cross and the Federal Disaster Assistance Administration have both done a tremendous job of helping Guam back on its feet. Yet, much more remains to be done if the typhoon victims on Guam and nearby islands are to return their shattered lives back to normal.

Red Cross officials have recently informed me that the lack of news in the national press about the intensity of the damage on Guam is hampering their fundraising efforts. For my part, I am doing all I can to publicize the Red Cross effort on Guam's behalf and am taking this opportunity to ask that you and your staff join me in supporting the Red Cross drive.

Thank you.

OUTSTANDING SOUTH TEXAS TEACHER RETIRES AFTER LONG SERVICE

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Miguel A. Cavazos, has helped to shape the lives of a multitude of boys and girls during his 37 years as a teacher. For most of those years he has been a vocational agriculture teacher in the Rio Grande City High School.

On his recent retirement, Mr. Cavazos said:

To see some of my pupils go into the field of agriculture locally with the state and federal government has been a memorable experience and I'll never forget it.

Nor will the young people who have had the benefit of his guidance ever forget Miguel Cavazos. He has given notable service to them and the community. I salute him as he retires from his teaching position and I, like his many other friends, am pleased to know that he will continue to lead an active life.

Mr. Speaker, wishing to share with my colleagues some knowledge of this fine citizen, I am appending with my remarks a story about him published in the South Texas Reporter, one of our area's great newspapers:

MIGUEL A. CAVAZOS

Way back in 1934, the Hidalgo School District hired Miguel A. Cavazos as a teacher. Ever since then, Mr. Cavazos has been at it, at the profession he thoroughly enjoyed.

In 1944 he came to Rio Grande City, and here he remained until his retirement this year, after 37 years of teaching.

"I thoroughly enjoy teaching," he said. "What has satisfied me most is teaching vocational agriculture to boys and girls."

"To see some of my pupils go into the field of agriculture locally with the state and federal government has been a memorable experience and I'll never forget it."

Cavazos attended La Joya High School. He acquired his B.S. Degree from Sam Houston University in 1932, then obtained his masters in 1952 at Texas A&I.

Known as "restless" by his brothers, Cavazos likes to stay active. Asked what he planned to do now that he has retired from the teaching field, he answered, "Open an office as a consultant in my field. I also intend to study law." With a smile, he added, "I'll practice a little magic also, and I'll open a nursery to keep busy during my free time."

Cavazos was born in Penitas, Hidalgo County, on August 7, 1910, one of four children—three brothers and one sister. He has been happily married for over 35 years and has one son, Miguel, Jr., who is office manager for the SBA in Corpus Christi, Texas, and one daughter, Ernestina C. Trevino, a language arts teacher at Rio High.

Mrs. Trevino, talking about her father to The South Texas Reporter, said, "Dad is easy to talk to. He's there when I need him. He is both a father and friend to me."

His younger brother, Narciso, had this to say: "Having known my brother as a coach, teacher and fellow instructor, it is a great privilege to state that he has well-balanced his books in his lifetime—and I am sure he has fulfilled his Heavenly Father's assignment on this earth."

Humberto, his older brother, who retired as art teacher at Rio last year, said, "Now that Mike has retired also, he'll be coming to bother me everyday, he's so restless."

For those of us who know Mike, as he is called by his friends, we can't think of a better guy to come and bother us any time. He is the life of the party, he is the guy with the right joke at the right time, the friend with the right advice for a friend in need. He is the guy with the infectious happy smile, who will cheer you up in one second flat.

OF NASA'S EFFORTS FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, NASA has undertaken in conjunction with HEW a pilot program applying lessons learned in our space program on food and nutrition to a program to better feed the rural elderly. A recent news article criticized this experimental program. Astronaut Joseph P. Kerwin, in a letter to the editor of the New York Times, provided a nontechnical and warmly human support for this modest but significant effort. Because it is another example of the contribution of space program derived technology to our daily lives, I am including Astronaut Kerwin's letter in the RECORD.

OF NASA'S EFFORTS FOR THE ELDERLY

To the Editor:

John Keats wrote recently on your Op-Ed page about a modest NASA effort to provide meals for elderly people. In it, he managed to misunderstand just about every aspect of what we are doing, to put down the elderly and to rouse my ire in the process.

Some old people need help to get adequate food to eat. Congress has recognized this fact and has stimulated the sponsorship of group meals for them in various city centers. For the millions who cannot get to group meals, programs such as "Meals on Wheels" deliver hot food to the homebound. But if you live in a small town, or in the country, or need a hot meal on a weekend, "Meals on Wheels" can't help you. So the Texas Governor's Committee on Aging came to NASA and asked: Could we help develop good-tasting, easy-to-prepare, easy-to-deliver meals for people not reached by current programs?

Despite the fact that the Space Act of 1958 was a little vague on the point of NASA feeding the elderly, we said yes.

We can help because our food engineers know a little about packaging and shelf life, and we are working with agencies which know a lot about the kind of food people like to eat. To correct a few misapprehensions:

The food is commercially prepared, not "space food." Some of it is freeze-dried, like campers' food, and some isn't. It's packaged in cans or pouches—nary a squeeze-tube, no problem for "palsied, arthritic fingers." It doesn't "require no preparation," but it's easy to prepare, using the recipient's own dishes and silverware. It will be up to the using agency whether to mail it or not; if it does (a week's worth at a time), it will arrive in good condition. The food has a two-year shelf life.

We care because we have relatives who are old, and because we'll be old ourselves soon—if we're lucky. And if packaged meals are the alternative to being put into a nursing home for the convenience of the government or our relatives, we'll make the obvious choice, even if the cuisine isn't up to Mr. Keats's continental standards.

People do need caring. When I flew, the chow was good, but the people who put it together for us were great—they were on our side, and they busted their butts to do the job for us. Now they're trying to use their talents to do the job for old people. The technology is good, but it's the caring of which I am most proud.

JOSEPH P. KERWIN,
NASA Astronaut.

Houston, May 2, 1976.

BALTIC CITIZENS—UNIQUE SPIRIT

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia continue to inspire our admiration during this Bicentennial Year. This year, it is estimated that about 1 million Americans of Baltic descent are commemorating the 35th anniversary of the mass deportations of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians to Siberia on June 14-15, 1941. These courageous people are to be commended on their continued fight for freedom and the right to maintain their cultural identity.

The present struggle for relief from oppression began over 35 years ago. This oppression began with the forcible entry and subsequent annexation of the Baltic

States by the Soviet Union, and was followed quickly by a public policy of tyranny, repression, and cruelty which began with thousands of deportations to Siberia. Tyranny by the Soviet Union continues to this day to forcefully restrain independent action by Baltic citizens.

This repression, however, does not diminish the spirit of Baltic citizens, but nourishes the unique spirit of independence and unity. Let us in our Bicentennial Year, a celebration of freedom, respond to their tireless efforts for freedom by continuing to refuse recognition of the annexation and incorporation of the Baltic States by Soviet Russia. We must stand firm in our resolve to continue our moral support to those people who resist oppressive governments where basic human rights are denied.

A POLITICAL LETTER

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, politics can be a very crazy game to play at times and I just feel compelled to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter which I received today and since it comes from a group with no personal signatures I am taking the liberty of reading it into the Record. The lady who wrote obviously wants to give me some guidance in the selection of our next President, even though none of the 26 members of her club made up of both men and women bothered to vote in the Illinois primary election in March.

It is interesting to note that the emphasis is placed again on the critical side. But then, she really puts the frosting on the cake when she says that we "could have had a candidate in Reagan who has oratorical ability and personality and is especially popular with the female voters." "Now those are really compelling reasons to vote for a President in this lady's mind. How many more of them are there who have no more strong feeling as to what makes a good President?"

The communication reads as follows:

DEAR MR. MICHEL: At our club meeting this week there were 26 members present both men and women and none of them voted in the primary but will vote in the election. Of the 26 present 4 preferred Ford, 5 Carter and 15 Reagan. All but four said that if Ford was nominated they would either vote Democratic or not vote at all.

All acknowledged that in a rough campaign any Democrat could beat Ford because of his many mistakes such as few following:

1. Pardon Nixon before found guilty—a deal;
2. Clemency for draft dodgers;
3. O.K. excessive grain deals to Russia at low prices which increased cost of bread;
4. Signing German boundary agreement with Russia; and
5. Urging and allowing vast numbers of profligate Vietnamese into this country at a time when millions were unemployed and most of them are now on welfare.

These are just a few that people remember. Ford is a sure loser in the coming election if nominated.

I am disappointed to see the Republicans run Ford when they could have had a candidate in Reagan who has oratorical ability

and personality and is especially popular with the female voters which Ford does not possess.

In summing up the situation it should be apparent to everyone that the citizens want a man for President with a new approach and new ideas who has never been involved in government in Washington, D.C.

This information is for your guidance before it is too late.

SECRETARY,
G & H Club.

FIFTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS
QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. ALAN STEELMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my annual practice to send a comprehensive questionnaire to the residents of the Fifth District of Texas each spring. At this time, I would like to share with my colleagues the results of the 1976 questionnaire and also, would like to thank those constituents who took the time and trouble to answer the questions and return the form to my Washington office. This questionnaire is the best method I have of gauging the feelings of my district on issues that I must vote on in Congress.

1976 FIFTH DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE

(1) I support a bill to provide mandatory prison sentences for using or carrying a firearm during commission of a federal crime:

	Percent
Strongly agree.....	85.3
Mildly agree.....	7.7
No opinion.....	2.4
Mildly disagree.....	1.6
Strongly disagree.....	3.0

(2) Controls on natural gas prices should be removed (deregulation):

	Percent
Strongly agree.....	37.2
Mildly agree.....	14.8
No opinion.....	12.1
Mildly disagree.....	10.6
Strongly disagree.....	25.2

(3) Public employees (including policemen, firemen, school teachers) should have the right to strike in bargaining for better wages and benefits:

	Percent
Strongly agree.....	13.9
Mildly agree.....	10.2
No opinion.....	4.1
Mildly disagree.....	13.1
Strongly disagree.....	58.7

(4) The activities and expenditures of U.S. intelligence organizations (such as the CIA) should be closely monitored by a Congressional Oversight Committee:

	Percent
Strongly agree.....	35.2
Mildly agree.....	22.1
No opinion.....	5.4
Mildly disagree.....	14.5
Strongly disagree.....	22.8

(5) The United States should retain its control over the Panama Canal:

	Percent
Strongly agree.....	76.5
Mildly agree.....	10.8
No opinion.....	6.1
Mildly disagree.....	3.0
Strongly disagree.....	3.6

(6) The General Revenue Sharing Program should be continued:

	Percent
Strongly agree.....	49.4
Mildly agree.....	21.3
No opinion.....	6.7
Mildly disagree.....	6.6
Strongly disagree.....	16.0

(7) I support Secretary of State Kissinger's policy of détente with the Soviet Union:

	Percent
Strongly agree.....	10.2
Mildly agree.....	18.9
No opinion.....	14.0
Mildly disagree.....	17.6
Strongly disagree.....	39.3

(8) I support legislation to open meetings of Federal regulatory agencies to the public:

	Percent
Strongly agree.....	62.3
Mildly agree.....	17.5
No opinion.....	10.0
Mildly disagree.....	4.9
Strongly disagree.....	5.3

(9) I support the decision to allow the British-French Concorde (SST) to land at Dulles and J.F.K. airports on a 16-month trial basis:

	Percent
Strongly agree.....	31.9
Mildly agree.....	25.5
No opinion.....	12.1
Mildly disagree.....	8.3
Strongly disagree.....	22.2

(10) Legislation should be passed to provide federal funding for child care and other supportive services in families where both parents are working and the services are requested:

	Percent
Strongly agree.....	10.5
Mildly agree.....	7.4
No opinion.....	3.5
Mildly disagree.....	12.3
Strongly disagree.....	66.3

(11) In your opinion, what action or combination of actions at the federal level would be most beneficial to stimulating employment?:

A. Appropriating more federal money for public service jobs—13.4%.

B. Increasing federal spending to stimulate employment—5.6%.

C. Increasing tax incentives to private industry in order to encourage expansion in the private sector—44.0%.

D. No federal action; let economy take its own course—37.0%.

(12) If the current trend continues, the Social Security fund may be in serious financial difficulty. In view of this, do you think Congress should:

A. Raise Social Security tax rates—10.4%.

B. Increase the maximum amount of wages that is subject to Social Security tax—32.0%.

C. Cover the shortage in Social Security revenues with general tax revenues—27.6%.

D. Reduce Social Security benefits and cost of living increases—15.9%.

E. Gradually increase the retirement age, for example from 65 to 67—14.1%.

(13) The amount of money allotted to Defense Spending in the projected Federal budget is \$101 billion, or 26% of the total budget. Do you think this is:

A. Too much—22.2%.

B. About right—46.8%.

C. Not enough—31.0%.

DEDICATION OF LAKE SUCCESS JEWISH CENTER

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, 1976, I had the honor of attending the

cornerstone laying and the dedication service of the Lake Success Jewish Center. In this Bicentennial Year of America's celebration as a "nation of nations," this dedication seems to signify the continued activity of the American Jewish community. It is particularly exciting to note that this center is in the same area of the community of Lake Success as the first United Nation's building was located in 1948, the year in which the nation of Israel was founded. This should remind us of our need to direct the U.N. to be committed to the security of Israel during its 28th year.

The service itself was very lovely. After the national anthem was sung, Cantor Sol Lesh gave a very moving rendition of Hatikvah, the Israeli national anthem. Moses Heyman made an interesting presentation on the historic significance of the cornerstone. The dedication of the center was made by Herbert Seaman, who deserves great commendation as both the driving energy and the guiding spirit which led to the building of this new synagogue, which is named after his father, Noah Seaman. I must also mention the strenuous efforts and laudatory remarks by Herbert Brown, the congregation's president and Morris Bauman, who introduced the guests of honor. The service was concluded by Rabbi Seymour Baumrind, with all participating in a closing hymn.

Finally, I would like to include in the Record the very beautiful inscription found on the memorial scroll of this center—words which we should never forget:

Because we remember . . . This Light shall burn perpetually as a memorial to our six million Jewish brethren who were victims of Nazi brutality. Their sacred memory is enshrined in our hearts forever. Let this stand as a stern warning to all men, never to be silent in the face of tyranny.

SEEDS FOR THE FUTURE

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, as Bicentennial fervor mounts, it is sometimes difficult for many of us to comprehend that some of our American citizens can rightly ask: "Why should we celebrate your Bicentennial?"

The question is pertinent when asked by our native Americans—they were not contesting taxation without representation and the tyranny of a mother country across the sea. They had no knowledge of such matters.

Elise Lussier, of Pickstown, S. Dak., posed the question—together with some answers at the 1976 South Dakota Girls' State. Her insights and perspective merit consideration by all Americans. I would like to share the reasons that one Indian young lady finds for celebrating the Bicentennial with my colleagues:

THE BICENTENNIAL AND ME
(By Elise Lussier)

As you know this is the year of the Bicentennial. Many grand parties are held on the eve of the most grand of them all—the fourth of July.

I've read history books and studied the subject several times and yet it has left me with a kind of empty feeling. We Indians have been here for hundreds of years, why should we celebrate your bicentennial? Of course, that feeling and others must be projected to many of my people. You see, for part of your independence you had to defeat us! This land, this big beautiful land we called "home" was no longer ours. We were shoved onto reservations and told to keep our place! Discrimination against the native American was outrageous!

Sure we got "so-called free land"; our own piece of the rock I guess you'd say—the reservation. When I was young I didn't live on a reservation, my family was the second of two Indian families attending our school. Let me tell you, those were the most fantastic years of my life! I was accepted as no different from anyone else. I didn't really know I was different until I moved with my family onto a reservation. I couldn't believe the separation—no, not segregation—these are two different things. We were separate—separate souls, the whiteman was so much better than me. I had no class, no value. I was rated low, because I had the misfortune to be born brown!

But let me tell you—you people had made a mistake! In my young years, seeds were planted within me—within my heart. It was those seeds that lead me on. They were the seeds of loyalty, honesty, love of country and patriotism. Each year I learned to love and cherish these sprouting seedlings. Each year they grew more and more until they were so enrooted in my soul, no one could remove them. I love "Old Glory" with all my heart and if necessary would die for her!

I have gone through more hassles and red lights than most of you. I had to take the four ships that often are abandoned at the dock: scholarship, leadership, citizenship, and most dear to me, friendship. Without my friends, who loved and understood, without them, I could have become a defeatist, accepted my lot and tried not to improve my situation. I, like many others, may have missed the boat, but they supported me, told me I must strive for a better America. I continue to toil.

Enough about me, let me tell you about you young women here at Girls' State, you possessed enough of these hard-to-obtain qualities to get here. You believe in America, be assured America believes in you.

I am no longer empty. I'll celebrate this bicentennial as the mark of a new society, a society built on truth, justice and love. I stand for America and I know deep in my heart and soul that America stands for me and it will continue to stand as long as mankind strives towards new and better horizons.

I believe together we citizens can awaken, yes, together with every American in this magnificent nation will grow and spread our seeds to the many deprived nations. Deprived of this land of the free and home of the brave.

ALLEN L. HUNTER RECEIVES RED CROSS CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

HON. MARK W. HANNAFORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. HANNAFORD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Allen L. Hunter, of Seal Beach, Calif., has been awarded the Red Cross Certificate of Merit. This is the highest award given by the American National Red Cross to a person who saves or sustains a life by using skills and knowledge learned in a volunteer training program offered by the Red Cross in first aid, small craft, or water safety.

On December 23, 1975, Mr. Hunter was in the parking lot of a local medical center when a car pulled into the space next to him. A passenger in the car was slumped over, unconscious, and not breathing. Mr. Hunter immediately began administering mouth-to-mouth resuscitation, restoring the victim's breathing and permitting his removal to a hospital. Mr. Hunter's prompt action sustained the victim's life.

It is an honor to bring to the attention of my colleagues Mr. Hunter's generous action. If we all exhibited his compassion and concern for the needs of others, the world would be a better place in which to live. I congratulate Mr. Hunter for the award he has received and express the thanks of all the people of the 34th District.

RETIREMENT OF WILBERT KAUTZ

HON. JOHN G. FARY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, within the Fifth Illinois Congressional District is an area of Chicago called the "back of the yards" neighborhood, noted for the community spirit of its people and the good works performed by its civic and fraternal organizations.

The Back of the Yards Journal for May 19, 1976, carried an article by Joseph Hamzik which appears below. It describes the career of an outstanding "back of the yards" athlete of former days, Wilbert Kautz, who later became a community leader and public servant in the field of public recreation.

I am proud to acknowledge that I have had the privilege of "Wibs" Kautz' friendship for many years. The profound influence for good that he has exerted on the lives of thousands of youngsters deserves the highest praise.

He has helped mold the character of generations of young users of McKinley Park by instilling confidence in them through his supervision of their activities and games and by counseling them on the problems inevitably to be encountered in adult life.

I wish him the very best as he enters upon his well-earned retirement.

The article follows:

McKINLEY PARK SUPERVISOR RETIRES

The former All-American basketball star, Wilbert "Wibs" Kautz, supervisor of McKinley Park for the past 16 years will retire June 1st. Wibs grew up in the Back of the Yards community while attending Everett Public School and Tilden Tech High. He was propelled into national fame as the leading scorer of the outstanding Loyola basketball teams of 1937-38-39. In his senior year, Loyola possessed an undefeated record with 20 victories when the team was invited to play in what is now the National Invitational Tournament in Madison Square Gardens.

As an eastern newspaper read "It will be unbeaten Long Island against unbeaten Loyola of Chicago, a game between the last two undefeated titans in the country". The following day before 18,000 spectators Loyola lost in a closely contested game, which did

not alter the selection of Wibs as an All-American for his stellar play throughout his spectacular college career. He joined the Chicago Bruins professional basketball team owned by George Halas, legendary boss of the Chicago Bears football team. Kautz was chosen to the All-Star teams in his first two seasons in the pro league. With the outbreak of World War II, Wibs joined the military and served in the intelligence branch. He concluded his brilliant basketball career after playing one season with the Chicago Stags following the end of the war.

Wibs joined the Chicago Park District in 1953, and has been the supervisor of McKinley Park and a member of the Back of the Yards Recreation Committee since 1960. In 1970, he was made a charter member of the new Loyola Athletic Hall of Fame with 20 other outstanding stars in celebration of the university's 100 years of sports history.

This Spring Wibs Kautz was chosen to represent the Chicago Park District in the 8th Annual Superior Public Service Awards competition sponsored by the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry. Other representatives were selected from the City of Chicago, Chicago Board of Education, City Colleges of Chicago, Chicago Housing Authority, Cook County, Metropolitan Sanitary District, and the Chicago Transit Authority. Wilbert Kautz was voted the winner and was presented with the Superior Public Award by Chicago mayor Richard J. Daley at a banquet in his honor at the Hyatt Regency Hotel. He and his lovely wife, the former Ada Black, plan to leave for the West Coast immediately in their new motor house for their retirement haven in San Diego.

LESTER LEE TIDWELL

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, all of us who work on Capitol Hill lost a good friend this past weekend when Mr. Lester Lee Tidwell was tragically killed.

Mr. Tidwell was a distinguished member of the Capitol Hill Police force who I am sure many of you have met and talked with during your work in the Capitol.

Mr. Tidwell was a native of Winston County, Ala., part of the Fourth Congressional District, which I represent.

Through this connection, I came to know Lester Lee Tidwell shortly after coming to Congress. Since meeting Mr. Tidwell, I have come to think of him as the epitome of a Capitol Hill policeman. His courtesy, friendship, and desire to serve in an admirable manner were all traits I came to respect. And all of those traits will be missed by those of us who knew Lester Lee Tidwell.

Mr. Tidwell came to the Washington area in 1965 and worked with the Federal Bureau of Investigation until 1967 when he joined the Capitol Hill Police force. He was promoted to the rank of sergeant in 1971. In August of 1973, he was again promoted for his outstanding service, this time to the rank of lieutenant.

Lester Lee Tidwell will be buried in his hometown of Double Springs, Ala., on Friday, June 18, 1976. I want to ex-

press my extreme sympathy to the family and many friends of Lester Lee Tidwell—a man who served in an outstanding manner during his years on Capitol Hill.

WILLIAM ODIE WRIGHT TO RETIRE

HON. MARK W. HANNAFORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. HANNAFORD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William Odie Wright, superintendent of the Long Beach, Calif., Unified School District and the Long Beach Community College District since 1962, will retire on June 29, 1976. Odie Wright has a long career of accomplishments that do him and his family credit. He began his career as an English teacher at Long Beach's Polytechnic High School in 1938. During World War II, he served as director of instruction and research at the U.S. Armed Forces Institute, returning to Long Beach in 1946 as dean of the general adult division of Long Beach City College. In 1952, he became principal of Polytechnic High School, and he held that position until 1955, when he became deputy superintendent of schools and director of educational personnel for the Long Beach Unified School District. In 1962, he was named superintendent.

Odie's contribution to the community has not been limited to working hours. He has served on many community organizations, including the Rotary Club, Community Redevelopment Corporation, Chamber of Commerce Education Committee, YMCA, Red Cross, Cancer Association, Heart Association, Tuberculosis Association, Salvation Army, and Children's Clinic.

He also has held several professional positions. In 1971, he was chairman of the Superintendents of Schools of Large U.S. Cities. He is a member of the American Association of School Administrators and the Association of California School Administrators. He is a former member of the executive committee and Council on Intergovernmental Relations, State of California, and the California Commission on Vocational Education.

Mr. Wright has received many well-deserved awards during his long and distinguished career. During 1976 alone he has been named the 1976 Distinguished Graduate by the Long Beach Citizens Committee for Public Schools Week, the 1976 recipient of the Long Beach Human Relations Commission Award, and Citizen of the Year by the Exchange Club of Long Beach.

The Long Beach School District, under the direction of Superintendent Wright, has become one of the finest in the Nation. Mr. Wright has established model educational programs that are emulated by other districts throughout the State and Nation. Mr. Wright's dedication to his profession and efforts to make our community a better place in which to live for all of us have made him a fine example for the youth of our area.

I have known and worked with Super-

intendent Wright for 24 years. He is a compassionate man, deeply committed to insuring that all the young people in our area receive a first-rate education.

All of us in the Long Beach area will miss Odie's leadership of our schools, but I am sure he will maintain his interest and dedication to the community and its people.

LT. LENDON R. DAVIS RETIRES

HON. MARTIN A. RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to an outstanding public servant and conscientious citizen. Lt. Lendon R. Davis, a veteran of 20 years with the Evergreen Park Police Department, and acting chief of police from 1968 through 1970, is retiring. Lieutenant Davis' friends are numerous, and they are organizing a gala retirement party in his honor on June 24. It is a special recognition well deserved by this fine man.

Perhaps anyone born on July 4th, as Lieutenant Davis was back in 1922, is destined to create some fireworks. And throughout his life, Lieutenant Davis has demonstrated that he is not only an able, effective and willing participant, but one who is capable of leading and charting a direction for others as well.

He began his career in law enforcement in 1956, in 1963 was promoted to sergeant and made lieutenant in 1966. It has been a career notable for its achievements and perhaps the aspect that should be particularly noted is that Lieutenant Davis never reached a point when he decided it was OK to stop growing, when he became complacent and disinterested in improving in his work and in bettering the community.

Lieutenant Davis continued participation in training programs in law enforcement by taking special courses from such institutions as the University of Chicago, Northwestern University, Southern Illinois University and the FBI. He demonstrated his commitment to improving community-police relations by becoming an active participant himself in community activities.

Lieutenant Davis was for 4 years assigned to the juvenile division. Even after leaving there, he did not abandon his caring involvement with youth. It is a sensitive and informed person who, as Lieutenant Davis did, establishes a 24-hour aid service in juvenile delinquency cases which provides, regardless of religious denomination, guidance from clergy in the Village.

As chief of police, he set up the training division within the Evergreen Police Department and was personally responsible for establishing the police cadet program in Evergreen.

There are other specifics that could be cited—serving with honor in the U.S. Navy, his active membership in organizations such as the American Legion, Lions Club, St. Bernadette Youth Society and the South Suburban Juvenile Associa-

tion. But perhaps the simplest statements say the most: the measure of a person is in the lengths to which he goes for others. Lieutenant Davis has given much of himself. His integrity and his commitment have surely illuminated a path for many seeking a way to serve others.

Lieutenant Davis and his wife Marge raised two children and have resided in Evergreen Park for 25 years. How fortunate for that area. Now the community is saying "thank you" for Lieutenant Davis' years of dedicated and selfless service. I know my colleagues join with me in commending Lieutenant Davis and wishing for him a most happy and fulfilling retirement.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9771

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, next week the House will vote on the conference report on the Airport and Airway Development Act Amendments of 1976 (H.R. 9771).

At that time, I will urge the defeat of the report. My objection is to only one provision of the report: Section 19 of the version adopted in the other body. But the parliamentary situation will not permit a separate vote.

Since the early days of the airline industry, it has been understood that the Federal Government will provide the following services for incoming international flights, during normal working hours, Monday through Saturday:

U.S. Customs Service.
Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Public Health Service.
Agriculture Department quarantine—the three services are: Plant, veterinary, and meat and poultry.

If airlines or the individual and corporate owners of private international jets wish to bring in international flights at odd hours or on Sundays and holidays, they have always paid for the resultant overtime.

The Senate amendment would shift much of that cost to the taxpayers. The total estimated bill could exceed \$24 million.

The irony is that the conferees, as members of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, will never have to find money to pay for this amendment. Every cent of the \$24 million will have to be diverted from programs authorized by the following committees:

Judiciary.
Ways and Means.
Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
Agriculture.

The most shocking example of how this will work is the case of the U.S. Customs Service. H.R. 14261, adopted in the House Monday, provides funding for Customs. The only new money in the bill provides 622 new positions for drug

enforcement. This entire increase in efforts to stem the flow of illegal drugs will be wiped out to pay for the proposed gift to the airlines.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the question on passage of the conference report will be the only opportunity the House will have to vote on this amendment. It has been the focus of far too little attention. It was adopted in the Senate as a "perfecting" amendment and was not subject to much discussion in conference.

However, it is the only vote we will have on this matter. Since our constituents may not agree with the case for this unbridled generosity, I think we owe it to them to send the bill back to conference if that is the only way of defeating the Senate amendment.

I make this proposal with complete confidence in the ability of my able colleagues on the Committee on Public Works and Transportation to reassemble the conferees and bring back a report deleting this matter. There is no reason to believe that this cannot be done within a week. Considering the cost of this questionable proposal, a brief delay in final passage of a bill—first acted on in the House 6 months ago—seems reasonable.

ORPHANS OF THE EXODUS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, all of the nations which signed the Helsinki Final Act, including the Soviet Union, pledged to do everything possible to reunite families separated by political boundaries.

Because the Soviet Union is not living up to that promise, Members of Congress are conducting a vigil on behalf of the families which remain separated.

A case history of these families entitled "Orphans of the Exodus" dramatically details this tragic problem. At this time I would like to bring to the Members' attention the situation of the Greenshpun family.

Lea Greenshpun is living in Moscow with her husband Aleksandr and their 7-year-old daughter, Yulia. None of the family members has been exposed to state secrets. Nevertheless, the government has repeatedly refused all exit visa applications for some vague reason which they call "regime."

Meanwhile, Lea's parents live in Israel and count the days till they will be able to be reunited with their daughter and her family.

In a letter from Israel, the mother wrote:

My husband and I are old sick people on pensions. My husband is 77 and I am 73 years old.

My husband suffers from multiple sclerosis; having his feet affected, he has to walk with the help of a cane. I have a heart ailment.

My husband and I arrived from Moscow on December 21, 1971. In March 1973, my son with his family also arrived from Moscow. We have no other relatives, besides our daughter. The emigration papers for her family were

submitted on August 24, 1973. The refusal was received on October 12, 1973 and repeatedly since then. At first, the authorities claimed that my son-in-law's father was against the emigration, but lately the refusal was for reasons of "regime." In this formula one can include anything. . . . But neither my daughter nor her husband has had secret work. Never did either have access to classified information.

Continuous appeals on behalf of my daughter and her husband to the corresponding authorities have gone without any answer. We greatly suffer from this prolonged separation from our daughter and her family.

Mr. Speaker, the travails of the Greenspun family are not unique. The many case histories placed into the Record as part of this vigil, as well as the frequent letters from concerned Americans, demonstrate that the Soviet Union is still engaged in a policy of restricting the emigration of Jews and that the harassment, punishment, and imprisonment of those who seek to leave the country or attempt to exercise their religious rights continues unabated. I hope that our message is heard in the Soviet Union. All obstacles to the free emigration of Soviet Jews, and others who wish to live in other countries, must be removed.

THE "SUNNERS": NEW WORLD TRI-CHAMPIONS

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, the Rising Sun Hotel, a tavern in Reading, Pa., has given the United States an added feather in its Bicentennial cap by sharing the Amateur Softball Association World Softball Championship in Lower Hutt, New Zealand, with Canada and New Zealand.

The "Sunnars," under the supervision of John Kramer and manager Rocco Santilli, and now sponsored by Manson-Billard, Inc., of Reading, finished the World Championships with an 11-2 record and had reached the championship game when a tropical storm forced the cancellation of the remaining games.

The Sunners scored victories over Japan, South Africa, New Zealand, Guam, Taiwan, and Canada. Their only two defeats were to Canada during the qualifying round. In the first game of the finals, however, Rising Sun topped Canada, 1-0.

Rising Sun pitching ace Ty Stofflet established six world records, tied another and drove in the winning run in two games and was named the tournament's most valuable player.

Stofflet set records for innings pitched (59), strikeouts (97), and tied the mark for the lowest earned run average (0.00). His game records included innings pitched (20), longest no-hitter (20), strikeouts (32), and consecutive batters retired (56).

Stofflet was named the most valuable player in the National Tournament for the third time and catcher Carl Solarek, shortstop Gary Distasio, and utility

player Art Weida were first team all-Americans. Utility player Bob Yoder and second baseman Joe Lalli were named to the second team.

The team's 1975 accomplishments were: Atlantic Seaboard Major Softball League Champions; Central Atlantic Regional Softball Tournament Champions; and National Fastpitch Softball Tournament Champions.

In 1976 the team was the Amateur Softball Association world softball championships tri-champions and finished the season with a 66-13 record.

The members of the Sunners are: Ty Stofflet, Larry Bergh, George Ulmer, John Erney, Carl Solarek, Greg Radka, Robert Yoder, Joe Lalli, Gary Distasio, Rennie Petre, and Paul Troika. Also, Art Weida, Gordy Frack, Brian Stofflet, Richard DeLong, Barry Distasio, Paul Price, Ralph Kerschner, John Snyder, Rocco Santilli, Carl Walker, Jerry De-figlio, John Kramer, and Denny Marchalonis.

OFFICE OF INDEPENDENT AUDITION

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, over the course of the last several years, and particularly in light of recent events, the American people have become increasingly alarmed and outraged over reported abuses, improprieties and conflicts of interest among Members of Congress and their employees.

The allegations concerning the payroll abuses and the improprieties of Congressmen have subjected Members and employees of this body to unparalleled attack and cynicism. We presumably have been elected to uphold the public trust, yet there is virtually no group in this country trusted less than our own.

Our system of government is based on respect for law and the democratic process. How can we expect our society of laws to stand when some of our most prominent lawmakers are also our most flagrant lawbreakers? The people of this country have a right to expect that Congressmen who establish a high standard to public morality also meet the same high standard for private conduct as well.

Typically, the congressional response to public criticism of the unethical conduct of its Members has been the adoption of myriad rules, regulations, codes of conduct and criminal statutes governing their behavior in office.

But the American people are impatient with the lip service being paid to rules and regulations that go unenforced; they are frustrated by the slowness of Congress to investigate charges of misconduct brought against its own Members; and they are infuriated by the hesitancy of the Congress to put its own house in order.

Because the unseemly conduct of a few Members reflects on all of us who have been elected to serve in the Congress, and seriously undermines our ability to provide effective leadership, it is essential

that we take immediate steps to restore public confidence.

The best means of achieving this restoration is through the creation of a totally independent and impartial office to investigate alleged violations of ethical standards by Members of Congress and their employees.

Mr. Speaker, what I am proposing today is legislation declaring it to be the sense of the Congress that there shall be created an Office of Independent Auditor, with the power to fully investigate and publicly report facts and recommendations concerning alleged violations of ethical codes by Members of Congress and their employees.

Only through the creation of such an independent office can we reassure the American people that alleged abuses of the public trust by Members of Congress will be thoroughly and objectively investigated and made public. An Independent Auditor can effectively restore public confidence in the integrity of Congress, and in the willingness of its Members to act quickly to insure that the high ethical standards of conduct which they have adopted are maintained.

I hope that this legislation will receive the consideration and support of my colleagues.

The text of my proposal follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas, there is widespread public concern and outrage over the belief that there exist abuses, improprieties and conflicts of interest among Members of Congress, its officers or employees;

Whereas, there exist numerous rules, regulations, codes of conduct, constitutional requirements and criminal statutes governing the Members of Congress, its officers and employees;

Whereas, immediate action must be taken by the Congress to restore public confidence in its ability to ensure that all Members of Congress, its officers and employees fully comply with each of these rules governing their conduct;

Whereas, this public confidence can best be restored by the creation of an independent and impartial office for the House and Senate to investigate alleged abuses, improprieties and conflicts of interest: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that there shall be created for the House and Senate jointly an Office of Independent Auditor, who shall have the power to investigate and publicly report facts and recommendations pertaining to any alleged violation by a member, officer or employee of the House or Senate of any law, rule, regulation or other standard of official conduct applicable to that individual's conduct in the performance of his or her duties.

FINANCIAL STATUS OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT W. EDGAR

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, as a firm believer in financial disclosure of public officials and candidates, I am submitting for the Record a listing of Mrs. Edgar's

and my assets and liabilities, as well as our 1975 income and taxes:

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN AND MRS. ROBERT W. EDGAR

ASSETS—AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1975

Savings account.....	\$49.52
Cash on hand in checking account.....	689.10
1971 Volkswagen.....	1,400.00
1975 Ford Granada.....	2,500.00
House in Broomall, Pa.....	37,000.00
House in Arlington, Va.....	60,000.00
Household goods and miscellaneous personal property.....	11,000.00
U.S. Civil Service Retirement Fund.....	2,930.41

Total assets..... 115,569.03

LIABILITIES—AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1975

Mortgage on house in Broomall, Pa.....	19,370.92
Mortgage on house in Arlington, Va.....	56,750.00
Personal loans.....	958.95

Total liabilities..... 77,079.87

Net worth..... 38,489.16

1975 TAXES

Federal.....	4,579.01
Pennsylvania (state).....	782.01
Pennsylvania (local).....	646.80
Virginia (local).....	403.96

Total taxes..... 6,411.78

1975 INCOME

Salary as a Member of Congress.....	39,072.08
Interest on savings account.....	28.59

Total income..... 39,100.67

COMMERCE'S COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS C. MARSHALL DANN RECEIVES 1976 JEFFERSON MEDAL

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, inventiveness has always been a trademark of Americans. The term "Yankee Ingenuity" is known worldwide. This is why, Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased that the Department of Commerce's Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, C. Marshall Dann, has been selected by the New Jersey Patent Law Office to receive a particularly prestigious award and I insert the article in the RECORD:

C. Marshall Dann, Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, U.S. Department of Commerce has been selected by the New Jersey Patent Law Association to receive the 1976 Jefferson Medal. The medal will be awarded to Commissioner Dann in recognition of his noteworthy contributions to the patent system and the Patent and Trademark Office during a career that spans both industry and government. The presentation will take place June 4, 1976 at the Chanticleer in Milburn, New Jersey.

The Association began granting the award in 1951 to recognize outstanding contributions by individuals to the American Patent System. Past recipients include Charles Kettering, inventor of the automobile self-starter and former Vice President for research

at General Motors Corporation; John W. Anderson, President of the National Patent Council; and Vannevar Bush, Honorable Chairman of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and member of the Advisory Committee of the National Security Resources Board.

Dann has served as Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks for over two years, since February 11, 1974. Prior to his appointment as Commissioner, he had been Chief Counsel of the Patent Division of DuPont Company in Wilmington, Delaware since 1968. He also served as Chairman of DuPont's Patent Board from 1966 until August 1973. Dann began working for DuPont in 1935 as a chemist. He transferred to the legal department in 1945.

In addition, Dann is a past president of the American and Philadelphia Patent Law Associations. Currently, he is a member of the American, Delaware and District of Columbia Bar Associations and the Association of Corporate Patent Counsel. He is a trustee of Worcester Polytechnic Institute and a holder of the Goddard Medal.

For further information contact Isaac Fleischmann, Director, Office of Information Services 703 557-3428.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FROM 35TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, NEW YORK

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, people of the 35th Congressional District have recently responded to my annual poll on national issues and I would like to share the results with my colleagues. My constituents expressed their views on public jobs programs, marijuana, national health insurance, Government spending, revenue sharing, abortion, relations with the Soviet Union, the performance of Government institutions and environmental controls. They cited as the Nation's No. 1 need a cut in Government spending, with more honesty in Government and more jobs as other high priority matters.

Under unanimous consent, I submit a list of the questions contained in the poll and the results expressed in percentages of the replies:

RESULTS OF 1976 CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE OF CONGRESSMAN BARBER B. CONABLE

1. Should Congress approve continuation of federal revenue sharing which returns \$6 billion a year to state and local governments to use as needed?

Yes.....	84.7
No.....	15.3

2. Should the U.S. Constitution be amended to prohibit abortion?

Yes.....	26.4
No.....	73.6

3. Should the federal government provide a job, regardless of the cost, for everyone who can't find employment elsewhere?

Yes.....	18.0
No.....	82.0

4. Should possession and use of marijuana be made legal?

Yes.....	26.5
No.....	73.5

5. Do you favor delay of stronger environmental pollution controls in order to improve energy conservation?

Yes.....	57.5
No.....	42.5

6. Should we continue to seek improved cultural, political and economic relations with the Soviet Union?

Yes.....	71.3
No.....	28.7

7. There are a number of national health insurance proposals before Congress. Which do you favor?

Percent

A plan of complete health care financed from taxes and administered by the federal government?.....	21.6
A plan covering only the most costly illnesses, financed by taxes?.....	35.0
No new national program?.....	43.4

8. Demands for government spending exceed the funds available, making spending priorities necessary. What priority would you assign to the following primary uses of your federal tax money:

Crime Prevention.....	1
Education.....	4
Energy Research.....	2
Environmental Protection.....	6
Health Services.....	5
Housing.....	7
National Defense.....	3
Transportation.....	8
Social Services.....	9
Postal Rate Subsidy.....	10

9. How do you rate the performance of these federal offices or institutions?

Percent

The President:	
Good.....	31.3
Fair.....	47.6
Poor.....	21.1

Congress:	
Good.....	10.8
Fair.....	50.4
Poor.....	38.8

Social Security Administration:	
Good.....	17.7
Fair.....	44.5
Poor.....	37.8

Postal Service:	
Good.....	12.3
Fair.....	31.4
Poor.....	56.3

Internal Revenue Service:	
Good.....	22.3
Fair.....	49.2
Poor.....	28.5

10. What is the nation's number 1 need?

- (1) Cut government spending.
- (2) Honesty in government.
- (3) More jobs.
- (4) Curb inflation.

CORE: A LEADER IN THE FIGHT FOR EQUALITY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday marked the 34th anniversary of the founding of the Congress for Racial Equality. This civil rights organization was in the vanguard during the struggle to achieve equality for black Americans.

They engaged in such "direct action" as sit-ins and voter registration which were all designed to reduce the remaining vestiges of racial discrimination in this Nation.

As we continue to celebrate our Bicentennial, I think it is only fitting that we recognize the contributions of organizations like CORE, who attempted to make the American dream a reality for all Americans.

CITIZEN SOLDIERS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, we have always been a Nation of "citizen soldiers." In times of crisis or war, we call upon our civilians to transform themselves into fighting men to defend our country and our way of life. At the conclusion of conflict, our men and women come home and return to their former lives.

It is in the readjustment phase that America is unique, for no other country makes such efforts in behalf of its veterans as the United States.

Recently, the Honorable Richard L. Roudebush, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs was the keynote speaker at the Noncommissioned Officers Association business meeting at their international convention in San Antonio, and commented on this fact. I include remarks in the RECORD for the consideration of all Members:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,

June 7, 1976.

HON. BOB WILSON,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILSON: Again, my sincere congratulations for being presented the NCOA "L. Mendel Rivers Award for Legislative Action" at our 15th Annual International Convention. I know of no one else in Congress today who truly deserves this recognition.

In relation to the convention, the Honorable Richard L. Roudebush, Administrator of Veterans Affairs, was our key note speaker the morning of June 3, 1976. Would you be so kind as to insert his remarks in the Congressional Record? The Association will be most grateful.

As Mr. Fred Darling, NCOA Executive Coordinator for Military and Veterans Affairs, advised you on your return trip to the San Antonio Airport, the NCOA will host a congressional reception in your honor sometime in September. We will be in touch with you at a later date to confirm arrangements.

With warm, personal regards, I am,

Respectfully,

C. A. "MACK" McKINNEY,
Director of Legislative Affairs.

SUGGESTED REMARKS

Mr. Speaker, recently I had the honor and privilege to be the recipient of the Noncommissioned Officers Association of the U.S.A.—NCOA—"L. Mendel Rivers Award for Legislative Action." The presentation was made on June 3, 1976, at the NCOA's 15th annual international convention, San Antonio, Tex.

Earlier that day, the Honorable Richard L. Roudebush, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, was the keynote speaker at the association's annual business meeting. I believe his remarks are pertinent and should be included in the RECORD.

Mr. Roudebush's remarks are as follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

I am grateful for the opportunity to spend a few minutes with you and to participate in your national convention.

This is not only my first time to address this organization, it is my first convention of the 1976 season, the first on a schedule that will be quite full toward the end of the summer.

So I have a special greeting for you not only as members of the first veterans group I have had the pleasure of addressing in convention this year.

I hope your meeting has gone well, that it has been both enjoyable and productive and that it will lead to a year of growth and progress.

As one of your newer members, I am willing to rely on you who have been around for a long time to do most of the work and to make the proper decisions. But I expect you to do the best you can in looking after the interests of those of us who are junior to you in membership and don't have much to say about the way things are run.

I know I can count on your capable leadership.

I am sure that during your proceedings here you have taken notice of the fact that we are in our Bicentennial year and that just one month from now the Nation will observe this most important birthday.

The Bicentennial observance has great meaning for the American people and nearly everything of a public nature that is done this year is influenced by or at least considered in terms of our country's 200-year history.

I think this is appropriate for it gives us cohesiveness as a people and it gives us a national theme to rally around. And certainly we have much to be proud of and great reason to respond to a joyous salute to our history.

There are, of course, no citizens who have had a more responsible role in our history and have greater reason to celebrate the success of America than those who have served in our armed forces.

Nearly every generation in the last 200 years has been called on to defend and fight for the principles that were first proclaimed when the Nation was born. The fact that we are today strong and free can be attributed to the dedication and the valor shown by Americans who answered a call to service when we were endangered.

I am sure you have no argument with the rather commonplace assertion that non-coms are the backbone of our armed services, the part of the structure that makes the whole arrangement work.

If this is true, then you and others who have been non commissioned officers are very special people indeed in the history of America.

You have had a great deal to do with making us strong militarily, with giving us the ability to turn back attacks against us and the freedom we cherish, in campaigns here and around the world.

I salute you, your predecessors and your successors as non-coms for the contribution you have made to all services and, thus, to a safe and free country.

I would also like to recognize you for what you have done since you came out of service, to congratulate you for your determina-

tion that you will do no less for your communities and your country now that you are civilians. This organization gives you a means of expressing that determination and I hope it grows, becomes increasingly effective and lives up to its bright promise.

Ever since Americans were first called on to bear arms and to defend and fight against our enemies, the Nation has felt a special obligation to provide care and service for those who returned from military duties with disabilities and with special needs.

The attention given ex-servicemen has not always been good, or even always adequate, throughout our years as a nation. For much of our history it consisted of meager pensions paid to disabled veterans and homes to shelter those who were old and feeble and had nowhere else to go.

I think it is a mark of the success and growth of America that we have become progressively more aware of the needs of those who have served us in uniform and have developed and improved in the way we respond to those needs.

The old-soldiers home mentality that governed for so long disappeared many years ago in favor of programs that have become increasingly more humane, more pertinent to need, more productive and a more appropriate and accurate reflection of the gratitude and indebtedness we feel toward those who served us well.

It was for the men of World War II that wholesale changes were made in our thinking about how to compensate veterans for time, opportunity and health lost in service. The G.I. Bill and other developments gave veterans' programs meaning and sophistication they had never had before.

Education and training were offered as a means of rehabilitation and readjustment. Veterans were given help in buying homes and starting businesses. Medical care was improved and VA hospitals were developed into a real system that coordinated with the Nation's other health resources.

We took giant steps during that period and we have continued to build both in programs and facilities since that time.

The result is that America offers its veterans more avenues of assistance than ever before and their opportunity to overcome obstacles and build happy and productive lives has never been greater.

No other nation in history has given so much attention to the needs of its returned servicemen. No nation has provided the depth and the quality of assistance that is available to American veterans today.

I know that you, as an organized veterans group, have your opinions as to the effectiveness of what is being done and that you have certain goals and intentions relating to improvement of programs and improvement of service.

There is no question that improvements are needed, no question at all that some needs of veterans require more attention that they are getting, no question that there are areas of concern that have not been treated as well as others and no question that new problems continue to arise.

We do not claim to have reached all our goals and we not only respect your opinions and your solicitations, we encourage them. We know you have valuable ideas and information to offer, as a group and as individuals.

But I know that you join me in the gratitude I feel toward the American people for their support and their generous provision of resources that make it possible for us to have the effective programs of assistance that we have today.

I believe that one of the great things about America that we have to celebrate in this Bicentennial year is the development over our history of such an enlightened philosophy toward the needs of our veterans and the establishment of facilities and means to carry it out.

What we do in this field is an indication of the level of responsibility and civilization we have attained.

There are today nearly thirty million veterans in the United States. While most of them never need anything from the Veterans Administration other than benefits that assist in adjustment from military to civilian life, requirements of veterans and dependents are still sufficient to require a VA budget in excess of \$18 billion this year.

This makes VA the third largest federal agency in expenditures. In employment it is the second largest agency, behind only the Department of Defense, with more than 200,000 persons working across the United States in Puerto Rico and the Philippines.

Those are some overall dimensions that indicate the size of VA. There are other indications, such as the fact that VA has the largest hospital system in the free world, administers a more than \$100 billion insurance program, is providing education and training for some two million persons and makes pension and disability payments to nearly five million persons.

Having established the size of the VA mission, I will not go into additional current statistics of VA but would like to offer this historical statistic:

During the 200-year history of this country VA and predecessor agencies have spent in excess of a quarter of a trillion dollars on assistance to veterans and dependents.

I mention this fact both to illustrate what I have been saying about what the Nation has done in this field and to preface some brief remarks about the future of veterans' programs.

We know that it will be a long future. We hope that there will be no more wars to produce veterans, but wars already fought will require service to veterans and their families for as many years ahead as anyone can see at this time.

We still pay pensions to Civil War widows. We pay pensions to needy parents of World War I veterans. The last dependent of the War of 1812 died after World War II. The last dependent of the Mexican War, which ended in 1848, died during the Vietnam War.

It is a safe prediction that for years after America celebrates its Tricentennial dependents of Vietnam Era veterans will be requiring assistance.

But that is far in the future and is brought up only as an intriguing thought at this time.

What is important, and I hope more interesting to you, is the more immediate future. We know that it will be a busy time.

There are today 13½ million veterans of World War II alone and their average age is 56 years. We know they will be needing more medical care and other services.

Veterans of the Korean Conflict are only a little younger. They and the millions of men and women who have seen service since Korea are also likely to call on VA in increasing numbers as they get older, especially for health services.

There are some 900,000 veterans of World War I still living and we hope we will have the privilege of serving veterans of this era for many more years.

The message I want to leave with you is that we at VA intend to meet our obligations to all veterans. We plan to be ready for them when they are ready for us to give them assistance.

We know that the American people support our endeavors, that they will expect us to perform well and that they will provide the proper resources.

New evidence of that support was provided recently when President Ford announced plans to construct eight new VA hospitals. These are facilities that will be built, largely, to replace old hospitals and expand and improve service now being given. They will

be phased into the VA system over a period of several years.

We at VA appreciate this indication of the President's interest. He is saying that we must look ahead to future needs, that the work of VA must not be handicapped by lack of facilities.

And he is saying that, despite his belief that government spending must be kept to a minimum and despite his dedication to reduced spending, care for veterans is a special obligation and we can not postpone our attention to it.

I have enjoyed these few minutes with you this morning and have appreciated the chance to discuss with you something about veterans' programs, past, present and future.

I know that you have a special interest in this subject because you are an organization of veterans. I hope I have been informative and I hope that I might even have led you to be a little more interested than you were previously.

We at VA value your ideas and we respect your judgment. We solicit your involvement in efforts to assist your fellow veterans and we hope to work closely with you.

I wish you well, individually and as an organization, and I appreciate your having me on your program.

THE SOVIET ANNEXATION OF LITHUANIA

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been 36 years since the sovereignty of Lithuania was forcibly stripped by the Soviet Union. After only 22 years of independence, Lithuania's right to self-determination perished.

This Baltic nation paid dearly in its futile fight to retain independence. Thirty thousand Lithuanians died in the resistance to Soviet annexation. Thirty thousand more suffered the hardships of prison or exile. To people of Lithuanian descent throughout the world, the sorrow that has afflicted their homeland has not been eased by the years that have passed since the days of World War II.

Documented cases of ruthless Soviet persecution of Lithuanians continue to reach the West. The abrogation of the right to worship, the right to dissent, the right to emigrate, and the right of free expression persists.

Although Soviet oppression can claim Lithuania's autonomy as one of its victims, the Lithuanians' proud spirit of freedom continues to flourish. Dissidents from the Lithuanian scientific and intellectual community battle at great personal risk for the rights that have been withheld. Lithuanian worshippers of every faith are not allowing Soviet repression to smother the expression of their religious reverence.

As a nation which was founded on the primacy of individual liberties, the United States must never allow its dedication to human rights to diminish. In this 200th commemoration of our struggle for independence, Americans are re-

affirming their commitment to freedom. This commitment must continue to be exercised as an inspiration to those whose rights have been crushed. We must not forget the plight of the Lithuanians and the millions of others who have been silenced by Soviet oppression.

As a Congressman who has strongly supported resolutions to protest the illegal seizure of the Baltic States, I salute the Lithuanian-American community for its constant efforts on behalf of its homeland. With the support and endeavors of millions throughout this country and other nations, the just cause of Lithuanian self-determination will not be abandoned. I pray that our united stand will one day result in the return of Lithuania's true independence.

THE EFFECTS OF DIVESTITURE

HON. BILL ARCHER
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing a movement in our country—and in this Congress—seeking to break up the U.S. petroleum companies which are vertically integrated. A number of companies in the petroleum industry are involved in the areas of discovering crude oil, producing this crude oil, the process of refining it into finished products; for example, fuel oil, gasoline, and marketing it to distributors and/or consumers. The same companies may also be involved in transporting these petroleum products at various stages including pipelines, seagoing vessels, and trucks. These companies became vertically integrated to promote efficiency in this very capital intensive industry.

Critics of our petroleum industry are promoting "vertical divestiture," which would break up the oil companies. Before the House of Representatives considers such a measure, I believe it is essential that we look at the harmful results of such actions. When the United States is facing an energy crisis and must rely more and more on foreign sources of energy, divestiture would deter our country from developing and becoming self-sufficient in oil and gas. Additional effects would be to eliminate the great efficiencies and cost savings which have resulted from vertical integration. The long range effect would be a shortage of supplies and significant price increases for the consumers. Economically, there would be chaos and confusion in the investment markets. If divestiture occurs, the United States would be taking a major step backwards in energy independence and efficiency.

Knowledgeable experts in the field have analyzed and given us their judgment on this situation. Testifying before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. Raymond B. Gary, managing director of Morgan Stanley & Co., an investment banking firm in New York City, stated his view on divestiture legislation:

I believe that such legislation would impair the financial strength of the major portion of the U.S. petroleum industry.

Mr. W. T. Slick, Jr., senior vice president of the Exxon Co., in testimony before the same subcommittee, discussed the eventual effects of successful divestiture legislation:

The dismemberment of the nation's twenty largest vertically integrated petroleum companies into separate functional entities would reduce the nation's domestic energy supplies, significantly increase the costs of energy to consumers, frustrate, if not reverse, attempts to recover from the recession, reduce competition in the petroleum industry, and have harmful effects upon the many millions of investors whose savings, incomes and pensions depend upon the returns from stocks and bonds.

If dismemberment legislation were to be passed, there would be significant transitory effects which would have both long and short-run implications. During the time between the passage of such legislation and the time it is implemented, the industry will be operating in an environment of total uncertainty. The immediate impact of such legislation on most affected companies in our judgment would be to suspend capital spending programs and focus top management attention on developing its dismemberment plan and on reevaluating and restructuring short and long-range plans.

And my distinguished colleague from the other body, Senator DEWEY F. BARTLETT of Oklahoma, in presenting his view reminded the subcommittee of some essential history of the petroleum industry and the consequences of mistaken action:

"Petroleum firms integrated in the first place not because of a sinister plot, but because of natural economic forces. Vertical integration enhances a firm's ability to compete. This subcommittee should know how the petroleum industry would look after divestiture. Would it be more competitive than it is now? Would it be better able to supply more energy to this Nation at a lower price?

I am not aware of any studies which answer these questions in a way supportive of divestiture. Most of the evidence with which I am familiar indicates that vertical integration evolved in order to lower overall costs and to increase the reliability of operations.

Before we in Congress legislate divestiture, it is imperative that we understand exactly what we are doing. This subject should be pursued with great caution, sobriety, and care.

Keep in mind that once divestiture occurs, it will not be possible to piece the industry back together again. If we make a mistake, the people in the United States will suffer the consequences by enduring great discomfort due to loss of services and by paying unnecessarily high prices for the energy in short supply.

The present system has worked well. Before destroying it, we must be certain our actions are right and in the national interest. The burden of proof is on the proponents of this legislation.

Every Member should review the highlights of this testimony before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Vertical divestiture would be a disaster for our energy industry and would be detrimental to our economy.

UNCOMMON VALOR

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to honor five of my constituents who have exhibited uncommon valor in performing one of the noblest actions known to man—that of risking one's own life in saving another. With all thoughts of personal well-being cast aside, these heroes rescued victims who, without aid, almost certainly would have drowned.

Eric Brockley is a 22-year-old student at Eisenhower College in Seneca Falls, N.Y., who, ignoring all personal peril, rescued a young local woman from the waters of a canal.

On Tuesday evening, May 11, Eric witnessed the young woman plunging off a bridge into the canal. He dived after her and swam with her to an abutment, where an unidentified couple aided them. The young woman was taken home unharmed.

Police Chief Anthony J. Casamassima of Seneca Falls presented Eric with the Good Citizenship Award of the Seneca Falls Police Department for his valor, pointing out that the water was over 30 feet deep at the place of rescue.

Michael Marrapese, Joseph Felice, and his son, Gary Felice are employees of the Seneca Knitting Mills Co., Seneca Falls, who, disregarding imminent danger, rescued an elderly woman from the swift current of the Seneca River.

At midday, Friday, April 3, the woman descended from a bridge abutment into the icy waters and was carried downstream. The three mill employees sighted the struggling woman from a window at the plant, rushed outside and rescued her at a point about 200 feet from where she originally entered. The woman was treated at a nearby hospital.

Police Chief Casamassima credited the saving of the woman's life to the courage and quickness of the three men.

Patrick MacDougall is a 7-year-old first-grader at B. C. Cate Elementary School in Montour Falls, N.Y., who, acting with great courage, saved his younger brother's life.

On the frigid evening of Thursday, March 11, 5-year-old Michael MacDougall, dressed in winter clothes, stepped across the thin ice of the family swimming pool and plunged into the numbing water below. Patrick, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Bernard MacDougall, Odessa N.Y., immediately dived into the chilling water and pulled his brother out of the pool to safety.

Young Patrick's instantaneous response was instrumental in rescuing his brother.

I commend the meritorious deeds of Eric Brockley, Michael Marrapese, Joseph Felice, Gary Felice and Patrick MacDougall. The noble actions these distinguished people have performed demonstrate not only a selfless disre-

gard for personal well-being, but also a noble regard for the welfare of others.

EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS FACING URBAN NATIVE AMERICANS—PART V

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the final article in a five-part series on Indian education which recently appeared in the Minnesota Daily, the University of Minnesota newspaper. This article, written by Morgan O'Brien, Donna Soutor, and Robert Hudson, describes the Red School House in St. Paul, an alternative school for Indian elementary and secondary students.

The Red School House was founded in 1972 by E. Benton Banai as an alternative to the programs offered in the St. Paul public schools. The school is oriented around the notion of survival skills—skills that will enable Native American students to understand and take a place in contemporary society. It seeks not only to help students master fundamental mathematics, reading, and communication skills but also to increase students' awareness and appreciation of Native American history, values, and wisdom.

Although the Red School House does interact with the St. Paul public school system, it has maintained a sovereign decisionmaking process. Such a course has presented hardships, particularly in the school's finances. But it has also allowed the students, staff, and community to structure a bold and independent educational alternative.

The article follows:

RED SCHOOL HOUSE: ALTERNATIVE FOR SURVIVAL—PART V

(By Morgan O'Brien, Donna Soutor, and Robert Hudson)

While a national television network camera crew packed up after two days of filming at the Red School House in St. Paul several weeks ago, Gabe Horn, the school's Native American history instructor, gave an impromptu lesson in survival to the assembled students.

"Why should we let other people tell about us? Who's better qualified to talk about Native Americans than ourselves? We're the ones who should be taking the pictures and writing the stories," he said.

Founded in 1972, the Red School House was begun as an alternative to public school education to teach survival skills to any person, but particularly Native American Indians lost in mainstream America. Surviving as a school has become the most relentless test of that vision.

Survival skills, according to staff member Joe Liles, are the three R's of traditional education—reading, writing, arithmetic—along with an understanding of how modern society, such as the government and the economy, works.

"For a long time Indian people have been so uncomfortable, so poverty stricken and so

bewildered by it all. Survival skills mean reducing that confusion and having our kids take their place in society, even in leadership roles," Liles said.

Religion is the cohesive center of the school's dynamics even though it is not treated as a separate subject. The most visible and constant evidence is the Sacred Circle. Any gathering of the student council, classes, pipe or drum ceremonies at the beginning or end of the day are held in a circle, symbolizing the group's unity with the natural universe and each other, while recognizing each member's equality and uniqueness.

Merri Medanis, 14, from Grand Rapids, Mich., thinks Indian youths in public schools are too afraid to learn. "They don't feel at home. They're afraid to raise their hand to answer a question. I know I was; I was in a shell. I wouldn't even sit at the front of a class."

A supportive, noncompetitive atmosphere among students is encouraged by grouping them into four areas based on their age and ability, with no threat of nonadvancement.

A staff of 18 currently serves 125 students. Instructors are not necessarily accredited by the State Department of Education. Some of them, like Maggie Folendorf, an English literature graduate of Macalester College and the school's primary grades instructor, don't have any formal training in their teaching area.

"But I like it a whole lot and can't imagine being at any other school. I can't see many of these kids in a public school because you can't hold them down. You can't tell them to sit and be quiet," Folendorf said.

"I sympathize with the public school teacher who has 30 kids of her own all day. I think I'd make them sit too if I were in that situation. But I don't think kids should have to be quiet. I just keep it down to a dull roar," she said.

While the public schools had a holiday on Washington's birthday, classes were scheduled as usual at the school and attendance was hampered only slightly by the lack of public school transportation.

Horn sees the school's emphasis on self-acceptance as a key to the school's nonpunitive attendance policy.

"A lot of these kids couldn't read a sentence when they first got here and they were in the seventh or eighth grade," Horn said.

"Now you can't keep a book out of their hands because they're reading books about Indians, about themselves, their religion and their history; how many people are going to turn away from that? That's why they come here."

"A lot of times you hear these kids referred to as dropouts. It seems to me most of the students are here because they want to be. Yeh, they had trouble getting along in public school, but who wants to go there anyway when they can be coming here and learning things that are natural to themselves and giving them an identity?"

As a teacher, Horn is hard on his students. "I expect them to do their absolute best whether it's writing, reading or thinking. If they hand me a paper that's sloppy, I give it right back to them, but I give it to them with an Indian value inserted in it, saying, 'We take pride in what we do.'"

The teacher's task is seen as creative, but difficult, according to graphic arts instructor Liles. "A lot of what a teacher does in his classroom comes out of his own head. We're dealing with subjects and perspectives in this curriculum that haven't ever been taught before."

At the lower grade level, the few reading work books are considered a luxury. Staff members are trying to write texts and teaching guides of their own use and to pass on

to other Indian schools struggling with the same lack of funds and materials.

While the school would welcome cooperation from the St. Paul Public School System, they are not interested in becoming a part of it and giving up their Indian sovereignty in the decision-making process of the school, according to E. Benton Banai, the school's founder. Policy is now set by equal representation, he says, of an executive board, parents advisory committee and the student council.

Financing the school over the past five years has been a struggle. Discussing the future finances, Banai said simply, "We pray a lot."

Banai said the school could use more than twice the money they are now spending. While this was the first financially stable year in its history, the need for renovation of the 79-year-old building at 643 Virginia Avenue (formerly St. Vincent's Parochial School) is critical for the safety of their students and a better learning environment. Money is also needed to match much sought after state grants.

Last Saturday's 15-mile "Walk for Survival" was the latest in a series of fund-raising efforts to realize some of the school's plans. A school spokeswoman said the unofficial pledge total was about \$16,000 from the 1,000 pledge cards turned in after the walk. The figure is more than organizers had said would make the walk a worthwhile effort, so the support the school needs to continue appears to be, at least in part, from the white community.

THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEPORTATION OF BALTIC PEOPLES TO SIBERIA

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, this year, about 1 million Americans of Baltic descent are commemorating the 35th anniversary of the mass deportations of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians to Siberia which took place on June 14-15, 1941. During these first arrests, 100,000 persons were deported to various places in Asia Siberia. This was done to subdue the Baltic States, which had been illegally occupied by the Soviet Union against the will of the people.

The Soviet Government began planning for mass extermination of the Baltic people soon after the conclusion of the Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939. The clear evidence of this is found in N.K.V.D. Order No. 01223 regarding the "deportation of anti-Soviet elements from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia." According to data collected by the Lithuanian Red Cross, 34,260 persons were deported from Lithuania, 35,102 from Latvia, and 33,500 from Estonia.

Statistics on age groups and professions have also been provided from a list of 20,974 persons. There were 1,626 infants; 2,165 children from the ages of 4 to 10; 2,587 persons from the ages of 10 to 18; 3,986 from the ages of 18 to 30 years; 7,778 persons from the ages of 30 to 50; 1,681 from 50 to 70 years; 427 over

70 years of age; and the remainder of undetermined age.

The largest groups were elementary and secondary school students: 6,378. There were 3,389 farmers, 1,865 housewives, 1,591 government employees, 1,098 teachers, 879 workers, 622 servicemen, and 416 university students.

All of these people were loaded into freight cars with 50 to 60 persons in each car. The windows of the cars were boarded over, husbands separated from wives, and children separated from parents. They all were locked in the cars lacking air, food, and water.

The long journey from the Baltic States to Siberia killed many weak and sick. Some dead children were thrown out of the cars by guards and left by the railroad, disregarding the enormous grief of their mothers.

In the following years, many other deportations took place. Baltic deportees were transported to northern Russia, western and eastern Siberia, and Kazakhstan. They were used for slave labor and many of them perished in the mines and forests, or they were annihilated by the cold, the starvation, and diseases because they lacked proper clothing, food, and medical attention.

Some managed to survive. A few even reached the United States, and readily testified to the inhuman conditions of life and to the cruelty of their imprisonment. Even Alexandr Solzhenitsyn in his book "Gulag Archipelago" witnessed how Baltic deportees were tortured and forced to live under inhuman conditions.

Four young Lithuanian girls, who were deported to Siberia, have secretly written a prayerbook, which through underground channels, has been smuggled to the Western World. It was published in English, and entitled: "Mary Save Us."

These young girls wrote:

The day has closed its eyes. Fatigue closes my eyes. My feelings have dried up, my strength has left me . . . with icy lips, with tear-filled eyes, tormented by despair, we fly to your straw-covered crib, O Holy Babe . . . We are drained of strength, our feelings have faded away, our hearts are benumbed thoughts we cannot control . . . Jesus help those who die in foreign lands without consolation of the Church or their dear ones, without the comfort and aid of their friends.

The Soviet Union also deported people from the Baltic States in following years. A Lithuanian woman, Barbara Armonas, was deported in May of 1948, but after many years of slavery, she managed to emigrate to the United States of America. She describes her deportation from Lithuania in her book: "Leave your tears in Moscow":

About four o'clock in the morning of May 22nd (1948), I heard a knock on my door . . . I opened the door and froze with fear . . . There was a whole detachment of soldiers, about thirty altogether, all with heavy weapons. In the yard, a machine gun had been set up. The officer pushed me aside, went into the house, and demanded my passport . . . He took a letter from his pocket and read in a monotonous voice that the state had decided to deport me from Lithuania to other Soviet states . . . I had only a half hour to prepare myself for the

deportation journey. Awakened by the noise, my son started to cry . . . I was told that I could take no suitcases, but must pack everything into a potato sack . . .

When the half hour was up, my son, myself, and our belongings were put into a buggy and escorted under heavy guard to the neighboring village . . . Some twenty-five families had been collected . . . Each family sat on their sacks in a group. No one talked.

Some two hundred families had been collected and put into trucks, each guarded by four Russian soldiers with guns. These trucks were nearly all American Lend-Lease equipment . . . At first, I thought all Lithuanians were being deported . . . The village of Aukstuoliai was left completely empty.

At the railroad station, we were put into cattle cars, about forty to sixty people to a car. The train stood in the station at Panevezys for two full days. We were given no food . . . Our transport consisted of sixty cars, so it can be estimated that it contained about 2,400 persons . . . The feeling of human beings herded into cattle cars are impossible to describe. No one knew where we were going or what could be expected . . . In one car, a woman with two small children whose husband was in prison, went mad, jumped from the moving train, and was killed . . . The biggest problem in our car was an 83-year-old paralyzed lady . . .

After about fifteen days, we stopped in a station about 160 miles from Irkutsk, the largest city in Siberia . . . We were ordered to get out . . . We stood there for about four hours in a cold rain mixed with snow. The children cried all the time . . .

The deportees were placed in barracks with broken doors and windows in company with many thieves, and Mrs. Armonas writes:

It was clear to everyone that we had been sent here to die.

On starvation rations, they were forced to cut trees in the forests 5 miles away from the barracks. The work norms were very high, and they had only primitive tools. The regime for prisoners was severe. Mrs. Armonas writes:

I was always hungry. We were not allowed to wear shoes in our rooms. We could not sit on the beds.

Fortunately for Mrs. Armonas, Khrushchev's amnesty released her from the slave labor camps, but there are still tens of thousands of Baltic deportees in Siberia, and tens of thousands buried there in unmarked graves.

The Communists murdered or deported about 350,000 people from Lithuania, the total exceeding 10 percent of the population, and these figures are also the same for Latvia and Estonia.

MONUMENT OF MEMORY TO MAJ. GEN. ARTHUR ST. CLAIR

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, today I am privileged to introduce a House resolution that in itself will serve as a "monument of memory" to Maj. Gen. Arthur St. Clair.

Maj. Gen. Arthur St. Clair was a Continental Army Officer, a President of the

Continental Congress, the first Governor of the Northwest Territory, a commandant of West Point, and a commandant of Fort Mifflin. He was a military hero at Trenton and Princeton at the beginning of the Revolution and his maneuvers at Saratoga led to the defeat of General Burgoyne of the British Army, a turning point in the Revolution. It was Maj. Gen. St. Clair who was chosen among all others to deliver the address at George Washington's funeral.

He left a successful career as surveyor for the Penn family, justice of the peace, judge of the probate court, recorder of deeds and general law enforcement officer so that he could serve in the Continental Army. It was out of such a self-sacrificing and dedicated spirit that America was born.

The existing inscription above Maj. Gen. St. Clair's grave reads—

The earthly remains of Major General Arthur St. Clair are deposited beneath this humble monument which is erected to supply the place of a nobler one due from his country. He died August 31, 1818 in the 84th year of his age.

It is clear to me that a more permanent memorial was intended for this man. What more fitting tribute could thus be paid than a permanent monument of memory in the form of a resolution by the people's House of the Government of the country that he gave his life and riches to create? I think that in this Bicentennial year it would be particularly appropriate to finally dedicate such a "monument of memory" to this great American.

ENEMIES OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY CONTINUE THEIR ATTACKS

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Organizing Committee for a Fifth Estate, publishers of the magazine Counterspy, has recently released the latest issue of their magazine. As I have pointed out previously, the function of OC-5 and Counterspy is to serve the Soviet and Cuban Communist intelligence services by attacking the American intelligence community. Former CIA Director, William Colby, has accused OC-5 of being in large part responsible for the murder of Richard Welch, the CIA station chief in Athens, Greece.

The latest issue of Counterspy, dated spring 1976, carries a full page of names of alleged CIA agents in Africa. The names had been provided by the left-wing Paris newspaper, Libération, and by the Black Panther Party.

Another full page of names were alleged to be CIA agents in London. This list which included U.S. Embassy staff members, including young secretaries, revealed the home addresses of the intended victims. The London list had been provided by the International Marxist

Group in England, the British section of the Trotskyite terrorist Fourth International. The leader of the IMG, Tariq Ali, is also a member of the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International. According to the Socialist Workers Party, Tariq Ali has publicly taken a position, "very favorable to the use of terrorism."

The Socialist Workers Party is the American section of the Fourth International. The SWP has also revealed that their British comrades in the IMG have been the major support for a terrorist group called Saor Eire which has committed murders and done bombings in both England and Ireland. The collaboration of OC-5 with such people in identifying alleged CIA agents is tantamount to setting up assassinations.

The same issue of Counterspy also carried an attack on this Member of Congress. I became the subject because a member of my staff is married to a man who publishes a newsletter called Information Digest which OC-5 finds objectionable. Counterspy refers to John Rees and his wife, Louise, who is employed on my staff as "extremely dangerous people." Is this another invitation for physical attack by the violence prone leftwing?

Much of the Counterspy article including large sections which are inaccurate or completely confused, were supplied by William Haddad, an employee of the New York State Assembly speaker, Stanley Steingut. I have previously discussed the peculiar career of Haddad who has acted as a source for Jack Anderson for many years.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues testimony which I gave before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security on March 26, 1976. The testimony concerns the Organizing Committee for a Fifth Estate. It appears under the title Subversion of Law Enforcement Intelligence Gathering Operations, part I.

THE HAYS AFFAIR

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include my Washington Report entitled, "The Hays Affair":

THE HAYS AFFAIR

If the Wayne Hays affair prompts the U.S. Congress to investigate itself to determine whether its members are abusing the prerogatives of high office, it could be one of the better things that has ever happened to the Congress.

As all the world must know by now, Congressman Hays first denied, and then admitted, that he had had a sexual affair with a former secretary, who said she had been hired with government funds solely to be his mistress. The central issue in the Hays controversy is not the sexual morals of a member of the Congress, but the abuse of power and the possible misuse of public funds.

This incident has sent public shockwaves across the country, and has provided the nation with a sex scandal it apparently relishes. More importantly, it calls attention to the

deficiencies in the operation of the Congress and it will have served a useful purpose if the Congress, which delights in investigating others, begins to investigate its own practices. The Hays affair shows that the House has failed to keep its own affairs in good order.

It may be accurate, and I think it is, to say that the majority of the Congressmen and Senators are honest, hard working and sober, but it is also accurate to say that there are just too many areas where Congressional conduct raises questions in the minds of the public. Although 12 members of the Congress have been convicted of crime in the last 20 years, the real problems exist below the level of criminality and with a wide range of questionable practices. Confidence in the Congress will not be fully restored unless these practices are examined and an effort is made to develop strict standards of public conduct.

This task is not as easy as it might appear. Travel abroad by a Congressman can be an important, even essential, part of his public responsibility. It can also be a junket at public expense. How can the two situations be distinguished and who should decide which trip is useful and which trip is not? Should a member accept lecture fees from special interest groups, own shares of stock in a corporation seeking federal contracts or favorable legislation, or belong to a law firm representing clients involved with the federal government? If a Congressman has a financial interest in a particular industry, is it unethical for him to vote on bills affecting that industry? Are the perquisites of office, for staff salaries, travel, and other allowances, too generous?

Although nepotism (the hiring of relatives) is illegal, what about the employment practices on Capitol Hill that enable Congressmen to put on the payrolls elevator operators, mailing clerks and other patronage employees? With more than 17,000 workers employed by the Congress and a payroll of more than \$100 million, there is no centralized system of supervising, hiring, or firing employees, and, other than the rules on nepotism, no guidelines or restrictions on how individual members of Congress can use their payrolls.

The answers to these questions are not quite as easy as they may appear at first glance. But what strikes me is that the Congress does not really address them in any sustained and systematic way. The overall record of the Congress in the area of overseeing the conduct of its members is poor. In recent years the list of instances of questionable conduct is long enough (Thomas Dodd, Adam Clayton Powell, Robert Baker) to persuade me that the Congress must go beyond the investigation of individual cases to a consideration of whether offensive practices may be more widespread, and to determine what practices are acceptable standards of conduct and what practices are not.

People are demanding heightened standards of conduct by those of us in public office. Those standards should be encouraged by the Congress through the vigorous and diligent performance of its own Ethics Committee. So long as the Congress keeps only a sleepy eye on its own members and their practices, it will stand low in public esteem.

My hope is that the Hays affair will create pressures for far-ranging reforms within the Congress. There are some encouraging developments. Most observers of the Congress agree that the vast majority of Congressmen, and especially the younger members, are able, dedicated and responsible. Citizen groups and the press apparently plan to keep the heat on the Congress, as they should. The House Ethics Committee is beginning to function again after years of inactivity, and a special

task force appointed by the Speaker is reviewing the prerequisite of offices, such as payrolls, expenses and newsletters.

The goal is a Congress that operates at a high level of ethical conduct. I happen to believe that the Congress has made progress toward that goal in recent years, but the struggle to do even better goes on. No final victories over dishonesty, illegality and unethical conduct by all members of the Congress will ever be won, or should be expected. But, by striving for that goal we resist the "deadly sin" of cynicism, and by moving to put our own house in order we begin to restore the respect of the people for an institution that is essential for their liberty.

H.R. 14143

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, extending the delimiting date for GI educational benefits continues to be a major concern of a great many Members of the House, evidenced by a bill which I introduced, H.R. 14143, which now has 116 cosponsors. Because of the many calls I have received from Congressmen asking to be cosponsors, I plan to reintroduce this bill in the near future.

H.R. 14143 will extend the delimiting date for 1 year not just for those veterans affected by the May 31, 1976, date, but it will also include all veterans whose delimiting date will expire in the future. During that year a veteran will be able to use a maximum of 9 months of educational assistance—1 school year—at any time during the 1 year extension. This will enable the veteran to better plan his education around the financial assistance available through the Veterans' Administration and his own financial situation. This bill will grant no additional monthly educational assistance to a veteran but will only allow him time to use the benefits he has left.

To be eligible for this extension, the veteran must be pursuing a program of education during his 10th year of eligibility. The extension will terminate when the veteran completes or ceases to pursue the program of education or training in which he was enrolled during his 10th year of eligibility, or at the end of 11 years from his last date of discharge or release from active duty. Since May 31 has already passed, this bill will go back and include those veterans whose eligibility period expired on or since that date but prior to the date of enactment.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is designed to assist those veterans who have already made a commitment to furthering their education. It is important to remember also that those Vietnam era veterans whose delimiting date will be expiring within the next few years will be eligible for this 11th year "teach down."

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Education and Training of the House

Committee on Veterans' Affairs held hearings on the extension of the delimiting date on May 19, 20, and 21. Since 9 of the 11 members of that subcommittee supported my amendment to the budget resolution to provide an additional \$610 million to the veterans' budget for a possible extension of the delimiting date, I am certain that they are as anxious as I for the subcommittee chairman to schedule a markup session.

Mr. Speaker, in order for my colleagues to better understand what has taken place regarding this issue, I have inserted the following excerpts from an article which appeared in the Stars and Stripes on May 27, 1976:

FORD, VA, AL, VFW, DAV, TEAGUE, ROBERTS, OPPOSE EDUCATION EXTENSION

American veterans have always stood tall, scared, hungry and dirty, but fought bravely regardless of the power of the enemy. Wednesday, Thursday and Friday (May 19, 20 & 21) the Vietnam veterans proved this again in their young lives, in the military arena and in the political arena.

Too often our troops have had to fight battles that should never have had to be fought in the first place. This time, the Vietnam veterans had the support of the National Association of Concerned Veterans, National Association of Veterans Program Administrators, College Veterans Clubs, International Conference of Police Associations, Unions and many Members of Congress.

From the time the First House Concurrent Budget Resolution hit the floor of the House, the battle objectives were clear and the parties to the battle were well known.

The objective: extend the 10-year delimiting date beyond May 31, 1976, even to the point of giving up the forthcoming cost-of-living increase to help provide funds if necessary.

The parties: the President and the Veterans Administration, who want to restore the 8-year delimiting date from the present 10 years; The American Legion; the Veterans of Foreign Wars; the Disabled American Veterans; Chairman of the Subcommittee on Education and Training, Rep. Olin E. Teague (D-TX); and Chairman of the full House Committee on Veterans Affairs, Ray Roberts (D-TX).

Congressmen fought for the recommendations of their Budget Committee and many stated their support was to "preserve the integrity of the Budget process" now that they finally have a Budget Target to work with. According to several, the Budget did not include several items badly needed by veterans. These items were left out of the President's Budget, and, regardless of the merit of the programs, the Budget Committee was not going to include them and give the President an opportunity to accuse the Congress of being "budget busters".

The President did leave out cost-of-living increases for disability compensation, pension, educational assistance, death benefits, military retirement recomputation, hospitals and medical care, among many other programs.

Representative Jim Wright (D-Tex.) was successful in obtaining \$1.2 billion for those programs pertaining to veterans and Rep. Robert W. Edgar (D-Pa.) was successful in obtaining \$610 million hopefully for extension of the educational delimiting date for over 500,000 veterans enrolled in college whose entitlement will expire May 31, 1976. The Budget compromise with the Senate reduced this \$610 million to approximately \$200 million.

After the First Concurrent Budget Resolu-

tion was locked up (passed), the President announced his desire that Congress find funds to build 8 new VA Hospitals with funding starting at \$249 million.

No one could disagree with the President that the 8 VA Hospitals were needed. The good and bad news about the announcement was expressed by many that they hoped the President did not expect the \$249 million to come out of the current VA Budget Target of \$19.5 billion and if Congress amends the VA Budget Target to grant the President's wishes by increasing the \$19.5 billion, Congress could also amend it to provide further funds for the extension of the delimiting date.

The Vietnam veterans express a fear that if the extension was not granted it would set a greater stage for further erosion of veterans' programs in the future. The American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Disabled American Veterans, in their opposition, were fearful that funds for the extension would rob funds needed for compensation, pensions and medical needs. They were assured repeatedly by the members of the Subcommittee that funds for these programs were already in the Budget. The AM-VETS did not appear, nor was a statement from them available at the hearings.

The following are excerpts from the testimony of Rufus H. Wilson, Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans Administration:

1. Underlying purpose of all GI Bills has been to help veterans adjust from military to civilian life by affording them monetary aid to obtain an educational status they might normally have aspired to and obtained had they not served their country, never a continuing benefit but a readjustment measure from service to civilian life.

2. History: WWII must start within 4 years from separation and finish within 9 years or July 25, 1956; Korean must start within 3 years from separation and finish within 8 years or January 31, 1965; PL 89-358 provided that veterans discharged after January 31, 1955 (end of Korean War) were allowed 8 years from June 1, 1966 or date of separation to finish. No time limit was required to start; PL 93-337, effective July 10, 1974, extended the 8-year delimiting date to 10 years. Applies only to those separated prior to June 1, 1966; thus, the present delimiting date of May 31, 1976.

3. Approximately 50 bills have been introduced to revise or eliminate the delimiting date.

4. Such proposals are inconsistent with the readjustment intent of the education programs and would discriminate against the WWII and Korean veterans who did not receive the same eligibility.

5. The VA has consistently opposed, and continues to do so, any extension or removal of the delimiting date, and at the request of the Administrator on February 6, 1975, H.R. 3702 was introduced to reinstate the 8-year delimiting period.

6. Veterans under the current GI Bill are in a better position than either their WWII or Korean counterparts—more time to complete and more educational opportunities and programs.

7. Those most likely to benefit from extension of May 31, 1976 are some cases who have been out of service as long as 20 years. All have had ample time to utilize their readjustment benefits for the purposes for which they were intended.

8. As the Chairman of your Committee has pointed out, the GI Bill is "not intended to subsidize educational institutions... is not a form of supplemental income for veterans who are not making enough money... or another form of unemployment insurance." GI Bill benefits are—and should be—what they are titled: readjustment benefits.

9. VA has notified those whose benefits will expire May 31, 1976 that VA Regional Office

personnel and Vet Reps stand ready to assist them in obtaining benefits from HEW's Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program, College Work-Study Program and Student Loan Program.

10. With so many other resources available to them, with greater benefits and a longer time to use such benefits, we feel that today's veteran has been provided with adequate educational assistance from the Veterans Administration.

Debating the extension is somewhat similar to the issue two years ago when the delimiting date was increased from 8 to 10 years. Rep. Margaret M. Heckler (R-MA) reminded her colleagues that at that time she had tried unsuccessfully to extend the delimiting date by 4 years instead of 2. The following are her remarks on the House floor on April 28, 1976:

Mrs. Heckler: Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. Before addressing the issue, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. Roberts), the Chairman of the Committee on Veterans Affairs. Although he and I do not always agree on every issue, I respect his leadership and am pleased to be one of his colleagues on the committee.

Two years ago, in the 93rd Congress, I was the author of an amendment in the Veterans Affairs Committee to extend the delimiting period for 4 years, from 8 to 12 years. In the committee procedure, with an honest difference of opinion, the committee sought and succeeded in setting the period at 10 years.

I think at this point we are still considering how long the GI Bill should be functional for the Vietnam era veteran. In support of the Edgar amendment, let me say that I think there is a significant difference between the level of benefits received by the veterans of World War II and Korea, and the level of benefits received by Vietnam era veterans.

For many years after the onset of the Vietnam conflict, the level of benefits were exceedingly low, and it was not really until the 93rd Congress that the level of benefits was increased sufficiently to attract a significant number of veterans into the program. Those veterans who were attracted 2 years ago found, finally, that their veterans' benefits would cover the cost of their tuition, but they also learned that they would only have 2 years' worth of education.

The question before this Congress is whether or not we really want them to complete their education. In my view, it would be fiscally wasteful, rather than fiscally responsible, to withdraw educational assistance from the nearly one-half million veterans who are enrolled in the program. If we refuse to approve the funds for extension we will force many of these veterans to become college dropouts—an outcome which I find unconscionable. I urge my colleagues to approve funds for extension, in order to allow full review of the numerous bills to eliminate the delimiting period which is now pending before this Congress. Otherwise, hearings on this issue, scheduled tentatively for mid-May, will be invalid. Let us resolve to deal with the issue—to meet the educational needs of hundreds of thousands of veterans who will be abandoned on May 31—by authorizing funds for the VA budget today.

The following are excerpts from the testimonies of those Congressmen who appeared in person to testify to the Subcommittee on Friday, May 21, 1976:

Representative Christopher J. Dodd (D-CT), "The majority of Members of the House indicated their support for the extension by voting in favor of the Edgar Amendment... this gives us some indication of the substantial support which exists among our colleagues for the continuation of these benefits... I, also, have introduced and co-spon-

sored legislation for the elimination of this time restriction... it puts undue pressure on a veteran to enroll in a program just to beat the deadline, even though the program may not be best for that individual... the real rate of unemployment remains at 10.5% and in my own State of Connecticut it is 12.1%... unemployment will increase if veterans are denied completion of their education."

Representative Robert J. Cornell (D-WI) responded that Congress has been more concerned with the dollars involved rather than with people. Rep. William F. Walsh (R-NY) said that Connecticut was like New York in that the cost of an education was too high in many areas for veterans to start immediately after separation from service. Rep. Clifford Allen (D-TN) stated that he was going to offer an amendment to the Foreign Military and Economic Aid bill to remove some of the fat, especially aid to many countries that would not lift a finger to help America, and one of the major reasons he is going to use in his rationale is to obtain funds for the extension.

Representative Benjamin A. Gilman (D-NY), "I have sought delimitation on the floor of the House and I hope this committee will help eradicate what I believe to be a misguided provision... occupational and family demands have hampered veterans from making full utilization of their education entitlement timely... many across the country are policemen and firemen and other shift-worker types that prevent full use within a time element... only the veteran can determine when best to use those benefits... the time factor is irrelevant... why is it so important that we, as legislators, tell these loyal men and women that this Nation intends to impose an artificial time barrier on the exercise of their hard-earned benefits?... not since the Civil War has a conflict divided this Nation so sharply, so bitterly, for so many years—a "war" that lasted for more than a decade, that created havoc to the Nation's political system and educational centers with such divisiveness, rancor and hostility... these are the reasons that distinguish the Vietnam era conflict from World War II and the Korean conflict, thereby meriting special consideration."

Representative Gilman was asked what he thought about the opposition of The American Legion, VFW and DAV. He responded that large numbers of Vietnam veterans have not taken advantage of membership in the major veterans' organizations and, therefore, we should think about all Vietnam veterans rather than just those that the major veterans' organizations can speak for as members. Rep. Walsh stated that as long as Rep. Gilman was in Congress, the Vietnam veterans need not worry that they have no word in Congress.

Representative Ronald A. Sarasin (R-CT), "I urge the Subcommittee to report out a bill that would exempt those now enrolled... when Congress passed this GI Bill, it did not at the same time provide a mechanism for informing veterans of the availability of this benefit... it was in 1972 that Congress passed provisions for the VCIP program, six years later... the VCIP and their outreach programs have produced a higher enrollment than the average GI Bill participation rate increase thereby attending to the success of the program... only since 1972 have thousands of veterans become aware that they had an educational entitlement... to NOT allow them to complete would be a waste of time and money already expended... in meeting with approximately 200 veterans who came here from Connecticut earlier this month to inform us of their need to complete their education, they also informed the Connecticut Congressional delegation that The American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars

and the Disabled American Veterans do not speak for the Vietnam veterans."

Representative Cornell agreed that since Congress saw fit to pass the VCIP program in 1972, it points out that Congress was convinced that veterans were not informed of their rights. Reps. Sarasin, Allen and Walsh agreed that if the Committee can get a bill to the floor of the House that it would pass.

Representative Thomas J. Downey (D-NY): "A one-year extension is not enough—it should be completely eliminated . . . it is extremely important to prevent our distaste for the Vietnam experience from adversely affecting our treatment of Vietnam veterans who were the first of our war veterans not to be the recipients of a universal respect and admiration from the American people . . . employers did not welcome them back with open arms and job offers as in the aftermaths of World War II and the Korean War . . . surely the ramifications of the nature of the Vietnam War form a convincing argument for a longer "readjustment" period to civilian life . . . Mr. Chairman, I contend that while it has been argued that educational assistance was not intended to be a continuing benefit, the consequences of having served in the armed forces DO continue, whether we like it or not."

Representative Edgar stated that a readjustment period may take 11 years. Previously, Rep. Edgar was told by the DAV that some veterans adjust very well very soon, others longer, and some never, it depends upon the individual and the help he receives. However, the DAV stated that further extension discriminated against the WWII and Korean veterans who were not given this much time. Rep. Edgar countered that if we are going to talk about discrimination among veterans, then why don't we give the WWI veterans the same amount of \$270 a month so that they will have the same and can live out their remaining years much better than they have now? The question went unanswered.

Representative Anthony Toby Moffett (D-CT), "With me is Julius Nido, President of the Veterans Association at Post College in Waterbury, CT . . . A young European prince once wrote in a letter to the young, 'Go out into the world and find what you need to survive and then go back to school and ask that your teachers teach you that' . . . It is in this spirit of such a mature and goal-oriented approach to their education that the veterans who may be about to lose their benefits have been attending college. I find them to be, in most cases, among the most serious and successful students on campuses in Connecticut . . . I find it disappointing to see an institution like the Veterans Administration taking a position of opposition without acknowledging that it was the VA's own incompetence and lack of outreach to veterans that put us in the current crisis situation . . . How can the VA take a position that these veterans have had enough time to complete their studies when hundreds of Members of Congress have heard from constituent veterans that they were never informed or learned of it late in the ten-year period? . . . Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting that a Federal agency has an obligation to find every last eligible person and inform him of his eligibility . . . Congress intended for the VA to get the word out, and the VA did a terrible job . . . this failure is also reflected by the Congress creating the VCIP program . . . The American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Disabled American Veterans do not speak for the Vietnam Era veteran . . . we should also take a look at some of the billions we spend on expensive military weapons and equipment, foreign aid to unfriendly nations . . . we are not talking about students of Harvard, Princeton or Yale—it's the student of the smaller

colleges . . . perhaps we can extend for one year or some other measure, but we must act quickly."

Representative Cornell commented that it is not possible for the VE veterans to obtain most scholarships as they are usually restricted to those age 17-20 and the Vietnam veteran is too old to qualify. He stated that most Members of the Subcommittee tried to assure the AL, VFW & the DAV that the Budget contained monies for increases in programs that were their priority.

Representative Edward P. Beard (D-RI), a member of the full committee, testified: "I am very distressed that the AL, VFW & DAV are opposed to additional time for education . . . they are not looking to the future in building their organizations . . . if this continues, they will be able to hold their National Conventions in a closet because the Vietnam veterans will not be there."

Representative Cornell stated that no one is more outspoken for the common man than Mr. Beard. Also, he found it significant that most of the Congressmen who were testifying were from eastern states where the unemployment was the highest. He added that The American Legion claim 600,000 Vietnam veterans as members; however, apparently the Vietnam veteran has little influence in The American Legion policies.

Rep. Edgar complimented Rep. Beard that, "like me, we have come to Congress as working people rather than as a lawyer or businessman, and I thank you for bringing this new perspective."

Representative Frederick Richmond (D-NY), "According to the VA, payments are being stopped in complete disregard to where the veteran stands in his training program . . . Education is not a give-away program and this is not a give-away program . . . it is an entitlement which has been earned and an investment in America's future . . . we should do everything possible to encourage its use . . . the delimiting date will mean that many millions of hours of study will go unused as it did for World War II veterans when an estimated 500 million hours of study were allowed to expire."

Rep. Cornell stated that, "your reference to an investment reminds me that the Secretary of the Treasury told us to talk about the money we would be saving if we cut back to the 8 years from the present 10."

Repeatedly throughout the hearings Rep. Clifford Allen, a Freshman first-term Congressman, made reference to the Freshman of Congress when addressing another Freshman. Most of the Congressmen who testified are Freshmen.

Many stated that the Vietnam veterans can count on the Freshman class in Congress. This remains to be seen. Vietnam veterans also have many Congressional friends who are beyond the Freshman class. Two hundred and eighteen, to be exact, however, several Congressmen stated the number would increase if a vote was taken on the extension right now.

THE HAND THAT ROCKED JIMMY CARTER'S CRADLE

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am a romantic and an idealist and I have been somewhat moved by the American people's response to the 1976 Presidential primaries—particularly, those Americans who know difficulty, confu-

sion and frustration. The single most significant chord that has played again and again, as the voters have expressed their preferences, is that of honesty, integrity, and decency.

The black community has always known that its allies were those who dared to live by their religious principles and who have been through the fire of persecution because of it. Jimmy Carter, the former Governor of the State of Georgia and the certain nominee of the Democratic Party in New York in July, is one of those romantic personalities who dared to stay and work effectively to deal with the problems of economic deprivation and race in the South. A stubborn, independent spirit and deep compassion enabled him to survive the moral contradictions exploding all around him. And I am convinced that he learned to love, and to know the nature of love, from his mother, one of the truly great women of our time. Southern women, whether black or white, have always been more free than the majority of the society.

Orde Coombs, a gifted young black writer who by his own admission is a bit cynical about the motives and actions of the liberal operatives in this country, journeyed south to discover from whence Jimmy Carter came. What Mr. Coombs discovered was that, "Lillian Carter's morality works for her son in 1976. It is morality based simply on doing for your neighbor what you would like him to do for you."

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was fond of quoting:

Greatness is characterized by antitheses strongly marked. A great man must be one with a tough mind and a tender heart.

Because I believe that the South is offering for leadership its best, and because I think I know from whence it came, I commend Mr. Coombs' article in the June 14, 1976, issue of New York magazine to my colleagues for their reading:

THE HAND THAT ROCKED CARTER'S CRADLE (By Orde Coombs)

I knew Jimmy Carter was going someplace when Aunt Bessie, black, 76, a lifelong Republican who still can't stand Franklin Roosevelt, told me that she was going to vote for Carter because of his mother. She had come to New York from Preston, Georgia, near where Jimmy Carter was born, and in her Bedford-Stuyvesant apartment she was happy to lecture me: "You young people don't know nothing, do you? You don't know that there are quality white people, even though most of them are nonquality. And you don't know that Lillian Carter nursed more than half of the colored people in her part of Georgia."

And then I read that Congressman Andrew Young had declared that Carter's mother was "one of the truly great women of our time." When I talked to him, he said: "I knew Lillian Carter long before I knew Jimmy, and I learned from her and others that the difference between Southern liberals and Northern ones is the difference between partnership and paternalism."

I decided I had to meet this quiet legend, and so recently I flew down to Plains and made my way to her house before the Georgia sun had gotten hot.

Lillian Gordy Carter comes out of her modest brick house, with its dull paneling

and its "family-antique" furniture, and I can see the smile starting, so that by the time we shake hands, it has already sliced her face and brought me quickly into the vortex of her "Southern charm." Age has wrinkled her face, which now rests somewhere between the cragginess of Lillian Hellman's and the canyons of W. H. Auden's in his last days. She is not without vanity, but she firmly believes that, as a woman born in August 15, 1898, she has "earned the right to carry the years" where they show. The rest of her is styled, prepared, ready. She has gotten used to giving interviews, to "helping Jimmy in really the only way I know how, and that's by telling the truth."

I watch this septuagenarian with critical eyes and I notice the dime-sized brown spot on her right cheek; the neatness of her light-blue pantsuit; the small feet encased in navy-blue canvas shoes; and the hair—full, gossamer whiteness that has been perfectly coiffed—and I am thinking that no adman could conceive a more perfect picture of white middle-class American grandmotherhood.

"Some bugs are eating my grass," she says. Look at that. They are eating from the house to the road. Did you ever see such? Come on in. Be careful of that step. More newsmen have tripped over that than anything else. They claim they can't see it. Now, where do you want to sit?" I keep my frozen smile and say nothing, for she is not going to snow me with Southern kindness and calculated disingenuousness.

She starts up again. "Do help me with this chair. I can't lift a thing. Is the sun too much for you over there?" And then, suddenly, it hits me, and I know why the words tumble out, why Lillian Carter cannot stop her meanderings. She is the out-of-place doyenne of Plains, Georgia—a woman who has been ahead of her time and still is in her hometown, but who has suddenly found that the times have caught up with her, that now she can get off her chest all she ever wanted to during the past 50 years among people who could not stand her eccentricities, her deviations from normal racist behavior.

"I never had close friends," she tells me. "I was never one to be running in and out of people's homes. Smalltown people can sometimes be afraid of independent minds."

"But weren't you able to do as you wished?" I ask. "After all, you were relatively well off."

"I have not always been well off," she counters, "but I've always had a mind of my own."

This statement was seconded later in the day by a 98-year-old black woman: "Miss Lillian is afraid of no man," she told me. "She says what's bothering her, and shoot, if you don't like it, she ain't about to stop to ask you why."

But a white woman shopping in Turner's Hardware Store was not so admiring: "Lillian Carter always felt she was better than us. She always felt she was a great reader. She brought up that church-integration thing in 1954, just so she could show us up. She didn't want colored people in there any more than we did. She thinks she is so smart and we're so dumb. Jimmy's much nicer."

As I sit on a yellow-and-brown-striped couch, she pulls her right leg under her and plops down in a yellow chair. "I must have my rest from twelve noon till one. But we can talk after that. If I haven't tired you out."

"Don't you always watch soap operas at that time?" I ask her. "Don't you always watch *The Young and the Restless* and *All My Children*?"

"You found me out," she squeals, "so stay and watch them with me. I started to look at them when I had my cataracts removed, and now I'm hooked. But it is a rest

period for me, because I just sit here and laugh and carry on my own dialogue with the actors."

As she speaks about her unanswered conversations with television actors, I remember the TV "star" who is the reason I am in this small town in Sumter County, Georgia, where the Seaboard Line train runs through the center carrying yellow Hustler-brand peanut pickers and where the Carter Worm Farm office is a stone's throw from the Sandcraft tourist shop that sells peanut jewelry. This is an area that saw bloody civil-rights battles during the sixties, but now boldly displays a poster of the Sumter County Improvement Association, with its picture of black hands and its legend:

HANDS THAT PICK COTTON NOW CAN PICK
OUR PUBLIC OFFICIALS

It is from this place that the most successful politician of the year has emerged, a man who is so Janus-faced, they say, that he is able to win the fervor of disparate people who ought to be natural antagonists. Because of this propensity, other presidential candidates have ganged up to attack Jimmy Carter, but they have all ended up sounding like Jimmy—one-note.

"We don't really know what Jimmy Carter stands for," says Gerald Ford.

Mr. Carter is waging a "campaign of generalities calculated not to offend people who may disagree with him," says Frank Church.

"Who is the real Jimmy Carter? What's behind the smile?" asks Jerry Brown.

Carter is a "waffler," says Mo Udall.

And so I've come to this town with no jail, with only one (white) policeman by day and one (black) by night, to find out what I can about a peanut metaphysician who, like a parrot I once owned, keeps saying to 215 million people, "trust me, trust me." I figure that if there was any person who could reveal the chinks in his armor—that granite control and iron will—it would be the woman who rocked his cradle, changed his diapers, and guided him to manhood.

I quickly got down to business. "Why do you think that your son, who has spent so much of his life in a little town in Georgia, should be the president of the United States? What qualifications does he have to make him even dream of this high office?"

Mrs. Carter folds and unfolds her hands. "Well, he is an honest man. An intelligent man. A hardworking man. A man devoted to his country and his God. And his heart is full of love and compassion." (Here it is again! Carter's own theme, one that worked so well in the rough steel towns of Pennsylvania that he won 65 out of 67 counties. Can it be that behind those hard, blue-collar exteriors lie closet hippies waiting to proclaim love as a philosophical imperative?)

I look at her looking at me, and I say coldly: "I could say all those things about the man who runs my neighborhood delicatessen, and God knows, he must work even harder than your son. But I certainly wouldn't want to see him president of the United States."

"Of course not," she snaps. "Your delicatessen man probably never dreamed large dreams and worked to see them come true. Besides, I don't think you can compare Jimmy's record and what he's trying to do now with selling roast beef."

She has had to learn how to talk back carefully, how to make her point and not offend, for her roots are deep in the red Georgia clay, even though her spirit has always soared with Dostoevski and Tolstoy. She was born in Richland, a simple southwest Georgia town, and she moved from there to Plains in 1921. She has traveled to many countries around the world, but she has re-

mained a small-town woman, anchored in Christian beliefs and in an unflinching devotion to what is right and opposition to what is wrong. It was her postmaster father who taught her "compassion," she says. He provided for his eight children, as well as his two adopted ones, and a grandmother who had nowhere else to live. "With thirteen of us around the table for supper, we had to learn that we couldn't always have an extra slice of bread just because we wanted it. Someone else might have a greater need." He also taught her not to judge people by the color of their skin, for Bishop William D. Johnson of the African Methodist Episcopal Church was a regular visitor to the Gordy house. These two men would talk about the Bible and "the living Christ." They would talk about the solace they got from the Methodist church, and then, raising their voices in disharmony, would sing:

The King of love my Shepherd is,
Whose goodness faileth never;
I nothing lack if I am His
And He is mine for ever.

Lillian Gordy never forgot those early years, so by the time she married James Earl Carter in September, 1923, she was so rooted in what she was that neither his aggressive pursuit of money nor his antiblack stance could unsettle her sense of herself. "He was considered a fine catch, you know. He had a grocery store, a dry-cleaning place, and a farm. I was working for the Wise brothers, who had a sanatorium here. Dr. Sam Wise thought that Earl would go far and that I would be a good wife for him, so he introduced us." Her eyes wander off for a moment and I can see nostalgia pulling her away. I bring her back abruptly to the present.

"Your son says that your husband was a segregationist, and all the black people around here who knew him say he was a terrible man."

For the first time today, Lillian Carter's jaws get tight, and she rises in her chair to defend the man with whom she lived for 30 years. "Earl was of his time. Of his time. He was not like me, certainly, but he did not stop me from doing what I wanted to do. You are too young to know, but I am talking about the twenties when we had nearly 200 black people working for us on our farms. It shames me now to talk about it, but they made practically no money, so they couldn't pay for any medical expenses. Well, I would go to their homes and nurse them and deliver their babies. And Earl, yes, Earl, would pay for their expenses. He never interfered with me, and in spite of everything, he was compassionate. Oh, he said things. He believed in the black man's inferiority, but he was no different from all those people around here and all over the country who are now trying to pretend they were never prejudiced. Earl would have changed, like everybody else who has changed. It annoys me to hear people denounce him when he was simply a Southern man who lived at a certain time."

She is breathless, and as I look at those watering gray-blue eyes, I understand the passion and pain of Jimmy Carter, and I sense where the chinks in his armor lie, why he plays it both ways. For he was born to a land that can boast only of pine trees, peanuts, and corn. A land where the heat comes hissing out of the red clay and the undulating highway is littered with dead possums. It is a land from which all dreamers must escape or go mad. And he was born to a father whose business was his life and who remained, for as long as he lived, a stranger to the world of books and new ideas. And to a mother to whom the spiritual life and her moral convictions meant so much that she would not warp her conscience to fit the society's mold. But because she knew how easily the land could claim a boy, she prevailed upon her brother to send books and

postcards from around the world to Jimmy, so that he would realize that Plains should not be the center of his universe. And when her flights of fancy went beyond what she knew, she entrusted him to the crippled, plain, and almost blind Julia Coleman, who taught school and who handed him *War and Peace* when he was twelve.

It must have been from that time that Jimmy Carter began to wonder about his future possibilities. But he was raised a dutiful son and so he never rebelled against his father. Although the pull of his mother's light was strong, he always refused to curse his father's darkness. When disagreement with his father about racial matters came to a head in 1950, he decided never to bring up the question of black equality again. So Jimmy Carter learned early to attempt to synthesize varying points of view, and when those attempts failed, he learned "to waffle." And so he can say with equal ease: "I am and have always been a conservative. . . . I'm basically a redneck" (1970) and "I've always been a liberal on civil rights" (1976). Though he was sympathetic to Martin Luther King Jr. and his cause, he prevented his mother from joining King's voting-rights marchers in Albany, Georgia. He didn't want her to get involved; it was too close to home.

In Lillian Carter's blue, four-door Caprice Classic, we drove to the pond house which her children built for her when she came back from India, aged 70 and 30 pounds lighter, after having spent two years as a Peace Corps volunteer. As we walk around the grounds, she tells me she has a lot of faith in God, but that she does not talk about it "as much as some people." "Like your son?" I ask. She smiles. "What I mean is that I'm a devout Baptist, but my practice is not as strong as my daughter Ruth's, who is an evangelist and faith healer, or Jimmy's, who worked up North spreading the word."

I interject, "It bothers me that your son feels that he is in direct communication with God. Doesn't it bother you?"

"We are all in communication with God," she answers firmly. "Some know it, others don't. Too much has been made of this religious issue. It's a private thing. I can tell by looking at you that you don't believe in what I'm talking about, about the power of prayer. But in India, when they placed me in the family-planning unit, I was very unhappy and I prayed to be moved out of it and into an area where I could do some good. My prayers were answered almost immediately."

I ask her if she prays for her son's victories. "No. Just that all will be right for him, and whatever God decides is fine, because it is all in his hands anyway."

Lillian Carter opens her arms to the sudden Georgia wind. "It's been a good life. Sometimes I feel like just sitting out here with a fishing pole and a book and looking at the squirrels run up these pine trees." I know those are mere words, for although she is 78, she feels she is too young to vegetate.

And suddenly I am thinking of old illiterate, black Ephraim in Faulkner's *Intruder in the Dust*, who says: "If you got something outside the common run that's got to be done and can't wait, don't waste your time on the menfolks; they works on what your uncle calls the rules and the cases. Get the womens and the children at it; they works on the circumstances." Faulkner knew that women like Lillian Carter existed, and that they always worked on the circumstances and always broke the rules when the heart had its reasons.

And then I remembered that she had said something that struck me as strange at first, but later made sense. "The black people are having a harder time adjusting to the new situation than the whites." I asked her what she meant, and she talked of the hostility of

young blacks to all whites. "They know nothing of the old order. They haven't suffered very much from it, but now they feel that they must make us pay. They have to convince themselves they are forever free from the fear of white people. But they still have to contend with racists like Uncle Buddy, my husband's brother, and others in this family. There's a lot of work to be done."

All of Lillian Carter's morality works for her son in 1976. It is a morality based simply on doing for your neighbor what you would like him to do for you. It is part of being a "good Christian." And it is part Pollyanna. It may be what the country needs now, but it will not take us into a new century, for it is essentially a morality of the past.

But for now the old morality will do. Lillian Carter knew that there were principles too dear to be compromised. She knew, too, that no matter how much she was vilified, she would eventually be proved right. For today, all over the South, mothers who could not understand Lillian Carter's "pussyfooting around" and insisting on principles are gazing in amazement at their sons.

WHAT IS OUR REAL POLICY ON CHILE?

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, it has been heartening at last to hear Secretary Kissinger defend the more idealistic of our American values at the OAS session in Santiago, where, in polite terms, he noted that Chile's lax observance of human rights "impaired" our relationship. Heretofore, he had generally argued that anything but quiet diplomatic nudging—even of those countries getting our arms hand-outs—smacked of interference in sovereign domestic affairs, engendered resentments, and in the end proved counterproductive. Unfortunately, this philosophy, ennobled or not, met with a conspicuous lack of success. About its only result was to put Congress in the uncomfortable position of either going along in the hope it would work, but in the meantime feeling an accomplice in bolstering repression, or being labeled irresponsible by the President.

Those of us who supported Representative FRASER's milestone human rights amendment accepted the latter fate and apparently contributed to provoking a veto of the fiscal year 1976 security assistance bill. Yet Congress was not exercising mere whim. It intended, on the contrary, only to exercise a proud, and one would have thought bipartisan, moral mandate. Our country was founded on individual liberty, and its foreign policy has since attempted to express this tradition. Congress leaned over backward to develop consensus language, simply affording the opportunity for a majority of our Nation's elected representatives to suspend military assistance on proof, in a given instance, of "a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized standards of human rights."

I believe it is becoming increasingly evident that our real and ultimate allies

are those who share our political and philosophical values, who truly believe in, and will defend, liberty and justice and social progress, not those countries whose small and shaky elites simply happen to have material interests that for the time being coincide with ours. Marriages of convenience just do not last, and even while they do, they are not so happy. The fact is that we are supporting a number of authoritarian regimes which fly in the face of the ideals for which America has stood for 200 years. Perhaps it can be argued that stability is a precondition for just and effective change, that an orderly evolution is more productive than a chaotic revolution, that communism thrives on disorder. Yet discontent in a right-wing society does not seem so good either, practically or morally. Nevertheless, a number of regimes that we have long been supporting have made no headway, or even attempt, at uplifting their impoverished, repressed, and potentially rebellious peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that Secretary Kissinger's statement signifies a moral new direction in our foreign policy. Regrettably, however, the rest of the administration is not yet entirely in tow and may even work to frustrate this rare and admirable initiative.

I want to call attention to a column from yesterday's New York Times which explains the problem:

TWO-FACED POLICY ON CHILE

(By Tom Wicker)

If the Ford Administration can be said to have a left hand, it seems to knoweth not what the right hand does in Chile.

Just last week, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, in Santiago for the Organization of American States meetings, belatedly criticized Chile for human-rights violations which he said had "impaired" relations between the two countries. Congress, meanwhile, was sharply restricting further economic aid to Chile.

Sixteen American and Canadian banks nevertheless have made a new \$125 million loan—without opposition from and probably with the tacit approval of the Treasury Department—to the repressive Government of General Pinochet in Chile. That Government was denounced at the O.A.S. meeting not only by Mr. Kissinger but in an official report of the Inter-American Human Rights Commission.

Chairman Henry Reuss of the House Banking and Currency Committee has pointed out however, that it is not just the Pinochet Government's record of jailing and torturing its opponents that makes the American loan inadvisable; Chile at the moment is also about as little "credit-worthy" as any nation in the world.

Mr. Reuss said the monthly inflation rate had almost doubled, to 13.5 percent since last November, and that payments and service on the more than \$4 billion of Chilean foreign debt will eat up 38 percent of Chile's export earnings in 1976. Unemployment is above 16 percent and the gross national product declined more than 12 percent in 1975. Various Western European nations, apparently more prudent than the American and Canadian bankers, are refusing to renegotiate their loans to Chile or to ease repayment terms.

The Treasury through the Comptroller of the Currency, managed to choke off loans to democratic Italy two years ago, Mr. Reuss recalled. He thinks the current Chilean loan,

at least the American share of it, could and should have been discouraged in the same way. But when he wrote the Comptroller, James E. Smith, last May 4 to inquire what was being done, he at first received no reply. When after many phone calls, a reply was received in the second week of June, it was too late. The loan had gone through on May 21.

That was just two weeks after Treasury Secretary William Simon visited Santiago; he came away praising Chile's "economic freedom" and saying that General Pinochet had assured him that human rights conditions would be improved. The new loan follows by a few months a generous World Bank loan, to which virtually every democratic member nation except the United States was opposed.

This is in sharp contrast to the economic squeeze the United States took the lead in imposing on the previous Chilean regime, the legally elected but Marxist Government of Salvador Allende Gossens. And it appears to be in contradiction of Mr. Kissinger's new-found reservations about General Pinochet's political prisons.

The Secretary of State's criticism, his support of the report of the Human Rights Commission, and his advocacy of increased powers for that agency all tended to deny General Pinochet's Government the international respectability it needs to ease its present debt burden and to find new credit sources. But the Treasury Department apparently did nothing to prevent the \$125 million loan—even though it was in violation of the banks' own stipulation that Chile first obtain a standby loan from the International Monetary Fund. No I.M.F. loan has been made but the banks went ahead anyway.

The Senate made its attitude clear on June 11, when it put a ceiling of \$30 million on economic aid to Chile for 1976 and 1977; the figure for 1975 had been \$200 million. Another \$38 million would be provided if Chile met stiff requirements on human rights. The House already had taken similar action. The Senate, moreover, has forbidden any further military aid to Chile, a provision expected to be accepted by the House in the final version of the military assistance bill.

Why the Treasury Department should have looked the other way when the 16 banks made the latest loan to Chile (credits to General Pinochet from the United States and the world organizations it strongly influences already totaled about \$1.8 billion) is not entirely clear. Mr. Simon can hardly be so naive as to believe that the release of a handful of political prisoners after his visit to Santiago was anything but a charade. He knows that major industries in this country badly need credit. Such a hard-nosed inflation fighter as he could have few illusions about the Chilean economy.

What is clear, however, is that the \$125 million bank loan tends to shore up the Chilean junta at a time when both the State Department and Congress are bringing greater pressures against it.

PROSPECTS FOR CIVIL AVIATION

HON. JIM LLOYD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. LLOYD of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, a speech delivered today by Dr. John L. McLucas, Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, to the Iron Gate Chapter, Air Force Association of New York City.

Last month, the Subcommittee on Aviation and Transportation, of which I am a member, and under the chairmanship of Congressman DALE MILFORD of Texas, held a week of hearings on the "Future of Aviation in the United States." The hearings took a comprehensive look at the future of aviation in this country. Historically, the United States has led the world in commercial aviation. This Nation's aviation industry has blossomed to the point where it not only supplies our aeronautical needs, but that of most of the world. Yet, in spite of its past successes, and proven importance to our national economy, our aviation industry is facing the severest problem in its history—foreign competition.

Dr. McLucas's speech reemphasizes the testimony he gave before the Subcommittee on Aviation and Transportation last month. It is important that Congress, and the American people become aware of the need for reviewing the problems that plague American civil aviation.

PROSPECTS FOR CIVIL AVIATION

(Remarks by Dr. John L. McLucas)

The growth of air transportation is one of the most remarkable developments of the Twentieth Century. It provides almost unlimited mobility to hundreds of millions of people all over the world. Many of the most distant and hitherto inaccessible regions of the world are easily reached by air, a fact of immense importance to industry and national economies, not to mention the benefits to individual people. And its tactical and strategic value in battle certainly needs no recounting by me to this group of aviation enthusiasts.

In the United States, the aviation industry has become one of our most important national resources. Currently, we produce about 85 percent of the commercial and general aviation aircraft used in the free world. The net "gold flow" for the aerospace industry is something like \$8 billion a year. Other U.S. industries that export a large amount of goods are most often counter balanced, sometimes outweighed, by imports of similar goods. The automotive industry, for example, once the world leader, now imports more units than it exports.

While we take great pride in the success of our aviation industry, we must be alert to the possibility that our lead will be lost. There already is evidence that our preeminence is slowly eroding.

Something substantial must be done to revitalize our national competitive stance, to renew the national interest in being first with the best, and to rekindle the "love affair" this nation once had with aviation. I believe that, as a nation, we may have lost sight of the importance of aviation to our well-being socially, politically and economically. After agriculture, aviation and aerospace contribute more than any other industry to the balance of payments. The number of people directly employed in the industry is 942,000. Beyond these measurable ingredients, aviation contributes to innovation in many other parts of our economy.

If we believe that the continued health of the industry is essential to the overall health of our economy, then we must accept as a national objective the development of a plan and the fostering of actions related to that plan. This will allow our manufacturers to develop and produce new aircraft which will meet the needs of today's and tomorrow's air carriers. And these airplanes must be available on financial terms which will be competitive in the world's markets.

Today, the majority of our Congressional leaders, most elements of the press, and the

public as well, have turned their attention to other matters: health care, education, law enforcement, urban transportation, and environmental concerns, to name some of the most pressing socially oriented problems confronting America.

This is not to say that we have not heard considerable discussion of stated goals for aeronautics in the U.S. Congress and in the Administration. But today, there is no clear mandate for specific federal action to support and direct progress in this major American industry.

The exception to our industry's problem areas is in the field of general aviation. Fortunately, this segment of civil aviation has enjoyed a period of growth and prosperity for several years. In fact, April billings in general aviation sales (amounting to \$114.5 million for 1,439 planes) are the highest of any month in history.

And, for the first quarter of this year, billings amounting to more than \$400 million are 14 percent higher than for the same period in 1975. For general aviation, business has never been better. So in my remarks today, due to the essentially healthy state of general aviation, I won't dwell on this aspect of the industry.

But for our industry as a whole, we are confronted by the question of what the government can do with respect to the major manufacturing side and to the airline segments of the industry as well. Fortunately, in recent months two significant actions—the debate on the Administration's proposed Aviation Act of 1975 and, more recently, the House hearings on the future of aviation—show some promise of financially strengthening and revitalizing the competitive and innovative prowess of U.S. aviation. While the proposed Aviation Act of 1975 has not met with universal acclaim as the answer to all the problems of our industry, I hope that out of the discussions and debates pro and con surrounding the Act, we can finally arrive at rate and route structures which will make it once more attractive for the principal owners of capital to look favorably on aviation.

Secretary of Transportation Coleman, during his testimony before the Milford Committee, said he felt the proper role of government is to create an environment in which the normal market forces can act. I think we can all agree on that. But translating that maxim into specific government action is no easy task. I am not discouraged about our ability jointly to get the job done. We are already beginning to move in the right direction—when we finally admit the existence of the problem. There is growing awareness that our industry has become "an endangered species" that we have to do something about.

In the past, military aviation has paced aeronautical technology, with civil aviation as the beneficiary. But today, as many of you may know, civil aviation has begun to press heavily on technology in its own right to meet the public transport demand. This is not to say that civil aviation is growing any less dependent upon the benefits of military research and development efforts. The level of military R&D which is applicable in one way or another to civil aviation ranges somewhere between \$2 and \$3 billion a year—a sum that dwarfs the aviation R&D efforts of all other government agencies, including NASA, in combination. DOD contributions to aeronautical technology, innovative research in aerodynamic structures, engine development and in the field of electronics are far too numerous to mention. I believe the future of civil aviation will always be beholden to the military for much of its progress, particularly in areas of advanced research. Nevertheless, our national priorities are changing. And with the changes, the economic health of many of our basic in-

dustries is endangered with many industries facing major organizational surgery and, in some cases, financial trauma. This is especially true of the aviation industry, particularly the civilian segment, both manufacturing and airline.

In this country development of new aircraft for civil use has always been primarily the responsibility of private industry even though industry has had considerable help both from technology developed by the military and from production orders for military versions of many of the most successful civil transports. But in the last few years, the costs of research and development and other pre-production costs related to producing a new aircraft have virtually brought the introduction of new aircraft designs suited to the major airlines to a standstill. As a case in point, pre-production costs of one of our latest jumbo jets topped out at about \$2 billion. Some combination of government and private initiative is going to be needed to finance the next generation of transports. There is room here for much closer cooperation of several government departments—Defense, Transportation, Commerce, Treasury and State—to fill the existing void.

As for the airline industry, there will be demand for an impressive number of new aircraft in the years ahead to replace its aging fleet and to provide the additional capacity which normal growth will require. Airline and industry sources estimate the need over the next 10 years at more than a thousand new aircraft, representing an investment of about \$20 billion. The financial climate within which our airline industry now operates, with some equipment units priced at upwards of \$25 million per plane, prohibits new acquisitions for all but the most prosperous airlines. Indeed, most carriers can now afford only to lease badly needed planes. The specter of another \$20 billion investment is just that—a specter!

So there's little doubt that we are facing some very difficult problems ahead in all aeronautical and aerospace matters. Solving them is going to take all the wisdom we can muster. One of our major difficulties, I believe, has been that in the past, like "Topsy," we have "Just growed." And because the necessary things were done, we took them for granted. The public enchantment with the wild blue yonder, the safety, speed and comfort of air travel, the economy and attractiveness of business aviation, the promise of space exploration, and the wonderful prowess of military aviation all have led us to expect continuing progress automatically and have not prepared us for the challenges we are beginning to face. It appears that our industry has marched off in so many directions, listening to so many drum beats, government and public, that it has lost its sense of direction.

What is needed now is better coordination among the industry, military, NASA, the FAA and other government agencies concerned with aerospace matters to prevent further deterioration, indeed, to bolster the competitive prowess of our industry. The creative national teamwork that waned after putting men on the moon needs urgently to be rekindled and redirected toward strengthening the U.S. in productivity, innovation and international competitiveness. The cost of the technology of today, and increasingly that of the future, requires the best thinking of economists, industry and government if the stance of aviation is to improve. Many are speaking out for the compelling need for much better overall coordination of air and space transportation matters. Whether such responsibility can be placed in one individual and just where that person would sit, in the Executive Office, in a special advisory council office, or in the DOT are problems for further study and Congressional consideration. But I believe such an official could

assist considerably in helping to clarify our goals and objectives related to maintaining our preeminence in aviation.

The stagnant R&D activities related to a future American SST needs review and reevaluation. And, I believe, the merits of the consortium approach to aviation research and production matters should be the subject of more favorable consideration—particularly in view of the staggering costs of "new" aviation and aerospace products.

The recent statement by French Transport Minister Marcel Cavallet that the British and French are investigating the possibility of a second-generation supersonic transport and would welcome U.S. cooperation in this effort should receive very careful study in this country. There is considerable merit in the idea of continued close cooperation with our European allies on advanced technological programs such as a second-generation SST. The exchange of research and other data is a worthwhile activity that can help expand the frontiers of aeronautical knowledge. Certainly those frontiers need significant expansion if we are going to be ready with the aerodynamics, the materials, and the clean, quiet, efficient engines which will allow us to fly the new SST economically in the late 80's or early 90's.

The Concorde represents a great step forward in aviation and we share the British and French desire to keep this technology alive now that those two nations have decided not to build more than the 16 Concordes originally committed to production. Certainly, the United States could make important contributions to any such cooperative undertaking on the basis of our experience in building and operating military supersonic aircraft and our research and development work with the civil supersonic transport. Although our own SST program was cancelled in 1971, we have continued to explore, under NASA's leadership, the feasibility of developing environmentally and economically acceptable supersonic cruise vehicles.

But the SST is not the only aerospace project involving possible trans Atlantic cooperation. A number of U.S. aerospace firms are exploring possible joint ventures with their European counterparts. A few are already well along on joint venture programs. Most notable are the interactions on the "10 ton" engine between General Electric and Snecma and among Pratt & Whitney, MTU, Rolls Royce and Fiat. Boeing also is pursuing a number of projects with the French, Italians and others. Scarcity of capital at home and antitrust complications of intercompany working agreements have led to the increased interest in forming alliances abroad.

This increased interest in foreign partners may be one answer to the imposing capital requirements of funding new projects. It also may satisfy the rising demand by the European aviation industry for a more significant role in the world marketplace. A joint effort to advance the prospects and the design of a next-generation SST would be in keeping with this new spirit of international cooperation. Frankly, I believe that a properly paced, well thought out program would receive favorable consideration by both the private and public sectors in this country.

We're all waiting to see how, or if, the Concorde SST service proves out from an economic as well as environmental point of view. NASA's work gives us confidence that engine noise could be significantly reduced in a second-generation SST. And NASA research also indicates that a second-generation SST might well approach today's narrow-body jets pound for pound in fuel consumption. As for the United States entry into this controversial area, I believe that eventually there will be an American SST program because this nation has demonstrated time and again in aviation that we may not always be first but we usually end up being the best. The next

successful SST is likely to be American, or to be the result of a cooperative American-European effort.

In closing, ladies and gentlemen, the investments we as a nation have made in science and technology have always paid substantial dividends. This is as true today as it was in the early development of this country when we put our science and technology to work to develop our basic transportation systems. And today, this nation must not run the risk of reducing its aeronautical lead.

In this Bicentennial year, we all are finding occasions for celebrating the progress of the past and for being thankful that we live in a country where progress has been possible and still is possible. Transportation is a field where our continental dimensions and our sense of adventure have combined over the centuries to produce some dramatic developments. One example of the dramatic is the parade of tall ships which I expect to have the pleasure of seeing here in New York harbor on July 4. An example of some of the problems which progress engenders is the special air traffic rules which we will have in effect here because of the large number of sightseers who are expected to jam the air in the vicinity of this impressive fleet of sailing ships. But the Bicentennial is also a time for taking stock, for seeing where we have been, what we think of where we are, and where we are going as a society of free people.

We are fortunate to live in a nation with an economic system capable of producing goods almost without limit, a system resourceful enough to produce prosperity with freedom and opportunity unmatched in the history of nations; and most important, a system flexible enough to change its ways dramatically when circumstances call for a change. For our aviation/aerospace industry the time is now.

Our industry has problems. Both manufacturers and airlines are in serious trouble. Aircraft noise is not only affecting the quality of life near our major airports, but has become a serious drag on our ability to expand ground facilities necessary to our future economic health. To overcome these problems, we need to demonstrate some of that well known flexibility and imagination.

If we are to maintain a healthy aviation industry, keep our world trade position, then we must exhibit new dedication and vision. We must demand a vigorous national commitment to continuous and aggressive advancement of our industry. And those of us in the public and private sectors must pool our resources and talents to see that an enlightened public policy provides the opportunity for an enlightened private industry to satisfy our transportation objectives to the ultimate profit and good of all of us.

EPISODE IN LENINGRAD—THE LENINGRAD TRIAL OF 1970

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, in recent months many of our colleagues have drawn our attention to those citizens of the Soviet Union who have been denied the right to emigrate to Israel. It is generally recognized that the event which first focused world attention on these "orphans of the exodus" was the Leningrad trial of 1970. At this time I would like to share with my colleagues an ac-

count of the trial and the events surrounding it. This account, a portion of which I am including in the *RECORD*, is entitled, "Episode in Leningrad." Veteran journalist Murray Seeger of the *Los Angeles Times* is the author of the piece which appeared in *Present Tense*, the magazine of World Jewish Affairs.

EPISODE IN LENINGRAD

(By Murray Seeger)

For the Jews of the Soviet Union who had been struggling to win the right to emigrate to Israel, the historic turning-point was the trial in 1970 of eleven foolish, naive young people who hoped to steal a small airplane and fly to freedom in Scandinavia.

The international reaction to the severe sentences was so strong that the government had to reduce all of them. In the years since the defendants were carted off to jails and prison camps, the flow of Jewish emigrants rose from an average of 2,000 for each year from 1967 to 1970 to a peak of 35,000 in 1973. Never before had so many individuals won the right to leave the closed borders of the Russian homeland in such a brief period. Through 1974, when the annual flow was reduced, the total outpouring from the date of the trial exceeded 100,000.

In the late summer 1974, the Kremlin bowed to continued international pressure and granted an amnesty and immediate exit to Silva Zalmanson, the heroine of the Leningrad trial. She has provided for the first free testimony about the planning of the hijack, the conduct of the trial and life in a contemporary Soviet prison camp.

Silva Zalmanson's route to the prison camp at Potma, a forbiddingly bleak, swampy area about 350 miles east of Moscow, started in Riga, the capital of Latvia. She was trained as a mechanical engineer, worked as an industrial designer and participated in the preparation and distribution of underground literature, known as *samizdat*.

Hillel Butman of Leningrad, one of Silva's associates in the distribution of *samizdat*, called her excitedly in February 1970 and made a date to meet her on Gorky Street, Riga's central artery.

Afraid he was about to be arrested, Butman told Silva about a tentative plan to organize a large group of Jews who, with the help of an already enlisted pilot, would hijack an airplane.

The code word for the enterprise was to be "wedding." Silva was to recruit a delegation of trusted people from Riga who would join those already lined up by Butman.

Silva took Butman to the apartment where she lived with her brother, Israel; her father, Joseph, and her new husband, Eduard Kuznetsov. A former student at Moscow State University, the country's most prestigious school, Kuznetsov had been released in 1968 after serving seven years in camps and the notorious Vladimir Prison for "anti-Soviet" activities. He was twenty years old when he was arrested in 1961 along with his friends, Anatoly Ivanov and Yuri Osipov, for publishing an illicit magazine, *Phoenix-61*.

Butman and Kuznetsov "took a walk," the safe way to carry on a conversation when a Soviet citizen assumes he is under surveillance by the KGB. As a former prisoner, under the section of the law concerning "anti-Soviet activities," Kuznetsov had to assume he was being shadowed as a potential security risk. As a Jewish activist, Silva expected the same attention. Although they had not met before, "Edik" Kuznetsov and Butman quickly became friends.

According to Kuznetsov's diary, during their conversation Butman said: "I have a friend who is a good pilot. We have no other way out but to organize a group."

The plotters knew they had to be extremely cautious. Even among the Jews there were

police informers "I thought, 'It will end this way, in talks, in discussions and in preparations,'" Silva said. "I thought that the matter would never reach the point when all of us would have to sit in the airplane. So I thought, but in spite of that, I dreamed of the day."

On the spur of the moment, she told her older brother, Wolf, an Army lieutenant who was home on leave from his post in Lithuania, about the scheme. Wolf said: "I cannot even dream of Israel. When I shall be released from the Army, the law of secrecy will apply to me for many years, and this thought alone makes me mad." He, too, joined the plotters.

Kuznetsov went to Leningrad to meet with Butman and the pilot, Mark Dymshits, and returned home more enthusiastic than ever. "It seemed that his will was as strong as steel and could move mountains," his wife remembered. The organizers of the Riga delegation gathered at Zalmanson's apartment to hear Eduard's report and to plan the next steps.

The first date picked for the "wedding" was May 2, 1970. At Kuznetsov's insistence, two non-Jews, Yuri Fyodorov and Elik Morzhenko, had been invited to join them. Kuznetsov personally vouched for both men, whom he had met in prison camp, but others in the group were opposed to taking anyone except dedicated Jews. The two were finally accepted. On April 28, four days before the target date, Butman called from Leningrad. "Silva, the wedding is postponed until fall," he said. "That's all—don't ask questions."

Eduard and Silva met with Dymshits and Butman in Leningrad. "I weighed everything, the risk is too big," Butman explained. "Too many people know of our plan, so many that certainly also the KGB knows. There is no sense in committing 'kamikaze.'"

Despite an intense argument, Butman held firm to his opinion. The other three decided to abandon him. Keeping only the code name for their plan, the trio set out to make a less ambitious attempt to grab a twelve-seat biplane, the Antonov-2, from the strip at Smolny Airport, a small field near Leningrad.

On May 28 in Riga, Silva received a coded message indicating that Israeli government officials opposed any attempted hijacking. Silva answered that the plan was cancelled but, as she said later, "I lied—we decided to go the limit."

A week later, Dymshits telephoned from Leningrad. "The wedding will take place," he announced. "Edik is invited to the engagement party."

The new plan called for the sixteen plotters to split into two groups. Kuznetsov and Dymshits would lead the larger one to Smolny Airport to board a regular AN-2 flight bound for Priozersk, north of Leningrad and then to Satavalla, a former Finnish city inside the restricted border zone. The twelve boarding at Smolny were to act like strangers to each other. Silva, Mary and Leib Knokh, and Boris Penson were to camp out in the forest near the Priozersk runway. When the plane was on the ground, the passengers were to grab the pilots, tie them up and put them in sleeping bags under the trees. The four on the ground would then also board the plane and it would be flown to freedom by Dymshits.

On June 14, Kuznetsov watched from a distance as Penson and Silva bought tickets at the Finland Station in Leningrad for the rail stop near Priozersk. "They are following us," Kuznetsov told the others. When Silva and her friends went to the baggage room to retrieve their luggage, they found it had been searched. Still, the four Jews boarded the train heading north.

"We did not encounter the followers and entered the forest," Silva recounted. "Very soon we lost our way. Penson and Knokh went to find the way but could not find the airport in the night darkness. We decided to

make a small fire and to sleep until about six in the morning. After sunrise, it would be easier for us to find our location."

"My watch ended at three in the morning and I was about to wake Borya Penson for his watch, but at that moment a man in uniform stepped from the trees and asked for a light for his cigarette," Silva went on. "I passed the matches to him and he lit his cigarette, stepped back to the woods and then turned back to us with a gun in his hands. He fired a shot over my head and shouted madly: 'Hands up.'"

Five hours later, Kuznetsov, Dymshits and their friends walked out of the small terminal building at Smolny and headed for the 8:30 flight to Priozersk. They never got to the plane—two large groups of KGB agents from Moscow and Leningrad surrounded them and competed with each other to make arrests and rough them up. The "wedding" was over.

The formal investigation ended on October 27. The trial date was scheduled for November 20. On October 28, Kuznetsov refused the services of a lawyer because, he said, "In political trials the defense has no significance," and on November 20 he refused to eat or drink. But there was an unexplained delay.

The postponement gave Kuznetsov more time to think and on Dec. 10 he changed his mind about making a defense and met with a lawyer. He was advised to "speak and behave like a repentant criminal resigned to his fate." "I don't like his proposal," Kuznetsov wrote in his diary. "It is good to love people and Russia, but from afar. In the West they have no idea of what's happening in the Soviet Union. They don't know that here we seek bread, not butter."

The government put eleven defendants on trial together on December 15. Two other wives and two young girls arrested with the Kuznetsov-Zalmanson group were released without explanation. Wolf Zalmanson was to be tried individually as an Army officer, following the main trial but before a second arraignment of hijack defendants. Those in the first trial were charged with violating Chapter 64-15 of the criminal code of the Russian Republic, the crime of treason for trying to leave the country without permission, and Section 93-15, theft of government property. Eight were also charged with breaking Section 70, generating anti-Soviet propaganda, and Section 72, participating in an anti-Soviet organization.

"I was brought into the courtroom as the last one," Silva recalled. "At last, I saw our whole company. I was impressed at once by their being clean-shaven and properly dressed—everything was ready for the 'parade.' All of us were put into the dock. We exchanged a brief 'shalom' and expressed all other words only in hurried glances. I looked at Edik and he looked at me. In my thoughts I asked him to forgive me everything I might have said improperly during the investigation, and his return glance told me that he understood and forgave me."

Prisoners in the Soviet Union assume from the moment of their arrest that they will be punished. The criminal justice and political security systems assume a position of infallibility. Some defendants, as Solzhenitsyn has reported, defy their captors, argue with their interrogators and persistently refuse to admit their guilt regardless of the pressures put on them. But most are willing to admit a great deal in the hope that their sentences will be moderated.

Silva and Israel Zalmanson, Dymshits and Mendel Bodnya pleaded guilty to the charges against them while Fyodorov pleaded innocent. The others entered modified pleas, admitting many of the facts presented against them but not the government's legal conclusions.

On December 22, the prosecutor, S. Y. Solouyev, summed up the evidence and ex-

panded widely on the alleged evils of the "intrigues of international Zionism." The defendants were shocked to hear the severity of the penalties he requested from the court. Probably determined in advance by the KGB and party officials, the sentences sought were: Kuznetsov and Dymshits, death by firing squad; Fyodorov, a Russian, and Murzhenko, a Ukrainian, fifteen and fourteen years respectively; Leib Knokh, thirteen years; Anatoly Altman, Israel Zalmanson and Boris Penson, twelve years; Silva Zalmanson, ten years in strict regime and Bodnya, five years. The two non-Jews were to be committed to the toughest kind of prison camp and Bodnya the mildest, with "strict regime," the middle level of confinement, for the others.

The defendants were then asked to make any final statements before the court pronounced its sentences. As Kuznetsov noted in his diary, "Silva's words were the best." Recorded by her relatives and dispatched to the Western press in Moscow and around the world, Silva's words became a rallying cry for the entire international movement in support of Soviet Jews.

"The prosecutor has not proposed that heads should roll for something that has not been done," she said. "And if the court agrees, then such wonderful people as Kuznetsov and Dymshits will die. I don't think that Soviet law can consider anyone's 'intention' to live in another country 'treason' and I am convinced that the law ought to bring to court those who unlawfully deny our right to live where we want to."

"Let the court at least take into consideration that if we were allowed to leave there would be no 'criminal collusion' which has caused so much suffering to us and even greater distress to our families. . . . Our dream of living in Israel was incomparably stronger than fear of the suffering we might be made to endure. . . . Even now, I do not doubt for a minute that sometime I shall go after all and that I will live in Israel. . . . This dream, illuminated by two thousand years of hope, will never leave me. . . . If I forget you, O Jerusalem, let my right hand wither away."

The next day the court imposed the sentences the prosecutor had requested, except in three cases—Israel Zalmanson was given eight years and Penson ten, each instead of twelve; Bodnya four instead of three.

Apparently because of widespread huge international revulsion expressed against the sentences levied in Leningrad, the Russian Republic Supreme Court examined the defendants' appeals in six days instead of waiting the normal two weeks.

On Dec. 31, the court announced it had found it possible to commute the two death sentences because the plan of Kuznetsov and Dymshits "was stopped at the stage of an attempt, while the death penalty is an exceptional measure of punishment." The two leaders were given fifteen years, Kuznetsov in the toughest type of camp and Dymshits in the "strict regime." The sentences of three others—Mendelevich, Knokh and Altman—were reduced. There was no change in Silva Zalmanson's sentence.

Silva arrived at Camp 10 in Potma, Moldavia, in June 1971. Her husband and most of her friends were confined in other parts of the same complex of two dozen camps in the desolate, wooded swamps 335 miles east of Moscow.

"The camp in Potma, in which I was imprisoned, is a prison for political criminals, people whose opinions differ from those of the authorities—democrats, religious people, nationalists from the Baltic countries and others dreaming of the liberty of their fatherland and of its independence from the Moscow metropolis; members of illegal, anti-Soviet organizations, individual rebels who used

to paste up anti-government slogans; fugitives from the Soviet Union, and we Jews claiming the right of going to Israel.

"All these people, apart from us, the Jews, aspired when they were free to change the Soviet regime. They sought truth, justice and an honorable life. One can say that those who got to the camp were fortunate—many have been sent to prisons and, still worse, to psychiatric prisons. A citizen protesting against the regime of compulsion and injustice is considered by the authorities as an 'anti-Soviet,' as a dangerous and crazy person, whom one should send to a camp or an asylum for the mentally sick—to isolate him from the healthy population," as it is usually stated in the Soviet Union."

In the women's barracks, Silva found informers who were given extra rations of food in return for their reports on more troublesome prisoners. One of the spies was Kogan, a Jew sentenced to seven years for mailing anonymous critical letters to the government. Another was a Tatar woman, Bakdoleeva, jailed for making critical remarks, who was also an anti-Semite. When Bakdoleeva persistently made anti-Jewish remarks to Kogan, Silva lost her temper and attacked her.

Silva had been in the camp fifteen months when this incident occurred. She was charged with "violating discipline," and given six months in the tougher "strict regime barracks." She considered herself lucky not to be sent to a more distant camp.

"I was given the worst cell in the whole building which was set aside for political prisoners, but a single cell which was originally designed for two. There were two iron cots between which I could choose," she said.

Instead of cloth netting, the cots had grids of narrow iron strips. "This would not have been so bad," she remarked, "except that at the places of welding of the strips there were long, sharp knots. Such a bed is probably suitable for a Yogi who is prepared to sleep on nails."

"During the night hours I used to spring up every ten minutes out of bed and start hopping like mad, trying to speed up the blood circulation in my veins. But for such hopping one needs strength and I had none—the food was just sufficient so that one did not die of hunger. Without a letter from Edik, I don't know what would have been the end of it."

The message from her husband was simply a short note smuggled hand-to-hand from his nearby camp to the strict barracks where Silva was confined. "You are cold, I know," he wrote. "You are to hop. Imagine that you were sent to a sports contest for six months—so hop!"

"Who else could know except Edik, who spent so much time in the punishment cell and solitary confinement," she said. "So, I hopped until I ran out of strength. Unless I did so, I would have frozen to death."

In December 1972, a rumor swept through the strict barracks that an amnesty was to be declared—a common wishful thought among Soviet prisoners for decades. Silva's neighbors first told her the amnesty would apply to those with terms of ten years or more. They then amended that to five years and finally to terms of less than five years. "I decided to believe in the first version; it made me feel warmer," Silva said.

"I sat in my cell," Silva continued. "My teeth knocked from the cold. I waited. When will the lieutenant colonels come to free me? I hear a rattle at the door and somebody asks from the threshold: 'Are there any complaints?'"

"I thought: 'What is the use of complaining now when I am being released?' And then I said, 'No complaints.' The lieutenant colonels retreated from the threshold and

the door closed. 'Well,' I thought, 'they apparently went to fill out the documents for my release. Perhaps there is no amnesty but because I received so many encouraging cables I shall be released anyway.'"

Silva's term in the cell ended in February and, by comparison, she found living in the barracks with other prisoners again "almost a paradise." A major improvement was the food—"boiling soup for dinner and there is bread," she observed.

Returning to the barracks also meant going back to sewing canvas work gloves. They worked in poor light with machines that broke down frequently to meet work quotas that entitled them to a little extra food. Ordinarily, breakfast consisted of a thin soup but those who met their quotas were able to get, in addition, a cereal augmented with vegetable fats and sometimes sugar. Lunch was usually cabbage soup and a thin cereal. At night there might be some fried fish and again cereal. The small wages paid for the work could be spent by prisoners in good standing for tobacco, margarine, cheese, canned fish, grey bread and jam at a camp store.

During her term, Silva suffered frightful stomach pains and persistent nausea. The sewing work hurt her back and she had trouble with her eyes from the combination of bad light and close work; she could not meet her quotas. She seemed to be losing her hearing and as the result of an accident in the barracks she burned her foot seriously and was sent to the camp hospital. There she met Olya, the wife of a worker from near Moscow.

One evening in the spring of 1974, Silva was called to the visitors' room. She had been expecting her younger brother, Syoma, to visit but did not know when he would come because of the long, difficult process required to get permission and arrange for such a trip. With great excitement she entered the visitors' room but instead of her brother she found her codefendant, Yuri Fyodorov, sitting there with his wife, Natasha. Then, belatedly, Syoma entered the room and they sat at a second table to talk.

Silva assumed that much of what she said would be overheard by Fyodorov and conveyed to her husband, since the men were confined to the same barracks. She was surprised to hear her brother suggest: "Silva, appeal for a pardon; it is worthwhile for you to appeal in writing for a pardon." Natasha then turned and made a similar plea.

"No, I do not want a pardon. I do not want your pardon!" Silva answered.

An inspector soon entered the room and ordered the two couples to separate. Silva and her brother were moved to another room and talked for another hour. But she was convinced the joint meeting was staged by the KGB to persuade her to ask for mercy and to give them an excuse to show their generosity and counteract the massive international campaign generated by Jews and their supporters around the world.

Silva's release was announced without advance notice to her in midsummer, 1974. "Zalmanson, you got an amnesty," a guard told her.

"But I did not ask for amnesty," she answered.

"Asked for it or not, it makes no difference," he said. "Take your things, you are free."

Silva went to the Moscow office for overseas passports (OVIR) on August 23, 1974, but insisted she would not leave the country until her husband and brothers were also released. She found this effort was useless, however, so she finally accepted the "pink piece of paper opening the gates of the fatherland for which it was worthwhile to fight and to risk one's life."

The other Leningrad defendants are still imprisoned. While the Soviets gained substantial humanitarian credit points by releasing the one woman punished for the escape attempt, they hold her friends as a warning to any other Jews who might be willing to take incredible risks to win the right of emigration.

WHAT HUMPHREY-HAWKINS WOULD MEAN

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, in the past 2 weeks several issues regarding the Humphrey-Hawkins bill have been addressed, particularly economic issues concerning inflation, employment, and the bill's counterproductive economic effects. A thorough discussion of the bill must include views from many sides. The bill, of course, was authored by those who would be called economic "liberals," and it has recently attracted much comment from liberal economists. Two weeks ago, Business Week published the views of several leading liberal economists. It is very important to point out that these men oppose the Humphrey-Hawkins proposal rather than favor it. Their discussion centers on various aspects of the bill that would rekindle double-digit inflation such as forced tight labor markets, fiscal-stimulus requirements, mandated wages, and other problems. Their analysis is stimulating and provides some important insights. The article is here-with inserted in the RECORD for the consideration of all Members:

WHAT HUMPHREY-HAWKINS WOULD MEAN

Despite the economy's strong recovery in the past year, the Democrats believe that the critical issue in the Presidential campaign is still unemployment. To sharpen the issue, they have made the proposed Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1976, sponsored by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D-Minn.) and Representative Augustus F. Hawkins (D-Calif.), their vehicle for convincing the American public that they really care, while the Republicans do not. Indeed, Democratic leaders in Congress are counting on President Ford to veto the bill, which they are certain will pass both houses, and are planning to write it into their party platform to keep the issue hot.

One trouble with the Democrats' script, however, is that, while it may have wide political appeal, Humphrey-Hawkins is playing badly with a crowd that should have loved a full-employment bill: the liberal economics establishment that normally provides the ideas and intellectual muscle for the Democrats' legislative programs.

The critics read like a *Who's Who* of liberal economics: Charles L. Schultze of the Brookings Institution, who says, "Call me a friendly critic"; his Brookings colleague Arthur Okun, former Democratic chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, who concedes that the bill is "beautiful poetry"; Franco Modigliani of MIT; former CEA member James Tobin of Yale; manpower expert Sar Levitan of George Washington University; and Otto Eckstein of Harvard, another Democratic CEA veteran.

Inflation fear: Most of them either decline to endorse Humphrey-Hawkins in its present form, or do so with many qualifications. Their biggest concern is that the bill would

be wildly inflationary yet makes no provision for dealing with a potential wage-price explosion. In deference to the AFL-CIO, it omits any reference to wage and price controls or, for that matter, to any form of incomes policy.

Humphrey-Hawkins would establish "the right of all adult Americans able, willing, and seeking work to opportunities for useful paid employment at fair rates of compensation." But unlike the Employment Act of 1946 which stated the same general goal, the bill sets up a mandatory process for achieving it and puts some hard numbers on the objective. It specifies full employment as a 3% adult unemployment rate, and it orders the coordination of all government economic policy to achieve this level within four years of enactment. In addition, the bill would:

Put the government into economic planning through an elaborate process that would involve the President, his CEA, Congress, the Federal Reserve Board, and a bevy of advisory groups. They would be required to come up with an annual "full employment and balanced growth plan."

Require the government to take steps, primarily through coordinated fiscal and monetary policy, to fulfill the plan, and if the long-term goals cannot be met in a given year, require the government to act as employer of last resort, using public service job programs.

Mandate that pay scales for jobs sponsored by the government reflect prevailing wage rates.

The 50-page bill contains a great deal of detail and would require numerous pieces of enabling legislation to implement it fully. But even in its broad outlines, most economists consider it overambitious. Currently, for example, the House version defines an "adult" as 16 years old and above. Humphrey wants to raise that to 18, but even at 18, the 3% adult unemployment target implies an over-all rate of roughly 3.5%, according to both Administration and Congressional economists. And the U.S. has never achieved a 3.5 rate over a sustained period.

In fact, and regardless of whether an adult is defined as 16 or 18, achievement of 3% would require phenomenal growth rates in gross national product. Says Levitan: "You'd have to keep real GNP growing at least 7.5% a year through 1980, and we've never grown so fast for so long a period."

Prediction. No one really knows what kind of inflation would occur if the economy steamed up that much, but economists are sure it would be explosive. Michael Wachter of the University of Pennsylvania, a member of Democrat Jimmy Carter's economic advisory team, estimates that "an attempt to get down to 3% unemployment by 1980 or so chiefly with aggregate-demand stimulus could cause inflation of 15% or more."

Carter has endorsed Humphrey-Hawkins in principle, but Wachter fears that the bill could turn out to be "an albatross for Jimmy, assuming he's nominated," if the bill's proponents succeed in their efforts to write it into the party's platform.

"Given the economics profession's widespread opposition to the bill in its present form," says Wachter, "it will be a liability for Carter. It's the wrong bill to deal with the problems that we face. The Democrats should be putting real issues into the platform—measures that deal specifically with structural unemployment and supply problems. This is what they should test Ford on."

From Levitan, the inflation warning comes through even more alarmingly: "We can do much more to reduce unemployment than Ford wants to do, but not this way. What Congress is doing with this bill is shooting at a rapidly moving target." As if 3% were not tough enough, says Levitan, the wage provisions would make public jobs so attrac-

tive that business would be forced to raise wages to attract workers back to the private sector. This, he says, would in turn "bring people out of the woodwork and into the job market. As a result, the labor force will grow—without exaggeration—by 3% to 4% more than it would otherwise."

Schultze, too, says that the wage provision would set a new general wage pattern and be too inflationary. To deal with inflation, he advocates some form of incomes policy short of controls, "perhaps a social contract arrangement such as the British are trying, where tax cuts are given in return for wage moderation." In addition, he would like to see the targets in the bill made "less specific."

Similarly, Tobin says he "would look more kindly on the bill if it had an incomes policy alternative," but he adds that "this mechanism should be available at the start of such an effort, not when the economy gets into trouble." Tobin and Wachter both argue that the structural reforms suggested in the bill should come into play at the outset, or else Humphrey-Hawkins would merely pump up the economy and never get to underlying labor market problems.

Rubbing noses. With all the bill's flaws, it is, as Okun says, "the litmus test for liberalism in economics." And most of the liberals do have some good things to say about it. Schultze says, "We must keep rubbing the government's nose in the problem of chronic unemployment." All agree on the need for a government process that coordinates macro and microeconomic policies, with special emphasis, as Eckstein puts it, "on making the Fed cooperate in achieving over-all economic goals instead of just reacting to weekly data."

Eckstein thinks that Humphrey-Hawkins involves "principally a set of plans, studies, reports, and advisers to advise the advisers." But he also sees it as an alternative "to telling the public we've got to live with high unemployment for years and are so intellectually bankrupt we won't even try to do something."

Does Eckstein endorse the bill? "No," he says, "I don't have to. I'm not running for President."

TWO HUNDRED YEARS AGO TODAY

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, 200 years ago, on June 18, 1776, the Continental Congress, attempting to curb the many abuses and illegal actions to which loyalists had been subjected, adopted the following resolution—

That no man in these colonies, charged with being a tory, or unfriendly to the cause of American liberty, be injured in his person or property, or in any manner whatever disturbed, unless the proceeding against him be founded on an order of this Congress, or (a duly constituted body) of the district wherein he resides; provided, that this resolution shall not prevent the apprehending any person found in the commission of some act destructive of American liberty, or justly suspected of a design to commit such act, and intending to escape, and bringing such person before proper authority for examination and trial.

Although innocent of any wrongdoing, thousands of loyalists and their property confiscated, were imprisoned and suffered many indignities.

THE MIDDLE WEST: BALANCE WHEEL OF THE REPUBLIC

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a splendid column by Nick Thimmesch published in the New York Times of June 6, 1976.

The column, "The Middle West: 'Balance Wheel' of the Republic," follows:

THE MIDDLE WEST: BALANCE WHEEL OF THE REPUBLIC

(By Nick Thimmesch)

DUBUQUE, IOWA—The rich, black soil of Iowa plays host to the recently planted corn. Farmers claim that only inclement weather can stop them from having another boomer year. Unemployment is lower here than in other regions. The Middle West, in this Bicentennial year, remains the balance wheel to the Republic. The heartland stretches from Ohio westward halfway through Nebraska, and from Minnesota south well into Missouri. It is not the most spectacular region in the nation, but surely is the steadiest. The Middle West considers the East's dictums and the West's enthusiasms, perhaps indulging itself for a while, but always comes to its senses, thus moderation.

The political liberalism in the Middle West is usually practiced by people unafflicted with urges to destroy. The conservatism is the sort which judged Barry Goldwater radical in 1964, because it perceived him to be against Social Security, assistance to agriculture and reckless with peace.

This year Middle Westerners seem comfortable with Jimmy Carter. They ask a visitor from Washington whether Carter would be a good President, and they also want to know, of late, what kind of man is California Gov. Edmund (Jerry) Brown.

Talk to Republicans and you will hear concern about President Ford's challenge from Ronald Reagan. The question which keeps popping up is, will Reagan really beat the President out of the nomination?

Middle Westerners are more interested in Barbara Walters and her \$1-million-a-year job than they are in the Panama Canal. Hell, said one man whose patriotism is above reproach, what is the canal good for anymore anyhow? He had read a lot about it and figured that while it was just fine that Teddy Roosevelt was so proud of it, today the canal isn't worth going to war over.

People who live along the Mississippi River enjoy catfish and avoid extremes. Inland, around the cities and towns which dot the undulating prairie, brown and black now until the corn shoots emerge, there seems to be contentment from not thinking about politics or great issues. It would be difficult to get anyone from Algona, Iowa, worked up over Angola.

There is great value to the nation in having this Middle Western balance wheel. The East has its high practitioners of doomsaying. Too many of the influential in the great metropolises are jaded. Still, the East holds considerable power, generates many new ideas and has a corner on the communications and opinion-making business.

The West has always been a refuge from the East, especially whenever the East became problematic. The West also lured those who were bored in the Middle West or failing in it. Adventurism always characterized the West. Frederick Jackson Turner's thesis that the West served as a national safety valve stands up well.

Take a chance in the West because people out there don't care who you are or where

you came from, but can you do it? So the West became freeways and hopeful transients and neon greetings to open spaces. The West goes without neckties, has dinner on the patio and doesn't worry that much about Henry Kissinger.

Again, historically, the Middle West functions as a balance wheel between the ram-bunctious West and the more rigid institutionalized East. But in recent years, the West has become more subtle in its life style and has even become concerned about its alluring qualities. The states of Washington, Oregon and California aren't at all eager to accept newcomers. They want to sit back and enjoy without being pestered by visitors and unseemly growth.

The great surge of movement, of growth, in America is felt in the South and Southwest; the balance wheel can handle it. The South is in a marvelous renaissance, freed of its fetters over race and receiving overdue respect. Visit the Southwest and you'll wonder if there ever was a recession. High-rises shooting like beanstalks. Glistening new shopping centers proudly sprawling. Excitement and vigor, and that's why they do get worked up over the Panama Canal. Lusty red, white and blue—that's the tone in the sunbelt states.

All of this amounts to generalization, of course. Walls do not isolate our great regions. There is big traffic back and forth in people and ideas. Our nation is vitalized because of such intercourse.

But it's reassuring to reflect on the whole, as we move closer to the 200th birthday of the Republic and realize that the Middle West quite nicely fills the role of the national balance wheel. Ours is a society capable of great gyrations and regional shimmy. But in the heartland there is a stability and measured approach—in fact, word and deed—which serves the Republic so well.

WHAT DIRECTION FOR LIBERAL EDUCATION?

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, recently the House of Representatives debated and passed two bills on post-secondary education. During the course of debate, scant attention was given to liberal education. Though it was a topic of little discussion, liberal education is something we should ponder if we are not to lose our focus on where we have been and where we are going, both individually and collectively.

Robert Goldwin, Special Consultant to the President, recently described the future of liberal education in a very thoughtful speech at the University of Nebraska—Omaha.

Because of the importance of this subject I commend Dr. Goldwin's remarks to my colleagues attention:

THE FUTURE OF LIBERAL EDUCATION

Several months ago, I was asked to talk to you about "The Future of Liberal Education." I have been thinking about and even worrying about it, ever since. And the more I thought, and the more I worried, the more clear it became to me that I have three kinds of news to deliver about the future of liberal education.

I

First, I'll tell you the bad news: Liberal education is in danger; its future is precarious at best.

The United States is, above all else, a nation of very practical-minded people. If we spend time and money and effort, we want a return. We like to know quite specifically what we're buying. It's easy to estimate the value of a course on how to upholster a chair, or repair an automobile; easy to judge what price makes it worth your while, whether for a vocation as an upholsterer or an auto mechanic, or for a do-it-yourself hobby.

But how does one know how much money or time is a good investment to study Victorian literature or ancient and modern theories of political society? You might be convinced that such things are important, but how do you put a price on it? As every salesperson knows, and every consumer knows, when the price is in doubt, the sale is in doubt.

Some people say that price isn't a problem because there are now so many courses available that are free or have a very low tuition charge. But, of course, there is no such thing as a free service. Courses offered in public institutions, or in some private institutions, may cost the user relatively little, or even nothing, but that just means the service is subsidized by others, either by donors or taxpayers, which means that it is paid for at full cost, but in a different way. And there is no way for others to subsidize the student's cost in personal effort.

So the question still remains, what is important enough to teach and study at considerable cost to individuals or to society as a whole? And is liberal education part of what is important? Liberal education is in a precarious position in these times because the answer to that question is not obviously and automatically, YES; the answer takes some thinking about.

II

The future of liberal education is precarious. That's the bad news. The second kind of news I have to tell you is worse: Liberal education has always been in danger, has always been in a precarious situation. The primary reason can be stated briefly and bluntly: It is part of the nature of liberal education that it is annoying, and the people who are liberally educated are annoying—they may be helpful, they may provide beauty and joy to our lives, they may even be absolutely indispensable, but above all they are annoying: they are truly a public nuisance.

The aim of liberal education is to know the truth, and the activity of liberal education is to ask unsettling questions. Liberal education questions what society does not question; it challenges beliefs that society accepts as true; it insists that things that are obscure, complicated, difficult, and even dreary, are really more deserving of our attention than things that are clear, simple, easy, and immediately entertaining. What could be more annoying?

Liberal education also claims to know what is good for us; in fact, it claims to know better than we know ourselves, what is good for us. And we keep asking, if it's so good for us, why does it so often bore us and fatigue us and make us feel like rebellious children waiting for the school bell to ring?

Also, not just in 20th century America, but in all times and societies it has been hard to see just what you can do with a liberal education, just how you can make a living with it. Long ago a liberally educated man wrote that "to a starving man, bread is more important than philosophy." At what financial distance from starvation does the balance start to shift away from bread to

philosophy? The liberally educated are often seen waiting at the doors of the rich and powerful, but how often are the rich and powerful seen waiting at the doors of the liberally educated?

Legitimate doubts, annoyances, and complaints endanger liberal education, now in all times, and make its future precarious, inevitably. Liberal education can thrive only with strong support from the public or powerful patrons, and why should we expect such support for what is considered a public nuisance and even a threat to those who are powerful?

If anyone doubts what I am saying, about the annoyance power of liberal studies and the people who make them a full-time occupation, if anyone thinks I am exaggerating, just remember ancient Athens and Socrates.

Socrates was the glory of Athens—in my opinion, more so than their poets, their playwrights, their sculptors, their architects, their political leaders—and Athens was the best city in the ancient world, perhaps the best ever. What authority do I have that latter claim? Socrates himself. He never left Athens except in military service. Even when death was the alternative, Socrates refused an offer to leave Athens to live elsewhere. But the Athenians executed Socrates, for the crime of annoyance—extreme, upsetting, aggravated annoyance. What annoyed them? His complete dedication to thinking and questioning and seeking the truth. He questioned everything, and that was intolerable. And if ancient Athens did not tolerate the finest example of liberal education, what kind of society will be hospitable to those who try to follow his example? The obvious answer to that question explains why I say that liberal education is, and always has been, and probably always will be, in danger.

III

I have talked all this time about liberal education without telling you what I think it is, without defining my terms. It is not easy for me to be very precise because I am not one who thinks of liberal education primarily in terms of certain courses or subjects to study.

It is much easier for others, who think liberal education is a certain list of subjects, to tell you what liberal education is. English literature is, for example, carpentry is not, according to most people. "I teach the liberal arts," someone says, and we guess, is it philosophy, poetry, history, languages, literature, theology, or some interdisciplinary combination of them? We know it isn't carpentry. Too practical. We are not sure that physics or biology should be included; we are not sure that sciences are part of liberal education: they have a fairly direct practical use, after all.

When I speak of liberal education, I do not start by thinking of certain subjects or authors or books, although I may end that way, as I will explain. Liberal education seeks to develop liberal skills, liberal arts within a student. These liberal skills or arts are internal in their purpose and direction; that is, the aim is not to produce some artifact or product external to the maker; the aim of liberal education is to make the student a disciplined person, with skills of the mind and character akin to the physical skills of a pole vaulter or a ballet dancer or a tight-rope walker. Liberal education aims to develop the skills of the human psyche, to make us aware of its extraordinary range of abilities which means a greatly increased capability for understanding, for achievement, for happiness, and—alas—for misery and sorrow, too. Liberal education gets its name from its power to liberate the human psyche from the fetters of ignorance, superstition, fear, greed and other follies that tend to enslave human beings, to diminish us, to make us less than we are capable of being.

Let me explain why I use the word *psyche*, originally, of course, a Greek word. Whatever *psyche* is, it is what psychology studies and psychiatry treats. *Psyche* is sometimes translated from the Greek as mind, sometimes as soul, sometimes as spirit. We moderns are in the strange position of putting great faith in psychology and psychiatry—but doubting the existence of the psyche; of eating soul food, listening to soul music, speaking of people as lacking soul or having soul—but doubting the existence of the soul; of singing spirituals, having spirited conversations, celebrating the Spirit of '76—but doubting the existence of the human spirit. We are not sure that anything really exists that is not composed of matter.

That is what we mean when we acknowledge that we are materialistic, and materialism is another reason why liberal education, the education that seeks to liberate the psyche, is in danger. *Psyche* is not exactly the same as soul, not exactly the same as mind, and not exactly the same as spirit, but *psyche* is everything that we human beings are that is not physical, material, matter, body. Those who are convinced that there is nothing that is not matter, and their numbers are great, are unlikely to be strong advocates and defenders of liberal education, which exists to give freedom to the psyche.

If liberal education is not defined by the subjects studied, how can we defend it? Surely everyone of us has taken a course usually considered a part of liberal education and found that it not only did not free our psyche, it put it into a state of numbness closely akin to death. Great dramas, wonderful poetry, Shakespeare himself, can be taught in such a way that any human being feels himself being enslaved, feels the handcuffs and ankle-chains tightening, and realizes that boredom can be so severe as to make one long for death. Why should such activity be called liberal education?

Less common, is that rare encounter with the master teacher who can guide you to uncover deep meaning in the activity of shaping pieces of wood or a lump of clay or even a bunch of flowers. When I speak of deep meaning I do not mean that you see it in the wood or the clay or the flowers. No, you see it in yourself. Why should such activity not be called liberal education?

If I am right, almost any learning effort can be liberalized or stultifying, and the decisive thing will not be the name of the course but the aim of the effort and whether it develops a skill that liberates the psyche, a little or a lot.

IV

When my third daughter, the Merit Finalist, was studying mathematics, languages, literature, history, and sciences at one of the nation's most renowned high schools, I think the most liberating teacher she had was the man who taught her the skills of horsemanship, after school. I'm not sure she would agree, but his instruction seemed to affect her psyche, and her understanding of what a human can accomplish, more, and more directly, than did her academic studies.

But let me give you a better and loftier example, before you begin to get the idea that I am anti-school, and anti-intellectual, which properly understood, I definitely am not.

Consider Analytic Geometry. Is it part of liberal education? Most people who have studied analytic geometry would say no. It is hard to learn; it is almost always studied for directly practical reasons; it has applications in engineering; and few people discover much about their psyche while studying analytic geometry, except that they have less endurance than they need, or more than they thought possible.

Descartes, the great French philosopher, wrote the first book of analytic geometry. You don't need to be a mathematician to follow what I am about to tell you, and I promise not to draw any diagrams. Descartes' book begins by saying that there is a certain problem of geometry, called the problem of Pappus, that has gone unsolved for more than a thousand years. He describes it and draws the diagram; it takes a page or two just to state the problem. Then he says, now I will show you the power of my new method of geometry: I will solve this thousand-year-old unsolved problem.

Step one: Consider the problem solved. Step two: How did I do it? And in a few pages Descartes leads the reader to an understanding of a new method of mathematical reasoning, analysis. This new problem-solving technique, as we would now call it, starts at the end, with the task complete, and goes backward, breaking it down into parts; that is, analyzing it. Immediately we see what we have always half-known. For example, it is easier, after we have made a trip, to say what route we took, step by step, than to lay out the route in advance, especially if we have never been there, and even more especially if we are not sure where we are going.

Further, once Descartes developed the method of analysis, it occurred to him, and to others since, that ancient geometry, euclidean plane and solid geometry, now called synthetic geometry, to distinguish it from analytic geometry, had no visible method of its own but was really analytic geometry disguised. That is, in order to know how to solve a difficult problem in euclidean geometry, you may have to see the answer first, see the problem in its entirety, analyze it into its parts, and see how the problem was solved. Descartes suspected that the ancients then erased it from their awareness, and proceeded step by step to the solution as if they were approaching it anew, without ever having been there.

That's why euclidean geometry can be so delightful and also so frustrating: frustrating because you feel you are proceeding blindly, delightful because there are such wonderful surprise endings—if you get there. Descartes took away both the frustrations and the delightful surprises—an alteration of the human condition now called modernity.

If you did not follow everything I just said about analytic geometry, it doesn't matter. The main point is that analytic geometry can indeed be taught as a liberalizing skill, as a way of lifting and strengthening and enlightening the human psyche, showing you what it is for, what it can accomplish, how it can build new worlds, how it can see the unseen and give new shape to the heretofore shapeless.

Only one thing gives more joy than making, and that is the understanding that enables us to make. The great liberators of human beings are the ones who have shown us new ways of making, and more important, new ways of understanding. That is why Descartes ranks as one of the great human benefactors, one of the greatest liberal educators, and why he and the few others like him are to be studied and restudied.

It is not wrong, as I may have seemed to be saying, to think that there is a connection between liberalizing study and certain subjects, certain books, certain authors. What distinguishes Descartes from most other mathematicians is exactly what I have been describing, the liberalizing dimension of his thought, the skills he can impart to his reader that tend to free the psyche by giving it new power. His geometry can be taught without soul, and horsemanship can be taught with soul, but the greatest treasures of liberal education are there in the greatest works of the greatest minds, and

it is no mistake that they are considered the source of human riches, even though few teachers know where the gold is or how to help students prospect for it.

Do you wonder what this has to do with the White House and the Department of Defense, and what I can possibly contribute to better government? First, let me assure you that I wonder sometimes, too. But, second, and this is my first hint that there is good news, it has been my experience in the world of practical affairs, that the higher one goes, the greater the awareness of the importance of the liberal skills—yes, even in a conservative Administration.

Many of the people I serve with now, I first met when they came to liberal arts seminars I ran at The University of Chicago and Kenyon College, including, among many others, my two present "bosses," then-Congressmen Gerald Ford and Donald Rumsfeld. The strong urge to understand, to learn more, to get to the bottom of things, to grasp the sources and origins of problems—these are characteristic of the best practical men and women.

I have never met a truly practical person, a real leader and manager of grand enterprises, who regularly reacted to inquiry in the tone of, "That may be all right in theory, Professor, but it won't work in practice." The truly practical leaders know very well how directly, and powerfully, understanding and action are linked, and the deeper the understanding, the more likely that action will be effective and will accomplish the desired results.

And that brings me to the good news and the conclusion of this talk simultaneously. There is no need to despair for liberal education's future because so long as there are human beings, they will never cease their efforts to understand—and that is what liberal education is, the effort, the striving, the struggle to understand.

It isn't true of all of us, or perhaps even of most of us, however we may try to show how "practical" we are, that we will exert ourselves only if there is some monetary or material reward. In fact, we human beings will go to the greatest lengths, against terrible odds, at the risk of sanity and even life, to understand, once we are puzzled; to answer a question, once it begins to bother us; to see more clearly with our mind's eye, once we perceive that there is something there, however dimly glimpsed.

If I am right, that the will to understand is a powerful and perhaps irresistible force of human nature, and that it cannot be suppressed in some of us even by the fiercest repression, and can be awakened in most of us, at least to some extent, by the right kind of questioning, then it is also clear that what we call liberal education is human education, perhaps the only education, surely the education most akin to our nature.

I conclude that the future of liberal education is inseparable from, and perhaps even identical to, the future of humanity itself.

THE NATIONAL DEBT SHOULD NOT BE INCREASED

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the national debt is at an alltime high, when that debt is fueling a serious problem of inflation and resulting unemployment and recession, it is irresponsible

to consider expanding the debt limit. To expand the debt limit would simply be to increase that inflation, unemployment, and recession. It would be a stab in the back to the economic recovery which appears now to be beginning.

In testimony before the House Committee on Ways and Means, Alan W. Bock, director of the Libertarian Advocate, asked some very important questions.

Mr. Bock asked:

How much longer can the conventional wisdom sustain this Government? How much longer can you keep spending far beyond what the people of this country are remotely willing to pay, and pretend that it is all for the benefit of those same people? How much longer can you keep the printing presses running, cranking out fiat money and destroying the value of hard-earned money before the citizens revolt and say, "No more. We're not paying any more."

Mr. Bock, in his testimony, urged the defeat of the request for an increase in the national debt limit and asked the Government to "face the same problem an overextended private citizen faces, and meet it honestly. To increase the debt ceiling and print up more money robs every honest citizen. The cycle should be stopped now."

In his testimony, Mr. Bock calls for a form of modern accrual accounting for the Federal Government. Such a step is essential to make sense of Federal spending and in this connection I have introduced legislation to implement accrual accounting which would provide for truth in Government accounting procedures. This legislation now has 116 cosponsors.

In addition, Treasury Secretary William Simon has announced that his Department plans to implement accrual accounting throughout the Federal Government in early 1978. This will accomplish two major goals: it will clarify the cumulated long-term debts of the Federal Government, such as social security; and it will present the Federal Government's financial situation in a much more accurate light. In the private sector, proper accounting controls and sound financial reporting on an accrual basis are prerequisites to fiscal responsibility and an accurate understanding of a unit's financial condition. Accrual accounting in the Federal Government will provide similar controls over governmental affairs and financial reporting.

The one point in Mr. Bock's testimony with which I disagree is his recommendation that the U.S. Government should repudiate its past debts. To do so, would harm countless innocent citizens and would eliminate the respect which a government must have if it is to govern. Nevertheless, it does seem clear that now is the time to call a halt to debt increases. Let us slowly pay the debt which exists at this time and then resolve to put our government on a pay-as-you-go basis. Only by pursuing this course can economic health be restored.

I wish to share with my colleagues the testimony of Alan W. Bock, director of the Libertarian Alternative, as it was presented before the House Committee on Ways and Means on June 1, 1976, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

STATEMENT OF ALAN W. BOCK

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, ladies and gentlemen. I am Alan Bock, Director of Libertarian Advocate, an action and lobbying organization formed to promote individual human liberty and to seek legislative avenues to maximize freedom for all Americans.

Well, here we are again, with the ever-more-frequent request to raise the legal ceiling on the National Debt—again. What used to occur every few years now happens every few months as Congress and its government continue spending money they are afraid to extract from the people directly.

This time the precise timing is strictly political. When this Committee last raised the ceiling in February, you could have boosted it enough to last through September or even November. But the figure needed might have been too high—who would have wanted to acknowledge a public debt as high as \$645 billion right in the middle of a campaign? So you took the lower figure—around \$630 billion—to get you through June.

Yes, now is the time to do it. Almost all the primaries are over. There will be a lull, and then the conventions will be upon us like a plague of locusts. You can pretty well count on the voters' attention being focused on the Presidential battles, which have become interesting in both major parties. You can be fairly sure that a new debt ceiling passed now, high enough to get you past the November elections, will have slipped out of the voters' consciousness in the hullabaloo of the coming months. Only a few cranks will work up enough indignation to threaten anybody's reelection.

Far be it from a libertarian to lack a realistic cynicism about politicians. There's not much I can do about it except to congratulate you on your ability to operate within the traditional bounds of what the conventional wisdom considers political pragmatism.

I wonder how much longer the conventional wisdom will be enough to sustain you. The political tide seems to be rolling in an anti-Washington direction this spring. You may be shrewd to raise the national debt ceiling during a political lull. But raising the ceiling should certainly give more ammunition to the anti-Washington candidates—as well as contributing to the further alienation of those, now almost always a majority, who indicate their respect for the political system by staying home on election day.

How much longer can the conventional wisdom sustain this government? How much longer can you keep spending far beyond what the people of this country are remotely willing to pay, and pretend that it is all for the benefit of those same people? How much longer can you keep the printing presses running, cranking out fiat money and destroying the value of hard-earned money before the citizens revolt and say, "No more. We're not paying any more." The best-kept secret in the country is the magnitude of the tax revolt, the massive numbers of people who just aren't paying any more. How long before those legions become so numerous that the government has to creak to a painful stop? I don't know, for sure, but surely the irresponsibility which this government shows in handling the money it takes from its citizens can't go on forever. Someday the reckoning must come.

There is one bright side to the magnitude of the national debt and the immense size of the deficit. It blows to smithereens the theory that there is any demand by the people for more government. There is one objective way to measure how much government the people want, and this is to figure out how much government they're willing to pay for. The existence of a national debt of more than \$600 billion, of a deficit hovering around \$80 billion, is an objective indi-

cation that the supply of government far exceeds the demand.

Very few politicians want a deficit and a huge national debt. If you could erase the deficit and the debt by raising taxes, you'd do it right away. But our antennae are sensitive enough to know that the people think taxes are too high already. In fact, most Congressmen are trying to find gimmicks to lower taxes. Let's extend the tax cuts, add some deductions, make the people happy. The demand for government, expressed in willingness to tolerate the taxes needed to pay for it, has come very close to its peak. The supply is larger than the effective demand. It can't continue forever.

Libertarian Advocate's recommendations are very similar to those we suggested the last time the debt ceiling was raised:

1. Defeat this request for an additional authorization for more "temporary" national debt. Let the government face the same problem an over-extended private citizen faces, and meet it honestly. To increase the debt ceiling and print up more money robs every honest citizen. The cycle should be stopped now.

2. For heaven's sake, adopt some form of modern accrual accounting for the federal government, and do it right away. I believe several members of this Committee have sponsored bills to get the government onto accrual accounting. What's the problem? The present stone-age method of accounting which the government uses is downright deceptive, seriously understating deficits and concealing expenditures and obligations. Most Members of this Committee should be familiar with the recent study by the accounting firm of Arthur Andersen. A private company which used the accounting methods employed by the United States government wouldn't last twenty minutes. But then private companies don't have access to the legalized thievery known as taxation—unless they do a lot of government contract work.

3. Once again, I raise the possibility of repudiating the national debt and declaring bankruptcy. The national debt is not owed "to ourselves" but to investors in Treasury Bonds and other government securities. Every investor takes a risk that his investment might go sour. But to protect the investments of certain foreign and domestic moneybags, we are now systematically robbing each citizen of this country—through taxes and government-created inflation. The poorest among us are those most seriously damaged by this process. The game should be called to a halt, and the government should get back on a sound fiscal basis.

Libertarian Advocate is concerned with personal freedom. Freedom is not just an abstraction to us. It is given flesh and bones by the ability to do as much as your talents and resources allow you to do, without artificial or arbitrary constraints. When your resources are stolen from you by an ever-growing government, your freedom is limited. A reduction in the burden which the government's debt places on each citizen would be an important step toward increasing the liberty of each person in this country.

The time to make that commitment to increased liberty is now.

PASSAGE OF CONGRESSMAN FINDLEY AMENDMENT TO CHANGE COTTON DISASTER PAYMENTS WOULD BE A DISASTER

HON. JOHN W. JENNETTE, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. JENNETTE. Mr. Speaker, the Findley amendment is both an inappro-

priate and ill-timed effort to deprive cotton producers of their limited insurance protection. I urge its defeat for several reasons.

Primarily, the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 dictates the provisions under which cotton producers in 18 States receive disaster payments for their crop losses. It was recognized by the able lawmakers of that time that cotton and wheat are not identical commodities, and should be treated differently under the act. Among the dissimilarities are the late planting time and higher preplanting expenses for cotton, which necessitates special treatment under the disaster loan program.

In another 8 months, the farm bill will be reviewed in light of farmers' crop alternatives and rotation systems. The effect of disaster programs will get special attention, and the particular needs of farmers for insurance protection. In view of the extensive hearings to come, I feel an amendment on this subject to an appropriations bill is highly inappropriate.

Let us remember that we are debating a system which provides protection to farmers for disasters. Crop yield must fall below two-thirds of their normal level before the producer is even eligible, with payments limited to the underproduction at only one-third of the target price. I do not believe any of us would like to callously abandon cotton producers under these circumstances.

Let us defeat the amendment, and allow the Agriculture Committee to fully investigate the ramifications of such a change at the proper time.

THE 58TH ANNUAL BEAUMONT CHERRY FESTIVAL

HON. SHIRLEY N. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mrs. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, for 57 years, the community of Beaumont, Calif., has held a festival to celebrate the harvest of the 45 cherry orchards in the area.

The highlight of this year's festival, which will be held June 16 through June 20, will be a 76-mile nonstop run by Jim Caulfield, president of the International Boxing Hall of Fame, to raise money for the San Geronio Pass Area Amateur Youth Boxing Club. Pledges have been secured from local civic organizations and individuals for each mile Mr. Caulfield runs. Proceeds will be used to purchase equipment and insurance for the boxing club.

The Riverside County Board of Supervisors recently adopted a formal resolution praising and supporting the efforts of Mr. Caulfield to establish amateur boxing clubs for the youth of the San Geronio Pass area. I would like to take this opportunity to insert the resolution and to offer my commendation to Mr. Caulfield for the fine work he is doing on behalf of the youth in several of the communities which I am proud to represent.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the International Boxing Hall of Fame, an organization to perpetuate and enhance the sport of boxing, received its initial start in the City of Palm Springs, County of Riverside, and

Whereas, the president of the International Boxing Hall of Fame, Jim Caulfield is engaged in a campaign to establish amateur boxing clubs for the benefit of youth in our communities, and

Whereas, the president of the International Boxing Hall of Fame is proposing to headline such campaign efforts by participation in the Annual Cherry Festival in Beaumont June 16 to 20, 1976, and

Whereas, the special participation by Jim Caulfield on behalf of amateur boxing clubs will be a run of 76 miles non-stop to stimulate support for such amateur club for the San Geronio Pass Area including Banning, Beaumont and Cherry Valley, and

Whereas, the efforts of the International Boxing Hall of Fame on behalf of youth has been endorsed by the city council of Banning, city council of Beaumont, the Beaumont Chamber of Commerce, and interested citizens of the Pass Area and the County of Riverside, now therefore,

Be it resolved, and proclaimed, by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Riverside, State of California, in regular session assembled on June 1, 1976, that commendation is due Jim Caulfield and the International Boxing Hall of Fame for their efforts on behalf of our youth, and urges the people of the County of Riverside to encourage the efforts of this group during the 76 mile run in connection with the Annual Cherry Festival at Beaumont.

REVENUE SHARING

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased with action of the House last week in approving an extension of the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act. I have noted the success of this program in my congressional district and across the country since its enactment in 1972 and fully supported this effort to continue the sharing of Federal revenues with the State and local officials. As we are all aware, our State and local governments are facing grave financial difficulties and, in most cases, have seen revenue sharing as an attractive alternative to raising property taxes in view of the current financial problems of so many Americans.

I favored the recommendation of the administration on revenue sharing, which would have provided \$39.5 billion for a 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ -year extension. While the legislation which passed extended the program for only 3 $\frac{3}{4}$ years, granting \$25 billion in funding, I was glad, as I know the mayors and local officials will be, that efforts on the House floor to require that this assistance be subject to annual appropriations approval by Congress failed. The legislation was passed as an entitlement program, granting the cities and States the \$6.65 billion a year, and this amount may not be reduced by Congress during this 3 $\frac{3}{4}$ -year period. Unfor-

tunately, the President's recommendation for \$150 million in annual increments was not in the bill as passed by the House.

I was also pleased to see that provisions for supplemental fiscal assistance and for requiring each State to prepare and submit to the Secretary of the Treasury a master plan and timetable for modernizing and revitalizing State and local governments were deleted from the final bill as passed by the House. The proposed change in the allocation formula that would have based allotments in part on the number of families below the poverty line instead of per capita income was also fortunately stricken from the bill. Elimination of the priority categories provision of the program will allow the units of government to use funds as they determine.

I am hopeful that the Senate will follow the action of the House on this legislation, perhaps adding an amendment providing an additional \$150 million in annual increments to cover inflationary increases. I would like to see the final bill passed with the fewest possible strings and changes in the present program which has worked so well.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, discussions of crime and the need for law enforcement reflect the concerns of all of our citizens, and the bill I am introducing today is directed at improving the law enforcement capacity of the special officer and the deputy special officers, who, as employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, are responsible for law enforcement services on 123 Indian reservations in 22 States.

At the present time, the primary authority on which the actions of the officers are based is an interpretation of the Snyder Act of November 2, 1921, and Department of Interior Appropriations Acts, which while providing statutory recognition of the BIA's law enforcement functions, do not provide clearly stated and adequate authorities for those functions.

The bill I am introducing will do so. It has three important sections in this regard:

First. It provides specific statutory authority for BIA commissioned law enforcement officers to carry firearms. At the present time, this authority comes through the interpretations mentioned above.

Second. It provides clear authority for BIA law enforcement officers to make searches and arrests. At present, such authority is clearly provided only for liquor law violations and the necessary authority in all other cases again is dependent on the interpretations discussed previously.

Third. It provides express authority for the issuing of BIA law enforcement

officer commissions to tribal law enforcement officers and to State and local law enforcement officers as well. Such use of non-Federal law enforcement personnel is essential to the provision of effective law enforcement services in Indian country. Without such assistance, the BIA could not provide anywhere near a level of adequate services without a significant increase in BIA employed law enforcement personnel.

I would like to urge that this bill be given expeditious handling so that it can be enacted as soon as possible.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 92 BECOMES LAW

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today President Ford signed into law House Joint Resolution 92, a bill to improve the collection and use of census data on this Nation's 12 million citizens of Spanish origin. As a cosponsor of this measure in the 93d Congress and author of an amendment to this year's final version, I am particularly glad to see Congress act directly and affirmatively on such a complex question.

We have reached an important point with this resolution. The Federal Government has finally recognized a failure to determine accurate social and economic needs of the Spanish origin people because of its inability to make regular, nationwide evaluations of their social and economic status. House Joint Resolution 92 requires the Bureau of the Census to gather as exact and complete information on this nearly invisible segment of our population as is possible, through improved enumeration programs which show greater sensitivity to the bilingual culture of Spanish origin citizens.

A lack of vital statistics about this group of Americans has denied them equal attention of Federal policymakers and an inadequate allocation of Government resources. So, as PATRICIA SCHROEDER, the distinguished chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Census and Population stated, it was "incumbent upon us to insure that the Government is fulfilling its obligation and is carrying out its responsibility to collect accurate and complete data on all Americans."

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in recognizing the efforts of Congressman EDWARD ROYBAL and Congresswoman SCHROEDER, who as prime sponsors of House Joint Resolution 92 deserve much credit for bringing this problem to the attention of Congress and leading us to a good legislative solution.

With the passage of this measure into law, we have taken a significant step in the continuing process of understanding and addressing the real effects of benign neglect of this group of our forgotten citizens.

SWEDEN'S LIBERAL UTOPIA IS SHEER BUNK

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for years on the debate trail throughout the country, spokesmen for the American left invariably point to Sweden when put in a factual corner. How many times have I heard a debate opponent retort with "it works in Sweden" or "look at the Swedish experience" when huckstering more of their socialistic nonsense.

Even the liberal Washington Post now points out that the liberal utopia of Sweden is turning up sour. It does not work there or anywhere because the liberal's stock argument that government must have more and more power always backfires. Power brings corruption and abuse. We conservatives have known that. Centuries have proven it infallible. Too bad our liberal opponents cling to this outmoded concept.

It is the same format there. Egghead liberals and union leaders cooperate with the socialist politicians—just like in the United States. The result is disaster as this article tells. I urge my colleagues to read it.

[From The Washington Post, June 14, 1976]
DEBATE OVER BUREAUCRACY—SWEDEN TRY TO
HUMANIZE SOULLESS GOVERNMENT

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

STOCKHOLM.—When actress Bibi Andersson was hauled into a police station here last winter, she was questioned for three hours before she discovered why: her Liechtenstein corporation was suspected of tax fraud.

The police, and the tax inspectors who are supposed to remain silent, questioned her with a Kafka-like intensity, according to unpublished but authoritative reports here. Andersson was obliged to prove her innocence of a charge that had not been made.

She pleaded to telephone her child, sources say. Permission denied. She asked to call a lawyer. Which one? Her questioners asked. She named him. He wouldn't do. She proposed four more. All were turned down.

Andersson reportedly was stripped, as a guard against suicide, and put in a cell for the night. The next morning she named another lawyer who was acceptable and he had her out in 30 minutes.

Unsurprisingly, Andersson now talks of never returning to Sweden. Her friend, director Ingmar Bergman, who was taken by police from a rehearsal to explain his Swiss corporation, has already renounced his native land. The fact that it is governed by their close friend, Prime Minister Olof Palme, adds a stroke of irony.

The tax troubles of these artists and those of Astrid Lindgren, a highly successful writer of children's books, have been seized upon by Palme's foes at home and abroad to demonstrate that a soulless bureaucracy dominates the world's most advanced welfare state.

But one thing is certain: From Palme on down, Swedes have become sensitive to the problems that flow from half a million civil servants in a state of 3 million—problems that every modern society faces. There is, moreover, the beginning of a debate here over how to make the government servant a human being.

The 68-year-old Lindgren, a lively woman

with a fey sense of humor, is the creation of Pippi Longstocking, the strongest nine-year-old in the world. But even Pippi's feat of lifting her own horse is not as impressive as the force her author unleashed with a single question.

What must I pay, she asked the tax authorities, on royalties of 2 million kroner (\$450,000)?

They answered: 2.02 million, or 101 per cent.

"There aren't that many per cents," Lindgren replied, and wrote a mock fairy tale for Expressen, the biggest selling daily, to prove it.

"It was like an avalanche, Lindgren recalled in her modest apartment the other day.

She was swamped with several thousand letters and phone calls from grateful Swedes, enchanted to find a voice for their rage against government. People complained of arbitrary tax assessments, of inadequate pay for property that had been seized, of too many forms, of bureaucratic refusals to correct mistakes.

"If you call a department, every little girl at the switchboard thinks she's the government," Lindgren said indignantly.

"In my heart I am a socialist," she said. "That's why I am so depressed. They don't have as clean hands as when they started. I have voted SD (Social Democrat) for 30 years, but I can't do that anymore. With bleeding heart, I will not vote SD in September."

Sven Lundquist is a leading leftist author who reports on China and Latin America. He staunchly defends Sweden's social democracy and its civil servants, "as honest and as efficient as any in the world."

But Lundquist senses that something has gone wrong, that civil servants are too remote from the people they are supposed to serve. As a Marxist, he blames this on class. The bureaucracy, he observes, is largely drawn from upper income and better educated groups.

In his newest book, "Change of Work," he proposes a Chinese-style solution: a system encouraging and compelling officials to leave their desks for a spell of common work. A judge might become a prison guard, an Education Ministry official a teacher. This, he argues, would make bureaucrats respond more readily to those they administer, and give the working class greater influence over decision-making.

One of Sweden's most thoughtful agency chiefs, a highly regarded ex-diplomat, talks of the "arrogance of power." Bureaucratic loftiness, he thinks, reflects in part the long dominance of the Social Democrats now in power for 44 years.

He thinks the highly publicized tax cases of the artists are far from typical, but acknowledges that there "is an acute problem."

Part of it, he contends, lies in the lack of an adequate education for many. A poll showed that 1 million Swedes did not know where to turn in government when they had a problem; more than 2 million confessed they could not write a letter to a government agency.

Palme is pulled in two directions by a debate he himself is encouraging. On the one hand, he speaks of his pride in the "loyalty, independence and incorruptibility" of the civil servants who carry out the reforms he zealously pilots through the Parliament. On the other hand, he is beginning to speak out in public about the need for "a more gentle society."

He denied that the issue of bureaucratic arrogance would figure in the coming election campaign, but he readily agreed that the three notorious cases—Andersson, Bergman and Lindgren—had caught his Social Democrats off balance, provided a focus for accumulated grievances against the govern-

ment and accounted for his party's depressed standing in recent polls.

He has put one deputy minister to work on a plan transferring tasks from the central government to the regions and towns. Decentralization is a major demand of the biggest opposition group, the Center Party.

In addition, Palme has assigned a professor of linguistics to his personal office to propose simpler and more understandable government communications.

Palme, however, strongly resists any suggestion that sheer size of the bureaucracy or the number of tasks it undertakes accounts for the weight of oppression felt by ordinary citizens.

"We don't have too many, but too few bureaucrats," he insists. "They are often overloaded."

Despite the furor over bureaucratic behavior, few Swedes show any disposition to give up the world's highest living standards, most extensive welfare benefits, full employment and an economy run with such skill that it continued to expand while the rest of the West suffered a severe recession.

Even opposition political parties—apart from the Conservatives who represent a business bureaucracy—do not pose any real challenge to the far-flung civil service or the high taxes that pay for the benefits. At bottom, the opposition says simply that it will run the same things better. Unlike Norway or Denmark, no anti-tax party has emerged here.

Gosta Ekman is the chief tax collector, head of the national tax board and an unrepentant bureaucrat. He said with some smugness that "there is some credit for us in this," referring to the Andersson-Bergman-Lindgren cases.

He meant that ordinary Swedes would take pleasure in the humbling of prominent artists, a reflection of the envy that is a less pleasant side of Swedish egalitarianism.

Ekman insisted, "We must have rules. I think the Swedes would not be content without rules. They like very clear rules."

Ekman acknowledged grudgingly that the police, not his "boys," "perhaps were going too far" in carting Andersson off to jail and pulling Bergman from his rehearsal. As for Lindgren, he anomalous 101 per cent tax was the fault of politicians, not bureaucrats, who made a tax change without consulting his experts. Anyway, the Parliament was now correcting its error.

Some 167 years ago, Sweden invented an institution for citizens to bring complaints against the all-powerful authorities whom Ibsen was later to describe so vividly. The ombudsman has been copied in other nations, but now many Swedes say it is a weak instrument.

Its four judges tend to be legalistic and focus on violations of rules. They toss out six of every seven complaints presented to them and receive only about 3,000 a year.

The ombudsmen are said to be timid in the face of ultimate authority. They declined to crack down on the Swedish intelligence service when, CIA-style, it was caught spying illegally on Swedish citizens. Similarly, an ombudsman excused police who unlawfully held some children for eight hours.

Ulf Lundvik, the handsome, silver-haired chairman of the ombudsmen, said he thought "there is a risk" that he and his colleagues are too sympathetic toward the civil servants they are policing.

But he contended that it was "an exaggeration" to say his team simply supported the government.

A thoughtful outside observer would agree that Swedish civil servants are as efficient and honest as any. Honesty and efficiency, however, are not the issues. What Swedes are questioning is arrogance, high handedness and inhumane treatment. Apart from the conservatives, they are not ready to link these traits to the bureaucracy's sheer size.

OUR CITY

HON. STEPHEN L. NEAL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Marley Willard, a friend and constituent of mine in Winston-Salem, N.C., has dedicated much of her life to teaching young people. She has discovered that youngsters learn best when their interest is stimulated and she has been experimenting with techniques to motivate them—first in creative dramatics, and now with variations in that technique. She has been able to raise the reading skills of first graders to much higher levels, mainly by stimulating their interest in other areas which require that they learn to read in order to learn about the subject which has captured their fancy. By using this procedure, they learn to read rather effortlessly.

As part of one project, Mrs. Wyatt's first grade class at Brunson Elementary School in Winston-Salem prepared a book for me. In it, they describe much of what life is like in Winston-Salem, N.C. It is a fascinating volume, especially because it was done by first grade students. The text is not burdensome, and I would like to share some of these children's wisdom with my colleagues. I believe the technique used by Mrs. Willard could be used for the great benefit of children throughout our country and I commend it to my colleagues. The text of "Our City" follows:

OUR CITY

(To Congressman Neal from Mrs. Wyatt's First Grade Class, Brunson Elementary School, Winston-Salem, N.C., April 18, 1976)

CONTENTS

- A Special Thanks.
- Chapter 1: People.
- Chapter 2: Schools.
- Chapter 3: Industry.
- Chapter 4: Recreation.
- Chapter 5: Construction.
- Chapter 6: Old Salem.
- Chapter 7: Beautification.
- Chapter 8: Woods and Forests.
- A Special Thanks to:

Mr. Marvin Ward, Mayor; Franklin Shirley, The County Commissioners, The Recreation Department, The Chamber of Commerce, Mrs. Anne-Marley Willard, and Mrs. Doretha Black.

CHAPTER I—PEOPLE

(By Scott Bennett, Larry Howard, Sandra Smith)

People

We have more nice people than bad people in Winston-Salem. People make houses, grow food, and make clothes for other people. They also make schools for children to learn in. People share things with each other. God really makes things grow, but the people have to help Him by digging the holes, putting the seeds in, covering them up, and watering the plants. Some people are messy. Some people are dumb. Some people like to be bossy and silly, but most people are smart and kind to others.

There are 137,000 people living in Winston-Salem.

They do all kinds of work. There are 2,146 six year old boys, and 2,115 six year-old girls in Winston-Salem. Most children start school when they are six years old. Winston-Salem is a good place to live because

people help those who are sick or old. The black people and the white people got together, and now they are kind to each other and everybody has his own way.

If you don't already live in Winston-Salem you can come and visit with us. We will be kind to you and show you our city.

CHAPTER 2—SCHOOLS

(By Michael Dunn, Stephen Lackey, Charles Lassiter, Carlette Russell)

Schools

The schools in Winston-Salem are nice. They have trees, flowers, grass, and playgrounds. In the halls are pictures that students have drawn. The plants inside and outside are beautiful. The books for students are good to read. The children's work is nice.

The teachers teach us good things to know and help us. There are twelve grades in the public school system. There are 66 schools. 45,000 children attend those schools. There are 2,000 teachers. 405 school buses take the children to school.

We went to visit the superintendent of schools. He showed us a map of his work and Brunson School. Stephen Lackey told Mr. Ward that he fell off his bike and broke his mandible. Mr. Ward said he was sorry to hear that. We had a good time when we went to see the superintendent. He was nice to us. We would like to go see him again.

CHAPTER 3—INDUSTRY

(By Kimberly Griffin, Wendy Hanes, Keith Kadlec)

Industry

Industry is stores, buildings, and factories that make things. It helps people. It gives them food and money and room for a living. When there is lot of industry in a town, people have good places to live, things to do, plenty of food, and pretty clothes to wear. Winston-Salem has all kinds of industry. We have factories that make tobacco, beer, electrical things, and clothes. We have factory stores, radio stores, clothing and other kinds of stores. Some stores give you trees and grass seed and bug spray that kill the bugs but not the grass. If it killed the grass you wouldn't have a nice yard. It would turn brown. You can buy anything in our stores except a giraffe because his neck is too long to fit in the store. His neck would have to be bent all his life.

There are very nice jobs in Winston-Salem. But how many people can fit in Winston-Salem? If too many people came there wouldn't be enough houses unless the builders built some more. They might not have the pieces or time to do it. We had better not get any bigger because we don't have enough room.

CHAPTER 4—RECREATION

(By Elizabeth Fox, Susanna Paisley, Deava Ray)

Recreation

The parks in Winston-Salem are big and beautiful. We have a lot of fun things to play on. There are swings, slides, monkey bars, merry-go-rounds, and lots more things you can do! The whole family can go and have picnics. There are places in the parks where people can roast and cook hotdogs, and other good food. In the parks you can play golf and other sports. There are 114 softball and baseball fields, 15 golf courses, 11 swimming pools, 79 places to play tennis, and 4 bowling lanes. The Y.W.C.A. looks after you if your mother works and there is nobody to look after you at home. It has a playground for you to play on. It stops at 5:25 p.m.

There is a park across the stream from the Y.M.C.A. Three bridges go across the stream. There are table tennis courts at the Y.M.C.A. Anyone can play there. Everybody who goes to the parks and recreation centers in Winston-Salem knows they are fun and they have a good time in them!

CHAPTER 5—CONSTRUCTION

(By William Holoman, Darryl Mason, Billy Padgett, Denise Parker)

Construction

We have a nice town because the buildings are built well. We went to a hospital, and we saw people molding bricks out of mud. Then they laid one brick on top of another, they cemented them together, and made a building. They started the building by digging a hole 40 feet deep in the ground, and putting steel pipes into the ground. They did this to keep the building standing. The new building will be used for emergencies, clinics, and to keep people if they are real sick and can't go home or work. The street lights in Winston-Salem look real neat! They turn on at night and turn off real early in the morning. The street lights help people to see at night. If their car lights are burned out they won't fall off bridges or have wrecks. If some of the street lights fall down on the road they can make them over again or repair them.

Some of the buildings in Winston-Salem are old and some are new. When a building is worn out they can make it over again.

Some of the roads are old and bumpy, and some are new and have no bumps. Trucks can't pass other cars when roads are narrow.

A double yellow line in a road means you can't pass. When broken lines are on your side you can pass. We like our town because it has pretty buildings, parking lots, nice stores, and schools.

CHAPTER 6—OLD SALEM

(By Angela Crews, Cordi Rumph, Robert Wiley)

Old Salem

Once upon a time there was a place called Old Salem. They made candles, cookies, coffee, pipes, food, and thread for cloth.

Back in those days the young men built furniture when they were fourteen. The young boys and girls lived separately because if they were together it would be too squishy. The boys had lots of brothers, and the girls had lots of sisters. Old Salem is very old, but they have fixed it up so that it doesn't look old. One hundred twenty-seven people lived in Old Salem 200 years ago. Some of the people in Old Salem could not read or write so shopkeepers made pictures and hung them outside the store so people could know if they were going in the right store. The coffee pot was the sign for the tin shop. It is rusty and dried now because it is so old. The organ is in the church room, and they sang to it when someone played the organ. It was built in 1797 and brought to Old Salem from Pennsylvania. Moravians lived in Old Salem. They are old people.

To make Moravian cookies you make dough, add sugar and cinnamon, roll it out, get the cookie cutter, and cut the cookies out. Put them in the oven and let them cook. They are great!

Old Salem is a good place, and we like it. Why don't you go and visit it some time?

CHAPTER 7—BEAUTIFICATION

(By John Goodwin, Stacy Hairston, Curtis Turner)

Beautification

Our city is a pretty city. The people in Winston-Salem don't litter. They put trash in garbage cans. They keep our city clean. Our city is called the Rose city because there are roses along the highways.

Winston-Salem has a horticulturist who takes care of the roses and other flowers. New trees are planted every year. They plant grass every year. Gardens grow flowers everywhere. When the old buildings get old, raggedy, and the paint comes off, the people clean them to keep them looking nice.

Across from the County Commissioner's place are pictures on the windows. They paint pictures on the outside walls of some buildings because it makes the buildings look

pretty. The city of Winston-Salem has a flag. The colors are red, blue, white, and gold. There is a seal with the date 1849 on it.

We like the beautiful flag.

If you want a nice place to live come here and join us. We will be happy to have you with us.

CHAPTER 8—WOODS AND FORESTS

(By Christopher Brown, Tracey Keck, Eduardo Martinez)

Trees and forests

Trees are fun to look at and climb. But they are scary when wolves live in them. Woods are nice places for rabbits to live. You can find food in the woods. If you want to shoot a wolf in the woods you had better not miss, because he will come after you. There are many animals and trees in the woods. That is where they live. There are deer, rabbits, wolves, foxes, bears, snakes, squirrels, chipmunks and birds. We have many trees in Winston-Salem. The city plants trees every year to make sure that we have enough. They have somebody to take care of the trees. When trees are chopped down the wood is used for houses, furniture, firewood, and paper. If we didn't have wood life would be hard because we wouldn't be able to make this book, or have houses to live in, or places for dogs to live. Flowers on trees are the most beautiful things in the world. We get many things to eat from trees. There are apples, oranges, tangerines, bananas, nuts, peaches, pears, lemons, limes, and cherries. Some of the food that comes off trees is the very best to eat. You had better take good care of trees because if we didn't have any trees life would be really hard. Don't chop down trees because one day you may not have any food to eat and you might get in trouble.

PASSAGE OF CONGRESSMAN PEYSER AMENDMENT TO PROHIBIT PUBLIC LAW 480 SALES OF TOBACCO WOULD BE UNJUST TO AMERICAN FARMERS

HON. JOHN W. JENRETTE, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. JENRETTE. Mr. Speaker, before we rashly act upon Mr. PEYSER's proposal to eliminate tobacco from the Public Law 480 program, let us put the matter into proper perspective.

The Public Law 480 program is divided into two titles, title I being a concessional loan program, and title II comprising donations through relief agencies, the U.N., and bilateral agreements. Tobacco falls under the first category, meaning it is purchased by foreign governments according to their needs and foreign exchange capabilities.

Unlike what Mr. PEYSER would like us to believe, the U.S. Government is not cramming tobacco down the throats of foreign officials. We are not dictating tastes or personal habits. But we are serving the neighborly intentions which the program connotes, and we are assisting small American farmers expand their long-term markets abroad.

Quite frankly, I cannot think of a worse threat to our credibility than to restrict the sale of a desired item overseas simply because it has been imperially decided that the item is unworthy of foreign consumption.

In closing, I would only remind the

Members that the two governments receiving Public Law 480 sales of tobacco this year are Egypt and Syria. Beyond this very real foreign policy consideration, let us not forget those Americans here at home to whom the amendment would cause a great injustice. With tobacco prices expected to be depressed later in the season, the Public Law 480 outlet for export sales could be critical to farm income in the United States.

I urge the defeat of the gentleman's amendment.

A LOOK AHEAD

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House an attention-holding, thought-provoking speech delivered by Mr. Otis B. Burnham, president of Burnham Enterprises, Inc. The occasion was the National Furniture Warehousemen's Association's 1976 Convention. These ingenious remarks address, in part, the important issue of effective regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission, a concern which has merited careful House consideration for many months.

Mr. Burnham's speech follows:

A LOOK AHEAD

(Remarks by O. B. Burnham)

Following such an august and astute panel sure makes me feel very inadequate. When Bob Tull asked me if I would make a few comments about the future and to "take a look ahead" I was flattered and said, "Yes." So one day soon after the invitation, I took out a pencil and paper and decided to quickly write something brilliant . . . lo and behold, the paper remained blank for minutes, hours, days and it went into weeks; however, gradually little bits and pieces began to fall into place. Nothing brilliant nor earth shaking came out of it but maybe a few words about the challenge of the future, will inspire us to respond creatively to an industry that has been good to all of us and cause us to fulfill an obligation to that industry and its customers. In one of the NFWA's bulletins about the convention, they said something about a "far-out look." Well, some of the ideas may seem far out, far-fetched and in the future, but the future is like change . . . and change is the only permanent thing we have today and just like birthdays, it will come faster than you and I think. The future is just ahead.

Like Eli Whitney and his cotton gin, which I'm sure many people said could not possibly be practical. There were members in the storage industry that said there was no way to containerize household goods . . . that the old, open storage, stack it on the floor, wrap it in brown craft paper was the only way. Yet, the cotton gin made history and palletization of household effects made our industry more progressive and successful, a creative idea made practical.

At a recent American Management Association seminar on long-range planning, a comment was made that would be appropriate for our convention and the subject of these comments. Planning, as you and I see it, can be preventative medicine, and you have only to dwell on that for a short period of time to see that a look in the future will require planning today. Peter Drucker, father

of professional business management, said, "That the plan itself is really not so important. What is important is the planning process . . ." meaning those people that took the time to think and dwell and work on a plan and the advantages reaped, not necessarily of a "final plan" but the interim benefits derived from the process and thinking about the plan—the future. This might very well be where the moving and storage industry is today. The far-out look at the future is not nearly so important as the planning and thought process that the industry will go through in the next decade or two to be ready for what we think year 2000 will demand of our industry.

Think about this, dogs can't dig holes any quicker now than they did two hundred years ago, but man, through technology can surely dig holes quicker than he did two centuries ago. This technology does not necessarily advance because of public demand, but it advances because businessmen from the very beginning of the industrial revolution to the present, have marketed that technology and have marketed it profitably.

What could some of the technological changes mean to the moving and storage industry? How does this grab you?

All power units, that is the trucks and the tractors, will now be nuclear powered. They won't pull one or two trailers, they'll pull three or four trailers.

Whereas now it takes 10 or 15 minutes to properly hook up a tractor/trailer unit, hooking up in the future will be a very simple matter of driving the tractor into place under the trailer, flipping a switch and through a powerful magnet the unit is safely and completely connected.

Once the unit is hooked up, it's driven to a metropolitan air freight port and is placed in a form of air craft that whisks the tractor, trailer, driver, family, dog, furniture and car together to their destination 2,500 miles away in three hours . . . impossible, fantastic? We only have to recall the C5A and probably the C10B that will be its successor. We have only to think of the Concord supersonic airliner to remind ourselves that it is possible.

As we look deeper into this subject of "a look ahead," it becomes fairly apparent that change is the very essence of the future, the future of the moving and warehousing industry. People implement concepts, they cause change, they predict the future through planning today, not fighting change, but fostering change.

I would like to share with you now, a concept of the future, a look ahead if you will, about a specific and more sophisticated type of management and effective measurement of the results of that management that might well be implemented in the late 70's or early 80's. I'm not sure we're ready yet—maybe we are.

In a rather thought provoking management book, "New Patterns of Management" by Rensis Likert, he points out that traditionally, management is measured by end results variables, such as productivity and cost. Now we are quick to agree that there's nothing wrong with this and that we acknowledge that hierarchically controlled management can, and usually does, produce favorable and impressive results . . . for the short term, but this could very well be at the expense of the human aspects of an organization.

Hierarchically, authoritative and traditional management measures an organization's effectiveness by the end results, such as production, sales, profits, percent of net earnings to sales, etc. This is coupled with a fair amount of information about market and the company's share of that market.

Much less attention, however, is given to another class of variable, which significantly influences the end results. These variables,

seriously neglected in decades gone by, and in even the present measurements, are a challenge of the 80's. They reflect the current condition of the human investment, of the internal state of an organization, its loyalty, skills, motivations and capacity for effective interaction, communication and decisionmaking. These variables are called intervening variables and received a lot of attention and research that is stated in Likert's "New patterns of Management." Actual tests prove, that attention to the human factors pays off—for everyone.

The present practices of watching closely, only the level of performance of the end results variables, is leading to faulty conclusions as to what kinds of management and leadership yield the best results. What often confuses the situation is that pressure oriented, threatening supervision can achieve amazing and impressive, short-run results.

But what may happen is absenteeism, turnover, high-scrap content in waste baskets, excessive attention to inspection and quality control, resentment and hostility displayed by subordinates. Management may become perplexed at the higher rates of grievances and slowdown, poor production and similar disturbances . . . wondering why?

Well, what do you do about this situation? A possible solution to this dilemma would be the introduction of periodic measurements of the intervening variables to reveal the current character and quality of the human organization. Estimates or opinions of the supervisors and managers and what they think the organization's pulse is have been proven seriously and dangerously inaccurate in test after test. An organization should get a reading from the "supervisee."

Until adequate measurements of the intervening variables are regularly obtained, warehouse managers and presidents will continue to be confronted by the serious dilemma. Moreover, confusion as to the underlying causes of many developments, both favorable and unfavorable, will still reign. This concept and concern about the human factors and the intervening variables will show up in the more progressive, sophisticated and successful management of the 80's. It won't be easy—it'll take guts but the results will be reflected in the survivors and progressive companies.

Whew! After such heavy stuff, let's "blue sky" a little bit. When you think about "blue sky" you think of fate, luck, and what it's done to you—like why man blames fate for all accidents but feels personally responsible when he makes a hole in one?

The following "dreams" were fun to think about—maybe not practical . . . yet . . . but who knows—maybe some day.

All of us here today could in a very few seconds recap the steps and the activities involved in giving an estimate to move a family. But let me give you something to think about of how this might be done ten years from now. Oh, it may take fifteen, but here we go.

Of course, the quickest and simplest way to move a family in the future will be to order up the AAA Airlift Relocation Company and have their sky crane move the entire house and contents several hundred miles to its new location on a vacant lot. Rocket ship transportation to the Moon and Mars is left to the dreamers of 2050. We'll stay just this side of 21st century.

On the flip side of that record is the fact that there wouldn't be any move at all because all furniture, although extremely attractive and durable was disposable and you merely put it in the garbage compactor and get new attractive, very inexpensive furniture at the next location.

Or as in "future shock"—you don't move your furniture or family. The bread winner, man or woman, merely goes to the new location and is matched up with another family

that has the same profile as the one they started. There may be some advantages to this but it sure will be tough on the mover and warehouseman.

One other thing before we get into the routine move, is that you no longer have a great deal of packing to do because all dishes except for the very best that great, great, grandmother left the grandchildren, are disposable, and by that I mean you don't even need a dish washer, you just merely throw them in the garbage disposal and they are ground up and disposed of in that way. It sure is a blessing for everybody that doesn't like to wash and dry dishes.

The certified moving consultant's job and his challenge of giving accurate cost information on a move becomes much easier. He merely takes a small scanner and aims the optical scanner at each piece of furniture located in the house which transmits this information directly to a central processing unit, maintained by the American National Relocation Association that records the item, gives weight, comparable charges, and ultimately prints out a hard copy at a portable terminal that the CMC has with him. The CMC then turns to this portable, data processing terminal, and gets the instant information he needs: point-to-point miles, rates, reservations for the move, motel, he can even call up the realty listings, etc., all on the boob tube.

Sounds far-fetched? Not necessarily, the furniture manufacturer could very well put magnetic tapes on all pieces of furniture for ease of inventoring and weighing... similar to what they do with the packages in the grocery stores now.

Suppose, however, you don't have a scanner, well, an inventory will be done in the 1980's by a high-speed, economical Polaroid type camera that photographs all the furniture, all sides, thus eliminating the necessity of an inventory.

As the furniture is loaded on the van, a harmless and invisible spray puts a protective film on all fabrics and pieces of furniture, eliminating the need for pads, etc.

Realizing that no NFWA member ever has any damage, but just in case he might have, this means that the protective film would have been either marred or broken so when the furniture is unloaded from the rear of the trailer, a harmless ray illuminates all of this damaged area and causes a slight discoloration of the protective film applied at origin. It's pretty easy to spot and determine if the damage did occur while in the possession of the mover, and a quick, prompt settlement of that claim makes for a happy customer. Incidentally, this film disappears 48 hours after exposure to the ray beam and does not harm the air that you breathe nor the furniture it covered.

Let's leave the actual move for a minute and talk about things in general as they might appear in 1985 or early 1990's but surely by year 2000.

Since crime seems to be in the forefront these days, in this new era, you merely flip a switch and surround your entire premises, not just your house, with a security ray. Any friends wishing to visit you know about it as they have one too, and they only have to "ring the bell" and at your mere thought about seeing who is at the door, activates a picture like, three dimensional color security screen that shows you who is your visitor, on voice command the security door "opens" and your friends enter.

Inertia powered, nonpollutant and noiseless vehicles, whisk us to and from our origin and destinations over short distances through the sky, all radar controlled to prevent any type of collision. Parking is no problem, you merely put the craft in hovering position and proceed with the business of the day.

You will find laser beam controlled expressways from major metropolitan areas where your power unit and the three or four trailers that it may be pulling are locked into the laser beam and whisk it 300 miles an hour from origin to destination without drivers, to be met at the terminal by a competent van operator that makes the final delivery.

In the meantime, the family has locked itself onto a laser way, not an expressway, for a more leisurely trip, with stop options in route, and lope along at about 100 or 150 miles an hour.

There will no longer be any railroads but airrodes over which trains (that's an antiquated expression, however) travel silently and swiftly, point-to-point on $\frac{1}{4}$ of an inch of air.

Well, by now you are probably gathered that I have completely lost my mind and that these ideas are absolutely ridiculous and you're probably right.

Without giving away my age, I'm sure that it was really wierd for anyone to look at a Buck Rogers or Flash Gordon film and see images of people shown up on some ole kind of glass tube, that really was ridiculous, wasn't it? Or a crazy looking space ship skooting through space. As you reflect back, not only was it improbable that the Wright brothers thought anybody could fly it was certainly forever and perpetually impossible that they would fly faster than the speed of sound. Whoever heard of such a thing?

Did you ever think that polio could be cured or prevented?

Did you envision that a beam generated from a precious stone, such as a ruby, could develop into something they call a laser beam? On the one hand in a matter of seconds burn a hole through 6 inches of hardened steel and on the other hand perform delicate eye surgery to micromillimeter accuracy?

There were some wild ideas about sending sound through the air called radio. Some people even thought about and dreamed about sending a space ship to the moon. It was kind of ridiculous to think that they could send a message, much less a picture back from the moon, so far away. And, whoever would believe that man would walk on the moon and return safely to earth.

Twenty years ago could you have envisioned eye banks, heart and kidney transplants? Could you have even envisioned a small calculator that could do all the complicated calculations of this little instrument.

Brilliant scientists, creative individuals and people of vision caused all those things to happen. Did you know, that there are more scientists living today than have ever lived in the past—combined—so we have the potential.

Well, let's go from the ridiculous to maybe not quite so far-fetched... something to think about at a more practical but still challenging level. William Shakespeare once said... "thoughts are but dreams till their effect be tried."

I believe the business and moving executive who wants to function effectively in 1985 will have to be a very farsighted individual and who has the ability to discern that which is obvious, but to also prepare for the eventualities that may come... and they will come... like the future, much sooner than most people think. Here are some of those things for our industry leaders to think about.

Eliminate the word "can't" because the phrase, "I can't"... eliminates any effort whatsoever and it's up to us to implement progressive, creative ideas to serve our customers better.

Here are 15 "happenings" that could become a reality in 1985... or there about.

1. Total standardization of container

sizes. That's not far-fetched. Imagine what canned good manufacturers had to go through to get standard size canned goods.

2. In 1985, origin and destination agent's services by the local warehouseman who is a carrier's agent very much like 1976 but the actual transportation from origin to destination could be handled by any certificated carrier. Reservations and execution of the long haul move made "just like the old Timey Air Lines space reservations were made way back in 1976."

3. Management expertise is elevated to a much higher level for more effective sophisticated planning. More awareness of the human factors, the intervening variables mentioned earlier.

4. Since land has become so expensive, silo type storage warehouses will become a reality. Not going 2 and 3 high but 10, 20 and 30 high. All automated and retrieved by an economical "lift arrangement."

5. Local moving, now in 1985, could really mean the relocation of the entire house. The use of the sky crane may even swap houses on lots.

6. Meaningful and effective regulation by the ICC (it survived the onslaught of the threat of deregulation efforts of 1975-76 because everyone from "The Hill" to the consumer recognized the value of the ICC and what it meant to the greatest transportation system in the world). The industry really rallied for this one and convinced everyone that the efforts to retain regulation were not self-serving but public need and necessity. In their, that is those who cause things to happen, infinite wisdom, did cancel all the regulations that had been adopted prior to 1976 because of ineffective overlap, overlay and conflicting requirements. It seems that the thought of a completely new set of effective ICC regulations (particular for moving and storage companies) was suggested in 1976 and the regulatory, consumer and industry leaders started the mammoth but challenging task of writing new regulations during 1976-77. They were published in the Federal Register in 1978 and adopted in 1979. Guess we better give that a pretty high priority, shouldn't we?

7. DOD finally realizes the importance of the moving/storage services rendered to the service member world wide and assigns an Under Secretary of Defense the total responsibility for supervising and coordinating and directing of all transportation activities with military and industry representatives. He has full power and authority over all services in matters of transportation importance and is the final word. This Under Secretary is a shirt-sleeve position of hard work, day-to-day involvement and direction. He works directly with a military/industry panel at policy and implementation levels.

8. The General Accounting Office recognizes that costs involved in moving are not just direct dollars and cents by the "total relocation process and cost", including but not limited to, quality service, making service members happier, more willing to relocate. GAO believes in this so strongly they recommended to Congress and they passed the law that quality service is the prime responsibility and cost is second in priority. This is supported by their approval of CERS IV that became effective in 1980 giving emphasis to quality service. GAO further recognized that service members were not trained in, nor expected, nor permitted to move themselves. That they were military men trained to serve their country, and for that dedication, were entitled to and will receive quality, professional moving and storage service provided by an equally dedicated moving and storage industry.

9. On board weighing devices perfected and used during the interim time between 1976 and 1979. This on board weighing device becomes obsolete before 1980 because of changes

in the methods of determining costs involved in relocation.

10. Estimating completely changed over to a science and not an art. This switch came about because a group of industry leaders working with consumer groups came up with an entirely unique and "never thought of" way to determine charges for relocation services and gained unanimous ICC support.

11. The general public now insists on discussing their relocation plans only with certified moving consultants.

12. Could you believe this... and believing could make it so, that there was one American National Relocation Association and under this organization a common board of directors with the various divisions that has as their responsibilities, areas such as tariffs, warehousing, local moving, long distance moving, relocation services, research and development, and management development. Wow, that's a wild one, isn't it? Probably many obstacles why it wouldn't work... things like antitrust, pride, change, all of the obstacles that we see impairing these achievements, are just the horrible things we see when we take our eyes off of that goal. A goal so worthwhile that we should not let anything stand in our way. It's about as wild an idea as some folks had around Williamsburg back in the 1770's. It took them quite awhile to put that one together, didn't it? Wonder how long it will take us to, not look at the "excuses" as why it won't work, but to look at the advantages it offers when it does become a reality. And it can.

13. Now, since the industry has "seen the light" and have grouped under one legally constituted umbrella association, one of the very first significant benefits that shows up is the tremendous impact such a vast association has on anything, but especially in Washington. Can you imagine the influencing leadership and direction that could come from this association when every warehouseman and his people, every carrier and his people, all from virtually every point in the postal guide, is motivated to drop a line to Washington? Well, this was recognized and in 1984 a significant legislative proposal was introduced into Congress and passed. The crystal ball wasn't clear what this was exactly... just that the industry finally took the offensive, and aggressive posture, rather than continuing the defensive one it had maintained since its inception.

14. Peace restored to the world, no through detente, strength, or threat, co-existence nor reprisal but by prayer, to the One from whom all things flow. It was finally recognized that capitalism without God, is just any other "ism."

15. An outstanding, intellectually proficient person of the highest moral standards, loyal to no party only to the country they are to serve, elected by an overwhelming majority of all votes cast by a write-in ballot and this person becomes... the first lady president of the United States... incidentally, she was born and raised in a small town in west, central Georgia.

Now that we have reflected on some of the things that have happened and some of the things that could happen, let me mention just a few that have not yet been resolved in this year, 1986.

1. You still have to wait for your luggage at destination.

2. The tires on whatever type vehicle you are using, still won't last over 12,000 miles. Excuse me, that's 19,308 kilometers.

3. Ladies' stockings still run the second time they are worn.

4. Light bulbs still burn out about every month or month and a half.

5. After dinner speakers continue to show up.

6. Although you have arrived at a destination by some sophisticated means, it still takes you 35 minutes to check into the hotel and 30 minutes to check out.

7. Buttons still come off at the wrong time and at the wrong place.

8. Within one millisecond from the time the light turns green, the fellow behind you will still blow his horn.

In conclusion, let me leave you with a thought provoking definition of creativity by Jack Taylor, because we in the moving and storage industry have before us the "look ahead", a challenge and a responsibility to be creative in our plans for the future. Creativity, as defined by Taylor is... "The imaginatively gifted, recombination of known elements into something new..."

All of these comments can be summed up in just four words: "Hang in there baby!"

PASTORAL LETTERS

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, in April of this year a number of distinguished members of the clergy issued a pastoral letter regarding our past involvement in Vietnam, and our continuing responsibilities toward healing the wounds of that terrible war. This pastoral letter is a powerful reminder to all of us that we cannot run away from our responsibility to our fellow human beings, regardless of their race or nationality, who were victimized by that long and devastating war.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this letter, along with the names of the signers, into the RECORD:

NEW YORK, April, 1976.

You shall not take vengeance or bear any grudge against the children of your own people. You shall love your neighbor as yourself.
—Leviticus 19: 18.

For more than 30 years Viet Nam has suffered the destruction of a merciless war. For the past 10 years that same war has caused pain and division within our own nation.

We now celebrate the first anniversary of peace in Viet Nam on April 30. We rejoice that people are returning to the land to till their rice fields once again. Reconstruction is in progress and reunification of families has begun. Viet Nam is at one and at peace!

Yet the pain and division of the war continues. Our government maintains its refusal even to recognize Viet Nam, a step which would begin to normalize diplomatic and cultural relations between our two peoples.

Our country, which was so unmerciful in destruction, must be generous in rebuilding. Land mines still explode as farmers plow their fields and bomb craters pockmark the paddy land. Bubonic plague, malaria, and tuberculosis add new victims as the legacy of war continues. Factories bombed; whole towns destroyed.

We call upon our government to meet Vietnamese requests for medicine, agricultural needs and industrial equipment. A government willing to spend \$150 billion on destruction should be willing to spend two percent as much on rebuilding.

More than one million American sons and daughters are still penalized for their opposition to the war in Viet Nam. Veterans with less than honorable discharges: 792,500; draft violators: 10,000; non registrants: 1-2 million; civilian war protestors: unknown; AWOL still at large: 25,000. Many are denied jobs because of bad discharges, others remain in exile.

The time has come to bind up the wounds of war and division both at home and with

Viet Nam. We appeal to the President and the Congress to carry out the healing task of reconciliation.

RECOGNIZE VIET NAM—HELP RECONSTRUCT VIET NAM

Grant full amnesty to all war resisters. And, we say to ourselves: Our past caution and inaction were factors in the escalation of the war in southeast Asia. We confess this grievous fault and ask forgiveness—forgiveness from God, and also from His children victimized by our timidity. We dare not, by perpetuating a feeble witness, neglect the needs of the Vietnamese and our own people. We pray for new insight and fresh courage to act within ourselves and through our communities to heal the spiritual and physical wounds still remaining from that long and painful war.

SIGNERS OF APRIL 1976 PASTORAL LETTER

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

Bishop James Armstrong, Methodist, The Dakotas.

John C. Bennett, President Emeritus, Union Theological Seminary.

Rev. Daniel J. Berrigan, S. J.

Peggy Billings, Women's Division, United Methodist Church.

Eugene Carson Blake, Former General Secretary, World Council of Churches.

Malcolm Boyd, Episcopal Priest & Author.

Rabbi Balfour Brickner, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Rev. John Fairman Brown, Ecumenical Peace Institute, San Francisco.

Dr. Robert McAfee Brown, Union Theological Seminary.

Bishop John H. Burt, Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Ohio.

Rev. William Sloane Coffin, Jr.

Wallace T. Collett, Chairman of the Board, American Friends Service Committee.

Dr. Harvey Cox, Professor, Harvard Divinity School.

John J. Dougherty, Auxiliary Bishop of Newark.

Martin L. Deppe, United Methodist Pastor, Chicago; Board of Directors CALC.

Lloyd A. Duren, Pastor, St. Mark's United Methodist Church, Brooklyn.

Rev. Richard Fernandez, Institute for World Order, Inc.

H. Lamar Gible, Peace and International Affairs Consultant, World Ministries Commission, Church of the Brethren General Board.

Jim Gittings, Presbyterian Editor, A.D. Magazine.

Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, Archdiocese of Detroit.

Donald Harrington, Minister, The Community Church of New York.

Rabbi Charles D. Lippman, Pearl River, N.Y.

Don Luce, Director, Clergy and Laity Concerned.

Rev. Paul Mayer, Theologian.

Rt. Rev. Paul Moore, Jr., Episcopal Bishop of Diocese of N.Y.

Rev. Robert V. Moss, President, United Church of Christ.

Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, Unitarian Church of Chicago.

Dr. Paul McCleary, Director, Church World Service.

Vern Prehehn, Asia Director, Mennonite Central Committee.

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler, President, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Michael A. Robinson, Rabbi, Temple Israel of Northern Westchester, N.Y.; Chairman, Committee on Justice & Peace, Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Bishop Walter J. Schoenherr, Auxiliary Bishop Archdiocese of Detroit.

A. Finley Schaefer, minister, Park Slope United Methodist Church, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Joel K. Thompson, Assoc. Gen. Sec. Gen. Board, Church of the Brethren.

Donald W. Shriver, President, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Dr. Dorothee Söle, Professor, Union Theological Seminary.

Eugene L. Stockwell, Assoc. General Secretary for Overseas Ministries, National Council of Churches.

Sister Mary Luke Tobin, Church Women United.

Dr. George Webber, President, New York Theological Seminary.

Dr. Charles West, Professor of Christian Ethics, Princeton Theological Seminary.

Rabbi Arnold Wolf, Hillel Foundation, Yale University.

Dr. Robert Nelson West, Pres. Unitarian-Universalist Assoc.

WILL THE CARRIER FOLLOW THE BATTLESHIP INTO THE ARCHIVES?

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year 1977 defense appropriations bill, H.R. 14262, will be considered by the full House tomorrow. Included in this bill of almost \$106 billion is \$350 million for the funding of long leadtime items for our next aircraft carrier.

In the administration's original defense budget request this year money for an additional aircraft carrier was not requested. However, the Armed Services Committee independently added this funding in its authorization bill passed last April by the House. At that time, an attempt by my colleague Mr. Hicks to delete the funding from the authorization bill failed by a very narrow margin. This same question will be put to the House once again tomorrow.

The main reason for removing this \$350 million item from the fiscal year 1977 budget is this: A full review of the usefulness of the aircraft carrier—and its optimum size—has yet to be completed. Many questions remain about the vulnerability and overall usefulness of the carrier in the years to come. These questions should be answered before we begin funding of a carrier likely to cost more than \$17 billion before its life is through. This is a lot of money; sums like this should not be approved lightly.

The aircraft carrier has been the mainstay of our fleet since World War II. In view, the carrier has served the interests of this country well since that time. But the question facing us today is whether the present *Nimitz*-class of carrier will continue to be as suitable for our future needs. Technological advances will be posing new threats to our carriers in the years to come.

Our decision this year is made especially significant by the magnitude of the money involved here. The total 35-year life cycle cost of just one additional *Nimitz*-class carrier and its air group is, according to figures supplied by the Navy, more than \$17.5 billion. Furthermore,

we are not only considering replacing one of our carriers; we are faced with a need to replace eight of our aging *Forrestal* carriers. Before we commit ourselves to the spending of such sums, we must establish whether the investment is truly justified.

The present debate over the usefulness of the aircraft carrier brings to mind a similar debate which raged between the First and Second World Wars. At that time, the Navy was faced with the decision over whether the battleship had outlived its utility as the Navy's capital ships and whether, in fact, the new concept of the aircraft carrier would completely revise future naval warfare. The U.S. Navy position at that time was that the battleship was, and would continue to be, the mainstay of our naval power. They were, of course, wrong. However, the Navy tendency to continue their allegiance to a proven concept even though new circumstances may have made the traditional approach obsolete may once again be behind the Navy's all-out commitment to bigger and better supercarriers.

As we now know, the Navy was wrong in its commitment to the battleship. The mistake in judgment at that time was not, however, fatal. Back in those days, we had enough time—boosted by the buffer of two oceans—to recover from any mistakes once they were discovered. This is not the case anymore.

I can quite honestly say that I am not absolutely certain that a decision to continue our plans for our next aircraft carrier would be a mistake of the same serious magnitude as the loyalty which typified our relationship with the battleship. I am certain, however, that the serious questions raised about problems which may be plaguing the carrier in the future have not been satisfactorily answered.

The naval affairs specialist at the Library of Congress has recently reviewed the historical record of the battleship debate. His paper, "Conditions That Led to the Tactical Obsolescence of Battleships" is well worth the attention of my colleagues. The paper raises the possibility that the use of missiles at sea just might change naval history as drastically as the introduction of the airplane at sea did during World War II. The result would have serious implications for the future vulnerability of the aircraft carrier itself.

This issue should be a critical consideration in any decision to continue production of *Nimitz*-class carriers. I think that my colleagues will find the discussion most useful.

The issue of changing threats at sea that will be facing the carriers in the future should be a critical consideration in any decision to continue production of *Nimitz*-class carriers. I think that my colleagues will find the discussion most useful.

The paper follows:

CONDITIONS THAT LED TO THE TACTICAL OBSCURITY OF BATTLESHIPS

During the interwar years (1918-1941), a continuing debate took place in the United States between advocates of battleships and those who believed that aircraft carriers would be the most effective fighting ships

in future wars. The debate was intense in 1920-1922, prior to the Washington disarmament conference. Thereafter, with the size and composition of the U.S. Navy controlled by treaty, the controversy was muted but did not die. Naval ship construction fell behind treaty limits and the fleet aged considerably after 1922.

In 1934, Congress passed the Vinson-Trammell Act which authorized new naval construction to increase and modernize the fleet within the limits prescribed by the treaties. Subsequent amendments and associated naval appropriations resulted in the construction of ten fast battleships in accordance with provisions of this act, prior to and early in World War II. These new battleships were used during World War II primarily as escorts for the fast carriers which came to replace the battleships as the backbone of the fleet.

This paper outlines the capabilities that made battleships the primary ships of the world's navies and identifies the factors that led to their tactical obsolescence. Appendix I contains the background material for the report and should be consulted for a more complete understanding of the matters discussed in this paper.

BATTLESHIPS DEVELOPED AS GUN SHIPS

Warships achieve their purpose by applying force, or the threat of force, against enemy ships or shore installations. Weapons used have varied throughout history. Early warships were platforms for seagoing soldiers who needed to get close enough to board the enemy ship or to land and attack his installations on foot.

The ram bow and early devices that hurled projectiles, including flaming liquids, began to alter this form of sea warfare. The invention of firearms accelerated the change. At the time of the Spanish Armada, British gunnery proved an effective alternative to boarding, but boarding and capture was regarded as an essential naval capability well into the 19th century. But that time, guns had become the primary ship-based weapons.

The "automobile" torpedo, introduced prior to World War I, provided a potential alternative to the naval gun for sea battles but not for use against land targets. After that war the gravity bomb, delivered by aircraft, became a promising weapon for use against naval targets at sea or ashore.

Battleships were the most advanced warships developed to employ naval guns. They became the backbone of the world's navies after the defeat of the Spanish Armada and remained so until World War II when aircraft carriers superseded them as the principal offensive warships. A discussion of the capabilities important to winning naval battles, and how these capabilities were embodied in battleships, will be helpful in understanding the tactical advantages which eventually permitted carriers to replace them.

CAPABILITIES IMPORTANT TO WINNING SEA BATTLES

Superior range and firepower of offensive weapons, mobility, and defensive strength are important to winning sea battles.

Superior range and firepower² of offensive weapons convey the ability to destroy an enemy before he can begin to retaliate. Ships with shorter-range weapons can be attacked with impunity unless the battle closes to a range where their inferior capability can be used.

Mobility means speed and endurance (cruising radius). Superior speed enables the ship to engage or disengage at will, and to choose the most favorable battle scene and direction from which to attack unless restricted endurance interferes.

Footnotes at end of article.

Defensive strength includes agility, defensive firepower, and passive features such as armor and interior compartmentation designed to limit damage caused by enemy action. Agility is helpful in evading the enemy's retaliatory efforts. Defensive firepower is not necessarily the same as offensive firepower; the big gun that destroys enemy ships and reinforced concrete shore fortifications is not always the best weapon against attacking aircraft, small craft or submarines. As is true in the offensive case, the advantages of longer-ranged weapons is important.

Ships can be passively hardened against damage by extensive interior compartmentation³ and by the installation of armor plates on both vertical and horizontal surfaces. These forms of passive defense have been highly developed and are effective, but they detract from speed and agility, are costly to install, and create difficulties when it becomes necessary to perform major repairs or alterations to equipment installed within the armored citadel.

BATTLESHIPS OPTIMIZED FOR WINNING GUN BATTLES

The fast new battleships available to the world's principal sea powers in World War II were optimized for gun battles in the following ways: Their 9 or more 18-inch guns could shoot over 20 miles and deliver enough firepower to ensure quick destruction. They were fast enough to keep up with other fleet units in all but the calmest seas and could outrun most smaller ships in moderate weather.⁴ They were heavily armored and had excellent compartmentation, were equipped with the best defensive gun batteries in the fleet, and were highly maneuverable. Battleship endurance was great enough not to be a consideration under ordinary circumstances.

In a gun battle, no other ship was a match for the battleship. However, battleships were superseded by aircraft carriers as the principal offensive units of their navies because planes possessed superior tactical capabilities over guns.

TACTICAL SUPERIORITY OF AIRPLANES OVER GUNS

Aircraft speeds were far greater than the speed of any ship, and by the beginning of World War II their endurance was adequate to permit sustained engagements provided that a nearby base was available. Carriers were mobile airbases that insured the sustained availability of air power. Aircraft could deliver bombs and torpedoes to ranges well beyond the 20 mile range of a battleship's guns. The aircraft carrier could remain safely outside retaliatory range while launching attacks.

Although highly vulnerable when hit, the agility of the aircraft made it a difficult target for the rudimentary antiaircraft weapons installed in ships at the beginning of the war. Ultimately air defenses were devised that effectively defended fleet units against all but the most determined attacks (by Kamikaze pilots and guided munitions). By that time the airplane was recognized as a superior offensive weapon and the fast new battleships with their fine defensive armament were principally employed to defend aircraft carriers against air attack.⁵

Although the carrier had less integral defensive power than the battleship, the relative vulnerability of the two types of ship to enemy attack did not prevent the shift to the aircraft carrier. In retrospect, it is apparent that the primary tactical advantage of the aircraft carrier over the battleship was the much greater distance at which its payload could be delivered to the target. This advantage had been recognized in 1921. (See the testimony of Admiral W. S. Sims in Appendix I.)

POTENTIAL FUTURE CHANGES

The principal tactical weakness of the airplane is its vulnerability when hit. During

and after World War II, fleet air defense weapons and tactics became increasingly effective. The proximity fuse was a technological triumph.⁶ Guided missiles were developed. The use of radar and digital computers for raid detection, fighter direction, and control of defensive fire became accepted practice. Air defense tactics were worked out that coordinated the efforts of a group of ships with those of the carrier's protective aircraft to achieve an effective defense for the entire force. These measures inhibited penetration to the target with gravity bombs and short-range torpedoes, and prompted efforts to develop weapons for aircraft which could be fired from outside the defensive perimeter. The production of glide bombs and guided missiles responded to this need.

Missiles can be fired from ships and submarines as well as from airplanes, and this raises the possibility that use of manned aircraft to transport ordnance to the target, or even part way to the target, may be curtailed in future in favor of missile-delivered ordnance for some missions. Submarine-launched ballistic missiles have already replaced carrier aircraft as the U.S. Navy's primary weapon for the strategic mission. Whether a similar shift will occur in general purpose force missions remains to be seen.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Early "torpedoes" were not self-mobile. They were either moored in seaways, like today's mines, or attached to small craft (sometimes on a long pole) and rammed into the side of their intended victim. The invention of the automobile torpedo, driven by small steam engines, was a major evolutionary step for this weapon.

² Firepower is a measure of the number of targets that can be effectively engaged by a particular weapon system or the combination of weapon systems in a ship, or group of ships, in a specified period.

³ If the interior of a ship is "honeycombed" with watertight compartments, battle damage that opens the skin of the ship results in only limited flooding.

⁴ However, most first-line aircraft carriers were faster than battleships.

⁵ Availability of battleships in carrier task groups also insured that the carrier would be defended against enemy battleships and other surface warships if they came close enough to be a threat.

⁶ Proximity-fused projectiles were designed to explode at, or near, their closest approach to the target. Their invention was a significant advance over earlier time-fused projectiles which depended on very precise measurements of range to the target and exact knowledge of its course and speed, information very hard to acquire under battle conditions against a maneuvering airplane.

APPENDIX I—PUBLIC RECORD AND PROFESSIONAL JOURNAL ARTICLES CONCERNING THE DEBATE OVER THE FUTURE OF BATTLESHIPS

Hearings Before the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives on Sundry Legislation Affecting the Naval Establishment, 1920-1921. 66th Congress, 3rd Session. (Extracts)

Naval Appropriation Bill, 1922. Hearing Before the Subcommittee of House Committee on Appropriations. 66th Congress, 3rd Session. Pp. 933-938.

"The Battleship and the Junk Heap," *Scientific American*, April 16, 1921.

"Case of the Airplane Against the Battleship," *The New York Times Book Review and Magazine*, August 28, 1921.

"Bomber versus Battleship," *The American Army and Navy Journal*, February 25, 1922.

"The Battleship," *United States Naval Institute Proceedings*, May 1938.

"Battleships," *United States Naval Institute Proceedings*, August 1940.

"The Genesis of the Modern U.S. Navy," *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, March 1966.

Vinson-Trammell Act, 1934. P.L. 73-135. 73rd Congress, 2nd Session.
Naval Construction Act, 1938. P.L. 75-528. 75th Congress, 3rd Session.

LETTERS ON ENERGY ACTION

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I attempted to insert in the RECORD the Federal Energy Administration's transmittal letters on energy actions Nos. 3 and 4, an amendment to the FEA price and allocation regulations which would exempt middle distillates— heating oil, diesel fuel, and kerosene— from price and allocation controls. Unfortunately, the second transmittal letter was not printed in the RECORD.

Therefore, I ask that both letters be inserted at this time so that my colleagues will be aware of the FEA action. I urge each of you to give careful consideration to these energy actions and the supporting documents that should have arrived in your office today. The House has until June 30 to act to disapprove such action if that is the wish of this body.

The letters follow:

FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., June 15, 1976.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Re: Exemption of Middle Distillates (Other Than No. 2 Heating Oil and No. 2-D Diesel Fuel) from the Mandatory Petroleum Allocation and Price Regulations (Energy Action No. 4).

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On April 21, 1976, the Federal Energy Administration gave notice of a proposal to exempt No. 1 heating oil, No. 1-D diesel fuel, kerosene and other middle distillates from the Mandatory Petroleum Allocation and Price Regulations and to revoke Part 215 (Low Sulphur Petroleum Products Regulation). Written comments from interested persons were invited through May 11, 1976, and a public hearing regarding the proposal was held on May 12 and 13, 1976.

FEA has now completed its consideration of all the information available in this proceeding and has determined that the proposal to exempt middle distillates should be adopted and that Part 215 should be revoked. As required by section 455 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, Pub. L. 94-163 (EPCA), which added section 12 to the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973, as amended (EPAA), each amendment exempting a refined product category from regulation must be submitted separately to each House of the Congress for review pursuant to section 551 of the EPCA.

FEA is, therefore, herewith submitting the amendment revoking Part 215 and exempting No. 1 heating oil, No. 1-D diesel fuel and kerosene (which are defined in the EPCA as a single product category) to the House of Representatives, and is concurrently submitting this amendment to the Senate, for Congressional review. By Energy Action No. 3, FEA is separately submitting to each House of Congress an amendment exempting the other middle distillates (No. 2 heating oil and No. 2-D diesel fuel), which are defined in the EPCA as a separate refined product category, for review pursuant to section 551 of the EPCA.

June 16, 1976

The findings and views supporting this amendment, which are required by section 455 of the EPCA, are set forth in the enclosed document entitled "Findings and Views Concerning the Exemption of Middle Distillates from the Mandatory Petroleum Allocation and Price Regulations".

The Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration has been delegated by the President all the authority granted to him by the EPAA (E.O. 11790, 39 F.R. 23185, June 27, 1974).

Unless disapproved by the Congress as provided by section 551 of the EPCA, the enclosed amendment will be effective July 1, 1976 or on the first day following expiration of the review period provided for by Section 551 of the EPCA, whichever is later.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. HILL,
Acting Administrator.

FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., June 15, 1976.

Re Exemption of No. 2 Heating Oil and No. 2-D Diesel Fuel from the Mandatory Petroleum Allocation and Price Regulations (Energy Action No. 3).

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On April 21, 1976, the Federal Energy Administration gave notice of a proposal to exempt No. 2 heating oil, No. 2-D diesel fuel and other middle distillates from the Mandatory Petroleum Allocation and Price Regulations and to revoke Part 215 (Low Sulphur Petroleum Products Regulation). Written comments from interested persons were invited through May 11, 1976, and a public hearing regarding the proposal was held on May 12 and 13, 1976.

FEA has now completed its consideration of all the information available in this proceeding and has determined that the proposal to exempt middle distillates should be adopted and that Part 215 should be revoked. As required by section 455 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, Pub. L. 94-163 (EPCA), which added section 12 to the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973, as amended (EPAA), each amendment exempting a refined product category from regulation must be submitted separately to each House of the Congress for review pursuant to section 551 of the EPCA.

FEA is, therefore, herewith submitting the amendment revoking Part 215 and exempting No. 2 heating oil and No. 2-D diesel fuel, which are defined in the EPCA as a single refined product category, to the House of Representatives, and is also concurrently submitting the amendment to the Senate for Congressional review. By Energy Action No. 4, FEA is separately submitting to each House of Congress an amendment exempting the other middle distillates (No. 1 heating oil, No. 1-D diesel fuel and kerosene), which are defined in the EPCA as another refined product category, for review pursuant to section 551 of the EPCA.

The findings and views supporting this amendment, which are required by section 455 of the EPCA, are set forth in the enclosed document entitled "Findings and Views Concerning the Exemption of Middle Distillates from the Mandatory Petroleum Allocation and Price Regulations".

The Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration has been delegated by the President all the authority granted to him by the EPCA (E.O. 11790, 39 F.R. 23185, July 27, 1974).

Unless disapproved by the Congress as provided by section 551 of the EPCA, the enclosed amendment will be effective July 1, 1976 or on the first day following expiration

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of the review period provided for by Section 551 of the EPCA, whichever is later.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. HILL,
Acting Administrator.

SELF-STYLED CONSUMERIST ASSAILS BUSINESS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, little by little the bark is starting to peel off of the Nader image. Like most things in politics, he is 90 percent image and 10 percent substance. As the substance is becoming better known, Americans are waking up.

Only yesterday we saw an example on the floor of a Member who became an instant expert in floor control and public works. He evidently took the Nader short course. You know you can take that and know about everything from bridges to gas mains to nuclear generating facilities.

This article by George C. Roche III which appeared in Human Events is quite revealing and should be read by all Members of this body who still think there is something in the 10-percent substance of Ralph Nader.

SELF-STYLED CONSUMERIST ASSAILS BUSINESS
(By George C. Roche III)

A recent Center for Constructive Alternatives seminar at Hillsdale College featured an examination of government regulation and its effects on American society. One of the speakers appearing as a part of the program was Ralph Nader. The invitation to Mr. Nader was in keeping with the CCA belief that the best means of sorting out the most (and the least) constructive alternatives on any issue is by providing a forum for widely differing views.

The Nader appearance provided a convincing demonstration of just how constructive his policy recommendations are likely to prove. Despite receiving and agreeing to the standard instructions for a CCA speaker—a 50-minute lecture followed by a 20-minute question period—Nader chose to hold forth a speech of nearly two hours before the questions ever began. Perhaps he needed more than double the usual time to inject all of the hit-and-run, partially examined innuendoes and half-truths on which his case depends.

To correct all the factual and logical errors which were advanced in those two hours would take more time than the original Nader speech. It is always easier to hit-and-run than to explore in depth. But there are several basic questions which should be answered. Some of those questions were raised in the question period following the lecture, but with wholly inadequate time for systematic analysis. Nader made comments which cried out for refutation.

For example, Nader made much of the "empirical" basis for his position, implying a cool, objective approach deeply grounded in the "facts" and the "latest findings." Yet he cited examples of "corporate power," especially the instance of John D. Rockefeller and Standard Oil which have been totally refuted in carefully documented historical studies available for years.

18785

Professors Ralph and Muriel Hidy of Columbia University studied the business records of Standard Oil and its competitors and demolished the "robber baron" thesis in their pioneering work over a decade ago. The work of the Hydys is the accepted work on the subject within the historical profession. Yet Nader ignores the existence of such material and trots out the old false charges, telling us all the while that he is dealing in "facts" and the "latest findings."

As another case in point, Nader makes much of the interest groups, noncompetition and special privilege which exist when the power of the regulatory state is used to favor some at the expense of others. All of the Nader examples are drawn from the corporate community, displaying a remarkable tunnel vision which conveniently ignores the abuses of government power which have grown from other special-interest groups.

Special interests are bred by government power as different groups struggle to exercise that power for their own purposes. Today we have not merely one, but many such special-interest groups, embracing not only the corporate community but education, the professions, welfare groups, local governments, state governments and every group of would-be beneficiaries out to use political power to their own advantage.

Nowhere has that political power been more abused than in two areas which Nader never mentions: labor and the bureaucracy itself. The empire-building, special privilege and abuse of the consumer within organized labor and within the regulatory agencies themselves are widespread, yet do not seem to concern Mr. Nader at all.

In his highly selective approach to the misuse of political power, Nader does great harm to the truth. We share Mr. Nader's concern that political power and government regulation have done so much damage to this country. We deny special privilege wherever it appears, but these are arguments against the granting of such great regulatory power—for any purpose.

Nader wishes us to believe that all will be well if we grant vast political powers to those who share his vision of society. Are we really to assume that Ralph Nader will prove an incorruptible and infallible regulator of our affairs? Is it possible that Nader's Raiders and their bureaucratic allies do not share the human frailties of the rest of us?

Nader's advocacy of vast governmental authority for regulatory agencies is based on the argument that such powers have always been abused. That is the best possible argument for suggesting, not that those powers should be increased, but that they should be sharply reduced or eliminated.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present in the House of Representatives for the session of June 14, 1976, due to a tornado which caused widespread disaster in my congressional district, and which made it necessary to remain there on that day. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on roll-call No. 367, which would prohibit funds appropriated in H.R. 14261 to be used in the IRS informer program. I would have voted "aye" on roll-call No. 368, which

June 17, 1976

would withhold 5 percent of the total budget authority under H.R. 14261 for payments not required by law.

I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 369, which would prohibit the use of IRS funds appropriated under H.R. 14261 for compiling and making public records of contacts made by members of Congress with respect to matters pending before the IRS. I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 370, the vote on final passage of H.R. 14261, the Treasury, Postal Service and general Government appropriation bill for fiscal year 1977.

I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 371, the vote on the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 14114, which would temporarily increase the public debt limit. I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 372, the vote on final passage of H.R. 14114.

Finally, on the following amendments to H.R. 6218, the Outer Continental Shelf

Lands Act Amendments of 1976, I would have voted "no" on rollcall numbers 374, 375 and 376.

LITHUANIA

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, as we in America near the observance of our 200th anniversary as a free Nation, it is appropriate that we pause amid our celebration and give some thought to those in the world who bear the burdens of tyranny and oppression.

Just 36 years ago, on June 15, the proud little nation of Lithuania was occupied by the Soviet Union and incor-

porated into their Communist country. Destruction of the free Government of Lithuania was followed by dispersal of many of its people. Many went to Siberia because of their forthright opposition to the shackles of the Communist form of government.

This anniversary is a rueful event for the thousands of Americans of Lithuanian descent, who still keep alive the dream that their homeland shall one day again be aglow with the light of freedom.

It should, also, be a reminder to all of us who enjoy the blessings of liberty that we must maintain eternal vigilance in a world harboring aggression and inhabited by many who are ill-disposed toward our Republic. It is appropriate that the House remember the date of Lithuania's fall, and that we use this occasion to rededicate ourselves to the support of freedom around the world.

SENATE—Thursday, June 17, 1976

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

PRAYER

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

Eternal Father, in whom we live and move and have our being, before whom the generations rise and pass away, we quiet our hearts in reverent remembrance of the emissaries of this Nation whose lives have been taken in the rampant violence of this age. O God of all comfort, be near to all their loved ones, assuaging their grief and comforting their hearts.

We thank Thee for devotion, even unto death, of those in far-flung foreign posts across the Earth who serve this Nation and the peace of the world. Be with them and their families in times of loneliness and isolation.

Into our hearts send Thy peace and with peace give us power and wisdom. When times are tense and the days are heavy with work, keep our hearts in tune with Thee lest we miss the sudden insight, the clear perception, the moment of high vision. Reward our labor with the inner satisfaction of doing our best in Thy strength.

We pray in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 16, 1976, be dispensed with.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar under "New Report."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be stated.

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert L. Martin, of Illinois, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

WAIVER OF SECTION 402(a) OF CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—CONSIDERATION OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 203

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 468. This has been cleared all the way around.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That pursuant to section 402(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the provisions of section 402(a) of such Act are waived with respect to the consideration of S.J. Res. 203. Such waiver is necessary be-

cause S. 2657, the Education Amendments of 1976, which was reported to the Senate on May 14 (Report No. 94-882), will not be enacted into law by June 30, 1976. S.J. Res. 203 is necessary to continue the authority of the Commissioner of Education to insure loans under the Guaranteed Student Loan Program during the Transition Quarter and to continue the Emergency Insured Student Loan Act of 1969 for the same period.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Without objection, the resolution (S. Res. 468) was considered and agreed to.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 905, Senate Joint Resolution 203.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated. The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 203) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 203) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 203

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Emergency Technical Provisions Act of 1976".

SEC. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 424 (a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and for the period beginning July 1, 1976, and ending September 30, 1976".

(b) Section 428(a)(5) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1975" and